South Asia

Choose certainty.
Add value.

Initial Certification Report

INITIAL CERTIFICATION OF THE CARBONFIX STANDARD PROJECT: ”PROJECT TOGO”

REPORT NO. 600500930

4 December 2014

Report No.	Date of first issue	Revision No.	Revision Date	Certificate No.
600500930	05 November 2014	2	4 December 2014	
Validity of the Report until: 24 November 2019				

Subject: Initial Certification of a CarbonFix Project version 3.2

Accredited TÜV SÜD Unit:

TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd., Certification Body “Environment and Energy”,
Environmental Technology, Carbon Management Service
Solitaire, I.T.I. Road, Aundh, Pune- 411007, INDIA

Project Developer / **Project Participant (PP):** natureOffice GmbH Friedrich-Ebert-Str. 1 55257 Budenheim am Rhein Germany	**Project Site(s):** The project area consists of 2 parcels covering a total area of 809 ha out of that 738 ha are potentially eligible. Presently 80 ha are eligible planting area. The project is located in the Prefecture Agou, Plateaux Region in the republic of Togo, West Africa. The PDD includes information on geographic boundary. Digital boundary files are provided by the PP.

Project Title: Project Togo
CarbonFix Project ID: TG-PTX

Applied Methodology / Version: CarbonFix Standard version 3.2

First PDD Version: Date of issuance: 05 Sep 2013	**Final PDD version:** Date of issuance: 28 October 2014
Ex-ante estimated total Emission Reduction over a 30 year crediting period:	**16,867 t CO_2-e**
Ex-ante estimated total Emission Reduction excluding the 30% CarbonFix risk buffer over a 30 year crediting period:	**11,813 t CO_2-e**
Estimated Total CarbonFix risk buffer (30%):	**5,062 t CO_2-e**
Estimated allowed assignment 50% of future CO2 Certificates	**5,904 t CO_2-e**

The amount of Emission Reductions stated in the CarbonFix internal “Climate Projects” system is not the same as the ones calculated in an Excel Sheet by the PP and checked by TÜV SÜD. Considering that the figures and calculations in “Climate Projects” are not traceable, the audit team cannot confirm the figures that are provided by Climate projects (in particular the document “Management-Units_PTX_CFS.pdf” for this project). Differences are likely to be due to rounding of numbers in the “Climate Projects” system.

Figures in Climate Projects, which cannot be confirmed by TÜV SÜD are:

Ex-ante estimated total Emission Reduction excluding the 30% CarbonFix risk buffer over a 30 year crediting period: 11,247 t CO_2-e

Estimated Total CarbonFix risk buffer (30%): 4,820 t CO2-e

Assessment Team Leader: Sebastian Hetsch	**Technical Reviewer:** Martin Opitz, Javier Castro
Assessment Team Members: Martin Seitz, Auditor Dr. Kossi Adjonou, Local Expert	**Certification Body responsible:** Eswar Murty

Summary of the Certification Opinion:

☒ The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant requirements for the CarbonFix Standard. Hence TÜV SÜD is recommending the project for registration by the CarbonFix Standard organisation.

☐ The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews did not provide TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. Hence TÜV SÜD will not recommend the project for registration by the CarbonFix standard organisation and will inform the project participants and the CarbonFix organisation on this decision

Abbreviations

CAR	Corrective Action Request
CB	Certification Body
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CFS	CarbonFix Standard
CR	Clarification Request
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
FAR	Forward Action Request
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
GHG	Greenhouse Gas(es)
GIS	Geographic Information System
GPG	Good Practice Guidance
GPS	Global Positioning System
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IRL	Information Reference List
IRR	Internal Rate of Return
LULUCF	Land-Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry
MP	Monitoring Plan
NCA	Nature Conservation Area
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
TÜV SÜD	TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Table of Contents

Introduction

1.1 Objective

The certification objective is an independent assessment by a third party, of a proposed project activity against all defined criteria set forth by the CarbonFix Standard.

In line with the CarbonFix Standard the certification shall be carried out by an organization appointed by the CarbonFix Standard Organization to do so, based on an accreditation from other standards. TÜV SÜD is accredited by UNFCCC to validate CDM projects. The CarbonFix Standard recognizes this accreditation.

The certification is part of the project cycle and will finally result in a conclusion by the executing Certification Body whether a project activity is valid and should be submitted for registration to the CarbonFix Standard Organisation. The ultimate decision on the registration of a proposed project activity rests at the CarbonFix Organisation.

The project activity covered by this certification report was submitted under the project title: “Project Togo”.

1.2 Scope

The scope of any assessment is defined by the underlying legislation, regulation and guidance given by relevant entities or authorities. In the case of a CarbonFix project the scope is set by

- the CarbonFix Standard,
- guidance documents provided by the CarbonFix Standard,
- the AR-CDM additionality tool for afforestation / reforestation projects.
- Management systems and auditing methods
- Environmental issues relevant to the applicable sectoral scope
- Applicable environmental and social impacts and aspects of CarbonFix project activity
- Sector specific technologies and their applications
- Current technical and operational knowledge of the specific sectoral scope and information on best practice.

The certification is not meant to provide any consulting towards the client. However, stated Requests for Clarification and/or Requests for Corrective Actions may provide input for improvement of the project design.

The only purpose of a certification is its use during the registration process as part of the CarbonFix project cycle. Hence, TÜV SÜD cannot be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the certification opinion, which will go beyond that purpose.

The purpose of the certification is to demonstrate compliance or non-compliance of the project with all stated and valid CarbonFix requirements. Additionally, the purpose of the certification is to enable the registration of CarbonFix project, which is only a part of the total CarbonFix project cycle.

1.3 Level of assurance and Materiality

The certification report expresses a conclusion with a limited level of assurance about whether the reported net anthropogenic GHG removals data is free from material misstatements. TÜV SÜD applied a materiality threshold with respect to omission or misstatements concerning reported quantities.

The audit team points out that based on the process and procedures conducted as part of this certification; there was no evidence that indicates that this GHG assertion

- is not materially correct and is not a fair representation of the GHG data and information presented, and
- was not prepared in accordance with the CarbonFix Standard.

2. Methodology

The project assessment applies standard auditing techniques to assess the correctness of the information provided by the project participants. The work starts with the appointment of the team covering the technical scope, technical area and relevant host country experience for evaluating the project activity. Members of the audit team carry out the desk review, follow-up actions, resolution of issues identified, and finally preparation of the certification report. The prepared certification report and other supporting documents then undergo an internal quality control by the CB “Environment and Energy” before submission to the CarbonFix Standard Organisation.

In order to ensure transparency in the certification process, assumptions are clearly and explicitly stated and background material is clearly referenced. CarbonFix provides a methodology-specific checklists and protocol customised for the project (see annex 1). The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), the discussion of each criterion by the assessment team, and the results from validating each relevant criterion.

The certification protocol serves the following purposes:

- To list the details of requirements which a CarbonFix project is expected to meet and provide of clarifications on the requirements if needed;
- To elucidate how a particular requirement has been validated as well as to document the results of the certification and any adjustments made to the project design document.

The completed certification protocol is enclosed in Annex 1.

2.1 Appointment of the Assessment Team

According to the technical scopes and experiences in the sectoral or national business environment, TÜV SÜD has composed a project team in accordance with the appointment rules of the TÜV SÜD certification body “Environment and Energy”.

The composition of an assessment team has to be approved by the Certification Body (CB) to assure that the required skills are covered by the team. The CB TÜV SÜD operates the following qualification levels for team members that are assigned by formal appointment rules:

- Assessment Team Leader (ATL);
- Validator / Verifier (V);
- Trainee (T);
- Technical Experts (TE).

It is required that the sectoral scope(s) and the technical area(s) linked to the methodology and project have to be covered by the assessment team.

Assessment Team:

Name	Qualification	Coverage of scope	Coverage of technical area	Coverage of financial aspect	Host country experience
Sebastian Hetsch	ATL	☑	☑ (14.1)	☑	
Martin Seitz	V	☑	☑ (14.1)		☑
Dr. Kossi Adjonou					☑

Technical Reviewer:

- Javier Castro (Technical Review Leader)
- Martin Opitz (coverage of respective TA 14.1)

2.2 Review of Documents

The first PDD was submitted to the audit team in Sept 2013. This PDD version and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline were reviewed to verify the correctness, credibility, and interpretation of the presented information. As a further step of the certification process, information provided by the PP was cross-checked with information from other sources (if available). A complete list of all documents and proofs reviewed is attached as Annex 2 to this report.

2.3 Follow-up Interviews

Between 18 and 25 October 2013, TÜV SÜD performed interviews, telephone conferences and physical site inspections with project stakeholders to confirm relevant information and to resolve issues identified in the first document review. The following table provides a list of all persons interviewed in this process.

Persons Interviewed:

Name	Organisation
Andreas Weckwert	Director, natureOffice
Franziska Niesch	natureOffice
Lekey Yauovi Koumassi	Director, Action Durable
Charity Nunyakpe	Consultant
Lekey Karoline	Volunteer
Nounyova Kokun	Préfet Agou
Sepe Komlan	Préfet Sekpele
Katanga Makiliwe	Police
Adoyih Rahid	Gendarme
Ankou Kossi	Work safety officer, Action Durable
Mamati Palabe	Forester, Action Durable
Frau Hellwig	Steuerberaterin, Kanzlei Lorenz/Wiesbaden

2.4 Cross-check

During the certification process the team has made reference to available information related to similar projects or technologies as the CarbonFix project activity. Project documentation has also been reviewed against the approved methodology applied to confirm the appropriateness of formulae and correctness of calculations.

2.5 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the certification is to resolve the requests for corrective actions, clarifications, and any other outstanding issues which need to be clarified for TÜV SÜD`s conclusion

on the project design. The CARs and CRs raised by TÜV SÜD are resolved during communication between the client and TÜV SÜD. To guarantee the transparency of the certification process, the concerns raised and responses that have been given are documented in more detail in the certification protocol in Annex 1.

The final PDD version dated 28 Oct 2014 submitted October 2014 serves as the basis for the final assessment presented.

2.6 Internal Quality Control

Internal quality control is the final step of the certification process and is conducted by the CB “Environment and Energy” who checks the final documentation, which includes the certification report and annexes. The completion of the quality control indicates that each report submitted has been approved either by the CB committee. In projects where either the Head of the CB or his/her deputy is part of the assessment team, the approval is given by the one not serving on the project team.

After confirmation by the PP, the certification opinion and relevant documents are submitted to CarbonFix through their web-platform.

Summary of Assessment

The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant requirements for the CarbonFix Standard. Hence, TÜV SÜD is recommending the project for registration by the CarbonFix Standard organisation.

Detailed findings are listed in Annex 1 of the report

Certification Conclusion & Opinion

TÜV SÜD performed an Initial Certification of the proposed CarbonFix project activity “Project Togo”.

Standard auditing techniques have been used for the certification of the project. A methodology-specific protocol for the project has been prepared to conduct the audit in a transparent and comprehensive manner.

The review of the project design documentation, subsequent follow-up interviews, and further verification of references have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of stated criteria in the protocol. In the opinion of TÜV SÜD, the project meets all relevant CarbonFix Standard requirements if the underlying assumptions do not change. TÜV SÜD recommends the project for registration by the CarbonFix Standard organisation.

An analysis, as provided by the applied methodology, demonstrates that the proposed project activity is not a likely baseline scenario. GHG removals attributable to the project are additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity. Considering that the project will be implemented as designed, the project is likely to achieve the total estimated amount of GHG removal of 16,867 tCO_2e over the 30 years crediting period, as specified within the final PDD version 28 Oct 2014. As per the CarbonFix Standard 30% (5,062 t CO_2e) will be included in the CarbonFix buffer. According to the CarbonFix Standard requirement 10.7 “Financial Capacity”, the project is only allowed to assign 50% of its future CO_2-certificares until the first successful monitoring certification – however at the earliest 3 years after initial certification. This means 5,904 t CO_2-e.

The certification has been performed following the requirements of the CarbonFix Standard and on the basis of the contractual agreement. The single purpose of this report is its use during the registration process as part of the CarbonFix project cycle. Based on the work described in this report, nothing has come to our attention that causes us to believe that any project component or issue has not been covered by the certification process.

Pune, 04 December 2014

Murty Eswar

Certification Body “Environment and Energy”
TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd.

Preconditions

01 Eligibility

A description of the historical and the current situation of the project area must be given for the last 50 years. This description must include the development of its socioeconomic situation, its changes in land-uses and changes of property rights.

Findings

The project activity is a carbon based development aid project and situated in the Plataux Region in the southern part of Togo, West Africa. The next bigger town is Kpalime. The aim is to reforest an area of nearly 1000 ha of degraded land with local tree species to create a natural forest that is not being used for the project period of 30 years.

The project area 1 is located north-east of the village of Fokpo and covers an area of about 85 ha. The area was deforested in the 70s (IRL 01_01) and partly used for small scale agricultural and grazing activities. Currently most of the land is not used by the villagers for quite some time except a patch of land which has been used for palm wine production and a small patch of cassava farming land. The land is owned by the community, which is represented by the village chief. The project area 2 lies south-east of the village of Abouzokope and covers about 850 ha. This area has been deforested many years ago as the villagers do not remember any forest cover (IRL 01-01). Currently there are some minor agricultural activities within the project area. The land here is owned for many years by a big family community.

Both areas were regularly affected by bushfires that prevented the existing trees and natural regeneration from growing into a forest according to the threshold defined by DNA. This was confirmed by interviews with the villagers during onsite visit.

The socio-economic situation is in Togo in general very difficult. High children mortality rates, limited access to clean drinking water and undernourishment of 24% of the children (IRL 01_07)are only some of the country's problems.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

-

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Preconditions

01 Eligibility

Planting area is ONLY eligible, if the land:

a. is planted with trees during the initial certification AND

b. is not a forest at the date of the project start AND

c. will result in the creation of a forest AND

d. has not been a forest for at least 10 years prior to the planting start OR has been a forest in the last 10 years prior to the planting start, but evidence is given that absolutely no relation between the project participants and the cause of deforestation exists (e.g. that the forest destruction was caused by force majeure)

Criterion 2d. must be proven by the interpretation of satellite images, aerial photographs, official maps or land-use records.

Findings

1. The plating activity started in March 2012 in Fokpo and in June 2013 in Abouzokope. In 2012 45 ha and in 2013 40 ha have been planted with trees in Fokpo according to the PDD and the Forest Management Plan (IRL 11_05). In Abouzokope only a minor part has been planted so far. This means that 95 ha out of 935 ha are eligible planting area. T
2. The DNA of Togo defined the forest threshold as follows, including Palm trees and Bamboos (IRL 01_10, 01_11):

   A single minimum tree crown cover value of 10 %

   A single minimum land area value of 0.5 ha

   A single minimum tree height value of 5 meters

   In project area 1 at Fokpo there are few patches of forests but they do not reach the threshold of 0.5 ha.

   In project area 2 at Abouzokope there is 1 forest area of a 2.34 ha which needs to be excluded.

   See also 4.

   During the onsite visit patches of forests have been detected in Fokpo.
3. The trees planted will create a forest in line with the above mentioned forest definition.
4. Multispectral classifications of satellite images were conducted to detect the land use change. For Fokpo area Landsat 7 ETM + (2001) and Quickbird (2012) data and for Abouzokope area Landsat 7 ETM + (2001) and Worldview 2 (2012) images were consulted. Pan-sharpening was performed to improve spatial resolution of the Landsat images from 30 m to 15m. Finally six land classifications were selected: Woodland, Shrubland with herbaceous layer and emergent's, grassland, bare land, water and settlements. No detection of any significant change in vegetation cover within the last 10 years could be detected. This information has been backed up with the results from the stakeholder surveys (IRL 01_01 and 01_02).

   GPS coordinates photographs were used for the classification. The work was conducted by Johannes Bender.

During onsite inspection the audit team detected settlements, patches of forests, some minor scale agricultural fields and general project area (nursery) within the eligible planting areas. The planted area of Abouzokope has not been provided as shapefile yet. The definitions and names off the shapefiles also showed inconsistency. The satellite images as base of the classification has not been provided.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 1.
Submit updated shapefiles with information about project area and MUs. Assure that forests, settlements, agric areas, nurseries etc. are excluded from eligible planting areas. Assure definitions are in line with CFS.

Preconditions

01 Eligibility

Planting area is ONLY eligible, if the land:

a. is planted with trees during the initial certification AND

b. is not a forest at the date of the project start AND

c. will result in the creation of a forest AND

d. has not been a forest for at least 10 years prior to the planting start OR has been a forest in the last 10 years prior to the planting start, but evidence is given that absolutely no relation between the project participants and the cause of deforestation exists (e.g. that the forest destruction was caused by force majeure)

Criterion 2d. must be proven by the interpretation of satellite images, aerial photographs, official maps or land-use records.

CAR 2.
Provide an updated systematic approach for identifying land use classes on the satellite images that exclude forests according to the definition (b and d). Include satellite images as reference.

Summary of project owner response:

CAR1: All shapefiles are updated. Forests, settlements, agric areas, nurseries etc. are now excluded from eligible planting areas.

CAR2: The systematic approach for identifying land classes was updated and a description of the new approach is part of the PDD now. Satellite images were added as reference.

Audit team conclusion:

CAR 1:

Updated shapefiles have been provided (IRL 1_17).

References including numbers need to be provided in this Certification Report. Assure definitions and wording used are in line with “CFS 3.2, Terms” (project area, nature conservation area, planting area, eligible planting area, non eligible planting area, MU). Eligible planting area needs to be clearly defined. Assure that the required figures (e.g. for eligible planting area) are consistent throughout supporting documents and PDD.

Name of tree species planted needs to be adapted in the PDD according to the forest management plan (IRL 01_13)

→ Actual version of the PDD and supporting documents need to be provided to the audit team and uploaded to the CarbonFix.info webpage.

CAR 2:

A new systematic approach has been conducted to identify the land use classes on the satellite images (IRL 01_14, 01_15, 1_16). The new approach has been compared with information and GPS data (IRL 00_03, 00_04) collected by the audit team during the onsite visit and found to be reliable and in line with standard requirements. The outcome of the assessment needs to be included in the relevant tables and calculations of the PDD.

Summary of project owner response:

CAR 1: Updated maps are used in the PDD (template eligibility, page …) now. All shapefiles in the supporting documents are now also updated. Tree species in the PDD were also updated according to the forest management plan. (template eligibility, page …)

CAR2:

The outcome from the new systematic approach to identify eligible planting area (template eligibility; page 11) is now included in all relevant table and calculations. The explanation on remote sensing as methodology for change detection and land classification is now described in the PDD too.

Audit team conclusion:

CAR 1:

Preconditions

01 Eligibility

Planting area is ONLY eligible, if the land:

a. is planted with trees during the initial certification AND

b. is not a forest at the date of the project start AND

c. will result in the creation of a forest AND

d. has not been a forest for at least 10 years prior to the planting start OR has been a forest in the last 10 years prior to the planting start, but evidence is given that absolutely no relation between the project participants and the cause of deforestation exists (e.g. that the forest destruction was caused by force majeure)

Criterion 2d. must be proven by the interpretation of satellite images, aerial photographs, official maps or land-use records.

Maps in the PDD have been updated.

The name of the tree species planted have been adapted.

The actual version of the PDD (dated 16 Sep 2014) has been uploaded to http://www.climateprojects.info.

CAR 2:

The methodology approach for the land classification is now included in the PDD (Eligibility, Baseline).

All Tables and calculations have been adapted accordingly.

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Preconditions

01 Eligibility

Planting area is NOT eligible, if the land:
a. was deforested and thereafter replanted in order to generate CO2-certificates OR
b. is wetland OR
c. is situated on ground that is permafrost OR
d. is agriculture farming land and threatens the food security of the local population through the conversion to forest.

Findings

a. According to the information provided above no indicators could be found that the project area was deforested in order to generate CO2 certificates by replanting it.
b. The soil map provided in the PDD (IRL 00_02) does not show water influenced soils in the project areas.
c. There is no permafrost in this region (West Africa)
d. According to the PDD there are no agricultural activities unless small scale palm wine production; therefore food security is not threatened.

This information could be sustained via field inspections and stakeholder interviews during onsite visit.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

-

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Preconditions

01 Eligibility

Evidence must be given, that in case any agricultural, agroforestry or silvopasture activities are taking place on the planting area, they contribute to the aim of creating a forest.
Findings
The project includes only silvicultural activities. This information was sustained via field inspections and stakeholder interviews during onsite visit.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
-
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Preconditions

01 Eligibility

Evidence must be given that project activities will NOT lead to a long-term increase of greenhouse gas emissions in the carbon pool ‘soil’ on the project area.
Findings
The project aims on afforestation/reforestation of unused lands with grass cover and isolated trees. A natural forest is the target. Irrigation is only permissible in the planting phase, if needed. Areas are not drained. No ploughing is conducted. Planting is done by hand. No fertilizers and no biocides will be used. Forest operations will be conducted in a sustainable way. Therefore no long term increase of the carbon pool ‘soil’ can be expected.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
CAR 3. **Provide detailed forest management plan and include reverence on the evidence in the PDD; include information on maintenance and implementation of buffers.**
Summary of project owner response: CAR 3: A detailed forest-management plan is provided now – it includes also information on maintenance and the implementation of buffers.
Audit team conclusion: A forest management plan has been provided (IRL 01_13) CAR 3: Information on maintenance and the implementation of buffers needs to be included.
Summary of project owner response: CAR3: Information on maintenance and the implementation of buffer are now included (supporting doc: 01_10, page 12 and page 17).
Audit team conclusion: Implementation and maintenance of the buffer alongside waterways is done in accordance to the standard and described in the Forest Management Plan (IRL 11_05). As the whole area is managed as conservation Forest, there is no difference in the treatment of the buffer zones.
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Preconditions

01 Eligibility

If litter (leaves and small branches) is extracted from the eligible planting area, it must be limited to the extent of not harming the nutrient balance of the soil.
Findings
Litter like leaves and branches are in general not removed from project area unless it is necessary due to prevent or fight pests or diseases.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
-
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Preconditions

02 Additionality

Evidence must be given that the project is not business as usual. Therefore, the additionality analysis must be executed according to the latest version A/R CDM 'Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality in A/R CDM project activities'.

Findings

The CDM A/R Methodological tool "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality in A/R CDM project activities" has been applied.

STEP 0. Preliminary screening based on the starting date of the A/R project activity:

The project is initialized, planned and managed by natureOffice GmbH, a consulting agency that advices companies in climate protection and offers services aimed at compensating unavoidable emissions (IRL 02_01). Therefore natureOffice decided to establish its own carbon project. The project has no other income as CO2 certificates and therefore early consideration of sale of carbon credits is obvious.

STEP 1. Identification of alternative land use scenarios to the proposed A/R CDM project activity:

Sub-step 1a. Identify credible alternative land use scenarios to the proposed CDM project activity:

Following alternative land use scenarios have been identified:

1. Continuation of the pre project land use;
2. Project Togo without certification
3. Afforestation/reforestation in commercial Teak wood plantation without carbon certification
4. Making use of areas for a commercial mass production of biomass – palm oil
5. Agricultural use for self –sufficiency –Grazing land and planting food crops

Sub-step 1b. Consistency of credible alternative land use scenarios with enforced mandatory applicable

laws and regulations:

1. There is illegal cattle grazing on the project areas by nomads; this is widespread praxis in the region and due to lack of benefit, no action is taken to avoid this.
2. Afforestation/reforestation of the project area compiles with the "Politique Nationale de l'Environment, to struggle against environmental degradation and promote increasing reforestation" (IRL 02_08; page 13, paragraph 4).
3. Same applies for the afforestation/reforestation with commercial Teak plantations (IRL 02_08).
4. Establishment of palm oil plantations for production of biomass also meets the legal requirements of the legislation (IRL 02_08).
5. Agricultural self use is not restricted.

Therefore all scenarios described above are plausible.

STEP 2. Barrier analysis

Sub-step 2a. Identification of barriers that would prevent the implementation of at least one

alternative land use scenarios:

I. Investment barrier: Reforestation investments in Togo bear a high risk for investors as the political and economical situation is not stable (IRL 01_04).

II. Technological barrier: According to the PDD there is no adequate technical and technological capacity for plantation establishment and management available in Togo. These include amongst others heavy machinery, trained forest workers and a good forest science basis for forest management (IRL 02_11, 02_12).

III. According to the PDD there are much better locations for palm oil plantation than Togo and the area available is too small for cost effective plantation management (IRL 02_13).

IV. Barrier due to local ecological conditions: The quality of soil is too poor for the cultivation of crops. (IRL 02_08)

02 Additionality

Evidence must be given that the project is not business as usual. Therefore, the additionality analysis must be executed according to the latest version A/R CDM 'Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality in A/R CDM project activities'.

Sub-step 2b. Elimination of land use scenarios that are prevented by the identified barriers:

According to the PDD all land-use scenarios are prevented by one or more of the identified barrier except scenario 1 "Continuation of pre-project land-use".

Sub-step 2c. Determination of baseline scenario (if allowed by the barrier analysis)

This scenario 1 "Continuation of pre-project land-use" therefore is identified as the baseline scenario.

→ Proceed to Step 4.

STEP 4. Common practice analysis:

There are several small scale reforestation activities in Togo.

- about 14 ha of monoculture plantations of Cordia species for the use as timber, assisted by the association "Hilfe für Togo e.V." (IRL 02_14, 02_15)

- other small scale afforestation activities supported by various voluntary NGOs (IRL 02_16, 02_17).

-There is no other CO2 A/R project activity with similar scale and the focus on natural Forest, managed as protective zone.

-There are Teak plantations alongside the roads.

According to the GoldStandard AR requirements, the project is additional, too.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 4.
Provide information of legal afforestation requirements and of afforestation rates in the region (see CDM tool section 9 and common practice analysis).

CAR 5.
Follow the stepwise approach (including sub-steps) according to the CDM tool, identify clear barriers and provide verifiable evidence on the existence and significance of the barriers identified.

Summary of project owner response:

CAR 4:

Information on legal afforestation requirements and afforestation rates in the region are provided now. Within the common practice analysis their influence to project additionality is described.

CAR 5:

Project additionality is provided by clear barriers now following the CDM tool.

Audit team conclusion:

CAR 4:

Further information on legal afforestation requirements and afforestation rates in the region needs to be provided and sustained with evidence (e.g. by the responsible forestry authority)

CAR 5:

Follow the stepwise approach (including sub-steps) according to the CDM tool, identify clear barriers and provide verifiable evidence on the existence and significance of the barriers identified (see CDM tool section 17)

Summary of project owner response:

CAR 4: Further Information on afforestation rates are provided in the PDD (template additionality, page 4) including references. (supporting doc: 02_15)

CAR 5: Projects additionality is provided by barriers following the CDM tool. (template additionality, page 9ff)

Preconditions

02 Additionality

Evidence must be given that the project is not business as usual. Therefore, the additionality analysis must be executed according to the latest version A/R CDM 'Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality in A/R CDM project activities'.
Audit team conclusion: CAR 4: A signed copy of the supporting doc: 02_15 has been provided to the audit team (IRL 02_19) CAR 5: The stepwise approach of the CDM tool has been followed and evidence of the additionality has been provided and described in the PDD. According to the GoldStandard AR requirements, the project is additional, too.
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Preconditions

02 Additionality

Evidence must be given that the most likely without-project-scenario would not lead to an increase of 'woody biomass' on the eligible planting area. If this is not the case, the baseline must refer to the biomass that would have been on the area in the long-term.

Findings

The most likely without project scenario is the continuation of the present use which is described as hunting, regularly affected by manmade fires. Therefore an increase of woody biomass cannot be expected. This is supported by the satellite images (see eligibility section) showing the development of the project area over the last 10 years and the stakeholder surveys (IRL 01_01, 01_02)

CARs / FARs / NCRs

-

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Preconditions

02 Additionality

Evidence must be given that the project contributes to a more sustainable development than the most likely without-project scenario, short-, mid- and long-term.

Findings

Short term: The project already creates jobs for the villagers and therefore improves the economical situation.

Mid Term: The ecological situation will improve through the forest cover and the enrichment of the soil. In addition the project contributes to a significant improvement of sanitary and educational structure (IRL 02_19, 02_20).

Long Term: The expansion of social and infrastructural projects leads to development in the project region. The conservation forest zone will support the development of a higher biodiversity.

During onsite the audit team visited the two villages. Inhabitants interviewed were informed about the project and contracts with the community/owners of the project areas have been translated and provided (IRL 02_19 and 02_20), checked by the audit team und found in compliance with the standard requirements. In Fokpo a new water supply well was drilled in the village and at Abouzokope a magazine was built and a community center and latrines are on their way.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

-

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

A description of the project's general forest management objectives must be given.

Findings

The Project aims to establish a natural forest on degraded lands. Nurseries are established to raise the seedlings out of seeds collected or bought in Togo. Land clearing of the direct planting place and planting is done by hand. In Abouzokope there are plans also to use sheep for clearing in a pilot trial. There is no strict planting scheme, as the aim is to create a natural forest. On parts of the area there is existing natural tree vegetation and existing trees on a quite high number. The appearance of regular bush fires avoid the growth of these regeneration to a level, that it could form a forest according to the definition. In areas with a high number of existing trees no planting is conducted. The following tree species are described in the PDD to be planted with minimum of 550 plants per hectare: Afzelia africana, Antiaris Africana, Azadrichata indica, Chlorophora excels, Gmelina arborea, Khaya grandifolia, Scylophie pavieflora, Colatier, Kaya senegalensis, Acazi laeta, Pterocarpus erinaceus, Triplochiton sclerxylon, Terminalia superba and Vitex doniana. During regular inspection dead plants will be removed and pests treated with local, natural, biologically degradable means. Manual weeding will be carried out during the first three years or until the planted trees reach a height of 2 to 3 meters. Where a high density is detected, thinning might be carried out. Selective thinning might be carried out in the first 10 years to assure a stable forest structure. Also for the maintenance of the 7 meters wide firebreaks clearings will be needed.

During the onsite visit it was detected that others than the described species had been planted. According to the forest manager responsible for the plantation only native tree species were planted. The audit team did not detect any non native species.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 6.
Species planted to be updated and provided in the PDD

CAR 7.
Clarify the definitions of terms according to CarbonFix Standard (Nature Conservation Area, native tree species, buffer, eligible plating area, planting area etc.)

Summary of project owner response:

CAR 6:

Planted species are now updated in the PDD.

CAR 7:

Terms are now used according to CFS definitions.

Audit team conclusion:

CAR 6:

Update list of species planted in consistence with the forest management plan in all relevant sections of the PDD.

CAR 7:

No adoptions clarifying according CarbonFix terms and definitions have been made in this section.

A description of the project's general forest management objectives must be given.
Summary of project owner response: CAR 6: The list of planted species is now updated in all relevant sections of the PDD. The updated list of species : - antiaris Africana - afzelia Africana - terminalia superba - xylopie aethiopica - cola nitida - khaya grandifolia - khaya senegalensis - triplochiton scleroxylon - acacia laeta CAR7: Nature Conservation Area was changed to Conservation Forest in the PDD. The list of planted tree species now only consists of native tree species. Eligible planting area is now identified by a new approach, eligible planting area is different to planting area.
Audit team conclusion: CAR 6: List of tree species has been updated. CAR 7: Terms are now used in line with Carbon Fix requirements.
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Evidence must be given that the boundaries of the project area, planting area (eligible and non-eligible), management units and nature conservation area are clearly defined and visible in the field.
Findings
All boundaries are marked by Jatropha hedges and/or Moringa trees. Additionally boundary stones are set and information boards put up. During onsite visit it was detected, that all boundaries bordering to outside area have been clearly defined and marked visible, but boundaries inside the project area need to be defined and marked too.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
CAR 8. Assure that all boundaries are marked according to CFS rules.
Summary of project owner response: CAR 8: Also boundaries inside the project area are marked according to CFS rules like described in the PDD and forest management plan.
Audit team conclusion: CAR 8: There is no detailed description and no evidence how the boundaries of eligible planting area and existing forests are marked in the field according to the requirement of CarbonFix Standard section 03.2 (clearly defined and visible in the field).
Summary of project owner response: CAR 8: A description is now given in the PDD (template forest management, page 8)
Audit team conclusion: CAR 8: A detailed description on boundary demarcation has been provided in the PDD.
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

A description of the following tree species characteristics must be given:
a. Origin and distribution of the tree species (indicate if the species are native or not)
b. Provenance of the seeds
c. Main purpose / Use of trees
d. Possible pests and diseases
e. Time when forest products are foreseen to be used

Findings

Following trees are used: Anacardium occidentale (Kashew nut) , Antiaris Africana, Azadrichata indica (Neem tree), Chlorophora excels (Iroko), Gmelina arborea, Khaya grandifolia (Dry Zone Mahogany), Pterocarpus erinaceus, Triplochiton sclerxylon, Terminalia superba and Vitex doniana.
All relevant data are provided in the PDD. During onsite visit other species were confirmed.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

See CAR 6.

Summary of project owner response:

Audit team conclusion:
List of tree species has been updated.

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Evidence must be given that at least 10% of the project area is managed
a. as a nature conservation area OR
b. to meet a national or sub-national HCV area definition.
Criterion 4. does not have to be fulfilled in case more than 30% of the project area is managed according to chapter '06 CO2-fixation - Option 1b) Conservation forest'.

Findings

As 100 % of the project area is managed as conservation forest, this criterion is not applicable.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

-

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Evidence must be given that the nature conservation area is managed in order to establish, maintain or restore the natural ecosystem of the landscape the project is integrated in.
Findings
Nature conservation areas (NCAs) are managed in a way that the natural ecosystem is to be established. This is done the same way as on the other parts of the area that is managed as conservation forest. Monitoring reports will be conducted on a regular base.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
CAR 9. Provide further information whether NCAs including required monitoring are established *(or exclude)*. See also CAR 3, detailed forest management plan.
Summary of project owner response: CAR 9: Monitoring of NCAs was excluded.
Audit team conclusion: The forest to be established under the project scenario is a natural forest with typical regional trees. There are no harvesting activities foreseen during the project period. The forest is managed as a conservation forest. No monitoring therefore is required. CAR closed
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Evidence must be provided that the protection or management of the nature conservation area enhances habitat connectivity.
Findings
100 % of the eligible planting area is managed as conservation forest. Therefore no NCAs need to be established. Connectivity is given as the project area is in big blocks.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
-
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Key figures on the following areas must be provided:
a. Project area
b. Planting area(s)
c. Eligible planting area(s)
d. Nature conservation area(s)

Findings

The table with the key figures has been provided in the PDD as follows:
Total project area is: 935 ha
Total Planting area is: 935 ha
Total Eligible planting area is: 100 %
Total Nature conservation area: 935 ha

During onsite visit it has been realized that these figures need to be adapted according to CFS terms and conditions found in the field. Total project area has been clearly defined and marked, but other figures need to be adapted.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 10.
The values in the table need to be adapted according to the CFS definitions (CFS page 4, Terms) and there is no clear distinction about NCAs, buffers and the eligible planting area. This needs to be clarified.

Summary of project owner response:
CAR 10:
Values were updated according to the new project area description, NCAs, buffers and the eligible planting area are now clearly distincted.

Audit team conclusion:
CAR 10:
Values need to be updated in consistency with information provided in the shapefiles (IRL 01_17)

Summary of project owner response:
CAR10: The values in the table (template forestmanagement, page 24) were updated according to the new landclassification and by correct use of CFS terms. Project area includes the project surface which is visible in the field by the boundary of jatropha hedges around. The project area consists of eligible and non eligible planting area – non eligible planting area includes buffers; settlements (including agricultural farming land) – settlement were surrounded by an additional non eligible area for growth; forest according to the DNA forest definition which is non eligible area. Planting area includes eligible planting area and buffers which are non eligible planting area. In Fokpo planting area also includes forest.

Audit team conclusion:
CAR 10: The values are now updated in line with the shapefiles:
Eligible planting area is as follows:
Fokpo: 73,45 ha, Abouzokope: 6,43 ha, Total: 79,88 ha
The table with the key figures has been provided in the PDD as follows:
Total project area is: 809 ha
Total Planting area is: 738 ha

Key figures on the following areas must be provided: a. Project area b. Planting area(s) c. Eligible planting area(s) d. Nature conservation area(s)
Total Eligible planting area is: 79,88 ha Total Nature conservation area: conservation forest
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Shapefiles with the following information must be submitted through ClimateProjects:
a. Project area(s)
b. Management Units

Findings

Shape-files were submitted through Climateprojects: (IRL: 03-03, 03-04, 03-06; 03-07, 03_08, 03-09, 03-10)
On these shapefiles the project area and the Management Units are not defined. The files are not areas, only lines. Definitions used in the shapefiles are not according to the CFS (eligible forest area?). Forest areas, watercourses, roads, settlements etc must be deducted from the eligible planting area according to the CFS. Clarification is required on the treatment of fire belts. MUs need to be defined etc.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

See CAR 1.

Summary of project owner response:

Audit team conclusion:
Respective updated shapefiles have been provided (IRL: 03-03, 03-04, 03-06; 03-07, 03_08, 03-09, 03-10).

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

The certification body may require the submission of shapefiles with the following information:
a. Land-use classes of the project area 10 years prior to planting start for ’01 Eligibility’
b. Wetland areas within the project area for ’01 Eligibility’
c. Nature conservation area(s) for ’04 Environmental Aspects’
d. Neighbours of the project (individuals, villages, towns, etc.) for ’05 Socio-economic Aspects’
e. Eligible planting area and non-eligible planting area for ’06 CO2-fixation’
f. Land-use classes of the project area just before the planting start for ’08 Baseline’
g. Infrastructure of the project (roads, rivers, houses, etc.) for ’11 Capacities’

Findings

Following shapefiles have been provided:
a. Land-use classes of the project area 10 years prior to planting start (IRL 03_05)
b. Wetland areas within the project area (IRL 03_10)
c. Nature conservation area(s) (IRL 03_06)
d. Neighbours of the project (individuals, villages, towns, etc.) (IRL 03_07)
e. Eligible planting area and non-eligible planting area (IRL 03_08)
f. Land-use classes of the project area just before the planting start (IRL 03_09)
g. Infrastructure of the project (roads, rivers, houses, etc.) (IRL 03_10)

During onsite it has been noted, that NCAs, settlements, forests, fire-belts, nurseries, agric fields etc are within the project area.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

See CAR 1.

Summary of project owner response:

Audit team conclusion:
Respective updated shapefiles have been provided (IRL: 03-03, 03-04, 03-06; 03-07, 03_08, 03-09, 03-10).

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

The project developer must provide a description of the different land-use classes of the project area. If significantly different land-use classes are bordering the project area, they must also be described.
Findings
The land use class within the project area is described as shrubland with herbaceous layer and emergents. Neighboring land-use classes are agriculture, woodland and settlement.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
See CAR 2.
Summary of project owner response:
Audit team conclusion: The methodology approach for the land classification is now included in the PDD (Eligibility, Baseline). All Tables and calculations have been adapted accordingly.
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

04 Environmental Aspects

Evidence must be given that the project has net-positive ecological impacts. Therefore,
a. positive ecological impacts of the projects must be enhanced AND
b. negative or potential negative ecological impacts must be mitigated.
Descriptions of the following project characteristics must be given in regard to criteria 2a. and 2b.:

- Soil, Nutrients, Erosion
- Water Quality, Quantity
- Biodiversity Flora, Fauna
- Climate Temperatures, Precipitation

Findings

Detailed description is provided in the PDD as followed:

Soil, Nutrients, Erosion

No negative impacts on soil, nutrients and erosion can be expected through the implementation of the project. By teaching the local communities to produce and use Terra Preta on their fields the activity and health of the soil will be affected positively. Regular sampling of the soil is conducted to determine potential damage.

Water Quality, Quantity:

No negative impacts on water quality and quantity can be expected through the implementation of the project. The construction of sanitary installations at the project locations will improve the water quality by reducing the spreading of photogenic germs. Regular sampling of water is conducted to determine potential damage.

Biodiversity Flora, Fauna:

No negative impacts on biodiversity, flora, and fauna can be expected through the implementation of the project. The variety of native trees enhances the biodiversity and provides improved conditions for the local fauna and flora. Regular sampling of the biodiversity is conducted to determine potential damage.

Climate Temperatures, Precipitation:

No negative impacts on climate, temperatures, precipitation can be expected through the implementation of the project. The microclimate is expected to improve by the establishment of the natural forest. Regular sampling on microclimate is conducted to determine potential damage.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 11.
Provide further information on regular sampling on microclimate, water, soil and biodiversity as described in the PDD and include this information.

Summary of project owner response:
CAR 11:
The formulation was changed and further information were added in the PDD.

Audit team conclusion:
CAR 11:
No further information on regular sampling has been provided and no changes could be detected this section of the PDD.

Summary of project owner response:
CAR 11: An explanation is given in the PDD (template environmental aspects, page 10 ff.)

Audit team conclusion:

04 Environmental Aspects

Evidence must be given that the project has net-positive ecological impacts. Therefore,
a. positive ecological impacts of the projects must be enhanced AND
b. negative or potential negative ecological impacts must be mitigated.
Descriptions of the following project characteristics must be given in regard to criteria 2a. and 2b.:

- Soil, Nutrients, Erosion
- Water Quality, Quantity
- Biodiversity Flora, Fauna
- Climate Temperatures, Precipitation

Respective information has been added in The PDD.

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

All endangered and critically endangered species of the IUCN Red List must be identified and evidence must be provided that appropriate measures are put in place to protect them
Findings
No endangered and critically endangered species were identified in the project area (IRL 04_03, 04_04)
CARs / FARs / NCRs
-
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Evidence must be given that the use of chemical products is
a. justified AND
b. documented AND
c. minimized

Findings

No use of chemical products is intended according to the PDD and the Forest Management Plan (IRL 11_05). During the onsite visit no use of chemicals could be detected.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

-

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Evidence must be given that waste is disposed in an environmentally appropriate way.
Findings
The project aims in avoiding producing waste. Organic waste is composted. Waste is collected and disposed centrally.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
CAR 12. Provide further information what is the meaning of “centrally disposed”?
Summary of project owner response: CAR 12: The centrally disposed was changed to centrally burned – the process was described more in detail.
Audit team conclusion: CAR 12: Neither the mentioned changes nor the detailed descriptions can be confirmed.
Summary of project owner response: CAR12: The changes an description can be found in PDD (template environmental aspects, page 19)
Audit team conclusion: Respective clarifying information has been provided in the PDD.
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Evidence must be given that 15 meter wide buffer strips along permanent or temporary water courses (streams, rivers, wetlands) are implemented. These buffer strips must be

- part of the nature conservation area, OR
- must be managed according to '06 CO2-fixation - Option 1b) Conservation forest'.

In both cases only native tree species are allowed to be planted.

Findings

There are no temporary or permanent waterways in Fokpo.

In Abouzokope there is a river at the boundary of the project area and two ponds are visualized in the shapefiles (IRL 03_10). The PDD describes only **one** pond in contrary to the shapefiles. 15 meter buffer strips need to be established around these areas and planted with native tree species only.

Respective information has been sustained during field visits in the Project area by the audit team.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

See CAR 1 and 3.

Summary of project owner response:

Audit team conclusion:

Respective information has been provided in the closure of CAR 1 and CAR 2.

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Evidence must be given that no genetically modified species are being used.
Findings
According to the PDD only native seeds and planting material is used. Use of GMOs is not supported by the project. No indication against this requirement could be observed during onsite visit.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
-
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

The project management shall plant native species in mixed stands and in case the timber of the forest is being used, selective harvesting management shall be applied.
If this criterion is not met, the project developer must justify its

- choice of tree species
- silvicultural system
- harvesting method

Findings

Some of the species used for the forest are not native to Togo but do grow in natural habitats in the project area. As harvesting trees is not allowed in the project the aim is to provide the surrounding population with fruits they are allowed to collect with the written consent of the project owner. All trees selected have certain secondary use for the local population.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

See CAR 3

Audit team conclusion:
Native trees are planted in mixed stands. Respective information has been provided in the closure of CAR 3.

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Evidence must be given that all species planted are site-adapted under changing climate conditions.
Findings
Tree species planted are mainly adapted to the climatic zone of savannah and therefore are expected to grow under new circumstances resulting from climate change. Seeds were collected from trees growing in the region or purchased from local sources (IRL 01_13 – 01_22). The local expert Dr. Kossi Adjounu from the forestry faculty of the University of Lome confirmed during onsite visit the selection of identified tree species as site adapted.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
-
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

05 Socio-Economic Aspects

Evidence must be given that the project has net-positive socio-economic impacts. Therefore,

a. positive socio-economic impacts of the projects must be enhanced AND

b. negative or potentially negative socio-economic impacts must be mitigated.

For criterion 1a. descriptions of the following aspects must be given:

- Creation of employment Capacity building of project workforce
- Welfare activities

For criterion 1b. descriptions of the following aspects must be given:

- Displacement of people
- Spiritual, religious, or other socially important places influenced by the project activities

Findings

Next to climate protection the project also focuses on social aspects. New jobs are created in the nurseries, for establishment and maintaining of the forest and in the administrative area of the project management.

Currently 9 people are employed in the project management (4 in Germany and 5 in Togo). On the midterm the project expects to employ about 10 full time employees (rangers). Until the planting/cultivating period is completed, about 40 community workers are needed throughout the year and seasonally more people are needed for special occasions (Planting, etc). The working conditions for the community work are described in the “Reglement interieur” for both communities.

The local project management staff is trained internally by project staff from Germany concerning finance, IT, GIS etc. and externally by German experts.

The community workers are trained by experts, students and graduates in Nursery management, sustainable forest management, ecology and nature protection, biometrics and others like first aid (IRL 05_18). Relevant information has been verified during onsite visit by interviews and document checks. The workshops will be carried out on a regularly base, usually 4 workshops on different themes per month for employees, contractors and workers. All of them are encouraged to join the workshops designed for other staff. Documents that describe workshop planning for quarter III + IV 2013 (IRL 05_19) have been provided during onsite visit to the audit team.

Activities and plans to improve the social structures and the infrastructure of the affected village communities in concerns of water, health, electricity and education will be implemented in close collaboration with the communities. There are plans for health centers, delivery wards and school toilets are constructed and medical personal appointed and trained. Education programs e.g. on hygiene and malaria prophylaxis will be implemented. Solar panels are implemented to secure essential eclectic demand e.g. for fridges in the health centers. In both villages wells were drilled; unfortunately the water of the well in Fokpo tastes slightly salty according to some villagers and the quantity of water supplied by the well in Abouzokope is insufficient. There are plans to drill another well. In Abouzokope a magazine has been build and a public toilet and a community center are presently being constructed. This has been confirmed during the onsite audit.

For Project Togo no displacement of people took place.

No negative effects on spiritually, religious or other socially important places were detected during stakeholder consultation. Social important places like community huts etc. are positively influenced by installation of solar lamps…

Respective information was sustained by the audit team via field inspections and stakeholder consultations.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

-

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted

Sustainable Forest Management

05 Socio-Economic Aspects

Evidence must be given that the project has net-positive socio-economic impacts. Therefore,

a. positive socio-economic impacts of the projects must be enhanced AND

b. negative or potentially negative socio-economic impacts must be mitigated.

For criterion 1a. descriptions of the following aspects must be given:

- Creation of employment Capacity building of project workforce
- Welfare activities

For criterion 1b. descriptions of the following aspects must be given:

- Displacement of people
- Spiritual, religious, or other socially important places influenced by the project activities

☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

05 Socio-Economic Aspects

Stakeholders must be subject to free, prior, and informed consent on project activities that may have an influence on them.

With all stakeholders groups an agreement on the continuous dialog shall be established from the project start. In this agreement the following topics shall be addressed:

- Contact person that represents the stakeholder group
- Means, frequency and contents of information exchange
- Standard procedure to address and solve concerns

Findings

Agreements with the following stakeholders have been established:

1. Project management in Togo (IRL 05_01)
2. Employees in Togo (IRL 05_05)
3. Workers, landowners, community of Fokpo (IRL 05_07)
4. Workers, community of Abouzokope (IRL 05_09)
5. Landowners, community of Abouzokope (IRL 05_11)
6. Community of Agotime (IRL 05_13)

Signed stakeholder agreements have been checked and confirmed by interviews during onsite inspection by the audit team.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 13.
Stakeholder identification and agreements for Forestry Authority and Sustainable Forest NGOs to be provided.

Summary of project owner response:

CAR 13: The missing agreement was added – no sustainable Forest NGOs could be identified in the project region.

Audit team conclusion:

CAR 13: No Stakeholder identification and agreements for Forestry Authority and Sustainable Forest NGOs has been provided.

Summary of project owner response:

CAR13: In coordination with the local forest authority (supporting doc 05_15) two organizations could be identified that are active in the region with sustainable reforestation: Partage et Action en Synergie pour le développement (PASYD) and Centre d'Assistance aux demunis et orphelins (CADO). Stakeholder agreements with those NGOs were added (supporting docs 05_16 and 05_17). The Stakeholder agreement for the Forest Authority was also added (supporting doc 05_18).

Audit team conclusion:

Stakeholder identification and agreements for Forestry Authority and Sustainable Forest NGOs has been provided (IRL 05_24, 05_26, 05_27).

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

05 Socio-Economic Aspects

Evidence must be given that the working staff is able to organize themselves and negotiate with their employers on a voluntary basis.

Findings

Details on the communication from employees with the management are described in the Human Resource Management (IRL 05_16, IRL Stakeholder agreement). Communication structures with the Community workers are described in “Reclement Interieur” and stakeholder agreement (IRL 05_01, 05_05, 05_07, 05_09, 05_11, 05_13). Implementation has been confirmed with interviews of respective staff by the audit team during onsite visit.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

-

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Evidence must be given that the working staff's working environment is kept safe and risk free.
Findings
In the Human Resource Management (IRL 05_16) a description concerning working safety is included. Several workshops on safety have been conducted (photos and interviews). A responsible person for work safety has been appointed (Ankou Kossi). This has been confirmed with an interview during onsite visit.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
CAR 14. A SOP on work safety including responsibilities needs to be provided.
Summary of project owner response: CAR 14: A SOP on work safety was added.
Audit team conclusion: CAR 14: Provide reference number for SOP on Work safety as it could not be found.
Summary of project owner response: CAR 14: SOP on work safety (05_19) were added and referenced in the PDD (template socioeconomic aspects, page 15).
Audit team conclusion: Respective SOP has been provided and found in line with standard requirements. (IRL 05_27).
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Evidence must be given that no children under the age of 16 are working for the project.
Findings
Child labor is prohibited for the project Togo. It is stated in the “Reglement Interieur” that child labor is not accepted. No indication on child labor could be observed during onsite visit.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
CAR 15. Provide statement on child labor and the “Reglement Interieur”.
Summary of project owner response: CAR 15: Reglemet interieur was added – including statement on child labor.
Audit team conclusion: CAR 15: Provide reference number of Reglement interieur as it could not be found.
Summary of project owner response: CAR 15: Reglement interieur was added (05_20) and referenced in the PDD (template socioeconomic aspects, page 16).
Audit team conclusion: Respective SOP has been provided (IRL 05_28).
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

05 Socio-Economic Aspects

Evidence must be given that contracts are clearly defined and include the following aspects:
For employees
a. working hours and leave days
b. duties
c. salary
d. modalities on health insurance
e. modalities on the termination of the contract

For contractors
a. tasks (quantity, quality, time)
b. payment
c. modalities on the termination of the contract

Findings

Contracts for employees include information on the required aspects (IRL 05_15). Contractors are not employed.

Evidence on health insurance has been provided. The contract with A.C.A Africaine de Courtage D'Assurance & Gestion De Patremoine includes the 5 members of Action Durable (IRL 05_20). Start is 17. Oct. 2013. Payment has been done for 1 year in advance, Invoice dated 17.10.2013 (IRL 05_21).

CARs / FARs / NCRs

-

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Evidence must be provided that preference is given to working staff from neighbouring areas.
Findings
According to the PDD Employees from all levels will be primarily hired from the project region. Information provided and interviews with the management staff confirmed that 4 out of 5 life in the project region. As for the community workers most of them are from the Project villages of Fokpo and Abouzokope, some from surrounding villages. This is documented in the contacts with the villages (Reglement interieur).
CARs / FARs / NCRs
-
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

05 Socio-Economic Aspects

Evidence must be given that throughout the project activity project stakeholders are able to dress heir concerns to the project management.
Findings
SOPs for complaint management are described in stakeholder commitments (IRL 05_01, 05_05, 05_07, 05_09, 05_11, 05_13)
CARs / FARs / NCRs
See also CAR 13
Audit team conclusion: Respective information has been provided with the closure of CAR 13.
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

05 Socio-Economic Aspects

Evidence must be given that throughout the project activity any concerns by project stakeholder are documented and appropriately responded to by the project management.
Findings
SOPs for complaint management are described in the Stakeholder commitments (IRL 05_01, 05_05, 05_07, 05_09, 05_11, 05_13) and in the Human resource management (IRL 05_16). No complaint has been documented yet. The audit team did not find indicators for complains during onsite visit and stakeholder interviews.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
-
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

CO2-Certificates

06 CO_2-Fixation

The present CO2-fixation must be assessed, once the average tree height within a management unit exceeds 3 meters. Hereby, the CarbonFix guideline ‘Forest Inventory’ must be followed.
Findings
The average tree height does not exceed 3 meters yet. There are areas with existing vegetation and trees that exceed the average height of 3 meters. This circumstance is considered in the baseline calculations. Therefore this criterion is not applicable.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
-
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

CO2-Certificates

06 CO_2-Fixation

The future CO2-fixation is determined by a management unit specific growth-model.
Evidence must be given, that growth-models are based on credible scientific sources and site-adapted factors.
Evidence must be given that before any monitoring certification, the management unit specific growth-models are adjusted according to the latest actual monitoring data gained though the assessment of the present CO2-fixation.

Findings

The calculations on future CO2 fixation have been provided to the audit team in a traceable excel format for assessment (IRL 06_04). All cells need to be linked. The source of date has been provided and checked during the audit (IRL 06_01, 06_02). There are no regional data/growth models available. This has also been confirmed by the local expert from the Lome university, Dr Kossi Adjonou. Therefore IPCC default values have been used. The R/S ratio needs to be adapted to the value 0.27 for Tropical/sub tropical dry forest (IRL 06_03, Table 3A.1.8).
Eligible are only areas that are planted with trees already!

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 16.
Updated CO2 calculations to be provided. See also CAR 1 and 2.

Summary of project owner response:
CAR 16:
CO2 calculations were update according to now areas and identified landuse classes.

Audit team conclusion:
CAR 16:
No updates could be detected in excel sheet “Calculations” provided on the 17.01.2014.

Summary of project owner response:
CAR 16: The calculation was updated (Excelsheet Calculation) There is actually: 73,58 ha eligible planting area in Fokpo and 6,43 ha in Abouzokope.

Audit team conclusion:
The final figures for eligible planting area are 73,45 ha in Fokpo and 6,43 ha in Abouzokope, which adds up to 79,88 ha.
Updated excel calculation sheet (summary CO2 fixation) and MU (CFS calculation) considering a deduction of 30% buffer and 50% due to CFS Capacities 10.7 have been provided.
The regional afforestation rates are conservatively considered by a deduction of 0,05% of the TOTAL NET PROJECT SEQUESTRATION (tCO2). Figures in the PDD are updated accordingly.

TOTAL FOREST AFTER 30 Yrs (tCO2/ha)	285
TOTAL PROJECT EMISSIONS (tCO2/ha)	1
BASELINE (tCO2/ha)	72
LEAKAGE (tCO2/ha)	0
NET SEQUESTRATION (tCO2/ha)	211
TOTAL HA	80
CONSERVATIVE DEDUCTION OF 0,05 % REGIONAL AFFORESTATION RATE (tCO2)	9

CO2-Certificates

06 CO2-Fixation

The future CO2-fixation is determined by a management unit specific growth-model.
Evidence must be given, that growth-models are based on credible scientific sources and site-adapted factors.
Evidence must be given that before any monitoring certification, the management unit specific growth-models are adjusted according to the latest actual monitoring data gained though the assessment of the present CO2-fixation.

TOTAL NET PROJECT SEQUESTRATION (tCO2)	16867
- 30% PROJECT BUFFER DEDUCTED (tCO2)	11807
30% PROJECT BUFFER (tCO2)	5060
- 50% DEDUCTION DUE TO CFS CAPACITIES (tCO2)	5904
PRESENTLY ASSIGNABLE FUTURE CO2-CERTIFICATES (tCO2)	5904

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

06 CO_2-Fixation

In case of 'selective harvesting' or 'conservation forest', the future CO2-fixation is based on the equilibrium stand volume during the crediting period of the project. If the equilibrium stand volume is not yet reached by the end of the project's crediting period, the future CO2-fixation is determined by the 'stand volume' of the year the crediting period ends. Evidence must be given through the project characteristics (tree species, project participants, etc.) and its silvicultural objectives that the forests will be used in a 'selective harvesting' regime or will be 'conserved' (no use of timber).

Findings

The forest is managed as conservation forest. The equilibrium stand volume has not been defined. Project crediting period is 30 years. According to the PDD the forest will be treated as conservation forest and no use of timber planned.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

-

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

In case of rotation forestry, the future CO2-fixation is based on the mean stand volume during the first rotation period.

Findings

n.a.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

-

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

CO2-Certificates

07 Project Emissions

In order to account for project emissions due to the use of fossil fuels within the project (e.g. through machines, flights, etc.), 0.5% of the future CO2-fixation must be deducted.
Findings
Parameters have been entered into the Climate project system. 0.5 % of future CO2-fixation has been deducted.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
See CAR 17
Summary of project owner response:
Audit team conclusion: See CAR 17.
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

CO2-Certificates

07 Project Emissions

In case fertilizer is used, 0.005 tCO_2 per kg of nitrogen (N) must be deducted. Hereby, no differentiation is made between synthetic and organic fertilizer.
Findings
Not applicable as no fertilizer is foreseen to be used, which could be sustained during field inspections.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
-
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

CO2-Certificates

07 Project Emissions

In case the biomass of the baseline is burned on the field for the purpose of land preparation, an additional 10% of the baseline emissions must be accounted for. This is due to other greenhouse gases (N_2O and CH_4) that are released during the burning process.
Findings
Not applicable as no burning of biomass is foreseen in the project scenario. This has been confirmed during onsite visit.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
-
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

08 Baseline

The baseline is the 'woody biomass' and 'non-woody biomass' on the eligible planting area just before the planting start. The calculation can be done in two different ways:

a. By executing field measurements. Here, the 'Forest Inventory' guideline shall be applied.

b. By estimating the biomass in reference to similar areas

- regional and national default values shall preferably be used
- international default values can only be used if other values are not available

Findings

Option b. is used for calculating the baseline.

International default carbon values from "Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, CDIAC" (IRL 08_01) are used for estimating the baseline for four identified strata. The selection of carbon values have been checked and rated as reliable by the Audit team.

- Bare Areas: 1 tC/ha on 351.17 ha
- Grassland: 4 tC/ha (Tropical dry forest, tropical shrubland, and tropical desert/Global) on 345.54 ha
- Shrubland: 46 tC/ha (Tropical Africa) on 195.77 ha
- Broadleaf Forest Classes: 72 tC/ha (Tropical Dry Forest (also applies in tropical desert and tropical shrubland) Africa) on 37.67 ha

The values of shrubland were weighted (IRL 08_02) with the FAO land-cover classification (IRL 08_03, 08_04).

During onsite visit the strata "bare soil" could not be confirmed in the size provided in the PDD (351.17 ha).

Reference points were taken by GPS on various areas within the project boundary and the vegetation assessed by the audit team. In addition the areas of patches of woody vegetation and "Forests" as described in the eligibility section need to be adapted. This might also affect the size of the different strata identified for the baseline calculations.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 17.

Baseline calculation to be updated in line with adapted land use classes update (see CAR 2).

Provide clarification on the definition of "Carbon Value" in IRL 08_01

Summary of project owner response:

CAR 17:

Baseline calculation was updated. The definition of "Carbon Value" in IRL 08_01 was clarified.

Audit team conclusion:

CAR 17:

Provide references and details of updated calculation. No updates could be found in the documents provided.

Summary of project owner response:

CAR 17: updated Calculation sheet. Carbon Value is clarified under supporting doc 08_05, in Mg/ ha.

Audit team conclusion:

Baseline calculations have been updated and found in compliance with standard requirements.

The results of the new assessment is as follow follows:

CO2-Certificates

08 Baseline

The baseline is the ‘woody biomass’ and ‘non-woody biomass’ on the eligible planting area just before the planting start. The calculation can be done in two different ways:

a. By executing field measurements. Here, the ‘Forest Inventory’ guideline shall be applied.

b. By estimating the biomass in reference to similar areas

- regional and national default values shall preferably be used
- international default values can only be used if other values are not available

Landcover class	Area (in ha)
Bare soil	16,25
Grassland	240,21
Shrubland with herbaceous layer and emergents	413,21
Woodland	107,06
Settlement	0,65
Water	0,17

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

09 Leakage

Leakage is caused by an increase of emissions outside of the project area as a result of the project activity. Leakage emissions can be caused due to a shift of the following activities:

a. fuelwood use
b. charcoal burning
c. timber harvesting
d. agricultural farming
e. resettlement
f. livestock grazing

Findings

According to the Stakeholder surveys the project areas have not been used by the communities unless for sheep grazing. Nomads used the area for cattle grazing. The PDD states that the sheep and cattle grazing activities shifted out of the project area will not have any impact on the carbon pool woody biomass outside the project area. Therefore the value of displaced heads is considered as 0.

During onsite visit neither cattle nor sheep grazing activities in or around the project areas could be detected.

On some areas closed to the village of Abouzokope use of firewood has been detected on minor scale. Also one small patch of farmland (Cassava field) in Fokpo area and some agricultural site at Abouzokope area have been found and documented.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 18.
Provide further information on leakage due to fuelwood use and agricultural farming. See also CAR 1 and 2.

Summary of project owner response:

CAR 18:

Further information to fuelwood use and agricultural farming was provided. The project area now also includes agricultural farming land which is declared as not eligibile.

Audit team conclusion:

No information could be found in the documents provided to the audit team.

Summary of project owner response:

CAR 18: Further information on carchoal production and agricultural farming is documented in the PDD (template leakage, page 1).

Audit team conclusion:

Required information concerning leakage (IRL 09_01, 09_02, 09_03) has been provided and included in the carbon calculation and in the PDD.

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

ClimateProjects – MU Document
Findings
The MU documents have been provided on the CarbonFix.info webpage.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
CAR 19. MU documents to be updated in line with update of carbon calculations (see CARs above).
Summary of project owner response:
Audit team conclusion: The MU document has been updated. However, the EXCEL calculation sheet provides a final figure for the Total Net CO2 Fixation, which is about 5 % higher that the MU figure. The excel sheet carbon calculation has been checked by the audit team and found in compliance with standard requirements.
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Permanence

10 Capacities

Evidence must be given that the project management has sufficient qualification and an appropriate structure to ensure sustainable implementation and management of the project.

Findings

The level of qualification of the project management has been described in the PDD. An organigram in the PDD (IRL 00_02, 10 page 3) shows the cooperation between the project owner natureOffice GmbH, Action Durable and the consultants. Information on qualifications of the management staff from the German natureOffice team have been checked and found reliable. The CV of the local forester managing the plantation work, Mamati Palabe has been provided (IRL 3) and checked by the audit team. The qualification has been confirmed with interviews and by visual inspection of the field work by the audit team. He is found able to manage the afforestation works.

Information on qualification of the local Executive director of “Action Durable” Lekey Yaovi Koumassi has been provided and checked. He worked since 2010 as company officer with statutory authority for L’associacion “Togo enfant Chande d’avenir” (IRL 4 dated 02.01.2010). He is a well educated person with excellent contacts to opinion leaders and decision makers in the region. He is in charge of the Management of the project in Togo.

The NGO “Action Durable” is contracted by natureOffice Germany with the implementation and management of the project (IRL 10_12).

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 20.
Provide further information on management structure and involvement of Action Durable Germany and Togo. The contractual agreement between natureOffice and Action Durable needs to be provided.

Summary of project owner response:

CAR 20:

More information about the management structure of ACTION DURABLE Germany and Togo was provided. The contractual agreement was added.

Audit team conclusion:

CAR 20:

Provide information and reference of the documents provided.

Summary of project owner response:

CAR 20: PDD is now updated (template Capacities, page 5) and the contract was added (supporting document 10_10)

Audit team conclusion:

Required clarification has been provided (IRL 10_12).

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Evidence must be given that project management decisions are based on a joint process
Findings
Decisions are taken over a fixed hierarchy. Within Togo all decisions are made in general by Director Mr. Lekey Yaovi Koumassi. Decisions beyond a certain financial framework contrary to adopted plans are directed to the German based Management. Communication structures are partly described in the stakeholder agreements (IRL 05_01)
CARs / FARs / NCRs
CAR 21. Provide management procedures and its implementation for 10.1 – 10.5 (SOPs).
Summary of project owner response: CAR 21: SOPs were added as supporting document with reference in the PDD.
Audit team conclusion: No information found in the documents provided.
Summary of project owner response: CAR 21: SOPs were added as supporting document (10_03) and referenced in the PDD.
Audit team conclusion: Respective information on management procedures has been provided (IRL 10_13) and included in the PDD.
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Permanence

10 Capacities

Evidence must be given that the project management has an internal quality-control system.
Findings
According to the PDD processes are evaluated on a regular base. An internal QA/QC system has been described but needs to be specified.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
See CAR 21 Provide management procedures and its implementation for 10.1 – 10.5 (SOPs).
Summary of project owner response:
Audit team conclusion: Respective information on management procedures has been provided (IRL 10_13) and included in the PDD.
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Permanence

10 Capacities

Evidence must be given that the project works with other institutions to continuously expand the project management's qualifications.
Findings
The project works together with the Fraunhofer Gesellschaft for testing Terra Preta.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
See CAR 21 Provide management procedures and its implementation for 10.1 – 10.5 (SOPs).
Summary of project owner response:
Audit team conclusion: Respective information on management procedures has been provided (IRL 10_13) and included in the PDD.
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Permanence

10 Capacities

Evidence must be given, that suitable knowledge transfer within the project management is ensured over time.
Findings
Trainings, seminars and field works are conducted on a regularly base to secure the knowledge transfer. The lessons are evaluated and future lessons are based on the evaluation.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
See CAR 21 Provide management procedures and its implementation for 10.1 – 10.5 (SOPs).
Summary of project owner response:
Audit team conclusion: Respective information on management procedures has been provided (IRL 10_13) and included in the PDD.
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

10 Capacities

Evidence must be provided that sufficient financial means are available for the long-term finance of the project.

Findings

As described in the PDD the annual cash flow turns negative after 10 years but the cumulative cash flow remains positive. Information concerning the projects cash flow is provided (IRL 10_03).

The project owner provided information on its balance sheets for 2011 and 2012 (IRL 10_11); information on the turnover of its core business, (Sale of Carbon certificates Jan 2013 – Sept 2013) was provided and checked on site. Information on signed frame-contracts with Heidelberger Druckmaschinen (IRL 10_08, dated 11.07.2013,), Filltral (IRL 10_09, dated 29.05.2013), Continental (IRL 10_10, dated 29.05.2013), EVVC and TÜV Hessen including frame-contracts with 240 printing companies for carbon free printing have been provided and checked by the audit team.

The project owner sells so called “expected carbon credits”. These sales are the base for the funding of the project activity.

A detailed plan of project costs (IRL 10_03) was provided and discussed during the audit and found reliable.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 22.
Provide further evidence on financial means:

> Commercial law planning and tax relevant planning to be discussed with naturOffice tax advisor (Kanzlei Lorenz, Wiesbaden). Respective contact permission and data need to be provided.

Summary of project owner response:

Audit team conclusion:

Commercial law and tax relevant planning has been discussed with tax advisor Frau Hellwig, Steuerkanzlei Lorenz/Wiesbaden by phone on 30 Jan 2014. Accruals from the sale of carbon credits in the early phase of the project are set aside to meet uncertain obligations according to German commercial law (HGB 249, 1). These are used to secure financial funding of the project activity for the complete project period.

CAR closed.

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Permanence

10 Capacities

If two or more of the following points apply, the project is only allowed to assign 50% of its future CO2-certificates until the first successful monitoring certification - however at the earliest 3 years after the initial certification:

- The project financier has not managed other projects (not necessarily in forestry) of similar financial scale, yet.
- The organisation of the project developer was founded earlier than 5 years ago.
- The project is located in a country which is ranked in the second half of Land Property (LP) rating by IPRI.

Findings

1. The project financier natureOffice has not managed other projects yet.
2. The organization of the project developer was founded earlier than 5 years ago – January 2008 IRL (10_05).
3. The project location Togo is not rated at IPRI.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 23.
Provide information on IPRI rating.

Summary of project owner response:
CAR 23:
While Togo is not rated at IPRI – the IPRI rating was calculated as average value from the neighboring countries.

Audit team conclusion:
CAR 23:
Provide clarification on the result of the calculation and which countries/values were considered.

Summary of project owner response:
CAR23: Calculation is now available in the PDD.

Audit team conclusion:
As a result of the information provided statement 1 and 3 apply. Therefore the project is only allowed to assign 50% of its future CO2 certificates.
The PDD and the calculations have been adapted accordingly.

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Permanence

10 Capacities

Evidence must be given that the project has sufficient technical capacity to ensure sustainable implementation and management of the project. Therefore, a technical description of the following activities must be given:

a. Nursery
b. Land preparation (incl. lining out /spacing)
c. Planting
d. Beating up (replacing of dead seedlings)
e. Maintenance
f. Pruning
g. Thinning
h. Harvesting

Findings

A detailed technical description of above activities has been provided in the PDD.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

See CAR 3, detailed forest management plan.

Audit team conclusion:
A forest management plan in compliance with good practice has been provided. (see CAR 3)

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Permanence

10 Capacities

Evidence must be given that non-permanence risks of a project are mitigated. Therefore, an evaluation of the following risks must be given

a. Water (drought, flood, hail, snow, heavy rains …)
b. Wind (storms, hurricanes …)
c. Animals (insects, domestic animals, wild animals …)
d. Fire (human made, natural)
e. Diseases (bacteria, viruses …)
f. Temperature (coldness, heat)
g. Encroachment of people
h. Others

A description of the projects potential risks and risks mitigation measures in-place must be given.

Findings

Descriptions and evaluations of the above mentioned non-permanence risk factors have been provided and implemented mitigation measures are described in the PDD.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 24.

- Animals: provide further information on mitigation measures on domestic animals like sheep, goats and cattle.
- Fire: a description of protective and mitigation activities of manmade fires is missing.

Summary of project owner response:
CAR 24:
The PDD was completed by information on mitigation measures on domestic animals and a description of protective and mitigation activities of manmade fires.

Audit team conclusion:
CAR 24:
No information included in the documents provided.

Summary of project owner response:
CAR24: PDD now is updated (template capacities, page 14)

Audit team conclusion:
Respective information in compliance with good practice has been added in the PDD.

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

If there is a risk of fire a 'Fire Management Plan' must implemented. This plan must include a description of the following activities:

a. Fire awareness
b. Fire prevention
c. Fire equipment
d. Fire detection
e. Fire suppression
f. Fire damage rehabilitation

Findings

A fire management plan has been provided (IRL 10_07) and a description has been provided in the PDD. As confirmed by visual inspection and through interviews during onsite visit implementation of the fire management plan is in progress. Fire lines have been partly established and trainings and information on fire protection have been conducted. Respective information could be sustained during onsite visit.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 25.
Further information on "f. Fire damage rehabilitations" is required in the fire management plan.

Summary of project owner response:
CAR 25:
The PDD was completed.

Audit team conclusion:
Information has been provided in the PDD. In case of a loss of planted area due to fire replanting will be executed.
CAR closed.

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Permanence

11 Land & CO_2 Tenure

Evidence must be given that the project developer has an uncontested legal land title of the project area, for a minimum period of the project's crediting period.

Findings

The community of the village of Fokpo is the owner of the Fokpo project area. There is a contract signed between the Chief of Fokpo as representative of the community and natureOffice GmbH: The commitment starts on the 27. Jan 2012 and ends after 30 years in 2042. An official translation of this contract has been provided (IRL 11_01, 11_03, 11_04). In the contract it is clearly defined that natureOffice has the right on the resources and carbon of the land.

Another contract is signed between Adelan Akutu, Mrs Kpanazo, Kodjo Amewu and Kokoroko Agbematsi Kossi as representative of the collective Adelan Akutu and natureOffice GmbH. The commitment starts on the 27. Jan 2012 and ends after 30 years in 2042. An official translation of this contract has been provided (IRL 11_02).

The contract includes all activities concerning the implementation of the plantation. In the contract it is clearly defined that natureOffice has the right on the resources and carbon of the land.

The contract is witnessed by le Prefet d'Agou, Mr. Nounyava Kouku at 25.03.2013.

The local expert Dr. Kossi Adjounu confirmed the reliability of the contract.

AVES in an NGO which was preciously involved in the project management in Togo. The collaboration ended on the 4.12.2012.

Interviews conducted during the onsite visit with villagers, the local village chiefs, representatives of the police of Kpalime and the Prefect of Agou confirmed the land ownerships and land rights.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Permanence

11 Land & CO_2 Tenure

Evidence must be given that all necessary permits for the implementation and management of the project (planting permits, harvesting permits, infrastructures permits, etc.) are secured for a minimum period of the project's crediting period.
Findings
In the contracts for the land lease (IRL 11_01, 11_02) the rights for the implementation of the project including necessary infrastructure are confirmed. Interviews conducted during the onsite visit with the local village chiefs, representatives of the police of Kpalime and the Prefect of Agou did not provide any information on necessary permits. A stakeholder consultation with the forestry department is missing.
CARs / FARs / NCRs
CAR 26. Provide evidence on national legislation, that all necessary permits for the establishment of the project are assured. See also Car 13.
Summary of project owner response: CAR 26: The project was visited by national Forest Authority, evidence is given in the PDD.
Audit team conclusion: No information on the CAR above could be found in the PDD 11.2. CAR 26 still open.
Summary of project owner response: CAR 26: Additional information was added in the PDD (template CO2 and land tenure, page 5).
Audit team conclusion: Respective information has been provided in the PDD; no permits are required for afforestation activities in this scale.
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Permanence

11 Land & CO_2 Tenure

On overview on the contact details of the project participants must be provided.
Findings
An overview on the contact details of the project participants is provided in the PDD. • Project developer: natureOffice • Owner of the CO2-rights: natureOffice • Owner of the land: village-community of Fokpo and Collectivité Adélan Akutu • Owner of the timber: natureOffice • Owner of other recourses: natureOffice • Project financier: natureOffice • Project implementation: Action Durable
CARs / FARs / NCRs
-
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Permanence

11 Land & CO_2 Tenure

Evidence must be given that the project developer is the

a. Owner of the CO2-rights AND
b. Owner of the land AND
c. Owner of the timber AND
d. Owner of other resources
e. Project financier

If the project developer is not all of the above, evidence must be given that the respective participant agrees with the expected project activity for the minimum period of the project's crediting period.

Findings

The project developer is natureOffice.

a. A natureOffice is the owner of the CO2-Certificates as defined in the contracts (IRL 11_01, 11_02)
b. Owner of the lands are the community of Fokpo and the collectivité Ad´lan Akutu. In the mentioned contracts (IRL 11_01, 11_02) the land owners agree with the project activity for the 30 years project crediting period.
c. Owner of the timber is natureOffice as stated in the contracts (IRL 11_01, 11_02).
d. Owner of other resources is natureOffice as stated in the contracts excluding mining. (IRL 11_01, 11_02).
e. Project financier is natureOffice GmbH.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

-

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Permanence

11 Land & CO_2 Tenure

In case the owner of CO2-rights is a group of multiple individuals, authorization for the issuance and assignment of the CO2-certificates must be given to the project developer with a written approval.
Findings
The owner of the CO2-certificates is natureOffice GmbH (IRL 11_01, 11_02), which is not a group of multiple individuals (IRL 10_05)
CARs / FARs / NCRs
-
Final Conclusion
☒ Accepted ☐ Accepted with FAR (…) ☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

Procedures

010 Avoidance of Double Counting

1. Templates shall be filled out with a green colour and the font type Calibri, size 10.
2. Red coloured comments in the template shall be deleted before document submission.
3. Maps shall include the following information: Name of the project, Direction of North, ID of the project, Used GPS coordinate system (e.g. WGS 84), Legend, GPS grid, Printing date, Infrastructure (roads, houses, etc.) and rivers, Scale, Information on the satellite or aerial picture used (date, resolutions, data source)
4. Figures above one thousand shall be formatted with a space (1 000 000), whereby decimals will be separated by a point (1.35).
5. Pictures, graphs and tables within project documents shall be clearly marked with a unique ID.
6. Supporting documents must be numbered according to the format outlined in the CFS. In the project documents, ONLY the reference number (01-02) shall be stated, together with the exact location of the referred information.
7. The project documents and supporting documents must be submitted in English, OR a language which has been agreed upon by the project developer, the technical board of CarbonFix and the certification body that executes the certification process.
8. The ClimateProjects platform must be used to submit the project information for any pre-validation and certification process. All project information must be made publically available through the ClimateProjects system, except for confidential information.

Findings

1. Templates are filled out in green color and font type Calibri, size 10
2. All red colored comments have to be deleted.
3. Required information on Maps is included.
4. Assure that all figures are formatted as required.
5. Figures, graphs and pictures are marked with an unique ID.
6. Supporting documents are numbered according to the format. Reference numbers in the PDD are often missing and need to be stated where necessary.
7. Project documents and supporting documents need to be submitted in English as there is no other agreement yet.
8. The climate project platform is used for submitting information.

It has been agreed upon with the audit team that supporting documents can be submitted in German and/or French.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 27.

The PDD needs to be provided in word and pfd to the auditor.

Assure that figures are formatted according to CFS (e.g. 100 000.20)

Summary of project owner response:

CAR 27:

PDD is provided in word and pdf to the auditor now.

Figures are formatted according to CFS.

Audit team conclusion:

CAR 27:

Assure that the actual PDD and latest set of supporting documents is uploaded to the Carbonfix Webpage and provided to the audit team.

Updated documents in line with the requirements have been provided on the CFS webpage.

1. Templates shall be filled out with a green colour and the font type Calibri, size 10.
2. Red coloured comments in the template shall be deleted before document submission.
3. Maps shall include the following information: Name of the project, Direction of North, ID of the project, Used GPS coordinate system (e.g. WGS 84), Legend, GPS grid, Printing date, Infrastructure (roads, houses, etc.) and rivers, Scale, Information on the satellite or aerial picture used (date, resolutions, data source)
4. Figures above one thousand shall be formatted with a space (1 000 000), whereby decimals will be separated by a point (1.35).
5. Pictures, graphs and tables within project documents shall be clearly marked with a unique ID.
6. Supporting documents must be numbered according to the format outlined in the CFS. In the project documents, ONLY the reference number (01-02) shall be stated, together with the exact location of the referred information.
7. The project documents and supporting documents must be submitted in English, OR a language which has been agreed upon by the project developer, the technical board of CarbonFix and the certification body that executes the certification process.
8. The ClimateProjects platform must be used to submit the project information for any pre-validation and certification process. All project information must be made publically available through the ClimateProjects system, except for confidential information.

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

1. In case a project is located in a district or country that is part of a national or pan-national scheme that must report its forest area, the project developer can only assign its CO2-certificates to a CO2-buyer using minimum one of the following options:

1a. The CO2-buyer explicitly agrees in purchase agreements to the statement as detailed in the CFS

1b. The respective agency of the projects host-country gives a statement as detailed in the CFS

1c. The project developer retires

- one additional CO2-certificate from another project certified according to the CarbonbFix Standard, OR
- one additional Gold Standard certificate

for every CO2-certificate assigned to a CO2-buyer.

Hereby, the additional retired certificate must carry the ID of the assigned CFS CO2-certificate.

Findings

No information concerning above requirement has been provided.

CARs / FARs / NCRs

CAR 28.
Provide information whether TOGO is part of a national or pan national scheme that must report its forest area.

Summary of project owner response:

Procedures

010 Avoidance of Double Counting

1. In case a project is located in a district or country that is part of a national or pan-national scheme that must report its forest area, the project developer can only assign its CO2-certificates to a CO2-buyer using minimum one of the following options:

1a. The CO2-buyer explicitly agrees in purchase agreements to the statement as detailed in the CFS

1b. The respective agency of the projects host-country gives a statement as detailed in the CFS

1c. The project developer retires

- one additional CO2-certificate from another project certified according to the CarbonbFix Standard, OR
- one additional Gold Standard certificate

for every CO2-certificate assigned to a CO2-buyer.

Hereby, the additional retired certificate must carry the ID of the assigned CFS CO2-certificate.

Togo is not obliged its forest land to reports. Rather, Togo in its efforts to fight against the climate change, recognized the mechanism of the CO2 market for funding for adjustments and to reduce emissions into the country (supporting document 02_05; page 27; paragraph 3).

Audit team conclusion:

Respective information has been provided that sustains the fact that Togo is not part of any scheme to report its forest area. (IRL 02_08)

Final Conclusion

☒ Accepted
☐ Accepted with FAR (…)
☐ Not accepted with NCR (…)

<table>
<tr><th>Ref. No.</th><th>Author/Editor/ Issuer</th><th>Title/Type of Document. Publication place</th><th>Issuance and/or submission date</th><th>Relevance</th></tr>
<tr><td>0.</td><td>Carbonfix Webpage</td><td>“Project Togo ”, project documentation accessed at: http://www.carbonfix.info/Project.html?PHPSESSID=v9it37l3k7khpavhkghlrtbmk5</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>00_01</td><td>TÜV SÜD</td><td>Interviewed Persons:
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Name</th><th>Organisation</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Andreas Weckwert</td><td>natureOffice</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Franziska Niesch</td><td>natureOffice</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Lekey Yauovi Koumassi</td><td>Director, Action Durable</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>Charity Nunyakpe</td><td>Consultant</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>Lekey Karoline</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>6</td><td>Nounyova Kokun</td><td>Prefet Agou</td></tr>
<tr><td>7</td><td>Sepe Komlan</td><td>Prefet Sekpele</td></tr>
<tr><td>8</td><td>Katanga Makiliwe</td><td>Police</td></tr>
<tr><td>9</td><td>Adoyih Rahid</td><td>Gendarme</td></tr>
<tr><td>10</td><td>Ankou Kossi</td><td>Work safety officer, Action Durable</td></tr>
<tr><td>11</td><td>Mamati Palabe</td><td>Forester, Action Durable</td></tr>
<tr><td>12</td><td>Frau Hellwig</td><td>Steuerberaterin, Kanzlei Lorenz/Wiesbaden</td></tr>
</table></td><td>18 – 25 Oct 2013</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>00_02</td><td>natureOffice</td><td>PDD – Project Togo</td><td>28 Oct 2014</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>01_01</td><td>natureOffice</td><td>stakeholdersurveyreport Fokpo_MAR2012.pdf</td><td>Mar 2012</td><td>1 Eligibility</td></tr>
<tr><td>01_02</td><td>natureOffice</td><td>stakeholdersurveyreport Abouzokope_JAN2013.pdf</td><td>Jan 2013</td><td>1 Eligibility</td></tr>
<tr><td>01_03</td><td></td><td>La¦ênderinformation Togo SOS Kinderdo¦êrfer_NOV2011.pdf</td><td>Nov 2011</td><td>1 Eligibility</td></tr>
<tr><td>01_04</td><td>Michel Adovi Goeh-Akue</td><td>synthese de l'histoire du togo_2011.pdf</td><td>2011</td><td>1 Eligibility</td></tr>
</table>

Ref. No.	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Relevance
01_05	Afrol News	afrol news 28 may_NOV2011.pdf	23 Nov 2011	1 Eligibility
01_06	Deutsche Botschaft Lome	Deutsche Botschaft Lome¦ü_MAR2012.pdf	Mar 2012	1 Eligibility
01_07	croix rouge togolaise	croix rouge togolaise_NOV2011.pdf	23 Nov 2011	1 Eligibility
01_08	ONU/DAES	code de l'eau_JUN2005.pdf	Jun 2005	1 Eligibility
01_09	Padabô Kadouza	characteristics of land tenure and difficulties of land reforms in sub-saharan Africa-the case of togo_2011.pdf	2011	1 Eligibility
01_10	UNFCCC	DNA forest definition Togo	Aug 2011	1 Eligibility
01_11	Republique Togolaise	code forestier_SEP2008.pdf	19 Jun 2008	1 Eligibility
01_12	IPCC	IPCC V4_07_Ch7_Wetlands_2006.pdf	2006	1 Eligibility
01_13	natureOffice	Forest Management Plan (01_10)	Feb 2014	1 Eligibility
02_01	natureOffice	Gutes Geschäftsklima (pdf)	2012	2 Additionality
02_02	Action Durable	Satzung Action Durable - Deutschland	2012	1 Eligibility
02_03	Finanzwelt.de	finanzwelt.de ÔÇô Terra Vitalis	28 Mar 2012	1 Eligibility
02_04	Mondinion.com	Invest in a Teak Plantation in Togo	28 Mar 2012	1 Eligibility
02_05	www.derivate.bnp paribas.de	WARRANT UND ZERTIFIKATE	May 2008	2 Additionality
02_06	DGVN	Eine-Welt-Presse	Jan 2008	2 Additionality
02_07	lifeforestry.com	Holz Investment	Mar 2012	2 Additionality
02_08	Republique Togolaise	Politique Nationale de lEnvironnement	Jun 1997	2 Additionality

Ref. No.	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Relevance
02_09	IWIM - Institute for World Economics and International Management	Wie können Investitionen in Afrika durch nationale, regionale und internationale Abkommen gefördert werden?	Jun 2004	2 Additionality
02_10	CarbonFix	Additionality_KFR_CFS	Aug 2013	2 Additionality
02_11	DW.de	Bildung in Togo	21 Aug 2013	2 Additionality
02_12	africasciencenews .org	Africa forests suffer from lack of scientists, learning institutions	Aug 2013	2 Additionality
02_13	The Oakland Intitute	Understanding Landinvestmentdeals in Africa	Sept 2012	2 Additionality
02_14	Hilfe-für-Togo.de	hilfe-fuer-togo.de	May 2013	2 Additionality
02_15	Hilfe-für-Togo.de	hilfe-fuer-togo.de_Landwirtschaft und Aufforstung	May 2013	2 Additionality
02_16	DAZ e.V.	DAZ-Der Verein	14 May 2013	2 Additionality
02_17	www.waldaktie-savanne.de	Waldaktie - Savanne	14 May 2013	2 Additionality
02_18	Case Togo	workchamp_Bericht_Togo	2007	2 Additionality
02_19	natureOffice	Contract de cession de terrain rural du Village de Fokpo	05 Dec 2012	2 Additionality
02_20	natureOffice	Vertrag über die Abtretung dorfeigener Flächen -Abouzokope	25 Mar 2013	2 Additionality
02_21	Gov. of Togo	Communication national sur les changements climatiques_02_05	Nov 2010	2 Additionality
03_01	FAO	FAO Guideline	May 2013	3 Forest Management
03_02	Kölnische Rundschau	Kölnische Rundschau, Arbeitsauftrag - Gras mähen	Aug 2013	3 Forest Management
03_03	natureOffice	KML file Fokpo	Aug 2013	3 Forest Management

Ref. No.	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Relevance
03_04	natureOffice	KML file Abouzokope	Aug 2013	3 Forest Management
03_05	natureOffice	shapefiles - Land use classes 10 years prior planting start	Aug 2013	3 Forest Management
03_06	natureOffice	shapefiles - nature conversation areas	Aug 2013	3 Forest Management
03_07	natureOffice	shapefiles - neighbors	Aug 2013	3 Forest Management
03_08	natureOffice	shapefiles - eligible planting area	Aug 2013	3 Forest Management
03_09	natureOffice	shapefiles - Land use classes just before the planting start	Aug 2013	3 Forest Management
03_10	natureOffice	shapefiles - Infrastructure	Aug 2013	3 Forest Management
03_11	natureOffice	Shapefiles updated – Fokpo (03_05)	June 2014	3 Forest Management
03_12	natureOffice	Shapefiles updated – Abouzokope (03_06)	June 2014	3 Forest Management
04_01	Fraunhofer Institut	Zusammensetzung B3	10 Jun 2011	4 Environmental Aspects
04_02	Institute for Veterinary Public Health	Klimadiagramme, Klimaklassifikation nach Köppken http://koeppen-geiger.vu-wien.ac.at/	Aug 2013	4 Environmental Aspects
04_03	US AID	Biodiversity and forest assessment - Togo	Feb 2008	4 Environmental Aspects
04_04	IBAT	Biodiversity monitoring	Aug 2013	4 Environmental Aspects
05_01	natureOffice	Stakeholder Agreement Management	Aug 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_02	natureOffice	Existing Information Exchange_Management	Aug 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_03	natureOffice	Dropbox “screenshoot”	Aug 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_04	natureOffice	Pictures Management	Aug 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_05	natureOffice	Stakeholder Agreement Employees	Aug 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_06	natureOffice	Existing Information Exchange_Employees	Aug 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects

Ref. No.	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Relevance
05_07	natureOffice	Stakeholder Agreement Villagecommunity Fokpo	Aug 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_08	natureOffice	Existing Information Exchange_Villagecommunity Fokpo	Aug 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_09	natureOffice	Stakeholder Agreement Villagecommunity Abouzokope	Aug 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_10	natureOffice	Existing Information Exchange_Villagecommunity Abouzokope	Aug 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_11	natureOffice	Stakeholder Agreement Landowner Abouzokope	Aug 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_12	natureOffice	Existing Information Exchange_Landowner Abouzokope	Aug 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_13	natureOffice	Stakeholder Agreement Agotime	Aug 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_14	natureOffice	Existing Information Exchange_Agotime	Aug 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_15	natureOffice	working contranct	Jan 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_16	natureOffice	Human Resource Manual	Sep 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_17	natureOffice	community work	Mar 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_18	natureOffice	First Aid Training documentation (verified and available on site)	Oct 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_19	natureOffice	Workshop planning schedule (verified and available on site)	Oct 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_20	natureOffice	Health insurance contract “Action Durable” (verified and available on site)	Oct 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_21	natureOffice	Health insurance invoice (verified and available on site)	Oct 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_22	natureOffice	Contract Reglement interieur Fokpo – to be provided in translation	Oct 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_23	natureOffice	Contract Reglement interieur Abouzokope – to be provided in translation	Oct 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_24	natureOffice	Stakeholderagreement_05_16_PASYD_FEB2014	Feb 2014	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_25	natureOffice	Stakeholderagreement_05_17_CADO_FEB2014	Feb 2014	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_26	natureOffice	Stakeholderagreement_05_18_Forest Authority_JAN2014	Jan 2014	5 Socio-econ. Aspects

Ref. No.	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Relevance
05_27	natureOffice	SOP on work safety (05_19)	Mar 2014	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_28	natureOffice	Reglement interieur	Nov 2013	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_29	natureOffice	Stakeholder Agreement PASYD	Feb 2014	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_30	natureOffice	Stakeholder Agreement CADO	Feb 2014	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
05_31	natureOffice	Stakeholder Agreement Forestry Authority	Jan 2014	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
06_01	natureOffice	IPCC – LULUCF good practice Guidance	2003	6 CO2 - Fixation
06_02	natureOffice	CO2 – Model 2011	2011	6 CO2 - Fixation
06_03	natureOffice	06_03_LULUCF good practice Anx_3A-1_2011	2011	6 CO2 - Fixation
06_04	natureOffice	CO2 – Calculation EEXEL-sheet	Oct 2014	6 CO2 - Fixation
08_01	CDIAC	Global Carbon Biomass Tables - Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory	26 Sep 2012	8 Baseline
08_02	natureOffice	Extent_landcover_classes	Sep 2013	8 Baseline
08_03	FAO	LAND COVER CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM	Sep 2013	8 Baseline
08_04	FAO	LAND COVER CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM-APPENDIX A	Sep 2013	8 Baseline
09_01	natureOffice	Leakage Betrachtung	Apr 2014	9 Leakage
09_02	natureOffice	Fuelwood in Kenya	Apr 2014	9 Leakage
09_03	natureOffice	Shape files “firewood harvesting zone”	Apr 2014	9 Leakage
10_01	natureOffice	Projektantrag – Magazin Abouzokope	04. May 2013	10 Capacity
10_02	natureOffice	Qualita¦êtsmanagementhandbuch	Aug 2013	10 Capacity
10_03	natureOffice	Cash Flow	Aug 2013	10 Capacity
10_04	Rep. du Togo	Code Forestiere	Sept 2008	10 Capacity

Ref. No.	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Relevance
10_05	natureOffice	Eintragung natureOffice.	Jan 2008	10 Capacity
10_06	Int. Property Rights Index	International Property Rights Index	2012	10 Capacity
10_07	natureOffice	Fire-management-plan	Jan 2013	10 Capacity
10_08	natureOffice	Contract “Heidelberger Druckmaschinen”	05 Jun 2013	10 Capacity
10_09	natureOffice	Contract “Filtral”	29 May 2013	10 Capacity
10_10	natureOffice	Contract “Continental”	05 Aug 2013	10 Capacity
10_11	natureOffice	Balance sheet natureOffice 2011/2012 (verified and available on site)	Oct 2013	10 Capacity
10_12	natureOffice	contract between Action Durable and natureOffice (10_01)	Nov 2013	10 Capacity
10_13	natureOffice	_SOPs - Management PT (10_03)	Jan 2014	10 Capacity
11_01	natureOffice	Landnutzungsvertrag_Fokpo	27 JAN 2012	11 Land tenure
11_02	natureOffice	Landnutzungsvertrag Abouzokope	25 Mar 2013	11 Land tenure
11_03	natureOffice	Erkla¦êrung der Bevo¦êlkerung von Fokpo	Mar 2012	11 Land tenure
11_04	natureOffice	GPS Fla¦êche Fokpo	Nov 2012	11 Land tenure
11_05	natureOffice	Forest Management Plan - Plan de gestion,	2011	11 Land tenure