Gold Standard
for the Global Goals

FORM

# FORM - PRELIMINARY REVIEW SUBMISSION

| | |
|---|---|
| PROJECT/POA ID | GS 23254 |
| PROJECT/POA TITLE | Brújula Verde |
| VPAS ID* | N/A |

**If multiple VPAs are submitted together for listing, the CME shall include GS IDs in the table, please add rows as needed.*

| | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Real Case VPA ☐ Regular Case VPA | GS ID |
| ☐ Real Case VPA ☐ Regular Case VPA | GS ID |

## Summary

The Preliminary Review Submission form is required to provide necessary information about a proposed Project activity /Programme of Activities/Voluntary Project Activity(ies) (henceforth 'Project' for short) for project listing on the Gold Standard Gold Standard Assurance Platform and Impact Registry.

The project developer/CME shall refer to paragraphs 5.1.3 to 5.1.12 of the *Principles and Requirements* document and the latest Rule Update for comprehensive information on the preliminary review process, including requirements and procedures. Furthermore, the project developer/CME should use the guidelines provided in this template to ensure compliance with all necessary steps.

# 1| SCOPE, APPLICABILITY AND ENTRY INTO FORCE

1.1.1 | As noted under Gold Standard for the Global Goals (GS4GG) *Principles & Requirements* paragraph 5.1.9, the preliminary review is intended as a guide to the project developer. It does not represent a certification review or results in certification. **It does not guarantee that a Project will be successful in validation, design review, ongoing verification, or performance review. Neither does it guarantee that no further issues or alternative interpretations will arise during validation or design review**.

1.1.2 | To list a proposed project, PoA and VPAs[1] with Gold Standard, the project developer/CME shall submit the preliminary review form in its most updated template version with supporting documents.

1.1.3 | The following project documents shall also be submitted with the latest version of Form - Preliminary Review Submission (this document);

a. Stakeholder Consultation Report (draft report – including summary of both rounds of consultation) *If multiple VPAs are submitted together then the stakeholder consultation report shall be submitted for each VPA except if a grouped stakeholder consultation is conducted. For details, please refer to section 4.9 of* Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement Requirements*)*
b. PoA Design Consultation Report (draft report for PoAs only)
c. Signed Cover Letter
d. Signed Terms and Conditions
e. Signed Terms of Use
f. Draft PDD/PoA-DD/VPA-DD
    i. only needed when no other project applying the same methodology and/or product is listed on Assurance platform the Gold Standard Impacts Registry, and
    ii. may include – NOT MANDATORY - a summary of demonstration of the financial additionality approach and a draft monitoring plan at the preliminary review stage.

1.1.4 | All projects, PoAs and VPAs submitted on or after 01/06/2025 for preliminary review shall use the latest version of the Form - *Preliminary Review Submission*.

[1] In case of regular VPAs, exemptions may apply, refer to the Programme of Activity Requirements for further details.

1.1.5 | All projects, PoAs and VPAs transitioning from CDM or other Standards to Gold Standard for the Global Goals (GS4GG) shall use a Form - *Transition Request Submission* instead of this Form - Preliminary Review Submission.

1.1.6 | The Form - Preliminary Review Submission must be submitted in Microsoft Word document format.

……

# 2| DECISION SUMMARY

TO BE COMPLETED BY GOLD STANDARD

| | |
|---|---|
| Date of the first submission[2] | 04/07/2025 |
| Stakeholder consultation report | ☐Draft report ☒Final report<br>*Confirm the status of the Stakeholder consultation report submitted for preliminary review.* |
| Date of decision/listing | 16/07/2025 |
| Decision | ☐Approved<br>*[without any CARs, FARs or OBs identified]*<br>☒Conditionally approved<br>*[with CARs, FARs or OBs identified that are not required to be resolved prior to submission for Design Review]*<br>☐ Not Approved<br>*[identified at least one potential Non-Conformity (NC)]*<br>Reason for rejection: |
| Forward Action Requests<br>*to be resolved during validation prior to submission for Design Review* | |

**FAR 1.** For retroactive cycle projects, the Project Developer (PD) shall demonstrate that: (a) the revenues from Gold Standard Certified SDG Impact Statements or Products, such as GSVERs, were seriously considered in the decision to implement the project, AND (b) there was continuous interest in Certified Impact Statements or Products for the project in parallel with its implementation. PD shall submit evidences/clear documentation to demonstrate prior consideration in parallel with its implementation interest at the time of validation, before submission for design review. The VVB shall validate the reasoning and evidences provided by project developer to demonstrate the retroactivity requirements.

**FAR 2.** The Project Developer (PD) shall ensure that all emission removal estimates under the afforestation/reforestation (A/R) activity are calculated in accordance with the conservative approach required by the applied methodology. This includes the use of scientifically supported and context-appropriate assumptions and parameters that avoid overestimation of removals. The PD shall provide complete documentation of all inputs used in the calculation of removals—such as growth models, planting densities, biomass accumulation rates, harvesting, mortality rate, and forest management practices. Any gaps or years with no reported removals shall be clearly explained and justified. The Validation/Verification Body (VVB) assess the conservativeness, consistency, and methodological validity of the assumptions and calculations as per the requirements of the applied methodology and validation and verification standards.

**FAR 3.** The Project Developer (PD) has selected multiple indicators under SDG 15 (Life on Land), including area under tree canopy cover and area planted with native species. As there may be overlap between these indicators, there is a risk of double counting. Therefore, the PD

[2] The date when the Project Developer submits the review request with the Form - Preliminary Review Submission and required documentation via assurance platform.

shall ensure that all selected SDG indicators are clearly defined, conservative, and non-overlapping. The PD is requested to clarify the relationship between overlapping area-based indicators and revise them if needed to ensure distinct and measurable contributions. The Validation/Verification Body (VVB) shall assess the clarity, appropriateness, and distinctness of each selected indicator as per the SDG Tool and applicable requirements. Where overlap is identified, the VVB shall request clarification or reclassification in line with the *Validation and Verification Standard.*

**FAR 4.** It has been observed that Group G is not included in the list of invitees in the Local Stakeholder Consultation (LSC) Report. The Project Developer shall review the stakeholder identification and invitation process to ensure compliance with the *Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement Requirements*. Any omissions in stakeholder engagement must be addressed in line with the applicable rules. The Validation/Verification Body (VVB) shall assess whether the stakeholder identification and consultation process meets the requirements, including whether all relevant stakeholder groups were appropriately invited.

**FAR 5. Land Eligibility Assessment – LUF:** The preliminary review submission form lacks clarity on the definition and breakdown of the reported project area (10,262 ha), intended expansion (30,000 ha) and eligible area (38,836.4 ha). The Project Developer (PD) shall ensure that all area figures are clearly defined, consistently reported, and traceable across the Project Design Document (PDD) and supporting documents during design certification. Project Developer shall submit the land eligibility assessment evidence against the LUF activity requirements for the purpose of validation:

- Distinguished the project area boundaries
- Identified area to protect or enhance the biological diversity
- Spatial analysis of land eligibility assessment results
- Proof that proposed eligible area was not partly or entirely deforested within the 10 years prior to the project start date

The Validation/Verification Body (VVB) shall confirm that all area definitions are consistent, methodologically sound, and fully compliant with the applicable requirements.

**FAR 6.** The Project Developer (PD) has marked the requirement related to the 10% conservation set-aside as "Not Applicable," stating that the entire project area is designated for conservation. However, this does not exempt the PD from complying with the applicable provisions under the *Land Use & Forests Activity Requirements*. Regardless of overall conservation intent, the PD is required to apply the High Conservation Value (HCV) approach as outlined in the relevant guidance. The Validation/Verification Body (VVB) shall verify that the project meets the conservation and HCV-related requirements, and that these are accurately reflected in the supporting documents.

**FAR 7. *Stakeholder Report Completion and Public Consultation Feedback Round***

The VVB shall validate the project's compliance with Gold Standard stakeholder consultation and engagement requirements through these actions:

- Review stakeholder consultation meeting documentation, including attendance records, minutes, photographs, and feedback forms to verify inclusive representation of all relevant groups
- Verify the stakeholder mapping exercise to ensure all affected and interested parties—particularly vulnerable groups, women, and indigenous peoples—were identified and invited

- Confirm that consultation meetings were conducted in local languages and culturally appropriate ways by reviewing meeting materials and participant feedback
- Interview a representative sample of stakeholders to verify their participation, project understanding, and accurate recording of their feedback
- Examine how stakeholder feedback was incorporated into project design and implementation, including documented changes made in response
- Assess the grievance mechanism's establishment and effectiveness by reviewing procedures and records of addressed complaints
- Check stakeholder feedback round documentation to confirm adequate review and comment periods were provided
- Evaluate evidence of ongoing stakeholder engagement plans and communication mechanisms for project implementation

**FAR 8. Stakeholder Consultation Documentation**

The project developer shall:

- Obtain and document explicit consent from stakeholders regarding the sharing of their personal information in consultation reports
- Submit two versions of the final stakeholder consultation report at design review:
    a. A redacted version with all personal details and stakeholder names removed
    b. A complete non-redacted version for review purposes

**FAR 9. FAR Delayed Stakeholder Consultation (Section 3.2.2: Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement Requirements)**

The VVB shall validate the reasons for conducting stakeholder consultation after the project start date by:

- Reviewing and assessing the project developer's explanation for why the stakeholder consultation was not conducted before the project start date
- Verifying documentation that demonstrates consultation was conducted at the earliest possible opportunity after the project start date
- Validating evidence that shows how stakeholder feedback was incorporated into project design and implementation, including:
    a. Documentation of specific changes or modifications made to the project
    b. Timeline showing when feedback was received and when corresponding changes were implemented
    c. Evidence that stakeholder concerns were adequately addressed
- Confirming that all required stakeholder consultation procedures and requirements were followed despite the delayed timing

**FAR 10. Validation of Legal Ownership and Transfer of Carbon Credits**

The VVB shall validate that the project demonstrates full and uncontested legal ownership transfer of all carbon credits generated under Gold Standard certification from project beneficiaries, in accordance with criteria (f), 3| GENERAL ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA, Principles and Requirements. The validation shall confirm:

- Clear documentation of the transfer process exists
- Evidence of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) from beneficiaries is available
- The transfer process is transparent and properly documented

**FAR 11. Land Eligibility Validation**

VVB shall assess the ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR LUF ACTIVITIES and supportive evidence for land eligibility assessment results and shall validate project's compliance with LUF activity requirements.

**FAR 12. Risk Assessment and Mitigation Validation**

The VVB shall validate the compliance with Safeguarding Principles compliance for risk assessment and mitigation planning through the following actions:

- Review risk assessment documentation thoroughly to verify:
  a. Identification and evaluation of all safeguarding-related risks
  b. Definition of appropriate mitigation measures with clear actions, timelines, and responsibilities
- Validate monitoring systems that track mitigation effectiveness, focusing on:
  c. Potential impacts to local communities
  d. Displacement risks
- Verify that:
  e. Stakeholder feedback is integrated into risk management plans
  f. Procedures are established for regular assessment updates

CLs/Observations

1. The PD shall use the latest version of the "Risks and Capacities Assessment Report – LUF and BCFW" template.
2. All projects that achieve listing status after 01/09/2024 shall use Digital SDG Impact Tool for the quantification and reporting of SDG Impacts and assessment against Safeguarding Principles and Requirements (Rule Update – Application of Digital Version of SDG Impact Tool).
3. Project developer shall complete the SDG impact and safeguarding assessment using the Digital SDG Tool at the time of validation before submission for design review, and VVB shall validate using the same.

NOTE:

- *The CARs, OBs and FARs, raised at the Preliminary review stage are indicative only; further matters may be raised or interpreted differently by the VVB and/or Gold Standard during the Project Cycle Certification.*

- *The validating/verifying VVB shall validate how FARs have been addressed and include its opinion in the validation/verification report as applicable.*

# 3| PROJECT INFORMATION

THIS SECTION IS TO BE COMPLETED BY THE PROJECT DEVELOPER/CME

## KEY PROJECT INFORMATION

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| GS ID and Title of the PA/PoA/VPA | Project classification | GS ID | Title |
| | ☒ Project Activity | GS23254 | Brújula Verde |
| | ☐ Programme of Activity | GSXXXXX | Insert here |
| | ☐ Real Case VPAs | GSXXXXX | Insert here |
| | ☐ Regular Case VPA | GSXXXXX | ADD rows as necessary |

| | |
|---|---|
| Host country | Colombia |

Location

| GSID | Country | State/region/province | City or village |
|---|---|---|---|
| GS23254 | Colombia | Vichada | Puerto Carreño, La Primavera |

Geo-coordinates of the project site

| GSID | Latitude | Longitude |
|---|---|---|
| GS23254 | 5°44’21.23’’ N | 68°13’25.84’’ W |

Project scale

☐ Micro scale ☐ Small Scale ☒ Large Scale

☐ Small-holder activity [Only applicable to Micro and Small scale activities]

☐ Other

Type of project

☐ Emission reductions activity
☒ Emission removals activity
☐ Emission reductions and removals activity

GS4GG Activity requirement

☐ Renewable Energy
☐ Community Services Activity
☒ Land-Use & Forests
☐ Agriculture
☐ Blue Carbon and Freshwater Wetlands Activity Requirements
☐ Engineered removal
☐ NA

Methodology(ies) applied

☒ GS approved methodology, including any specific GS applicability criteria
☐ A project-specific methodology (Microscale Project or PoA/VPAs only)
☐ A proposed methodology (for which a public consultation has been completed)

| Methodology title | Version No. |
|---|---|
| METHODOLOGY FOR AFFORESTATION/REFORESTATION (A/R) GHGs EMISSION REDUCTION & SEQUESTRATION | 2.1 |
| | |
| | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Product requirements applied | ☒ GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration<br>☐ Renewable Energy Label<br>☐ [Reporting only] | | | |
| Project cycle[3] | ☐ Regular cycle<br>☒ Retroactive cycle | | | |
| Project start date and Crediting period (CP) start and end date | GS ID | Start date | CP start date | CP end date |
| | GS23254 | 15/05/2023 | 15/05/2023 | 14/05/2053 |
| Stakeholder consultation dates | PoA design consultation ☒ NA | Physical meeting[4] | Feedback round | |
| | | | Start date | End date |
| | dd/mm/yyyy | 26/10/2024 | 12/11/2024 | 12/12/2024 |
| | Describe deviations from requirements here, if any here. | | | |
| Stakeholder consultation documentation | ☒ Stakeholder Consultation Report – project<br>☐ Design Consultation Report - PoA<br>☐ Design Consultation Report - PoA and the Stakeholder Consultation Report for at least the first Real Case VPA<br>☐ Stakeholder consultation report – Real/Regular Case VPA | | | |
| | ☐ Draft report[5] | ☒ Final report | | |

[3] The project Start Date and the stakeholder consultation date determine the project as –
(a) Regular cycle Projects, for which the Stakeholder Consultation (1st round) has been conducted before the Project Start Date.
(b) Retroactive cycle Projects, for which the Stakeholder Consultation (1st round) is conducted after the Project Start Date.
Retroactive Projects submitted for preliminary review at a date later than one year (five years for LUF projects) from the project start date are not eligible for Gold Standard certification. Retroactive projects are required to provide evidence to demonstrate prior consideration at the time of validation (paragraph 7.1.3 of GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration Product Requirements)

[4] If multiple meetings are organized enter the 1st meeting date.

[5] Note that for the preliminary review, project developers may submit a draft stakeholder consultation report detailing the physical meeting (1st round of consultation). This report shall include, at minimum, the consultation date, a list of invited stakeholders, the invitation method, information shared with stakeholders, and feedback received.)
Regardless of validation of listing status, project developers shall submit the final stakeholder consultation report—covering both physical meeting (1st round of consultation) and feedback round (second round consultations) —within one year of the project's start date or as required by the activity requirement.
Note that extended submission timelines may apply for certain activities, such as those outlined in LUF activity requirements or the Shipping sector.

| | |
|---|---|
| Other mandatory documentation | ☒ Signed *Cover Letter*<br>☒ Signed *Terms and Conditions*<br>☒ Signed *Terms of Use* |
| Other optional documentation | ☒ Draft PDD/PoA-DD/VPA-DD (if applicable, refer to Section 1 above)<br>☒ Draft *SDG Impact Tool*<br>☒ Others (*List the document below*)<br>☒ Other 1 – GS23254_Brújula Verde_Preliminary Review_Instructions and files list.xlsx<br>☐ Other 2 |

| CONTACT DETAILS | |
|---|---|
| Project developer NAME: | Inverbosques S.A |
| Project representative NAME: | Álvaro Trujillo<br>Inverbosques S.A<br>Email: alvaro.trujillo@inverbosques.com<br>Address: Calle 26 Sur #22 – 27 Envigado, Colombia |
| Declaration | The Project Developer/CME and Project Representative acknowledge and affirm that:<br>☒ the preliminary review is intended as a guide to the project developer, is not a certification decision, and does not guarantee that a Project/PoA or VPA shall be successful in validation or design review or ongoing verification and performance review.<br>☒ the information provided in the Preliminary Review Form and supporting documents is correct and accurate to the best of their knowledge and understanding of Gold Standard rules and requirements.<br>☒ the consequences of any change in applicable GS4GG rules and requirements or any information found incorrect during validation or design certification, is the sole responsibility of the project developer.<br>☒ prior consent from stakeholders has been or will be obtained in compliance with applicable host country regulations for sharing the personal information publicly as included in the document submitted to Gold Standard.<br>☒ I hereby affirm my commitment to adhere to all relevant data privacy laws, regulations, and industry best practices for data management throughout the entire project lifecycle. This commitment includes, but is not limited to, the proper collection, storage, processing, and protection of all stakeholder data in accordance with applicable legal requirements and ethical standards. |
| Contact details of the representative | ☒ Project Developer / CME<br>☐ Project Representative |

| | |
|---|---|
| signing the declaration | Organisation: Inverbosques S.A<br>Position: Chief Sustainability Office<br>Full Name: Álvaro Trujillo<br>Email: alvaro.trujillo@inverbosques.com |

# 4| PROJECT DESCRIPTION

THIS SECTION IS TO BE COMPLETED BY THE PROJECT DEVELOPER/CME

## A. Purpose and general description of the project

### A.1 Project Purpose and Climate Impact

Brújula Verde, developed by Inverbosques, is a reforestation project that promotes Sustainable Forest Management in Vichada, Colombia with the objective of conserving biodiversity and reforesting degraded savannas.

The project focuses on the activities of planting, conserving and maintaining forest plantations of Eucalyptus pellita and native species such as Aceite (*Copaifera pubiflora/officinalis*), Congrio (*Acosmium nitens*), Macano (*Terminalia amazonia*), Simaruba (*Simarouba amara*), Yopo (*Anadenanthera peregrina*), Nauno (*Albizia guachapele*), Cedro (*Cedrela odorata*), Casia (*Cassia moschata*), Jacarandá (*Jacaranda copaia*), Saladillo Blanco (*Vochysia lehmannii*), and Carbonero (*Calliandra pittieri*), among others. *E. pellita* serves as a restorative species of degraded soils and the long-term objective is to promote and enrich growth, as well as natural regeneration and planting of native species facilitating the process of creating forests in succession. It is expected that the gradual reforestation will transform the land into a thriving ecosystem, where newly established tree corridors enable both flora and fauna to naturally proliferate. As these restored forests develop, they foster greater biodiversity by enriching both the variety of species and the genetic pool within the area.

The project boundaries are:

i. the Expansion Region, which is Vichada department,

ii. the Project Area, currently defined as the eligible planted area at validation (10,262 ha) and

iii. the Prioritized Area, consisting in a set of 58 properties within Vichada in which Inverbosques has a strong relationship with the owners and there is an interest to use them in the project, this was the area used in the Eligibility Assessment.

The primary objective of Brújula Verde is to conserve biodiversity and reforest degraded savannas in the Vichada department through sustainable forest management, thereby creating self-sustaining forest ecosystems that support both flora and fauna.

Climate change mitigation/adaptation contributions:

- Mitigation: By establishing 20,000 ha of new forest with a goal to expand this in the future to at least 30,000 ha (Further information is provided in section A.1 of the Project Design Document), the project acts as a significant carbon sink, sequestering atmospheric $CO_2$ in biomass and soils.
- Adaptation: Restoration of tree cover reduces soil erosion, enhances water retention, and increases landscape resilience to droughts and fires, improving local climate regulation.

### A.2 General project overview

As described above, the project focuses on the activities of planting, conserving and maintaining forest plantations, for administrative reasons the project is divided into phases:

1. Phase 1 (2023–2024): the first phase of the project consists in the planting of 10,012 ha (divided in 31 properties all of them located in Puerto Carreño, Vichada) planted with *E. pellita* between 2023 and 2024, these areas were established with a planting density of 1,200 trees/ha, following the initial mortality of Eucalyptus seedlings, native species seedlings were planted to replace them maintaining the planting density. Currently, around 90% of the individuals correspond to Eucalyptus, and the remaining 10% (1,200,000 trees) to native species dispersed across the planted area.

2. Phase 2 (2025–2027): The second phase will also cover around 10,000 ha; in this case the expectation is to plant 5,000 ha with *E. pellita* and 5,000 ha with native species. This phase started with the planting on 250 ha of native species in one property, more areas will be planted between 2025 and 2027 to reach the goal of around 20,000 ha planted in the project.
3. Phase 3: A third phase with around 10,000 ha is envisioned, the design and composition of the planting model for this potential Phase 3 will be defined in future verification cycles, as applicable, through the Monitoring Report.

To achieve this goal Inverbosques has developed a nursery with the capacity to produce around 19,000,000 high-quality seedlings per year, with protocols for genetic diversity and seedling health.

The selected baseline scenario of the project is the situation without it, which is basically the continuation of degraded grassland uses, perpetuated by cyclical burning and minimal economic incentives for restoration.

## A.3. Stakeholder Information

- Landowners: Provide land, assist in site preparation, and participate in ongoing maintenance.
- Local Communities: Hired for nursery work, planting, and monitoring, generating local employment and skills development.
- Inverbosques: Project developer responsible for design, technical execution, carbon accounting, and reporting.

## A.4. Location and Timeline

Geographic coverage details:

- Expansion Region: Entire Vichada department, Colombian Orinoquía.
- Project Area: 10,262 ha for validation, classified as eligible areas already planted.
- Prioritized Area: 58 properties with agreements for implementation.

Implementation schedule:

| Project phase | Timeline | MU* | Year of the plantation | Area (ha)* | Total Ares /Phase | planting scheme | Details |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2023–2024 | 1 | 2023 | 5,039.0 | 10,012.0 | *Eucalyptus Pellita* with Native species enrichment | The 10,262 ha included in the current validation corresponds to the areas that are already planted in Modeling Unit 1 (Phase 1), Modeling Unit 2 (Phase 1), and Modeling Unit 3 (Phase 2). By the end of 2027, the project aims to reach approximately 20,012 ha of total planted area through the establishment of additional areas under Modeling Units 4 to 7, as part of Phase 2, which are planned based on the established forest plantation model and form the remainder of Phase 2. These areas are scheduled for planting between 2025 and 2027 and are considered part of the project's confirmed expansion plan. |
| | | 2 | 2024 | 4,973.0 | | *Eucalyptus Pellita* with Native species enrichment | |
| 2 | 2024–2027 | 3 | 2024 | 250.0 | 10,000.0 | Native species | |
| | | 4 | 2025 | 5,000.0 | | *Eucalyptus Pellita* with Native species enrichment | |
| | | 5 | 2025 | 1,250.0 | | Native species | |
| | | 6 | 2026 | 2,000.0 | | Native species | |
| | | 7 | 2027 | 1,500.0 | | Native species | |
| 3 | 2027- | TBD | TBD | ~10,000.0 | | TBD | Considering that the total |

| Project phase | Timeline | MU* | Year of the plantation | Area (ha)* | Total Ares /Phase | planting scheme | Details |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | TBD | | | | | | eligible area of the project, at the time of the submission, is 38,836.4 ha, the project envisages further expansion over this area, of mixed-species plantations beyond Phase 2. Specifically, the project plans to establish an additional 10,000 ha over the next five years (beyond 2027), which would correspond to a potential Phase 3. However, since these areas represent a future and currently undefined planting phase, this phase remains contingent and will be designed according to evolving restoration needs and opportunities and will not be included in the current ex-ante estimations.<br>The design and composition of the planting model for this potential Phase 3 will be defined in future verification cycles, as applicable, through the Monitoring Report. As such, the additional 10,000 ha shall be considered a potential planting area and once the planting design is finalized and the sites are confirmed, the area will be formally integrated into the project's scope and associated projections. This approach ensures transparency, consistency with Gold Standard requirements and methodologies, and alignment with the project's phased implementation strategy. |
| | | Total | | 30,012.0 | | | |

(Source: Prepared by South Pole (2025), based on information from the initiative, and the Gold Standard requirements)

## A.5. Project Specific Elements

- Project Type: Afforestation, Reforestation & Revegetation (ARR) with native species enrichment.
- Sustainable Forest Management: Protection against cyclical burning, non-chemical pest control, and periodic monitoring.
- Ecosystem Services: Carbon sequestration, biodiversity enhancement, soil conservation, and watershed protection.
- Nursery Capacity: 19 million seedlings per year ensure timely scaling across phases.

## B. GHGs included

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☒ $CO_2$ | ☐ $CH_4$ | ☐ $N_2O$ | ☐ Others (please specify below) |

## C. Expected GHGs emissions reduction/removal

| Emission reductions/removals | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Annual emission reductions over the crediting period of the proposed activity | Emission reduction /removals for | ☐ 1st Crediting period<br>☒ Total crediting period | |
| | Emission type | tCO2e/year – annual average | |
| | ☐ Emission reductions | | |
| | ☒ Emission removals | 534,646.2 | |
| Estimated annual emission reductions/removals per project technology or measure or appropriate units distributed/ implemented in the proposed project activity | Technology/measure | tCO2e/year – annual average per technology/ measure or appropriate unit | |
| | Forestation | 25.1 tCO2e/year per hectare | |
| | Forestation SOC | 1.6 tCO2e/year per hectare | |
| | YEAR | | PROJECT ESTIMATE (tCO2e/year) [6] |
| | Year 1[7] | 2023 | 0.0 |
| | Year 2 | 2024 | 314,047.9 |
| | Year 3 | 2025 | 947,129.9 |
| | Year 4 | 2026 | 1,736,884.4 |
| | Year 5 | 2027 | 2,252,408.0 |
| | Year 6 | 2028 | 1,843,853.2 |
| | Year 7 | 2029 | 1,552,127.7 |
| | Year 8 | 2030 | 1,258,960.9 |
| | Year 9 | 2031 | 1,582,034.1 |
| | Year 10 | 2032 | 967,843.9 |
| | Year 11 | 2033 | 662,190.2 |
| | Year 12 | 2034 | 481,344.3 |
| | Year 13 | 2035 | 779,154.1 |
| | Year 14 | 2036 | 668,291.1 |
| | Year 15 | 2037 | 146,574.3 |
| | Year 16 | 2038 | 0.0 |

[6] The Net Climate Benefit presented in this column reflects the total net GHG emissions avoided or sequestered by the project, after accounting for project emissions, baseline emissions, and leakage. However, in accordance with the Gold Standard GHG Emissions Reduction and Sequestration Product Requirements V3.0 (Section 11 – Land Use & Forest Specific Requirements, sub-section 11.1 Compliance Buffer), *for projects applying the Land Use & Forests (LUF) Requirements, 20% of the issued Project Emission Reductions (PERs) and Gold Standard Verified Emissions Reduction (GS-VERs) associated with carbon sequestration must be transferred into the Gold Standard Buffer*. This contribution serves to manage the risk of non-permanence (reversal risk) linked to sequestration activities. Accordingly, while the Net Climate Benefit quantifies the full mitigation impact of the project, the number of GS-VERs available for issuance (80% of that net benefit), will exclude the buffer-apportioned volume for the sequestration component (remaining 20% allocated to the Gold Standard buffer pool).

[7] From May 15 to December 31,2023

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Year 17 | 2039 | 0.0 |
| | Year 18 | 2040 | 272,135.9 |
| | Year 19 | 2041 | 329,206.2 |
| | Year 20 | 2042 | 0.0 |
| | Year 21 | 2043 | 0.0 |
| | Year 22 | 2044 | 0.0 |
| | Year 23 | 2045 | 0.0 |
| | Year 24 | 2046 | 0.0 |
| | Year 25 | 2047 | 0.0 |
| | Year 26 | 2048 | 0.0 |
| | Year 27 | 2049 | 0.0 |
| | Year 28 | 2050 | 71,453.4 |
| | Year 29 | 2051 | 68,355.6 |
| | Year 30 | 2052 | 60,608.0 |
| | Year 31[8] | 2053 | 44,783.6 |
| | Total | | 16,039,386.8 |
| | **Total number of crediting years** | | 30 |
| | **Annual average over the crediting period** | | 534,646.2 |

[8] From January 01 to May 14, 2053

# 5| Project Eligibility Assessment

## GENERAL ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Is the activity eligible project type under Gold Standard for the Global Goals? Refer to Section 4a, ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES, *Principles and Requirements* | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 2. Does the activity involve any technology/measure related to<br>- geoengineering<br>- energy generated from fossil fuels<br>- nuclear energy,<br>- fossil fuel switch,<br>- avoided deforestation<br>- enhanced oil recovery<br>- or in any way support, enhance or prolong such energy generation? | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No |
| 3. In case the technology/measure is related to "energy generated from fossil fuels" (for example, LPG stoves), is exception made and captured in the relevant Activity Requirements, Approved Methodology and/or Product Requirements? | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No<br>☐ Not applicable |
| 4. Is the activity also registered or pursuing certification under any other voluntary or compliance standards programme? | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No |
| 5. If the proposed activity is a part of another standard, voluntary or compliance standards programme, confirm the name(s) below. Otherwise, select 'Not Applicable'. | ☐ Yes<br>☒ Not Applicable |
| ☐ CDM; ☐ PACM; ☐ VCS/VERRA; ☐ ACR; ☐ CAR; ☐ Plan Vivo; ☐ Other<br>If other, please specify here | |
| 6. Does the activity have an overlapping Project Area with that of another Gold Standard or other voluntary or compliance standard programme of a similar nature? | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No |
| 7. Is the proposed activity or any component of it required by an existing legally binding mandate, regulatory requirement of a host country? | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No |
| 8. Does the activity involve legal ownership transfer of any Products that are generated under Gold Standard Certification (for example carbon credits) from project beneficiaries? | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No |
| 9. Is a relevant activity requirement available for the proposed project activity? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 10. Is PA/PoA/VPAs located in conflict zones, refugee camps or areas that pose a high risk to life and/or health? | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No |

## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT

| | |
|---|---|
| 11. Does the project positively contribute to a minimum of three Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): SDG13 (mandatory) + two other SDGs? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 12. Select below the identified SDGs that the project will likely contribute to. | |

| SDG name<br>*[Tick the box if the project is contributing to the selected SDG and monitoring plan for corresponding contribution has been developed otherwise leave it unmarked.]* | Confirm the host country's objective priority alignment |
|---|---|
| ☐ SDG 1: No Poverty | ☐ Yes |
| ☐ SDG 2: Zero Hunger | ☐ Yes |
| ☐ SDG 3: Good Health and Well-being | ☐ Yes |
| ☐ SDG 4: Quality Education | ☐ Yes |
| ☒ SDG 5: Gender Equality | ☒ Yes |
| ☐ SDG 6: Clean Water and Sanitation | ☐ Yes |
| ☐ SDG 7: Affordable and Clean Energy | ☐ Yes |
| ☒ SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth | ☒ Yes |
| ☐ SDG 9: Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure | ☐ Yes |
| ☐ SDG 10: Reduced Inequalities | ☐ Yes |
| ☐ SDG 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities | ☐ Yes |
| ☐ SDG 12: Responsible Consumption and Production | ☒ Yes |
| ■ SDG 13: Climate Action | Mandatory |
| ☐ SDG 14: Life Below Water | ☐ Yes |
| ☒ SDG 15: Life on Land | ☒ Yes |
| ☐ SDG 16: Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions | ☐ Yes |
| ☐ SDG 17: Partnerships for the Goals | ☐ Yes |

## SAFEGUARDING PRINCIPLES ASSESSMENT

| | |
|---|---|
| 13. Have you completed the assessment against the Gold Standard *Safeguarding Principles and Requirements*? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |

Summary of Safeguarding Principles and Requirements assessment

| Principle | Sub principle | Relevant for activity | Risk identified | Mitigation plan in place |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Human Rights | | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| 2. Gender Equality and Women's empowerment | | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No | ☒ Yes |
| 3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions | | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No | ☒ Yes |
| 4. Cultural Heritage, Indigenous Peoples, Displacement | 4.1. Sites of cultural and historical heritage | ☐ Yes<br>☒ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| | 4.2. Forced eviction and displacement | ☐ Yes<br>☒ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| and Resettlement | 4.3. Land tenure and other rights | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| | 4.4. Indigenous peoples | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| 5. Corruption | | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| 6. Economic Impacts | 6.1 Labour Rights and Working Conditions | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| | 6.2 Negative economic consequences | ☐ Yes<br>☒ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| 7. Climate and Energy | 7.1 GHG Emissions | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No | ☒ Yes |
| | 7.2 Energy supply | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| 8. Water | 8.1 Impact on Natural Water Patterns/Flows | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| | 8.2 Erosion and/or water body instability | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| 9. Environment, Ecology and Land Use | 9.1 Landscape modification and soil | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| | 9.2 Vulnerability to natural disaster | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No | ☒ Yes |
| | 9.3 Biosafety and genetic resources | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| | 9.4 Release of pollutants | ☐ Yes<br>☒ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| | 9.5 Hazardous and non-hazardous waste | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No | ☒ Yes |
| | 9.6 Pesticides & Fertilisers | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No | ☒ Yes |
| | 9.7 Harvesting of forests | ☐ Yes<br>☒ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| | 9.8 Food security | ☐ Yes<br>☒ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| | 9.9 Animal welfare | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |
| | 9.10 High conservation value (HCV) areas and critical habitats | ☒ Yes<br>☐ NA | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No | ☒ Yes |
| | 9.11 Endangered species | ☒ Yes | ☐ Yes | ☐ Yes |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | ☐ NA | ☒ No | |
| | 9.12 Invasive alien species | ☐ Yes<br>☒ NA | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No | ☐ Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| 14. Have you identified any relevant potential risks and adverse outcomes following the GS4GG *Safeguarding Principles and Requirements*?. | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 15. If the answer to the previous question is "Yes,", is the Project Developer aware that the project must comply with the requirements with regard to the relevant safeguarding principle through design, management or risk mitigation? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No<br>☐ Not applicable |
| 16. If the answer to the previous question is "Yes," is the Project Developer aware that the mitigation measures must be added to the Monitoring Plan (as required)? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No<br>☐ Not applicable |

## GENDER EQUALITY

| | |
|---|---|
| Gender Equality Certification | ■ Gender sensitive (mandatory) ☐ Gender responsive |

Summary of Gender Sensitive certification

| | |
|---|---|
| 17. Does your project comply with and support the host country's gender policies and national gender strategy? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 18. Does the project involve or plan to involve measures to strengthen women's participation and empowerment in alignment with national development goals and gender principles? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 19. Have specific measures been or will be implemented to prevent sexual harassment, gender-based violence, exploitation, and ensure women are not subject to increased work burden or time poverty in project activities? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 20. Have monitoring and reporting mechanisms been or will be established to track and address gender discrimination or violence, ensure equal access to project resources and benefits, and protect women's ownership and inheritance rights regardless of marital status? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 21. Have measures been or will be implemented to ensure equitable participation and fair compensation through equal pay regardless of gender, accommodation of pregnancy and parental leave, and creation of conditions that enable both men and women to participate equally in project activities? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 22. Has your project ensured, or will it ensure meaningful participation and representation of women and marginalized groups in stakeholder consultations and decision-making processes? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 23. Have specific engagement approaches and feedback mechanisms been or will be implemented to facilitate active participation and gather input from women and marginalized groups? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |

## SUMMARY - STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

| | |
|---|---|
| 24. Did you conduct the physical stakeholder consultation for stand-alone project activity or VPAs before the project start date, or, for retroactive projects, before submission for preliminary review? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 25. Did the CME conduct the PoA design consultation before the time of the first submission to Gold Standard for Preliminary Review? | ☐ Yes<br>☐ No<br>☒ Not applicable |

26. If the Stakeholder Consultation is conducted after the start date of the project (retroactive project), is the Project Developer shall provide clarification below
    a. on why the stakeholder consultation is not conducted before the project start date, and
    b. conduct consultation with relevant stakeholders as early as possible, and
    c. provide further explanation of how comments received during the consultation were taken into account in the design and implementation of the project.

Clarification: The initial absence of stakeholder consultation is justified by the fact that InverBosques, as a company previously certified under Gold Standard in project GS 4221 has extensive experience and a solid track record in managing areas for forest regeneration, already has a solid socio-environmental management structure that ensures the implementation of appropriate measures for mitigating risks and impacts.

Since the beginning of the Brújula Verde Project, the company has followed practices aligned with sustainability standards, ensuring that significant negative impacts on the communities or the environment during the early phases of the project are being managed and addressed. However, with the pursuit of independent certification and the new Gold Standard ID for this particular project, InverBosques and the Brújula Verde Project have recognized the importance of formalizing the consultation process. This action not only complies with regulatory requirements but also strengthens the company's commitment to the inclusion and participation of local communities. The Stakeholder Consultation Plan includes the dissemination of a non-technical summary of the project, outlining its objectives, methodology, and expected benefits. Furthermore, a participation mechanism has been designed for communities to express their concerns and proposals through a formal communication channel, ensuring the proper handling of requests, complaints, claims, suggestions, and compliments (PQRSF).

| | |
|---|---|
| 27. In case a grouped stakeholder consultation for multiple VPAs was conducted, is the Project Developer aware of the following requirements:<br>a. The VPAs correspond to the same real case VPA(s), and<br>b. The VPAs are to be implemented within the same host country, and<br>c. The VPAs are to be implemented within the geographical boundary, applicable to the group defined for a single consultation. The applicable geographical boundary is defined at the time of the first physical meeting of the specific grouped consultation, and | ☐ Yes<br>☐ No<br>☒ Not applicable |

| | |
|---|---|
| d. The VPAs are included in the PoA within two years of the first physical meeting conducted for grouped consultation | |
| 28. Does the list of invited stakeholders cover all stakeholder groups (a) to (g) listed in section 3.3.1 (for stand-alone project activity or VPAs) or groups (a) to (e) listed in section 4.4.1 (for PoA) of *Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement Requirements* | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 29. Did the invitation methods solicit input from women and marginalised groups, including women, youth, the poor, informal sector workers, ethnic minorities, indigenous peoples, disabled or elderly people, and members of the LGBTQ community? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 30. Were the stakeholders invited at least 30 days before the physical stakeholder meeting? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 31. Did you share information in a manner (format, medium, language(s), etc.) that allows local stakeholders to understand how the project is likely to affect them? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 32. Did you discuss identified direct positive and negative impacts of the projects with stakeholders as assessed for SDG contributions and safeguarding assessment? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 33. Was a gender lens applied to assessing comments? (For example, if only men provided comments on a household device project, was this taken into consideration when assessing the relevance of the comment?) | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 34. Were any serious, reasonable, and proportional concerns raised taken into account and satisfactorily addressed? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No<br>☐ Not applicable |
| 35. Did you provide feedback to Stakeholders on how their comments have been taken into account as part of the stakeholder feedback round? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No<br>☐ Not applicable |
| 36. Were any points that warrant mitigation measures marked as such and their monitoring plan be designed and be included in the PDD? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No<br>☐ Not applicable |
| 37. Did you discuss the potential options for continuous input and grievance mechanism with stakeholders and agree on an appropriate method? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 38. Is the mandatory Continuous Input / Grievance Expression Process Book's location clearly stated (and therefore usable)? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 39. Have you documented the stakeholder consultation process and outcomes in a Stakeholder Consultation Report? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 40. Is the Project Developer aware that the PDD must include a summary report of the comments received from local stakeholders? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 41. If indigenous communities, local landowners, local communities, or farmers are involved has the project developer discussed the mechanism/approach to explicitly discuss how carbon credit ownership rights will be transferred to the project developer? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No<br>☐ Not applicable |

| | |
|---|---|
| 42. Has the Project Developer conducted and completed a Stakeholder Consultation – both rounds in accordance with the requirements of *Gold Standard Stakeholder Consultation & Engagement Requirements*? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| Question(s) number answered "No" for Section D Stakeholder Consultation Summary | Not applicable |
| Please specify the reason | Not applicable |

## Benefit Sharing Arrangement

| | |
|---|---|
| 43. Does proposed activity currently have a benefit sharing mechanism in place for distributing proceeds from carbon credits revenue to project participants? If NO skip rest of the questions in this section. | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| Summary of Benefit sharing[9] arrangement[10] | |
| 44. Does the benefit sharing mechanism include monetary benefits for project participants? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 45. Does the benefit sharing mechanism include non-monetary benefits for project participants? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 46. Has your project determined the specific types and proportions of benefits to be allocated to different participants? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 47. Is there an established mechanism or process through which these benefits will be distributed to legitimate project participants? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |

## Compliance with Activity Requirements

| | |
|---|---|
| 48. Does the project conform to the relevant Activity (CSA/RE /LUF/Blue carbon)? In case of other activities, follow the requirements specified in the GS *Principles and Requirements*. | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No<br>☐ Not applicable |
| 49. Do any specific eligibility criteria/requirements stipulated in the Activity requirements apply to the project? (See Annex A of CSA/RE). | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No<br>☐ Not applicable |

## Applicability of the methodology/tool version

| | |
|---|---|
| 50. Does the project or VPAs comply with all the applicability and eligibility criteria of the applied methodology/ies? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |

[9] Benefit Sharing - Benefit sharing refers to intentional distribution of proceeds from carbon credits revenue, whether materialized or anticipated, among legitimate project participants for their contribution to mitigation or removal of GHGs. Benefit sharing may involve transfer of monetary and non-monetary incentives.

[10] Benefit sharing mechanisms refer to the methods followed to share both monetary and non-monetary benefits to the project participants. This includes determining the types and proportions of the benefits allocation, and establishing the mechanism through which these benefits will be distributed.

| | |
|---|---|
| 51. Does the project or VPAs comply with any additional Gold Standard applicability criteria set for using the applied methodology? *Refer to Impact quantification methodology.* | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 52. Does the project apply the latest version of the methodology and applicable tools available at the time of the first submission of this form? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No |
| 53. Does project involve any deviation from approved methodology? If yes, please explain below | ☐ Yes<br>☒ No |

Details of deviation:

## Additional Information for Activities

applying Land-Use & Forests, Agriculture Blue Carbon activity requirements:

| | |
|---|---|
| 54. Project Area (ha)<br>The project area is the sum of all eligible and non-eligible areas. | 10,262 ha (for validation) with a goal to expand this in the future to at least 30,000 ha |
| 55. Eligible Area (ha)<br>*Refer to the applicable **Activity requirements** for further details.* | 38,836.4 ha |
| 56. Is the project area and eligible area unambiguously delineated?? | ☒ Yes<br>The eligible area of the first phase of the project has been identified and is available on maps and shapefiles, similarly, potential expansion areas for the second phase are also mapped.<br>☐ No<br>☐ Analysis not completed |
| 57. Does the project developer/CME have evidence as per the applicable activity requirements that the proposed eligible area was not partly or entirely deforested prior to the project start date? | ☒ Yes<br>☐ No<br>☐ Not applicable |
| 58. How much of the project area will be identified and used to protect or enhance biological diversity following the High Conservation Value (HCV) approach? Refer to the applicable activity requirements for further details. | 100%<br>The project aims to protect and restore forests for biodiversity conservation. It takes into consideration the HCV approach in its choice of the land to protect and enhance biological diversity. The entire project area is and will be managed for conservation and meets the LUF requirement. |

## RISK & CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

59. Select the applicable Gold Standard Risk & Capacity guidelines used for the assessment:

☒ Risks & Capacities Guidelines for Agriculture & Forestry Activities

☐ Risk and Capacities Guidelines for Blue Carbon and Freshwater Wetlands Activities

Summary of Risks and Capacities Assessment

| Risk Category | Mark if the Sub-category has a present risk score of 7 or above | Is a mitigation plan in place? |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Natural Disturbance | ☒ Fire damage | ☒ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Wind damage | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☒ Temperature extremes | ☒ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☒ Water extremes | ☒ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☒ Climate variability (Predicted long drought period) | ☒ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Climate variability (Seasonal variability of rainfall pattern) | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Climate variability (Increase in extreme events) | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Climate variability (others) | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Geological extreme events | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Dominant Animal or plant related | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☒ Pest and disease outbreaks | ☒ Yes ☐ No |
| 2. Political | ☐ Political interventions | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Land acquisition | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Non-regularized resettlement | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Exploitation of natural resources | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| 3. Project Management | ☐ Technical capacity (availability) | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Technical capacity (dependency) | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Financial capacity (availability) | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Financial capacity (dependency) | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Legal capacity (availability) | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Legal capacity (dependency) | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Capacity to maintain GS4GG certification (availability) | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Capacity to maintain GS4GG certification (dependency) | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Constraints in technical equipment | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| 4. Financial risks | ☐ Lack of secured, continued financial resources for activity implementation until the activity's cumulative break-even cash flow | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| 5.Market risks | ☐ Lack of liquidity/financial resources due to price variations | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Risk of competing commodities | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | ☐ Risk of competing infrastructure | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| 6. Other risk | | |

# Annex 1. PROJECT SPECIFIC DETAILS WITH EXAMPLES

## Afforestation Projects

### Example Afforestation Project: Highland Forest Restoration Initiative

#### A.1. Project Purpose and Climate Impact

The Highland Forest Restoration Initiative is an ambitious environmental project aimed at transforming 500 hectares of degraded grassland in the Eastern Highlands into a thriving, diverse native forest ecosystem. This strategic initiative will not only sequester approximately 150,000 tonnes of $CO_2$ equivalent over three decades but also plays a crucial role in restoring biodiversity and generating local employment opportunities.

#### A.2. General Project Overview

The project encompasses several key components including an extensive native tree planting program involving 75,000 trees, comprehensive soil restoration and erosion control measures, establishment of a community nursery, and implementation of a robust training and capacity building program. The technical framework has been carefully designed with tree spacing at 4x4 meters and a strategic species mix comprising 70% native hardwoods and 30% fast-growing pioneer species. We've set an ambitious minimum survival rate target of 85%, with projected average growth rates of 15-20 cubic meters per hectare annually.

#### A.3. Stakeholder Information

The project operates through a well-structured partnership model with the following key stakeholders:

- Local community cooperative (primary implementer) Regional forestry department (technical support) Environmental NGO partner (capacity building) Carbon credit buyers

The carbon revenue distribution has been strategically allocated with XX% directed to the community cooperative, while XX% each is designated for project maintenance and project expansion and monitoring.

#### A.4. Location and Timeline

The project is situated in the Eastern Highlands Region, characterized by elevations ranging from 1,200-1,800m above sea level, annual rainfall of 1,000-1,200mm, and sandy loam soil with moderate fertility. The implementation follows a systematic three-year planting schedule, with 200 hectares in Year 1, another 200 hectares in Year 2, and the final 100 hectares in Year 3, followed by a comprehensive 26-year maintenance and monitoring period.

#### A.5. Project-Specific Elements

The project area's history reveals its previous use for extensive grazing, which was abandoned over the past decade due to declining productivity. Satellite imagery verification confirms the absence of forest cover for the past 30 years. The land is under communal ownership, with clear title deeds held by the local community cooperative, and all necessary permissions and environmental impact assessments have been secured.

The current site assessment shows scattered vegetation covering only 10% of the area, dominated by native grasses and shrubs, with noticeable soil erosion in 30% of the area and no existing mature trees within the project boundary.
The forest management strategy includes:

- Monthly maintenance schedule, Fire prevention through firebreaks and community patrols, Biannual monitoring of tree growth and survival, Annual biodiversity assessments, Regular pruning and thinning from year 5, Sustainable harvesting plan starting year 15.

# Blue Carbon Activities:

## Example Blue Carbon Project: Coastal Mangrove Restoration Initiative

### A.1. Project Purpose and Climate Impact

The Coastal Mangrove Restoration Initiative aims to rehabilitate and protect 200 hectares of degraded mangrove ecosystems along the coastal wetlands. This strategic initiative will sequester approximately 25,000 tonnes of $CO_2$ equivalent annually while enhancing coastal resilience, supporting marine biodiversity, and creating sustainable livelihood opportunities for local communities.

### A.2. General Project Overview

The project encompasses several key components including systematic mangrove replanting of 150,000 propagules, hydrological restoration through strategic canal blocking, establishment of community nurseries, and implementation of a comprehensive monitoring program. The technical framework has been designed with optimal spacing of 1x1 meter for seedlings and a strategic species mix comprising 60% *Avicennia marina*, 25% *Rhizophora mucronata*, and 15% *Sonneratia alba*. We've established a minimum survival rate target of 80%, with projected carbon sequestration rates of 8 tonnes $CO_2e$ per hectare annually.

### A.3. Stakeholder Information

The project operates through a collaborative partnership model with the following key stakeholders: Coastal fishing communities (primary beneficiaries) Marine Conservation Department (technical oversight) Local Environmental NGO (implementation support) Research institutions (scientific monitoring).
The carbon revenue distribution has been structured with XX% directed to community conservation efforts, XX% for project maintenance and monitoring, and XX% for technical support and research.

### A.4. Location and Timeline

The project is located in the Coastal Conservation Zone, characterized by a tidal range of 1.5-2.5 meters, water salinity of 20-35 ppt, and semi-diurnal tidal patterns. The implementation follows a systematic five-year restoration schedule, with 50 hectares annually for the first four years and intensive monitoring in the fifth year, followed by a comprehensive 25-year maintenance and monitoring period.

### A.5. Project-Specific Elements

Historical analysis shows significant mangrove degradation over the past 20 years due to aquaculture development and coastal erosion. Satellite imagery verification confirms a 60% reduction in mangrove cover since 2000. The area is under state protection, with community usage rights formally recognized through a co-management agreement.
The current site assessment shows 40% degraded mangrove cover, three dominant native species present, water quality parameters within acceptable ranges, rich sediment composition suitable for mangrove growth, presence of natural regeneration in 30% of the area
The mangrove management strategy includes: Monthly monitoring during initial establishment, Community-based patrol system, Quarterly water quality assessments, Semi-annual sediment sampling, Annual biodiversity surveys, Hydrological monitoring through automated data loggers, Sustainable resource use plan for local communities

# Agroforestry Activities:

## Example Agroforestry Project: Sustainable Coffee Shade-Growing Initiative

### A.1. Project Purpose and Climate Impact

The Sustainable Coffee Shade-Growing Initiative aims to transform 300 hectares of conventional coffee farms into biodiverse agroforestry systems. This strategic initiative will sequester approximately 45,000 tonnes of $CO_2$ equivalent over two decades while enhancing coffee quality, generating sustainable income streams, and preserving local biodiversity through integrated farming practices.

### A.2. General Project Overview

The project encompasses several key components including strategic integration of 30,000 native shade trees, establishment of fruit tree buffer zones, and implementation of comprehensive soil conservation measures. The technical framework has been carefully designed with shade tree spacing at 6x6 meters and coffee plants at 2x2 meters, creating an optimal three-tier vegetation structure. We've projected yield improvements of 25% within five years, complemented by diversified revenue streams from fruit and sustainable timber production.

### A.3. Stakeholder Information

The project operates through a well-structured partnership model with the following key stakeholders:

- 150 smallholder coffee farmers (primary implementers), Regional coffee cooperative (coordination), Agricultural extension services (technical support), Fair trade certification body (market access)

The carbon revenue distribution has been strategically allocated with XX% directed to participating farmers, while XX% is designated for project maintenance and XX% for technical support and monitoring activities.

### A.4. Location and Timeline

The project is situated in the Central Highland Coffee Region, characterized by elevations ranging from 1,000-1,500m above sea level, annual rainfall of 1,600-2,000mm, and optimal coffee-growing conditions. The implementation follows a systematic three-year conversion schedule, with 100 hectares annually, followed by a comprehensive 20-year maintenance and monitoring period.

### A.5. Project-Specific Elements

The current site assessment shows predominant coffee monoculture (85% Arabica varieties), Soil organic matter content averaging 2.5%, Current coffee yields of 0.8 tonnes per hectare, Limited existing shade cover (15% of total area), evidence of soil erosion in sloped sections

Our integrated management strategy includes, a comprehensive quarterly farmer training program, Regular soil fertility monitoring protocols, Integrated pest management systems, Systematic pruning schedules for all vegetation layers, Organic waste composting facilities, annual biodiversity assessment program

Detailed soil analysis confirms improved nitrogen content through nitrogen-fixing shade trees, while water retention capacity has increased by 30% in established agroforestry plots. All participating farmers have secured their land tenure through verified ownership documentation or formal long-term lease agreements.

# Agriculture Activities

## Example Agriculture Project: Sustainable Rice Water Management Initiative

### A.1. Project Purpose and Climate Impact

The Sustainable Rice Water Management Initiative aims to transform 400 hectares of conventional rice paddies into climate-smart farming systems. This strategic initiative will reduce methane emissions by approximately 30,000 tonnes of $CO_2$ equivalent annually while maintaining rice yields, improving water efficiency, and promoting sustainable farming practices.

### A.2. General Project Overview

The project encompasses multiple key components including implementation of Alternate Wetting and Drying (AWD) irrigation technique, laser land leveling, improved variety selection, and installation of water monitoring systems. Current soil health indicators show moderate fertility with NPK levels at 120:60:40 kg/ha. The technical framework has been designed with optimized field layouts and water control structures. The project water savings of 30% while maintaining or improving current yield levels of 3.0 tonnes per hectare.

### A.3. Stakeholder Information

The project operates through a collaborative partnership model with the following key stakeholders:

- 200 rice farmers (primary implementers, Local water user association (water management), Agricultural extension department (technical support), Research institution (monitoring and validation), Carbon credit buyers

The carbon revenue distribution has been structured with XX% directed to participating farmers, XX% for infrastructure maintenance and monitoring, and XX% for technical support and training.

### A.4. Location and Timeline

The project is situated in the Delta Rice Basin, characterized by alluvial soils, annual rainfall of 1,200mm, supplemented by canal irrigation infrastructure with 85% distribution efficiency. and traditional rice cultivation history. Implementation follows a two-year conversion schedule, with 200 hectares annually, followed by a comprehensive 15-year monitoring period.

### A.5. Project-Specific Elements

Current site assessment shows: Traditional continuous flooding practice, Average water use of 15,000m³ per hectare Current rice yields of 3.0 tonnes per hectare, Chemical fertilizer usage: 150 kg/ha/season, Soil organic matter content of 2.8%, High methane emissions from continuous flooding

Our integrated management strategy includes:

- Smart irrigation system with soil moisture sensors, Integrated nutrient management plan, Weekly water level monitoring during cropping season, Installation of field water tubes, Regular soil moisture assessment, Capacity building for AWD implementation Yield monitoring and documentation, GHG emission measurement system, Irrigation planning

# Community Service Activities

## Example Community Project: Clean Cookstoves Distribution Initiative

### A.1. Project Purpose and Climate Impact

The Clean Cookstoves Distribution Initiative aims to replace traditional biomass cookstoves with energy-efficient models across 5,000 households. This initiative will reduce approximately 15,000 tonnes of $CO_2$ equivalent annually while improving indoor air quality, reducing fuel wood consumption, and demonstrating the viability of sustainable cooking technologies.

### A.2. General Project Overview

The project involves distribution of certified clean cookstoves with minimum thermal efficiency of 35%, integrated chimney systems, and proper ventilation design. The technical framework includes installation of cookstoves with standardized testing results, user training programs, and maintenance support systems.

### A.3. Stakeholder Information

The project operates through a structured partnership model with the following key stakeholders: Local community organizations (primary implementers), Cookstove manufacturer (technology provider), Women's self-help groups (distribution partners), Local health department (impact monitoring), Technical training partners and Carbon credit buyers
The carbon revenue distribution has been structured with XX% directed to participating households, XX% for maintenance and monitoring, and XX% for training and support services.

### A.4. Location and Timeline

The project is implemented across 25 rural communities, targeting households currently using traditional three-stone fires. Implementation follows a three-year distribution schedule, with continuous monitoring and support over a 10-year crediting period.

### A.5. Project-Specific Elements

Baseline consumption analysis shows: Average daily fuelwood consumption: 5kg per household, Traditional stove efficiency: 10-15%, Indoor air pollution levels exceeding WHO guidelines by 300%, Annual fuelwood costs of $120 per household, Current greenhouse gas emissions of 6 tonnes $CO_2e$ per household annually
Our implementation strategy includes: Regular efficiency testing of installed stoves, Participatory monitoring system, quarterly maintenance checks, User satisfaction surveys, Community-based repair workshops, Emergency support hotline, Performance verification protocols. The monitoring protocol includes regular household visits, fuel consumption tracking, and third-party verification of emission reductions.
The feasibility assessment demonstrates potential fuelwood savings of 30% per household, with associated health benefits from reduced indoor air pollution.

# Transport Activities:

## Example Transport Project: Solar-Powered Taxi Fleet Initiative

### A.1. Project Purpose and Climate Impact

The Solar-Powered Taxi Fleet Initiative aims to replace 500 conventional diesel taxis with electric vehicles powered by solar charging stations. This initiative will reduce approximately 12,000 tonnes of $CO_2$ equivalent annually while demonstrating the viability of clean transportation solutions and improving urban air quality.

### A.2. General Project Overview

The project implements a comprehensive electric mobility system including 500 electric vehicles (EVs), 20 solar-powered charging stations, and a smart fleet management platform. Technical specifications include EVs with 300km range, 75kWh battery capacity, and solar charging stations with 200kW capacity each, supported by battery storage systems.

### A.3. Stakeholder Information

The project operates through a structured partnership model with the following key stakeholders: Taxi operators association (primary beneficiaries), EV manufacturer (technology provider), Solar charging infrastructure company (implementation partner), City transportation authority (regulatory support), Local utility company (grid integration), Carbon credit buyers Carbon credit revenue distribution includes XX% for vehicle maintenance and operations, XX% for charging infrastructure, and XX% for driver training and support programs.

### A.4. Location and Timeline

The project is implemented across the Metropolitan Area, with strategically located charging stations. Implementation follows a three-year rollout schedule, with continuous monitoring over a 15-year crediting period.

### A.5. Project-Specific Elements

Transport baseline analysis shows: Average daily mileage: 200 km per taxi, Current fleet fuel consumption: 15L/100km, Current operational costs: $0.25/km, Peak charging demand: 2MW across fleet
Our implementation strategy includes: Real-time fleet monitoring system, Smart charging management, Driver training program, Regular vehicle maintenance checks, 24/7 technical support, Performance tracking and optimization, automated emissions reduction calculations.
The monitoring protocol includes automated vehicle tracking, energy consumption monitoring, and third-party verification of emission reductions.
The feasibility assessment demonstrates potential operational cost savings of 30% per vehicle, with associated air quality improvements in high-traffic areas.

# Energy Efficiency Activities

## Example Energy Efficiency Project: Heat Pump Building Conversion Initiative

### A.1. Project Purpose and Climate Impact

The Heat Pump Building Conversion Initiative aims to replace conventional gas and electric heating systems with energy-efficient heat pumps across 50 residential buildings. This strategic initiative will reduce approximately 55,000 tonnes of $CO_2$ equivalent annually while improving energy efficiency and reducing operational costs with the implementation of clean heating technologies.

### A.2. General Project Overview

The project encompasses installation of air-source heat pumps with a Coefficient of Performance (COP) of 3.5 or higher, smart building controls integration, and comprehensive building envelope improvements. The technical framework includes installation of variable-speed heat pumps sized between 10-50kW depending on building requirements, with projected energy savings of 60% compared to existing heating systems.

### A.3. Stakeholder Information

The project operates through a structured partnership model with the following key stakeholders:

- Building owners and facility managers (primary beneficiaries), Energy service company (ESCO) (implementation partner), Local utility company (grid integration support), Building certification bodies (performance verification), Carbon credit buyers

The carbon revenue distribution has been structured with XX% directed to building owners, XX% for system maintenance and monitoring, and XX% for technical support and verification.

### A.4. Location and Timeline

The project is implemented across the Metropolitan Business District, targeting buildings with outdated heating systems. Implementation follows a two-year conversion schedule, with 25 buildings annually, followed by a comprehensive 10-year monitoring and verification period.

### A.5. Project-Specific Elements

Baseline energy consumption analysis shows average annual heating energy use: 250 kWh/m² Current heating system efficiency: 65-75% Peak load demands of 75-180kW per building Annual maintenance costs of $8,000 per building with GHGs emissions of 60 kg $CO_2e/m^2$ annually.

Our implementation strategy includes continuous energy monitoring through smart meters, Real-time performance tracking system, Quarterly maintenance inspections, Annual efficiency verification, User training program for facility managers, Emergency response protocols Regular system optimization reviews.

Energy audit results demonstrate potential energy savings of 330,000 kWh annually per building. The monitoring and verification protocol includes automated data collection through building management systems and third-party verification of energy savings.

# Renewable Energy Activities

## Example Renewable Energy Project: Grid-Connected Solar PV with Battery Storage

### A.1. Project Purpose and Climate Impact

The Grid-Connected Solar PV with Battery Storage project aims to install a 10MW solar photovoltaic system with 20MWh battery storage capacity. This initiative will generate approximately 16,000 MWh of clean electricity annually, reducing carbon emissions by 55,000 tonnes of $CO_2$ equivalent while providing grid stability and reliable power supply during peak demand periods.

### A.2. General Project Overview

The project incorporates high-efficiency bifacial solar panels, smart inverter systems, and lithium-ion battery storage. Technical specifications include 25,000 solar panels rated at 400W each, advanced tracking systems, and grid-tied inverters with 98.5% efficiency. The battery system features modular 2MWh units with sophisticated energy management systems for optimal dispatch and grid services.

### A.3. Stakeholder Information

The project operates through a structured partnership model with the following key stakeholders:

- Local utility company (power purchase agreement), Project developer (implementation and operations), Technology suppliers (equipment and maintenance), Local municipality (land lease and permits), Grid operator (interconnection services), Carbon credit buyers
- Revenue distribution includes XX% for project operations and maintenance, XX% for community benefit programs, and XX% for grid infrastructure improvements.

### A.4. Location and Timeline

The facility is located in the Southern Solar Belt with annual solar irradiance of 2,100 kWh/m². Implementation follows an 18-month construction schedule, followed by a 25-year operational period with regular maintenance and performance monitoring.

### A.5.Project-Specific Elements

Resource assessment studies confirm:

- Average daily solar radiation: 5.8 kWh/m²/day,
- Grid availability: 99.5%
- Annual energy yield: 1,600 kWh/kWp
- Performance ratio: 82%
- Battery round-trip efficiency: 90%

The operational strategy includes:

- 24/7 SCADA monitoring system
- Automated performance optimization
- Quarterly equipment maintenance
- Real-time grid integration management
- Advanced weather forecasting integration
- Emergency response protocols
- Regular efficiency verification

Grid connection arrangements include a dedicated 33kV transmission line with automated protection systems and smart grid interfaces. The battery storage system provides frequency regulation, voltage support, and peak shaving services to enhance grid stability.

# Waste Management Activities:

## Example Waste Management Project: Landfill Gas Capture and Electricity Generation

### A.1. Project Purpose and Climate Impact

The Landfill Gas Capture and Electricity Generation project aims to collect and utilize methane emissions from a 50-hectare municipal landfill for power generation. This initiative will reduce approximately 75,000 tonnes of $CO_2$ equivalent annually through methane capture while generating 3MW of renewable electricity, demonstrating the viability of waste-to-energy technologies.

### A.2. General Project Overview

The project implements a comprehensive landfill gas collection system with vertical extraction wells, horizontal collectors, and a centralized processing facility. The technical framework includes installation of 120 gas wells, advanced gas conditioning systems, and three 1MW generators with heat recovery capabilities.

### A.3. Stakeholder Information

The project operates through a structured partnership model with the following key stakeholders:

- Municipal waste management authority (primary operator), Local utility company (power purchase agreement), Environmental monitoring agency, Local community representatives (oversight committee) and Carbon credit buyers

Revenue distribution includes 50% for operation and maintenance, 30% for municipal waste management improvements, and 20% for community development programs.

### A.4. Location and Timeline

The facility is located at the Central Municipal Landfill, which receives 500 tonnes of waste daily. Implementation follows a 24-month construction schedule, with gas collection beginning in phases, followed by a 15-year operational period.

### A.5. Project-Specific Elements

Waste assessment studies confirm:

- Annual waste deposition: 180,000 tonnes,
- Average waste depth: 9 meters,
- Organic content: 55%,
- Methane concentration: 45-55%,
- Current methane emissions: 900 $m^3$/hour

Our operational strategy includes: Continuous gas quality monitoring system, Automated wellfield control and optimization, Daily collection system inspection, Flare operation for excess gas management, Leachate management integration, Environmental compliance monitoring and Regular safety training and emergency procedures.

The landfill gas collection efficiency is projected at 85%, with electricity generation capacity factor of 85%. The system includes automated shutdown protocols, flame arrestors, and comprehensive gas migration monitoring to ensure safe operations.

## For Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR) Projects:

### Example CDR Project: Ethanol Plant $CO_2$ Capture and Storage Initiative

#### A.1. Project Purpose and Climate Impact

The Ethanol Plant Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) project aims to capture $CO_2$ emissions from a large-scale ethanol production facility and permanently store them in deep geological formations. This initiative will capture and store approximately 500,000 tonnes of $CO_2$ annually while demonstrating the technical and economic viability of biogenic carbon capture and permanent geological storage.

#### A.2. General Project Overview

The project implements an integrated carbon capture and storage system at a 100-million-gallon ethanol facility. Technical specifications include dehydration and compression units achieving 95% capture efficiency, a dedicated 50-kilometer steel pipeline system, and injection wells reaching secure geological storage formations at 2,500 meters depth.

#### A.3. Stakeholder Information

The project operates through a structured partnership model with the following key stakeholders: Ethanol facility operator ($CO_2$ source provider), Pipeline infrastructure company (transportation system), Geological storage operator (injection and monitoring), State geological survey (technical oversight), Environmental regulators (compliance verification)

The carbon credit revenue distribution includes xx% for capture operations, xx% for transportation and storage, and xx% for monitoring and verification activities.

#### A.4. Location and Timeline

The project facilities span from the ethanol plant in the agricultural heartland to the storage site in a characterized deep saline formation. Implementation follows a 36-month construction schedule, followed by a 30-year operational period with comprehensive monitoring.

#### A.5. Project-Specific Elements

Technical assessment confirms: Daily $CO_2$ capture: 1,400 tonnes, Pipeline capacity: 2,000 tonnes/day, Storage formation porosity: 12%, $CO_2$ stream purity: >99%, Annual injection rate: 500,000 tonnes, Storage capacity: 20+ million tonnes

Our operational strategy includes: 24/7 capture system monitoring, Real-time pipeline pressure tracking, Continuous seismic monitoring, Groundwater quality assessment, Surface deformation measurements, Automated emergency shutdown systems, Regular well integrity testing. Performance verification follows methodology requirements with independent third-party validation.

The storage system includes multiple monitoring wells, pressure management systems, and sophisticated modeling tools to ensure permanent carbon sequestration.

---

# Document Information

| Version | Date | Description |
|---|---|---|
| 4.0 | 24.04.2025 | Revisions to add updates to assessment questions, guidelines and editorial changes |
| 3.0 | 12.11.2024 | Revisions to accommodate the procedural changes and the expand the fast-track process to LUF activities. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2.0 | 16.08.2022 | Changes in line with the Rule-Update, namely;<br>1. Addition of details pertaining to pathway 1 and 2 of the preliminary review<br>2. Revision of assessment questions |
| 1.1 | 21.02.2022 | Editorial changes.<br>Reflecting the publication of the SDG Impact Tool. |
| 1.0 | 08.12.2021 | Initial adoption |

**Published by Gold Standard**

**Contact Details**
The Gold Standard Foundation
International Environment House 2
Chemin de Balexert 7-9
1219 Châtelaine Geneva, Switzerland
Tel +41 22 788 70 80
Email help@goldstandard.org