



Verification Report

Version 1.4
15-Sept-2025

Document Prepared by AENOR CONFIA S.A.U.



Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)

Carbon Fund

Verification Report (VER)

ER Program Name and Country	Emission Reduction Program in Dominican Republic (ERP-DR)
Reporting Period Covered In this Report	01-03-2021 to 31-12-2021
Number of FCPF ERs	836,147tCO ₂ e
Number of ERs allocated to the Uncertainty Buffer	184,444 tCO ₂ e
Number of ERs allocated to the Pooled Reversal Buffer	209,036 tCO ₂ e
Number of FCPF ERs from enhanced removals through afforestation/ reforestation	-
Name of the VVB	AENOR CONFIA S.A.U.
Contact information of the VVB	Génova 6. 28004 Madrid - Spain. Telephone +34 914326000 jfuentes@aenor.com www.aenor.com
Report Version	4
Date of the Verification Report	15-09-2025
Report Approved by	José Luis Fuentes

1. VERIFICATION STATEMENT

The review and cross-check of explanations and justifications included in the Monitoring Report Version 4 dated on 06/08/2025 and supporting documents have provided AENOR with sufficient evidence to determine with a reasonable level of assurance the compliance of the reported information with the applicable verification criteria and materiality set out in the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Methodological Framework (MF), the Validation and Verification Guidelines (VVG) and other applicable normative documents requirements.

The scope covered by the verification includes the ER Program's crediting period ((01-03-2021 to 31-12-2024), the reporting period (01-03-2021 to 31-12-2021), the accounting area (1,295,981 ha), the REDD Country Participant's Forest Monitoring System, the national REDD+ Programs and Projects Data Management System and the following GHG sources and sinks (REDD+ activities), carbon pools and type of GHGs:

GHG sources and sinks (REDD+ activities)
• Emissions from deforestation – Included • Emissions from forest degradation – Included • Removal as a result of enhancement of carbon stocks (forest remaining forest and land converted to forest land) – Included • Emissions and removals from carbon stock conservation – Excluded • Emissions and removals from sustainable forest management - Excluded
Carbon pools
• Above-Ground biomass (AGB) – Included • Below-Ground biomass (BGM) – Included • Litter – Included • Dead wood – Included • Soil Organic Carbon (SOC) – Included
GHG
• CO₂ – Included • CH₄ – Excluded • N₂O – Excluded

The verification was performed through a combination of document review, interviews, and communications with relevant personnel. Findings were issued, requesting; MAJOR Corrective Action Request (MCAR), MINOR Corrective Action Requests (mCAR) or Observations (OBS) according to the FCPF VVG v2.7 section 11, to ensure compliance with all requirements.

A total of 12 MCAR, 3 mCAR and 3 Observations were raised as part of the validation with extended scope process. All MCAR, and OBS were successfully addressed by the ER Program and closed by the VVB. These findings are described in Appendix 1 of this report.

AENOR is able to verify with a reasonable level of assurance that the ERP-DR, quantified in accordance with the verification criteria, amount to 1,229,627 tCO₂e. AENOR verified that the uncertainty buffer ERs amount to 184,444 tCO₂e and that the non-permanence ERs amount to 209,036 tCO₂e. The amount of FCPF Units to be issued would be 836,147tCO₂e. There are no uncertainties associated with the verification conclusion.

Statement Issuing Date: 15-September-2025

Intended User: World Bank Group, FCPF Carbon Fund Participants



Javier Cócera
Team Leader



José Luis Fuentes
Climate Change Manager

2. AGREEMENT

2.1 Level of Assurance

The verification audit assessment was conducted to provide a reasonable level of assurance concerning material misstatements, errors, or omissions in conformance with the verification criteria and scope set out in the FCPF requirements, in conformance with paragraph 31 of the VVG v2.7. The provisions undertaken to ensure such a reasonable level of assurance included a risk assessment of the sources and the magnitude of potential errors, omissions, and misstatements, as required by section 4.4.1 of ISO 14064-3:2006, previous to the elaboration of a sampling/evidence-gathering plan.

Based on the previous provisions and considering the findings raised during the audit, a positive evaluation statement reasonably ensures that the FCPF Program GHG assertion is materially correct and is a fair representation of the GHG data and information provided in the ER Monitoring Report and supporting documents.

2.2 Objectives

The objective of audit was to conduct a systematic, independent, and documented process for the evaluation of the GHG assertion made by the Emission Reduction Program in Dominican Republic, for the reporting period from 01-03-2021 to 31-12-2021 against the FCPF criteria applicable to verification and to determine if the reported information in the ER Monitoring Report is in compliance to the agreed criteria and free from material errors, omissions, or misstatements.

The general objectives of the verification, as required by paragraph 32 of the VVG v2.7, were:

- Review of the ER Monitoring Report and supporting information to confirm the correctness of presented information;
- Identify if the methodological steps and data are publicly available in accordance with applicable criteria;
- Assess whether the start date of the crediting period proposed by the ER Program is in compliance with the definition provided in the FCPF Glossary of terms;
- Assess the extent to which the reported ERs have been reported with a transparent and coherent step-by-step process that enables reconstruction and have meet the requirements of applicable criteria;
- Assess the extent to which the GHG emissions/Emission Reductions are materially accurate;
- Identify sources of uncertainty due to both random and systematic errors related with any sources of bias that can impact the estimate of the total ERs and determine whether the ER Program has conducted the uncertainty analysis in compliance applicable criteria;
- Assess the National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS) of the ER Program and validate that there are controls for sources of potential errors, omissions, and misstatements in place;
- Identify components of the NFMS that require attention and/or adjustment in future monitoring and reporting or identify areas of risk of future non-compliance.

The specific objectives of the verification, as required by paragraph 34 of the VVG v2.7, were:

- Assess the extent to which the methodologies and methods used to estimate GHG emissions and removals during the Reporting Period are consistent with the Reference Level and with the Monitoring Plan as described in the ER Monitoring Report;
- Assess the extent to which the ER Monitoring Report includes a complete and accurate report, to the extent possible, on the implementation of its strategy to mitigate and/or minimize potential Displacement and on any on changes in major drivers in the ER Accounting Area;

- Assess the extent to which the ER Monitoring Report contains a complete and accurate report on the mitigation, to the extent possible, of significant risks of Reversals identified in the assessment, and addresses the sustainability of ERs;
- Determine whether the ER Program has quantified ERs allocated to the Uncertainty, Reversal, and Pooled Reversal Buffer during the Reporting Period in compliance with the Methodological Framework and other applicable criteria;
- Assess the extent to which systems to avoid that ERs generated under the ER Program have not been counted or compensated for more than once have been adequately implemented and confirm that issuance has not occurred in other known registries;
- Determine whether the national or centralized REDD+ Programs and Projects Data Management System are implemented and operated in compliance with the Methodological Framework and other applicable criteria. For that purpose, and specific audit of the operations of the REDD+ Programs and Projects Data Management System was carried, as per indicator 37.4 of the MF.

2.3 Criteria

The audit assessment was carried against the criteria set for verification by the following documents:

- FCPF Methodological Framework, v3, April 2020.
- Validation and Verification Guidelines v2.7 January 2025.
- Buffer Guidelines v4.2.1 March 2025.
- Guidelines on the application of the Methodological Framework.
 1. Use of Interpolation of Data in Relation to the Reference Period of an ER Program v1 June 2016.
 2. Technical Corrections to GHG Emissions and Removals Reported in the Reference Period v2 November 2020.
 3. The Definition of Reporting Periods of Emission Reduction Programs v1 November 2018.
 4. Uncertainty Analysis of Emission Reductions v1.0 November 2020.
- Process Guidelines v6.3 March 2025.
- Glossary of Terms v2.3 January 2025.
- Guidelines contained in the ER Monitoring Report Template (v3.1.2) and the Verification Report Template (1.4.2, March 2025);
- ISO 14064-3:2006
- ISO 14065:2013
- ISO 14066:2011

The following documents will be considered as documents that provide acceptable methods for satisfying requirements provided in the above criteria, as per VVG paragraph 38:

- 2006 IPCC Guidelines;
- 2013 IPCC Wetlands Supplement;
- 2019 refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines;
- GFOI 2016 Methods and Guidance Document;
- FCPF Guidance Notes.

Specifically, the following criteria and indicators of the MF were applicable to the validation with extended scope, as per paragraph 37 of the VVG 2.7:

Criteria/indicator	Topic
6	Data availability
7, 8, 9.1	Identification and address source(s) of uncertainty
9.2, 9.3	Estimation of residual uncertainty
14.1	Consistency of monitored estimates with RL

17.3, 17.4	Monitoring and reporting of displacement mitigation
18.2	Addressing reversals
19	Account for reversals
22	Calculation of Emission Reductions
23	Double counting
37	REDD projects and programs DMS

2.4 Scope

The scope of verification included, as per section 8.4 of the VVG v2.7:

- The Crediting Period of the ER Program;
- The selected Reporting Period;
- The ER Program Accounting Area as defined in the ER Program's Final ER Program Document (ER-PD);
- The GHG sources and sinks associated with any of the REDD+ activities accounted for as required by the MF;
- The carbon pools and GHGs to be accounted for as required by the MF;
- The REDD Country Participant's NFMS as described in the ER Monitoring Report;
- The national REDD+ Program and Projects Data Management System (DMS) as described in the Monitoring Report.

2.5 Materiality

The materiality threshold of the verification, as required section 8.5 of the VVG v2.7, was:

- Quantitative: the threshold for materiality with respect to the aggregate of errors, omissions, and misrepresentations relative to the total reported GHG emission and removals was one percent (1%). (Under-estimation of the Reference Level was not considered a material discrepancy).
- Qualitative: any issue related to management system and controls, poorly managed documentation, and non-compliance with the applicable requirements of the MF and other applicable criteria; and any errors in reporting of factual information in the ER Monitoring Report as required by the FCPF MF.

The verification process based on the desk review and remote found that there are not quantitative nor qualitative material discrepancies affecting the Reference Level and the Reference Level setting.

The verification process based on the desk review and remote audit found that quantitative nor qualitative material discrepancies affecting the GHG assertion and leading to overestimations of the reported ERs.

3. METHODOLOGY AND PLANNING

3.1 Verification team

Name	Role	Activities				
		Desk review	Site visit	Reporting	Supervision	Technical review
Carlos Jiménez	Team Leader until September 2024	X	X	X	X	
Javier Cócera	Validator/verifier auditor Team Leader after September 2024	X		X		
Daniel Bermejo	Validator/verifier auditor	X		X		
Adrián Vidal	Validator/verifier auditor	X		X		
Pablo Moreno	Auditor in trainee	X		X		
José Luis Fuentes	Reviewer				X	X

3.2 Verification schedule

Tasks	Deliverable	Date	Responsible
1. Kick off meeting	Minute	10.05.2023	All parties
2. Desk review of documents	Preliminary findings (if required)	18.05.2023	AENOR
3.1. Draft sampling plan	Sampling plan draft	18.05.2023	AENOR
3.2. Sampling plan	Sampling plan	25.05.2023	AENOR
4.1. Draft Audit plan	Audit plan draft	25.05.2023	AENOR
4.2. Audit plan	Audit plan	01.06.2023	AENOR
5. Country visit	-	20-21.06.2023	AENOR/ Country participant
6. 1st round of findings	1st round of findings	09.08.2023	AENOR
7. Answer to findings	Answer to findings	14.09.2023	Country participant
8. Review of findings and potential 2nd round of findings (if required)	2nd round of findings (if required)	28.09.2023	AENOR
9. Answer to the 2nd round of findings (if required)	Answer to findings	06.10.2023	Country participant
10. Review of answers		13.10.2023	AENOR

11. Draft reports	Validation and verification draft reports	03.11.2023	AENOR
12. Provide opportunity to REDD Country and FMT to comment draft reports	Comments to draft reports (if required)	03.11.2023	Country participant/ FMT
13. Final validation report and final verification report with statements. AENOR technical review	Final validation and verification reports	08.09.2025	AENOR

3.3 Methodology description

The verification was performed simultaneously with the validation with extended scope of the ER Program, through a combination of document review, interviews, and communications with relevant personnel. The conformity was evaluated against the criteria described in section 2.3.

A sampling/evidence-gathering plan was developed for the validation and first verification of the ER Program, as required by section 9.4 of the VVG v2.7. A risk assessment of the sources and the magnitude of potential errors, omissions, and misstatements was carried out, as required by section 4.4.1 of ISO 14064-3:2006, previous to the elaboration of the sampling/evidence-gathering plan. The sampling/evidence-gathering plan was developed considering all the criteria set by section 4.4.3 of ISO 14064-3:2006:

- a) Agreed level of assurance;
- b) validation and verification scope;
- c) validation and verification criteria;
- d) amount and type of evidence (qualitative and quantitative) necessary to achieve the agreed level of assurance;
- e) methodologies for determining representative samples; and
- f) risk of potential errors, omissions, or misstatements.

All evidence requested and reviewed was crosschecked in order to evaluate the consistency of information in the ER Monitoring Report. All statements, claims and procedures described within the scope of the verification included in the ER Monitoring Report were part of the assessment of the sampling/evidence-gathering plan and all the reviewed supporting evidence were evaluated against the ER Monitoring Report.

The magnitude of the sampling was based on the previous experience of AENOR as VVB and ensure the achievement of reasonable level of assurance. The sampling/evidence-gathering plan was open to be modified based on any new risks or materiality concerns that could potentially lead to errors, omissions or misstatements identified during the verification process.

The audit team carried out a deep and meticulous review of the calculation spreadsheets to verify the correct application of the used methodology (formulae, equations) and checked that data required to calculate the GHG emission was appropriately provided.

All documentation provided by the Country Participant was assessed against the applicable criteria described in section 2.3. Several MCAR, mCAR and OBS were raised and submitted to the Country Participant to ensure compliance with all requirements, which addressed them either by providing to the audit team with the requested information or by making the appropriate corrections. Updated versions of the documentation were submitted by the Country Participant and the audit team reassessed them against the guidance documentation. This process was repeated iteratively until all MCAR were fully closed (there is one mCAR pending to be closed).

A total of 12 MCAR, 3 mCAR and 3 Observations were raised as part of the validation with extended scope process. All MCAR, and OBS were successfully addressed by the ER Program and closed by the VVB.

3.4 Review of documentation

A detailed review of all documentation was conducted to ensure consistency with and identify any deviation from FCPF requirements. Initial review focused on the ER Monitoring Report. Specially, in relation to the reported ER, the methodological approach for their determination and its consistency with the Reference Level, the accuracy and availability of data and parameters used for calculations, the estimated uncertainty, the design of the DMS, displacement, reversals, and risk of double counting.

In addition to the ER Monitoring Report, all documentation cited in it was download and reviewed in order to verify its public accessibility and to crosschecked with the statements made in the ER Monitoring Report. These documents include, among others, calculation spreadsheets used for the determination of emission factors (EF) and estimation of the ER, GIS data (satellite images and remote sensing analysis) used for determination of activity data (AD), and additional documents related to monitoring procedures, literature sources of parameters, etc.

As result of the desk review of documents and interviews, the audit team required additional documentation to the Country Participant to verify certain statements or have further clarification regarding GHG assertions, data and parameters used or employed procedures. All the additional documents requested were added to the later versions of the ER Monitoring Report, as required by criterion 6 of the MF.

For a listing of all documents provided by the Country Participant and review for the verification, see Appendix 2.

AENOR confirms that sufficient evidence was presented for all GHG assertions and that there is a clear audit trail that contains the evidence and records that validate the stated figures in this verification report since:

- Sufficient evidence available: the Country Participant has provided the 100% of data used in the calculations to achieve the final estimated amount of GHG emissions and removals.
- Nature of evidence: the raw data were collected from reliable sources. They are detailed in the program documents and have been provided to the audit team.
- Cross-checked evidence: AENOR cross-checked the collected information through interviews with stakeholders and reproducing calculations.

3.5 REDD Country Visit

In accordance with FCPF Carbon Fund Facility Management Team (FMT) and the Country Participant, and provided that a reasonable level of assurance was achievable, AENOR as VVB, carried out an onsite audit that ensured the achievement of the assurance level required by the FCPF.

Thus, the Audit was performed onsite, complemented with desk revision: some aspects were assessed remotely, since reported Emission Reductions rely on activity data estimates through Earth Observation data obtained in a centralized Forest Monitoring System with few field data. On the other hand, other aspects were assessed onsite thanks to the Team Leader onsite visit, as VVG paragraphs 48 and 50 allows.

The audit was based on the following auditing techniques:

- Document review and cross checks between the information provided in the ER Monitoring Report and supporting information and evidence provided by the Country Participant.
- Review, based on the selected methodologies, tools and the other applied methodological regulatory documents, of the appropriateness of formulae and accuracy of calculations.

- Meetings, via teleconference and during the onsite visit, with relevant stakeholders and personal responsible for the implementation of the ER Program and the elaboration of the ER Monitoring Report, as identified in section 2 and 9.2 of the ER MR.
- Cross checks between information provided by interviewees to ensure that no relevant information was omitted.

The audit procedure was agreed with the Country Participant on the basis of available means and safety procedures. The teleconferences were carried using software agreed with the Country Participant, i.e., Microsoft Teams.

Two technical sessions (one for validation with extended scope and the second one for verification) during the site visit were carried out on June 20th-21st 2023 with Country Participant's staff involved in the management of the ER Program and the elaboration of the ER Monitoring Report. The aim of the sessions were to cross-check and verify with the responsible staff of each area the procedures described in the ER Monitoring Report and additional documents, as well as to clarify doubts from the audit team, prior to the issuance of the first round of findings.

The following table includes the list of all Country Participant's staff that participated in the technical sessions, who gathered in the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources offices, together with the VVB Team leader, while the rest of the VVB team supported with documentary revision.

Name	Organization	Role/Position
César Augusto Abrill Cáceres	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	REDD Coordination Office Manager
Germán Obando Vargas	World Bank	Carbon accounting specialist
Betsy Carolina Morales Gutiérrez	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Analyst
Esther María Villalona García	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Financial Analyst
Juan Grillo	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	REDD Coordination Office
Kenia Amarilis Feliz Sánchez	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Head of Climate Change Metrics and Transparency Department
Maiker Carvajal Paulino	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Administrative support
María Evangelina Hidalgo Ramírez	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Climate Change Analyst
Rafael Antonio Rivera	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Zoning Manager
Rafael Santiago Hernández Batista	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Geomatics Department Manager
Ramón Alberto Díaz Beard	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Forest Monitoring Coordinator
Sarita Altagracia Marte Jiménez	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Technical assistant
Patricia Garffer	ANAB	Auditor

The program covered during the technical sessions was the following:

Activity & Information
Opening meeting Introduction and scope of the Audit. Review of meeting agenda. Generalities.
Technical meeting 1 (validation with extended scope): 1. <u>1. Carbon pools, sources and sinks</u> Sources and sinks associated with the REDD+ Activities. Criterion 3 MF Significant Carbon Pools and greenhouse gases. Criterion 4 MF 2. <u>Reference level</u> Use of the most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) guidance and guidelines. Criterion 5 MF. Key data and methods detailed and available for reconstruction of the Reference Level. Criterion 6 MF. Clearly documented Forest Reference Emission Level or Forest Reference Level for the ER Program Measures Area. Criterion 10,11, 12 and 13 MF 3. <u>Measurement, monitoring and reporting</u> Robust Forest Monitoring Systems. Criterion 14 MF. National Forest Monitoring System. Criterion 15 MF. Community participation in Monitoring and Reporting. Criterion 16 MF. 4. <u>Uncertainties of the calculation</u> Identification and address source(s) of uncertainty (identify, minimize, quantify remaining). Criterion 7, 8, 9.1 MF.
Technical meeting 2 (verification): 1. <u>Implementation and operation of the ER program during the reporting period</u> Monitoring and reporting of displacement mitigation Criterion 17.3, 17.4 MF. 2. <u>System for measurement, monitoring and reporting emissions and removals occurring within the monitoring period</u> Consistency of monitored estimates with RL 14.1 MF. 3. <u>Data and parameters</u> Key data and methods detailed and available for reconstruction of the reported emissions and removals. Criterion 6 MF. 4. <u>Quantification of emission reductions</u> Calculation of Emission Reductions. Criterion 22 MF 5. <u>Uncertainty of the estimate of emission reductions</u> Identification and address source(s) of uncertainty (identify, minimize, quantify remaining). Criterion 7, 8, 9.1 MF. Estimation of residual uncertainty. Criterion 9.2, 9.3 MF. 6. <u>Transfer of title to ERs</u> REDD projects and programs DMS. Criterion 37. Double counting. Criterion 23 MF. 7. <u>Reversals</u> Addressing and account for reversals Criterion 18.2 and 19 MF
Closing Meeting: Remarks, clarifications, questions, following steps.

4. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

4.1 Implementation status of the ER Program and update on drivers

AENOR has reviewed the ERP-DR' Monitoring Report and all supporting documents and deems they are complete and accurate. The verification team confirms that sufficient information has been included to explain any changes in major drivers in the ER Accounting Area and the status of the implementation of the strategy to mitigate and minimize potential displacement.

4.2 Methodological Deviations

AENOR has reviewed the ERP-RD Monitoring Report and all supporting documents and there has not been any Methodological deviation for this monitoring period. Therefore, the verification team confirms that section 12.3 of the VVG is not applicable.

4.3 System for measurement, monitoring and reporting emissions and removals occurring within the monitoring period

4.3.1 Forest Monitoring System

AENOR confirms that the NFMS (National Forest Monitoring System) of the ERP-DR is functioning and can produce high quality data. The documents reviewed by the verification team demonstrate the necessary controls to address relevant sources of potential errors, omissions, and misstatements are in place. AENOR also confirms that the NFMS has been developed in accordance with the requirements of the FCPF Methodological Framework.

4.3.2 Forest Monitoring Approach

Not applicable as the country made no changes to the monitoring plan.

4.3.3 Measurement, monitoring and reporting approach

AENOR assessed section 2.2 of the ERP-DR' Monitoring Report and attests that the equations and methods used for measuring, monitoring, and reporting are correct and consistent with the Reference Level, as described in Annex 4 of the same document.

In addition, AENOR confirms that the link among the equation parameters and the parameters under fixed data and parameters and monitored data and parameters are appropriate and correct.

4.4 Fixed Data and Parameters

After review of all information, procedures, calculations, and supporting documentation, AENOR confirms that the fixed data and parameters are applied consistently in line with the ER Monitoring Report template (see sections 4.8.1 Activity data and 4.8.2 Emission Factors, in AENOR's Validation Report of the ERP-DR) and are consistent with the reported fixed data and parameters described in Annex 4 of the ER Monitoring Report.

AENOR confirms that fixed data and parameters are made publicly available according to criterion 6 of the MF, since links to access all sources are provided in the ER Monitoring Report.

4.5 Monitored Data and Parameters

AENOR confirms that all data and parameters subject to monitoring have been reported and are free of errors and material misstatements. Additionally, the verification team confirms that the reported data is in line with the guidelines provided in the ER Monitoring Report template.

AENOR reproduced all spreadsheets' information to check the correctness of each step of monitoring from measurement to data transfer and calculation, and in line with IPCC methods used to estimate

emissions and removals for Measurement, Monitoring and Reporting (MMR). AENOR confirms the reliability of the source and nature of the reported evidence justified the selection of the monitored data and parameters; and that have been reported in line with the verification criteria.

AENOR also confirms that methodological steps and data were publicly available in accordance with applicable criteria, and the open links to the multiple sources are provided in the ERP-DR' MR. AENOR confirms that the evidence provided by the ER MR is sufficient and appropriate to determine the GHG reductions and removals.

AENOR confirms that the ERP-DR monitors emissions by sources and removals by sinks included in the scope using the same methods to those used to set the Reference Level.

AENOR confirms that ER Monitoring Report states as monitoring period from 01-03-2021 to 31-12-2021.

Assessment details are as follows per monitored parameters:

Parameters	$A(j, i)_{MP}$; $A(j, i)_{LU}$; $A(j)$; $R(j, i)_{LU}$
Free of Material Misstatement	Yes
Reported Appropriately	Yes
Assessment Details	These parameters represent: - $A(j, i)_{MP}$: Area converted from forest type j to non-forest type i during the Monitoring Period (hectare) - $A(j, i)_{LU}$: Area converted from forest type j to non-forest type i of the Land Unit (hectares) - $A(j)$: Area of Stable Forest type j (hectare) - $R(j, i)_{LU}$: Area converted from non-forest type j to forest type i of the Land Unit (hectare) Deforestation and enhancements (land converted to forest land) were determined through sample-based visual interpretation, primarily using remote sensing data of all satellite imagery available to the country, to collect sample information. ERP-DR presented information about data sources for estimating Activity Data, methods for mapping land-use and land-use change (including sampling design and size, absence of stratification justification, assessment and labelling, analysis and Activity Data calculation), QA/QC procedures applied, values applied, and uncertainty associated with these parameters. The validation team conducted an independent analysis of similar remotely sensed data to confirm that the source data was reliable and appropriate. Additionally, the validation team was able to ensure that LULC classification was appropriate and followed the defined classification system. The validation team conducted independent data checks for each step necessary for the quantification of these parameters. Activity data parameters were examined using remotely sense imagery to ensure accurate classification of LULC classification. Spatial analyses conducted in ESRI GIS confirmed the geographical boundary, ensuring that all activity data fell within the Accounting Area and that the Accounting Area was computed correctly. Independent data checks were used to ensure that the quantification of the parameters was performed correctly. This included an independent

	review of the literature cited in reference to the applied equations. The uncertainty associated with this parameter was independently calculated after a thorough review of the calculation spreadsheets. The calculation of uncertainty applied the methodology from Olofsson, et al. (2014), and the validation team reviewed and confirmed that the estimation was correct and without any error.
--	--

Parameters	Deg(j,i) _{MP}
Free of Material Misstatement	Yes
Reported Appropriately	Yes
Assessment Details	These parameter represents: - Deg(j,i)_{RP}: Area converted from forest with canopy cover j to forest with canopy cover i during the Monitoring Period (hectare/year) Degradation and enhancements (forest remaining forest) were determined through sampling-based estimates and associated uncertainties were used to calculate the activity data. Forest cover annual maps were used as reference information to determine the canopy cover categories for each sampling point. DR ER Monitoring Report presented information about data sources for estimating Activity Data (including type of sampling, number of sampling units, classification scheme, sources, interpretation key, data collection and analysis), values applied, QA/QC procedures applied, and uncertainty associated with these parameters. The validation team conducted independent analysis of the information provided to confirm that the source data was reliable and appropriate. Additionally, the validation team was able to ensure that LULC classification was appropriate and followed the defined classification system. The validation team conducted independent data checks for each step necessary for the quantification of these parameters. Spatial analyses conducted in ESRI GIS confirmed the geographical boundary, ensuring that all activity data fell within the Accounting Area and that the Accounting Area was computed correctly. Independent data checks were used to ensure that the quantification of the parameters was performed correctly; this included an independent review of the literature cited in reference to the applied equations. The uncertainty associated with this parameter was calculated by the bootstrap method, with 1000 simulations based on the bias estimate, and independently calculated by the VVB after a thorough review of the calculation spreadsheets.

5. VERIFICATION OF GHG ASSERTION

5.1 ER Program Reference level for the Reporting Period

The Reference level for the Reporting Period, according to the ER Monitoring Report, and, as reported in AENOR's Validation Report, is as follows:

Year of Monitoring <i>t</i>	Average annual historical emissions from deforestation over the Reference Period (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	If applicable, average annual historical emissions from forest degradation over the Reference Period (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	If applicable, enhanced removals from afforestation/reforestation (AR) (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	If applicable, enhanced removals from other activities besides A/R (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	Adjustment, if applicable (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	Reference level (tCO ₂ -e/yr)
2021	2,703,708	745,945	-1,840,160	-595,042	0	1,014,451
Total	2,703,708	745,945	-1,840,160	-595,042		1,014,451

The following table represents the values for the reporting period, in which the por-rata discount was applied. The factor is 0.84.

Year of Monitoring <i>t</i>	Average annual historical emissions from deforestation over the Reference Period (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	If applicable, average annual historical emissions from forest degradation over the Reference Period (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	If applicable, enhanced removals from afforestation/reforestation (AR) (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	If applicable, enhanced removals from other activities besides A/R (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	Adjustment, if applicable (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	Reference level (tCO ₂ -e/yr)
2021	2,266,670	625,367	-1,542,709	-499,857	0	850,471
Total	2,266,670	625,367	-1,542,709	-499,857	0	850,471

5.2 ER program emissions by sources and removals by sinks

After the review of all ERP-DR information, procedures, calculations, and supporting documentation, AENOR confirms that the equations and methods used for measuring, monitoring, and reporting are correct and consistent with the Reference Level, free of material misstatements, errors, and omissions.

The Country Participant presented the estimated emissions by sources and removals by sinks included in the ER Program. The Country Participant also prepared spreadsheets with all the calculation processes. It can be publicly accessed, and the links are provided in the ER Monitoring Report.

AENOR reviewed the entire estimation process to confirm that is in with the MF and the verification criteria. AENOR was able to reconstruct ER estimate with given calculation spreadsheets. The formulae applied were correct to reproduce the final estimate of ER. The reported ERs are materially accurate. AENOR confirms that the ERs have been reported following a transparent and coherent step-by-step process that enabled the reconstruction of estimates.

Year of Monitoring Period	Emissions from deforestation (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	If applicable, emissions from forest degradation (tCO ₂ -e/yr)*	If applicable, enhanced removals from afforestation/reforestation (AR) (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	If applicable, enhanced removals from other activities besides A/R (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	Net emissions and removals (tCO ₂ -e/yr)
2021	1,796,239	1,401,051	-2,287,467	-1,362,085	-452,262
Total	1,796,239	1,401,051	-2,287,467	-1,362,085	-452,262

Finally, a pro-rata factor was used to adjust the Emission for the reporting Period. This factor was only applied to Emission produced during 2021, since annual net emissions were computed for the Monitoring Period. By dividing the total days of the Reporting Period (306) by the number of days in 2021 (365), a 0.84 factor was obtained. The discount is only applied to emissions.

Year of Monitoring Period	Emissions from deforestation (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	If applicable, emissions from forest degradation (tCO ₂ -e/yr)*	If applicable, enhanced removals from afforestation/reforestation (AR) (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	If applicable, enhanced removals from other activities besides A/R (tCO ₂ -e/yr)	Net emissions and removals (tCO ₂ -e/yr)
2021	1,505,888	1,174,579	-1,917,412	-1,141,912	-379,156
Total	1,505,888	1,174,579	-1,917,412	-1,141,912	-379,156

5.3 Uncertainty of Emission Reductions

5.3.1 Uncertainty analysis

The Country Participant identified and assessed through a stepwise approach, the sources of uncertainty of the Emission Reduction in Activity Data (measurement, representativeness, sampling), Emission Factors (DBH measurement, H measurement, plot delineation, wood density estimation, biomass allometric model, sampling, and in other parameters such as Carbon Fraction, root-to-shoot ratios, etc.), as well as in Integration. This approach was the same as for the uncertainty analysis of Reference Level.

The audit team recalculated the uncertainty statistics independently to confirm the accuracy of the reported precision, reviewed assumptions and sources associated with parameters used in the quantification, and reviewed uncertainty of the Emission Reductions due to random and systematic errors. AENOR confirms that the sources of uncertainty are systematically identified and correctly assessed in the Measurement Monitoring, and Reporting system, and addressed according to verification criteria, including the Guideline on the application of the Methodological Framework Number 4.

Additionally, AENOR confirms that there is an appropriate process for reducing uncertainty in the activity data and emission factors, where possible: systematic errors are minimized through the implementation of a consistent and comprehensive set of standard operating procedures, including a set of quality assessment and quality control processes; and random errors and other uncertainties are minimized to the extent practical based on the assessment of their relative contribution to the overall uncertainty of the emissions and removals.

5.3.2 Uncertainty of the estimate of Emission Reductions

The Country Participant estimated the uncertainty of aggregated Emission Reductions based on Monte Carlo analysis, same as for the Reference Level. A total of 10,000 iterations were calculated for the cumulative emissions of the monitoring period. The uncertainty estimate for the Emission Reductions strictly follows the guidelines of Approach 2: Monte Carlo simulation from 2006 IPCC Volume 1 General Guidance and Reporting Chapter 3 as well as the Guideline on the application of the Methodological Framework Number 4.

The verification team reviewed and confirmed that elements mentioned in 5.3.1 related to the estimation of uncertainty for the ER were all addressed in the provided Uncertainty spreadsheet. AENOR also confirmed that the estimations were correct and that the results matched the Reference Level included in the ER Monitoring Report. Therefore, AENOR concludes that the application of Monte Carlo simulation for the quantification of Uncertainty of the Emission Reductions was performed correctly and free of errors and misstatements.

5.3.3 Sensitivity analysis and identification of areas of improvement of the MRV system

In order to identify the relative contribution of each parameter to overall uncertainty, a sensitivity analysis was conducted by the Country Participant in which the uncertainty of each parameter was selectively removed prior to running Monte Carlo simulations and combining uncertainties.

AENOR confirms that uncertainty of AD and EF used in Reference Level setting is quantified in a consistent way.

AENOR confirmed that the underlying sources of error in data and methods for integrated measurements of deforestation, degradation and enhancements were combined into a single combined uncertainty estimate and are reported at the two-tailed 90% confidence level, obtaining a result of 15% of for the uncertainty discount.

AENOR reviewed and confirmed that above-mentioned (section 5.3.1) elements related to the sensitivity analysis were all addressed in the provided calculation spreadsheets. The validation team also confirmed that the estimations were free of errors and the results matched the sensitivity analysis included in the ER Monitoring Report. Therefore, AENOR concludes that the sensitivity analysis was performed correctly.

5.4 Transfer of Title to ERs

5.4.1 Ability to transfer title

The transfer of title is 100% according to the information received from the FCPF team. The ER Program in the Dominican Republic has faced challenges in identifying and documenting ER ownership due to insecure land tenure and unregistered properties. The lack of protocols for tracking land status and georeferencing data means that the full transfer of ER ownership for the 2021 Reporting Period will not be completed on time. To be able to carry out 100% of ER title transfer corresponding to the current Reporting Period (2021) and considering the issue of land ownership, the Dominican Republic identified that the Executing Entities that have sufficient information and required documentation on the number of hectares and their land ownership status are the Asociación de Silvicultores San Ramón and the Vice Ministry of Protected Areas and Biodiversity.

5.4.2 Program and Projects Data Management System

AENOR confirms that the RSPP is in charge of supervising REDD+ projects at the national level. To fully play this role, it is necessary to ensure that the REDD+ activities that are implemented in the territory comply with the guidelines and commitments made in the National REDD+ Strategy. AENOR confirms that Operational guidance is in place and comply with the requirements of the MF.

Regarding the Data Management System, Dominican Republic developed the new tool, which was reviewed by the VVB in April 2025. This new tool provides a good source to identify the potential double issuance and accountability issues. Therefore, a national register to identify the different initiatives

contributing to the reduction of emissions in the program area and also to implement the benefit sharing plan was developed to comply with previous criteria and ensure that national emissions are not double-counted. AENOR has reviewed the Geoportal to confirm that is in compliance with the ERMR data.

5.4.3 Double counted ERs

AENOR confirms that systems to effectively detect and prevent double counting and/or compensation of ER generated has been properly designed and put in place and that, during the audit, no evidence of ER double-counted or compensated was found in the crosschecked revision that AENOR carried out by looking at other GHG programs/registries.

No ERs have been sold, assigned or otherwise used by any other entity for sale, public relations, compliance or any other purpose including ERs accounted separately under other GHG accounting schemes nor ERs have been set-aside to meet Reversal management requirements under other GHG accounting schemes.

5.5 Reversals

5.5.1 The occurrence of major events or changes in ER Program circumstances that might have led to Reversals during the Reporting Period compared to the previous Reporting Period(s)

This section is not applicable since this is the first verification of the ERP-DR.

5.5.2 Quantification of Reversals during the Reporting Period

This section is not applicable since this is the first verification of ERP-DR.

5.5.3 Reversal Risk Assessment and Buffer ERs

Risk Factor	Risk indicators – Assessment by VVB	Resulting reversal risk set-aside percentage
Default risk	10%	10%
Lack of broad and sustained stakeholder support	Reversal Risk is considered low: 10% discount. AENOR considers that the information provided is appropriate to justify the risk rate and updated to the current Monitoring Period. On the other hand, the risk rate is the same as the one declared in the ER-PD.	0%
Lack of institutional capacities and/or ineffective vertical/cross sectorial coordination	Reversal Risk is considered medium: 5% discount. AENOR considers that the information provided is appropriate to justify the risk rate and updated to the current Monitoring Period. On the other hand, the risk rate is the same as the one declared in the ER-PD.	5%
Lack of long term effectiveness in addressing underlying drivers	Reversal Risk is considered low: 5% discount. AENOR considers that the information provided is appropriate to justify the risk rate and updated to the current Monitoring Period. On the other hand, the risk rate is the same as the one declared in the ER-PD.	0%

Exposure and vulnerability to natural disturbances	Reversal Risk is considered high: 0% discount. AENOR considers that the information provided is appropriate to justify the risk rate and updated to the current Monitoring Period. On the other hand, the risk rate is the same as the one declared in the ER-PD.	5%
	Total reversal risk set-aside percentage	20%
	Total reversal risk set-aside percentage from ER-PD or previous monitoring report (whichever is more recent)	20%

In conclusion, AENOR determined that the Buffer Guidelines have been correctly used to calculate the Total reversal risk set-aside percentage, and the conservativeness principle in order to determine the default reversal risk set-aside percentages and the discounts have been applied by the Country Participant, since the Total reversal risk set-aside percentage is the same as in the ER-PD and no reasons have been found to increase it.

AENOR verified that enough evidence was provided to justify the default reversal risk set-aside percentages and the discounts. ERs allocated to the Buffer is quantified in the following section.

5.6 Calculation of emission reductions

AENOR confirms that the ERP-DR has quantified ERs in compliance with the MF, the ER Monitoring Report template, and the rest of applicable criteria, including FCPF Guidelines.

AENOR confirmed that the evidence provided allow to assess the GHG assertion made in the ER Monitoring Report as sufficient, without material discrepancy, and with a reasonable level of assurance, with respect to material misstatements, errors, or omissions.

The results are as follows:

		2021	Total
A	Reference Level (tCO₂-e) (Section 5.1)	850,471	850,471
B	Net emissions and removals under the ER Program (tCO₂-e) (Section 5.2)	-379,156	-379,156
C	Emission Reductions during Reporting Period (tCO₂-e) (A-B)	1,229,627	1,229,627
D	If applicable, number of Emission Reductions from reducing forest degradation that have been estimated using proxy-based estimation approaches (use zero if not applicable)	0	0
E	Number of Emission Reductions estimated using measurement approaches (C-D)	1,229,627	1,229,627
F	Percentage of ERs (A) for which the ability to transfer Title to ERs is clear or uncontested (Section 5.4.1)	100%	100%
G	ERs for which the ability to transfer Title to ERs is unclear or contested because they are sold, assigned or otherwise used by	0	0

		2021	Total
	any other entity for sale, public relations, compliance or any other purpose (Section 5.4.3)		
H	Total ERs (D+E)*F-G	1,229,627	1,229,627
I	Conservativeness Factor to reflect the level of uncertainty from non-proxy based approaches associated with the estimation of ERs during the Crediting Period (Section 5.3.2)	15%	15%
J	Emission Reductions allocated to the Uncertainty Buffer $(0.15 * D / C * H) + (I * E / C * H)$	184,444	184,444
K	Total reversal risk set-aside percentage applied to the ER program (Section 5.5)	20%	20%
L	Emission Reductions allocated to the Pooled Reversal Buffer (H-J)*K	209,036	209,036
M	Number of FCPF ERs (H-J-L)	836,147	836,147
N	Percentage of Emission reductions from enhanced removals from afforestation/reforestation as a percentage of the total removals [Optional if the country wishes to generate enhanced removals]	0%	0%
O	Number of FCPF ERs from enhanced removals from afforestation/reforestation (M * N) [Optional if the country wishes to generate enhanced removals]	-	-
P	Percentage of Emission reductions from HFLD [Optional if the country wishes to label HFLD units]	-	-

6. NON-COMPLIANCES AND OBSERVATIONS

To ensure conformance of the ER Program with all requirements set by the FCFC and the audit criteria (section 2.3), the validation team issued findings in accordance with section 11 of the VVG v2.7 in the following cases:

- **Major Corrective Action Request (MCAR):** i) the evidence provided to demonstrate conformity is insufficient, unclear, or not transparent and may lead to a material error, omission, or misstatement, and/or a breakdown in the systems delivery; ii) underlying assumptions used to develop the reported estimates are not supported by data; iii) material errors, omissions or misstatements have been made in applying assumptions, in data or calculations; or i) non-compliance with verification criteria.
- **Minor Corrective Action Requests (mCAR):** i) the evidence provided to demonstrate conformity is insufficient, unclear, or not transparent, but does not lead to a material error, omission, or misstatement, and/or a breakdown in the systems delivery; or ii) non-material errors, omissions or misstatements have been made in applying assumptions, in data or calculations;
- **Observations (OBS):** i) there is no objective evidence to prove that there is a non-conformity, but the VVB observes practices and/or methods that could result in future MCAR and mCAR; or ii) the VVB wishes to identify an area of the Forest Monitoring System that requires attention and/or adjustment in future monitoring and reporting.

The findings were submitted by the audit team in a single document, in which the Country Participant was able to offer answers to each of them and list supporting documents provided.

The Country Participant made the requested corrections and provided the audit team with updated versions of the ER Monitoring Report, which the audit team reassessed against the guidance documentation. The audit team either closed the opened findings when corrections, evidence and answers were satisfactory to comply with the audit criteria or asked for further corrections or clarifications. This process was repeated iteratively until all MCAR were suitably closed, as required by paragraph 62 of the VVG v2.7.

A total of 12 MCAR, 3 mCAR and 3 Observations were raised as part of the validation with extended scope process. All MCAR, and OBS were successfully addressed by the ER Program and closed by the VVB.

APPENDIX 1: OVERVIEW OF NON-COMPLIANCES & OBSERVATIONS ISSUED DURING THE VERIFICATION BY THE VERIFICATION TEAM

Non Conformities (NCs)

NC ID: Major	01	Date: 09/08/2023
Description of NC		
The presentation of values in the ER-MR, including those used for the calculation of emission reductions, is not in international standard format (e.g. 1,000 representing one thousand and 1.0 representing one), as the MR template requests.		
Project Participant response		Date: 14/09/2023
All numerical values have been revised to ensure that they comply with the international standard format.		
Documentation provided by the Project Participant		
VVB Assessment		Date: 28/09/2023
The PP has revised the numbers and updated the MR. Therefore, MCar 01 is closed		

NC ID: Major	02	Date: 09/08/2023
Description of NC		
1- Section MR 1.1 does not contain all the information requested in the MR template. 2- Same section does not include the information requested by Indicators 27.1 and 27.2.		
Project Participant response		Date: 14/09/2023
Although the finding raised by the auditor was not clear as it did not specify which information was missing, section 1.1 has been updated to include additional information covering the updates on the strategy to minimize displacement, and the effectiveness of the organizational arrangements and involved partner agencies.		
Documentation provided by the Project Participant		
VVB Assessment		Date: 28/09/2023

1. Section 1.1 has been updated to include all the sections indicated in the template. 2. The explanation of compliance with indicator 27.2 of the Methodological Framework is still missing in section 1. Therefore, MCar 02 is not closed.	
Project Participant response	Date: 02/10/2023
Section 1.1 has been edited to summarize the currently planned ER Program measures to address the key drivers of deforestation and degradation	
VVB Assessment	Date: 13/10/2023
Information regarding “planned ER Program Measures and how they address the key drivers and the entities that would undertake them” is now included in section 1.1. Note that the assessment of its compliance (indicator 27) is out of the VVB validation and verification scope. Therefore, MCar 02 is closed	

NC ID: Minor	03	Date: 09/08/2023
Description of NC		
In section MR 1.2: 1- Subsection ‘Update on the strategy to mitigate and/or minimize potential Displacement’ would correspond to MR section 1.1, according to MR template instructions. 2- Sources of figures 1-1 and 1-2 are not provided.		
Project Participant response		Date: 14/09/2023
The text covering the strategy to mitigate displacement has been moved to section 1.1. Also the sources of the figures have been included.		
Documentation provided by the Project Participant		
VVB Assessment		Date: 28/09/2023
The section has been updated. Therefore, mCar 03 is closed		

NC ID: Major	04	Date: 09/08/2023
Description of NC		
Section MR 2.1 does not contain all the information requested in the MR template.		
Project Participant response		Date: 14/09/2023

Although the finding raised by the auditor was not clear as it did not specify which information was missing, section 2.1 has been updated to include additional information covering the following topics:

- Selection and management of GHG related data and information
- Process for collecting, processing, consolidating and reporting GHG data and information
- Design and maintenance of the forest monitoring system
- Role of communities in the forest monitoring system

Documentation provided by the Project Participant

VVB Assessment

Date: 28/09/2023

Section 2.1 has been updated properly.

Therefore, Mcar 04 is closed

NC ID: Minor	05	Date: 09/08/2023
Description of NC		
1- Please, ensure that equations cited in sections MR 2.2.2, 3.1 and 3.2 are reflected in line diagram of section 2.2.1 (Figure 2-2).		
Project Participant response		Date: 14/09/2023
The line diagram of section 2.2.1 was updated reflecting the equations cited in sections 2.2.2, 3.1 and 3.2.		
Documentation provided by the Project Participant		
VVB Assessment		Date: 28/09/2023
The diagram was updated and now it is considered correct.		
Therefore, mCar 05 is closed		

NC ID: Major	06	Date: 09/08/2023
Description of NC		
In section MR 3.1 it is stated "with these three surveys a total of 573 plots were collected". However, the figure does not match the one in the source provided (Footnote 22: FREL-RD_FOREST-CarbonDensities_Tool_V6.xlsx.		
Project Participant response	Date: 14/09/2023	

We confirm that the correct number is 573 plots. The footnote link refers to an outdated version of the Carbon Densities estimate tool, but it has since been updated to provide access to the final version (<https://app.box.com/s/x4dhc9qynotu4rwmn82mulysneirvrhv>).

Documentation provided by the Project Participant

VVB Assessment

Date: 28/09/2023

The VVB has reviewed the spreadsheet and considers that the value of 573 plots does match with the plots stated in the MR.

Therefore MCar 06 is closed

NC ID: Major

07

Date: 09/08/2023

Description of NC

Table 3-24 in MR section 3.2 includes a column that states "Area 2006-2015 (ha)". However, in the spreadsheet source and the table title, it is categorized as area of change 2019-2021.

Project Participant response

Date: 14/09/2023

The title in the area of change column in Table 3-24 in MR section 3.2 has been updated as the area of change 2019-2021.

Documentation provided by the Project Participant

VVB Assessment

Date: 28/09/2023

The chart has been updated and it is deemed correct.

Therefore MCar 07 is closed

NC ID: Major

08

Date: 09/08/2023

Description of NC

1- Throughout the MR, 7,697 Permanent Sampling Units are mentioned; however the sum of the plots broken down by land use type gives a result of 7,694 plots (as in Table a4.1).

2- Throughout the MR, 2,083 sampling points are mentioned; however the sum of the plots broken down by land use type gives a result of 2,043 plots (as in Table a4.2).

3- Throughout the MR, 573 plots are mentioned; however the sum of the plots broken down by land use type gives a result of 597 plots (as in Table 3-4 and 8-12).

Project Participant response

Date: 14/09/2023

1. We confirm that the Activity Data estimate for both the reference and monitoring periods is based on 7,697 Permanent Sampling Units. You can verify this information in the control

table found in the “Resumen FOLU” sheet in the Activity Data tools for both the monitoring and reference periods. The total number of points in this control table is 7,967. However, when validating the canopy cover change map from 2006-2015, only 7,694 points were used. The reason for this is that the remaining three points corresponded to no-data information in the canopy cover maps. A footnote was added in Annex 4 - Technical Corrections section for clarification.	
- The number of sampling plots mentioned in Annex 4 - Technical Correction Section has been updated to match the information in Table A4.2, which contains 2,043 sampling points. - We can confirm that the correct number of plots is 573, which can be cross-checked in the final edition of the Carbon Densities estimate tool available at https://app.box.com/s/x4dhc9qynotu4rwmn82mulysneirvrhv. There was an error in Tables 3-4 and 8-12 where it was mistakenly stated that there were 24 plots for Human settlements. However, it was assumed that the carbon density of Human settlements was the same as that of Grasslands. The indication of 24 plots for Human settlements has been removed from Tables 3-4 and 8-12. Therefore, the total number of plots is 573.	
Documentation provided by the Project Participant	
VVB Assessment	Date: 28/09/2023
- The information is deemed correct and the clarification is approved - The figure has been updated and deemed correct. - The tables have been updated and deemed correct. Therefore MCar 08 is closed	

NC ID: Major	09	Date: 09/08/2023
Description of NC		
In section MR 4.1 it is stated “The Reporting Period starts on March 1st and ends on December 31st, 2021; therefore, the pro-rata's factor is 0.84”, which is not correct. On the other hand, while in Table 4.1 the monitoring period (first column) indicates 2021; however, 2021 is not the monitoring period and the pro-rata factor has not been applied in the values of the Table. Please, for clarify indicate the values for the Reporting period and the Monitoring period.		
Project Participant response		Date: 14/09/2023
The Reporting Period runs from March 1st to December 31st, 2021. Meanwhile, the Monitoring Period started on January 1st, 2019, and ended on December 31st, 2021. A pro-rata factor was used to adjust the Emission Reductions calculation for the Monitoring Period. This factor was only applied to Emission Reductions produced during 2021, since annual net emissions were computed (due to the availability of change dates) for the Monitoring Period, despite having data covering the period 2019-2021. By dividing the total days of the Reporting Period (305) by the number of days in 2021 (365), a 0.84 factor was obtained. Section 4.1 has been updated with a clarification and the corresponding Table has been revised to include all the years monitored.		
Documentation provided by the Project Participant		

VVB Assessment	Date: 28/09/2023
The section has been updated and it is deemed correct. The clarification provided is deemed correct. Therefore MCar 09 is closed	

NC ID: Major	10	Date: 09/08/2023
Description of NC		
In section MR 4.3 it is stated “Monitoring period starts January 1st and ends December 31st, 2021”; however, that is not correct.		
Project Participant response		Date: 14/09/2023
Similar to the above response, the Reporting Period runs from March 1st to December 31st, 2021. Meanwhile, the Monitoring Period started on January 1st, 2019, and ended on December 31st, 2021. A pro-rata factor was used to adjust the Emission Reductions calculation for the Monitoring Period. This factor was only applied to Emission Reductions produced during 2021, since annual net emissions were computed for the Monitoring Period. By dividing the total days of the Reporting Period (305) by the number of days in 2021 (365), a 0.84 factor was obtained. Section 4.3 has been updated with a clarification.		
Documentation provided by the Project Participant		
VVB Assessment		Date: 28/09/2023
The section has been updated and it is deemed correct. Hence MCar 10 is closed		

NC ID: Major	11	Date: 09/08/2023
Description of NC		
In section MR 5.2 it is stated “Twenty-one values for the Reference Period”; however, according to the sources provided, values are twenty-two.		
Project Participant response		Date: 14/09/2023
Text in section 5.2 has been updated as follows “Twenty-two values for the Reference Period”.		
Documentation provided by the Project Participant		
VVB Assessment		Date: 28/09/2023

Section updated and deemed correct.

Therefore, MCar 11 is closed

NC ID: Major	12	Date: 09/08/2023
Description of NC		
Footnote 91 links to a Buffer Guidelines that is not the updated one (Version 3.1 May 2022). Please, correct the link and ensure the content complies with the most updated version of the Buffer Guidelines.		
Project Participant response		Date: 14/09/2023
Footnote 91 presented in page 69 has no link to the Buffer Guidelines. It is footnote 99 the one that included the link to an outdated version of the document. The link has been updated.		
Documentation provided by the Project Participant		
VVB Assessment		Date: 28/09/2023
In the version reviewed by the VVB it was footnote 91. The link has been updated, however, the title of the reference is still referring the buffer guidelines (2015) Therefore, MCar 12 is not closed		
Project Participant response		Date: 02/10/2023
The title of the reference has been adjusted to clarify that the current applicable version of the Buffer Guidelines is from 2022		
VVB Assessment		Date: 13/10/2023
The title of the reference in footnote 99 has been corrected. Therefore, MCar is closed		

NC ID: Major	13	Date: 09/08/2023
Description of NC		
In section MR Annex 4: 7.1, values for Emissions from deforestation and Emissions from forest degradation in Table A4-7 0 1 do not match the spreadsheet.		
Project Participant response		Date: 14/09/2023
The values for all sources and sinks in Table A4-7-0-1 have been updated to reflect the estimates made in the Emission Reduction calculation tool.		
Documentation provided by the Project Participant		

VVB Assessment	Date: 28/09/2023
The values have been updated and they are deemed correct. Therefore, MCar 13 is closed	

NC ID: Major	14	Date: 09/08/2023
Description of NC		
According to the MF 6.1 and 6.2 indicators, the ER-MR (sections MR 2.2, 3, 4.2, Annex 4: 8.3, 9.1) shall mention if key data and methods for building the Reference Level and monitoring period have been made public. If this information has not been made public, explain why.		
Project Participant response		Date: 14/09/2023
The data and methods used to create the Reference Level and monitor emissions have been publicly shared in the ER-MR report available on the FCPF website (https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/default/files/documents/domrep_er_mr_2020_ver03_ghg_accounting_final.pdf). The report includes links that provide unrestricted access to all data and calculation tools.		
Documentation provided by the Project Participant		
VVB Assessment		Date: 28/09/2023
The clarification is deemed correct. Therefore, MCar 14 is closed		

NC ID: minor	15	Date: 28/11/2023
Description of NC		

According to MF v3:

- Indicator 37.2: A national REDD+ Programs and Projects Data Management System or a third party centralized REDD+ Programs and Projects Data Management System needs to provide the attributes of ER Programs, including:
 - i. The entity that has Title to ERs produced;
 - ii. Geographical boundaries of the ER Program or project;
 - iii. Scope of REDD+ activities and Carbon Pools; and
 - iv. The Reference Level used.

An ER Program for the Carbon Fund shall report its activities and estimated ERs in a manner that conforms to the relevant FCPF Methodological Framework C&Is.

- Indicator 37.3: The information contained in a national or centralized REDD+ Programs and Projects Data Management System is available to the public via the internet in the national official language of the host country (other means may be considered as required).

However, DR' DMS access is not currently public (restricted access to general public). On the other hand, the content does not include information regarding indicator 37.2.i (related to the information provided in section '6.1 Ability to transfer title' of the ER-MR).

Project Participant response	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by the Project Participant	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/11/2024
In November 2024 the VVB has reviewed this finding again, and after one year from the issue, the Country has not provided response yet. Nevertheless, in April 2025, the Country Participant has already updated the MR with the corresponding response. The new information is deemed correct, and hence, this finding is closed. mCar 15 is closed	

Observations (OBSs)

Obs ID:	01	Date: 09/08/2023
Description of the OBS		
The MR Table of Content contains format errors.		
Project Participant response	Date: 14/09/2023	

The table of contents has been updated.	
Documentation provided by the Project participant	
VVB Assessment	Date: 28/09/2023
The index is still having some errors. Specifically in section 4.1. Complementary the size of the index according to the template is 11. Therefore, OBS 01 is not closed	
Project Participant response	Date: 02/10/2023
The index and its font size have been adjusted	
VVB Assessment	Date: 13/10/2023
The table of contents was corrected. Therefore, OBS 01 is closed	

Obs ID:	02	Date: 09/08/2023
Description of the OBS		
In section MR 5.2, table “Parameters and assumptions used in the Monte Carlo method”, “Removal factors” row, it is stated “See all values in the Carbon Densities calculation tool ‘CarbonDensities’ Sheet cells G45..G62”. However, cells are G45-G52.		
Project Participant response		Date: 14/09/2023
Text in section 5.2 has been updated as follows “See all values in the Carbon Densities calculation tool ‘CarbonDensities’ Sheet cells G45..G52”.		
Documentation provided by the Project participant		
VVB Assessment		Date: 28/09/2023
The section has been updated.		
Therefore OBS 02 is closed		

Obs ID:	03	Date: 09/08/2023
Description of the OBS		

1- Please, use the same Font as in the rest of the MR.

2- Note that the Table is not in section 8.

3- Please, delete instructions.

Project Participant response

Date: 14/09/2023

2. The Font has been standardized

2. Section 8 has been adjusted

3. All instructions of the body of the report and annex 4 have been removed

Documentation provided by the Project participant

VVB Assessment

Date: 28/09/2023

The observation is considered updated and correct.

Therefore OBS 03 is closed

APPENDIX 2: EVIDENCE PROVIDED BY COUNTRY PARTICIPANT AND REVIEWED BY AENOR

Title
Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Carbon Fund ER Monitoring Report (ER-MR): fcpf_DomRep_ER_MR_2020_16 oct 23_clean
Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Carbon Fund ER Program Document (ER-PD): Version ERPD 14-08-2019 Uncertainty correction-Trend in Ref level_rev
Signed Contract ERPA
Database of visual interpretation of hi-res imagery to determine land-use change activity data during the reference and monitoring periods (Propuesta Protocolo version 2 de EVM RB Junio-2019 rev LA TP3-GO.docx, ArchivoCEP, ArchivosCSV_Malla7k_2001-2018, ArchivosFinalesDatosRefRD)
NFI database used to estimate carbon densities (Base Estadística INF-RD 2018 CALCULOS (Fase I y II) VERSIÓN SEPTIEMBRE 2019.xlsx, Forest Degradacion Biomass Plots.xlsx, ForestBiomassPlotsData.xlsx, Inventario_Nacional_Forestal_Rep_Dominicana.pdf, NT9_Dominicana_InventarioNacionalForestalMultipropsitodeRepblicaDominicana2015-2015-2.pdf, PROTOCOLO PARA EL CONTROL DE CALIDAD INF-RD.pdf)
Database of the 32 additional sampling plots used to estimate carbon densities (Lukeinvestment_Informe_Final_09_12_2021.docx, NEW_ FORMULARIO DE DIGITACION INMF R. DOMINICANA 2021_Revisado.xlsx, Resultados 32_UM_15 Nov 2021.xlsx)
Non-Forest Biomass Inventory database used to estimate carbon densities (BD_Republica_Dominicana_23jul2018.xlsx, InvBiomasaNoBosque.shp, InvBiomasaNoBosque_Suelos.csv, Inventario Biomasa No Bosque Estimaciones totales e incertidumbres 291018.xlsx, MANUAL DE CAMPO INVENTARIO DE BIOMASA Y CARBONO EN SISTEMAS NO BOSQUE 25.10.17.docx, NonForestBiomassPlotsData.xlsx)
Database used to estimate carbon densities (CarbonDensities_Tool.xlsx)
Activity Data (DatosDeActividad_PR.xlsx, DatosDeActividad_PM.xlsx)
Excel tool used to estimate the canopy cover change category determination uncertainty by the bootstrap method and Error of Tree Canopy Cover change (IncertidumbreDoseIRDv3.xlsx)
Database of SOC sampling plot data used to estimate the SOC linear decreasing rate estimate: Database of SOC before and after conversion (Resultados COS 130 UM.xlsx), Final database used to estimate average SOC before and after conversion (COS_EFV2.xlsx)
SOC Emission Factor calculation tool (COS_EF.xlsx)
Uncertainty calculation tool (EstimacionIncertidumbre.xlsx)
Terrapulse, 2022. Appendix IV: Quality Assessment for TCC and forest datasets. In Technical Document: Estimation of Activity Data on Deforestation, Forest Degradation and Enhancement of Forest Carbon Stocks of Dominican Republic using Annual Time Series Analysis of Landsat data (used to stratify the forest biomass sampling plot according to forest age and category of canopy cover). 19p.
Ministry of the Environment. 2015. Inventario nacional forestal de la República Dominicana: Measure and assess forests in order to understand their diversity, composition, volume and biomass. Field Manual. Forest Monitoring Unit. REDD7CCAD-GIZ. Regional Project 48 pages

Núñez, J.A.; Milla, F.; Navarrete, E. and Duarte. F. 2021. Collection of information required for the technical correction of the Forest Reference Level of the Dominican Republic, 2006-2015. LUKINVESTMENT SRL. Final Report.
MARN-GIZ. 2014. Manual de Campo del Inventario Nacional Forestal de la República Dominicana. Unidad de Monitoreo Forestal. Programa REDD CCAD GIZ. Santo Domingo, R.D. 61p.
MARN-GIZ. 2018. Protocolo para el control de calidad del Inventario Nacional Forestal de Republica Dominicana 2018. Unidad de Monitoreo Forestal y Unidad de Gestión del Proyecto de Preparación REDD+ de la República Dominicana. 9p.
MARN, 2017. Manual de Campo: Evaluación del contenido de biomasa y carbono en sistemas de No Bosque en la Republica Dominicana. Unidad de Monitoreo Forestal. Proyecto de Preparación de REDD+. 54p.
MIMARENA, 2019. Revisión de la propuesta de Protocolo de Evaluación Visual multitemporal para la obtención de datos de referencia para la estimación de la incertidumbre de los datos de actividad para el proceso REDD+. Programa Regional REDD+. GIZ. 26 p.
Ministry of the Environment. 2017. Assessment of the biomass and carbon content in non-forest systems in the Dominican Republic. Field Manual. Forestry Monitoring Unit REDD+ Preparation Project. 54 pages.
Chave, J., Réjou-Méchain, M., Búrquez, A., Chidumayo, E., Colgan, M. S., Delitti, W. B. C., ... Vieilledent, G. (2014). Improved allometric models to estimate the aboveground biomass of tropical trees. <i>Global Change Biology</i> , 20(10), 3177–3190.
Cairns, M., Brown, S., Helmer, E. et al. Root biomass allocation in the world's upland forests. <i>Oecologia</i> 111, 1–11 (1997).
Arreaga, W. 2002. Almacenamiento de carbono en bosques con manejo forestal sostenible en la Reserva de Biosfera Maya, Petén, Guatemala. CATIE. Escuela de Postgrado. Tesis. 73p.
Segura, M.; Kanninen, M.; Suárez, D. 2006. Allometric models for estimating aboveground biomass of shade trees and coffee bushes grown together. <i>Agroforestry Systems</i> 68(2): 143-150.
Andrade, H.J.; Segura, M.; Somarriba, E.; Villalobos, M. 2008. Valoración biofísica y financiera de la fijación de carbono por uso del suelo en fincas cacaoteras indígenas de Talamanca, Costa Rica.
Ares, A., Boniche, J., Quesada, J., Yost, R., Molina, E. and Smyth, T. 2002. Estimacion De Biomasa Por Metodos Alometricos, Nutrimientos Y Carbono En Plantaciones De Palmito En Costa Rica. <i>Agronomía Costarricense</i> , (26): 19-30.
Olofsson, P., Foody, G. M., Herold, M., Stehman, S. V., Woodcock, C. E., & Wulder, M. A. (2014). Good practices for estimating area and assessing accuracy of land change. <i>Remote Sensing of Environment</i> , 148, 42–57.
GFOI. (2016). Integración de las observaciones por teledetección y terrestres para estimar las emisiones y absorciones de gases de efecto invernadero en los bosques. Métodos y orientación de la Iniciativa Mundial de Observación de los Bosques (Edición 2) y GFOI. (2021). Issues and good practices in sample-based area estimation. Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Alimentación y la Agricultura.
Ovalles, P. (2018). Elaboración de mapa de Uso y Cobertura del Suelo 2015. Análisis de Cambios y Mapa de Deforestación en la República Dominicana. Informe Final. Santo Domingo.

Sexton, JO, X-P Song, M Feng, P Noojipady, A Anand, C Huang, D-H Kim, KM Collins, S Channan, C DiMiceli & JR Townshend. 2013a. Global, 30-m resolution continuous fields of tree cover: Landsat-based rescaling of MODIS continuous fields and lidar-based estimates of error. International Journal of Digital Earth 6: 427-448.
TerraPulse, 2018. Estimation of Activity Data on Deforestation, Forest Degradation and Enhancement of Forest Carbon Stocks of Dominican Republic using Annual Time Series Analysis of Landsat data. Technical Document. 12 p.
Sexton, JO, P Noojipady, A Anand, X-P Song, C Huang, SM McMahon, M Feng, S Channan & JR Townshend. 2015. A model for the propagation of uncertainty from continuous estimates of tree cover to categorical forest cover and change. Remote Sensing of Environment 156: 418-425
Technical and Methodological Proposal Responding to the Conditions Pointed out in Resolution CFM/20/2019/5
Chave, J. 2006. Medición de densidad de madera en árboles tropicales. Proyectos Pan Amazonía - RAINFOR. 7 pp.
Registry System of REDD+ programs and projects (4to Producto Sistema de Registro Funcional documento técnico.pdf)
User Manual of the Registry System of REDD+ projects and programs (5to Producto Manual de Usuario.pdf)
Capacitación en Sistema Nacional de Registro de Programas, Proyectos y Acciones REDD (7mo Producto Realización y Documentación del Taller.pdf)
Dec. No. 269-15 establishing a National Climate Change Policy Repeals Decree No. 278-13. G. O. No. 10813 of 2 October 2015.
De los Santos, J., Muñoz, G., Egas, J. J., De Salvo, C. P., & Schmitd, T. D. (2018). Farming Policies, DR-CAFTA and Climate Change in the Dominican Republic.
FAO. (2015). Global Forest Resources Assessment 2015 National Report. Dominican Republic.
Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources. (2018). Dominican Republic Third National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. 2014-2017.
Dominican Republic First Biennial Update Report (fBUR).

Document information

Version	Date	Description
1.0	03-Nov-2023	Final report version after Internal Technical Review.
1.1	10-Nov-2023	Corrections after ITR
1.2	18-Nov-2024	Review of the report after communications with the WB
1.3	08-Apr-2025	Final report after DMS updates
1.4	29-Apr-2025	FMT review 1



1.5	05-May-2025	Update after FMT Review
-----	-------------	-------------------------