

VERIFICATION REPORT

American Carbon Registry

ACR375: Bluesource – Hawk Mountain Improved Forest Management Project

Reporting Period:

17 March 2020 to 16 March 2021

Prepared for:

Bluesource

30 August 2021



AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY

Prepared by:

Doug Baldwin | Lead Auditor

Greenhouse Gas Verification Program

+1.510.452.8000

dbaldwin@scsglobalservices.com

SCSglobal
SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600, Emeryville, CA 94608 USA

+1.510.452.8000 main | +1.510.452.8001 fax

www.SCSglobalServices.com

Project Title	Bluesource – Hawk Mountain Improved Forest Management Project
Client	Bluesource
Prepared By	SCS Global Services
Date of Issue	30 August 2021
Contact	2000 Powell Street, Suite 600, Emeryville, CA 94608, USA http://www.scsglobalservices.com Email: CPollet-Young@scsglobalservices.com Telephone: +1 (510) 452-8000
Audit Team	Lead Auditor: Doug Baldwin Auditor: Alexa Dugan Internal Reviewer: Michael Hoe

Executive Summary

This report describes the verification services provided for the Hawk Mountain Improved Forest Management project (“the project”), an Improved Forest Management project located in Berks and Schuylkill counties in eastern Pennsylvania, USA that was conducted by SCS Global Services. The overall goal of the verification engagement was to review impartially and objectively the claimed GHG emission reductions/removal enhancements for the reporting period from 17 March 2020 to 16 March 2021 against relevant ACR standards and the approved methodology. The verification engagement was carried out through a combination of document review and interviews with relevant personnel. As part of the verification engagement 5 findings were raised: 4 Non-Conformity Reports, 0 New Information Requests and 1 Observation. These findings are described in Appendix A of this report. The project complies with the verification criteria, and SCS holds no restrictions or uncertainties with respect to the compliance of the project with the verification criteria.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	About SCS Global Services	1
1.2	Objectives.....	1
1.3	Scope.....	2
1.4	Verification Criteria	2
1.5	Level of Assurance	2
1.6	Treatment of Materiality	3
1.7	Summary Description of the Project.....	3
2	Assessment Process.....	3
2.1	Method and Criteria.....	3
2.2	Document Review	3
2.3	Interviews.....	4
2.4	Site Inspections	4
2.5	Resolution of Findings.....	5
2.6	Techniques and Processes Used to Test the GHG Information and GHG Assertion	5
3	Verification Findings.....	6
3.1	Results of Quantitative Uncertainty Assessment	6
3.2	Analysis of the Quantification Methodologies and Applicable Data Sets and Sources	6
3.3	Basis of Data and Information Supporting the GHG Assertion.....	8
3.4	Leakage Assessment	8
3.5	Risk Assessment	8
4	Conclusion.....	9
	Appendix A: List of Findings	11

1 Introduction

1.1 About SCS Global Services

SCS Global Services (SCS) is a global leader in third-party certification, auditing, testing services, and standards. Established as an independent third-party certification firm in 1984, our goal is to recognize the highest levels of performance in environmental protection and social responsibility in the private and public sectors, and to stimulate continuous improvement in sustainable development. In 2012, Scientific Certification Systems, Inc. began doing business as SCS Global Services, communicating its global position with offices and representatives in over 20 countries.

SCS' Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Verification Program has been verifying carbon offsets since 2008 and to date has verified over 250 million tonnes of CO₂e, providing GHG verification services to a wide array of industries including manufacturing, transportation, municipalities, and non-profit organizations. The GHG Verification Program draws upon SCS's established expertise to serve the global carbon market.

1.2 Objectives

The overall goal of third-party verification was to review impartially and objectively the claimed GHG emission reductions/removal enhancements against relevant ACR standards and the approved methodology. SCS independently evaluated the GHG assertion, based on supporting evidence and GHG verification best practice. The objectives of verification were to evaluate

- Reported GHG baseline, project emissions and emission reductions/removal enhancements, leakage assessment, and impermanence risk assessment and mitigation (if applicable).
- Any significant changes to the project procedures or criteria since the last verification.
- Any significant changes in the GHG project's baseline emissions and emission reductions/removal enhancements since the last verification.

SCS reviewed the GHG project plan, GHG assertion, and any additional relevant documentation provided by the client to determine

- That the reported emissions reductions and/or removal enhancements are real.
- Degree of confidence in and completeness of the GHG assertion.
- That project implementation was consistent with the GHG project plan.
- Eligibility for registration on ACR.
- Sources and magnitude of potential errors, omissions, and misrepresentations, including the
 - Inherent risk of material misstatement.
 - Risk that the existing controls of the GHG project would not have prevented or detected a material misstatement.

1.3 Scope

Verification included examination of some or all of the following elements of the GHG project plan:

- Physical infrastructure, activities, technologies, and processes of the GHG project
- GHG SSRs within the project boundary
- Temporal boundary
- Baseline scenarios
- Methods and calculations used to generate estimates of emissions and emission reductions/removal enhancements
- Original underlying data and documentation as relevant and required to evaluate the GHG assertion
- Process information, source identification/counts, and operational details
- Data management systems
- Roles and responsibilities of project participants or client staff
- QA/QC procedures and results
- Processes for and results from uncertainty assessments
- Project-specific conformance to ACR eligibility criteria

SCS examined the reported data, quantification methodologies, calculation spread-sheets or databases, source data, project data management systems, data quality controls in place, measurement and monitoring systems, and records pertaining to emissions quantification. Calculation and error checks, interviews with project participants, an iterative risk assessment, sampling plan, and audit checklist were performed to the extent necessary for SCS to develop an understanding of how data are collected, handled, and stored for a specific project.

1.4 Verification Criteria

The verification criteria were comprised of the following:

- ACR Standard, Version 5.0
- Improved Forest Management Methodology for Quantifying GHG Removals and Emission Reductions through Increased Forest Carbon Sequestration on Non-Federal U.S. Forestlands, Version 1.3 (“the methodology”)

1.5 Level of Assurance

The level of assurance was reasonable.

1.6 Treatment of Materiality

For verification purposes, it was required that discrepancies between the emission reductions/removal enhancements claimed by the project proponent and estimated by SCS be immaterial, i.e. be less than ACR's materiality threshold of $\pm 5\%$, as calculated according to the equation in the ACR Standard.

1.7 Summary Description of the Project

The project is located in eastern Pennsylvania, USA and is aimed at long-term conservation and sustainable management of the forest. The project proponent, the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association, intends to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable management of the forest, promote healthy wildlife habitat, and prevent future compromise of the forest carbon stocks. By committing to maintain forest CO₂ stocks above the regional common practice, the project will provide significant climate benefits through carbon sequestration. The project aligns with and contributes to the UN Sustainable Development Goals (13) *Climate Action* by reducing emissions that may have been incurred through industrial forestry practices within the project area and providing credits to offset emissions, and (15) *Life on Land* by preserving the forest ecosystems within the project area.

2 Assessment Process

2.1 Method and Criteria

The verification services were provided through a combination of document review and interviews with relevant personnel, as discussed in Sections 2.2 through 2.4 of this report. At all times, an assessment was made for conformance to the criteria described in Section 1.2 of this report. As discussed in Section 2.5 of this report, findings were issued to ensure conformance to all requirements.

The audit team created a sampling plan following a proprietary sampling plan template developed by SCS. The audit team identified areas of “residual risk”—those areas where there existed risk of a material misstatement (see Section 1.6 above) that was not prevented or detected by the controls of the project. Sampling and data testing activities were planned to address areas of residual risk. The audit team then created a verification plan that took the sampling plan into account.

2.2 Document Review

The monitoring report (version 2.0 dated July 07 2021; “MR”) was carefully reviewed for conformance to the verification criteria. The following provides a list of additional documentation, provided by project personnel in support of the aforementioned documents, that was reviewed by the audit team.

Documentation Reviewed During the Course of Verification Activities		
Document	File Name	Ref.
Calculations workbook	HawkMountain_RP4_ERT_HWP_07_07_21.xlsx	1
Calculations workbook	HawkMountain_RP4_CO2_031921.xlsx	2
Monitoring Report	DRAFT HawkMtn_RP4_MonitoringReport_07_07_2021.pdf	3
Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Plan	HawkMountain_GHG_Plan_11_06_18.pdf	4

2.3 Interviews

2.3.1 Interviews of Project Personnel

The process used in interviewing project personnel was a process wherein the audit team elicited information from project personnel regarding (1) the work products provided to the audit team in support of the MR; (2) actions undertaken to ensure conformance with various requirements and (3) implementation status of the project activities. The following provides a list of personnel associated with the project proponent who were interviewed.

Interview Log: Individuals Associated with Project Proponent			
Individual	Affiliation	Role	Date(s) Interviewed
Tim Hipp	Bluesource	Forest Carbon Analyst	Throughout audit
Ian Hash	Bluesource	Manager	Throughout audit

2.3.2 Interviews of Other Individuals

The process used in interviewing individuals other than project personnel was a process wherein the audit team made inquiries to confirm the validity of the information provided to the audit team. The following personnel not associated with the project proponent. The following provides a list of individuals not associated with the project proponent who were interviewed.

Interview Log: Individuals Not Associated with Project Proponent			
Individual	Affiliation	Role	Date(s) Interviewed
Steve Ziegler	Pennsylvania Dept of Conservation and Natural Resources	Schuylkill County Forester	8/5/2021, 8/10/2021

2.4 Site Inspections

No on-site inspections were conducted as part of the verification services.

2.5 Resolution of Findings

Any potential or actual discrepancies identified during the audit process were resolved through the issuance of findings. The types of findings typically issued by SCS during this type of verification engagement are characterized as follows:

- **Non-Conformity Report (NCR):** An NCR signified a discrepancy with respect to a specific requirement. This type of finding could only be closed upon receipt by SCS of evidence indicating that the identified discrepancy had been corrected. Resolution of all open NCRs was a prerequisite for issuance of a verification statement.
- **New Information Request (NIR):** An NIR signified a need for supplementary information in order to determine whether a material discrepancy existed with respect to a specific requirement. Receipt of an NIR did not necessarily indicate that the project was not in compliance with a specific requirement. However, resolution of all open NIRs was a prerequisite for issuance of a verification statement.
- **Observation (OBS):** An OBS indicates an area where immaterial discrepancies exist between the observations, data testing results or professional judgment of the audit team and the information reported or utilized (or the methods used to acquire such information) within the GHG assertion. A root cause analysis and corrective action plan are not required, but highly recommended. Observations are considered by the audit team to be closed upon issuance, and a response to this type of finding is not necessary.

As part of the audit process, 4 NCRs, 0 NIRs and 1 OBS were issued. All findings issued by the audit team during the audit process have been closed. All findings issued during the audit process, and the impetus for the closure of each such finding, are described in Appendix A of this report.

2.6 Techniques and Processes Used to Test the GHG Information and GHG Assertion

- Review of project documentation including the MR (Ref 3) and calculation workbooks (Refs. 1-2) to check for project-specific conformance to ACR standard and methodology, appropriateness of methodologies and tools applied, accuracy of GHG information and assertion.
- Assessment of any disturbances or forest management activities that took place in the project area during the reporting period.
- Review of the application of project scenario during the reporting period.
- Review of the sources, sinks and reservoirs of GHG emissions within the project boundary (Refs. 1-2).
- Assessment of the emission reduction calculation inputs and procedures was performed to review the quantitative analyses undertaken by Bluesource to convert the raw inventory data into emission reduction estimates during the reporting period. This included a re-calculation of project emissions, ERTs, and uncertainty using inventory data as described below in section 3.1 and 3.2 (Refs. 1-2).

- Communicate with project personnel and project proponent via interviews, emails, and meetings to gain a better understanding of the project team's methodologies.
- Examine the data management and quality control processes and its controls for sources of potential errors and omissions.
- Review of project documentation including risk assessment and regulatory compliance.

3 Verification Findings

3.1 Results of Quantitative Uncertainty Assessment

SCS devoted a portion of the verification assessment to the review of the manner and propriety by which the project personnel quantified uncertainty associated with the individual GHGs in the project, in addition to the uncertainty of the calculation of GHG emission reductions and removals. The project uncertainty of 6.29% (Ref. 1) was verified via independent re-quantification (see table below).

The audit team also calculated the total materiality of the GHG reduction and removal assertion.

3.1.1 Project Uncertainty

The reported total Project Uncertainty (UNC_t) value of 6.29% was independently re-quantified by SCS using equation 19 in the methodology. No issues were found (see table below). The audit team found the difference reasonable and immaterial.

	SCS Values	Client Values	Difference
Reporting Period	UNC _t	UNC _t	
4	6.29%	6.29%	0.00%

Materiality

$$\% \text{ Error} = \frac{(\text{Project Emission Reduction Assertion} - \text{Verifier Emission Reduction Recalculation})}{\text{Verifier Emission Reduction Recalculation}} * 100$$

$$\% \text{ Error} = \frac{(40,870 - 40,870)}{40,870} * 100 = \frac{0}{40,870} * 100 = 0.0\%$$

3.2 Analysis of the Quantification Methodologies and Applicable Data Sets and Sources

The audit team re-quantified project emissions, emissions reductions, and project uncertainty from the raw inventory data provided by the client. This process entailed verifying that the methods detailed in the MR were applied as indicated. The team confirmed the emissions reduction by conducting the following analysis:

- Calculate the end of reporting period diameter of individual trees from the raw inventory by adding about two seasons of growth to trees in the tree list (Ref. 2).
- Recalculate the live aboveground, live belowground, and standing dead carbon pools using Jenkins equations and decay class information (Ref. 2).
- Calculate the change in project carbon stock stored in above and below ground live trees using equation 11 in the methodology (Ref. 1).
- Calculate the change in project carbon stock stored in above ground dead trees using equation 12 in the methodology.
- Calculate any greenhouse gas emission resulting from the implementation of the project in the reporting period using equation 13 in the methodology (Ref. 1).
- Calculate the change in the project carbon stock and GHG emissions during the reporting period using equation 14 in the methodology.
- Calculate the percentage uncertainty in the combined carbon stocks in the project during the reporting period using equation 18 in the methodology.
- Calculate the total project uncertainty (percentage) during the reporting period using equation 19 in the methodology.
- Calculate the net greenhouse gas emission reductions (in metric tons CO₂e) during the reporting period and during each annual vintage using equation 20 in the methodology.

Emission Reductions

The audit team verified that the project personnel used the appropriate emissions factors and GWP's to calculate total emission reductions, which is adherent to the ACR Methodology. The team recalculated the final emission reductions and confirmed that they are without material discrepancy.

The ERT's associated with the fourth reporting period are reported in the ERT workbook and are verified by the verification team are as follows:

- 50,457 tCO₂e (Emissions reductions at the end of the current reporting period without risk buffer deductions)
- 40,870 tCO₂e (Emissions reductions at the end of the current reporting period including risk buffer deductions)
- 9,587 t CO₂e Risk buffer contribution
- 33,638 t CO₂e Leakage deduction

Variances or Deviations

For this reporting period, there were no variances and no deviations.

Uncertainty

See section 3.1.1 above.

3.3 Basis of Data and Information Supporting the GHG Assertion

The following table indicates whether the data and information supporting the GHG assertion were based on assumptions and industry defaults, future projections, and/or actual historical records.

Assumptions and Industry Defaults	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Future Projections	<input type="checkbox"/>
Actual Historical Records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3.4 Leakage Assessment

Section E3 of the GHG Plan (Ref. 4) states: “All forestlands owned by Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association have been certified by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC). To prevent activity-shifting leakage, Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association will not conduct harvests on other lands under its ownership that would offset the harvest reductions attributable to the project. Therefore, leakage is limited to market leakage. We conservatively assume market leakage of 40%.”

SCS confirmed that the applicable market leakage factor of 0.4 was applied.

3.5 Risk Assessment

The reported value of the total risk score, as determined based on the risk analysis documented in the PP and MR, was 19%. The audit team performed a complete review of the risk assessment against the requirements of the ACR Tool for Risk Analysis and Buffer Determination. The audit team concludes that the assignment of risk scores is appropriate and in conformance to the ACR Tool for Risk Analysis and Buffer Determination. A more detailed review of the audit team’s conclusions may be found below.

Actions Undertaken to Evaluate Whether the Risk Assessment Has Been Conducted Correctly		
Risk Category	Value Selected	Verification Activities
A	4%	Confirmation, through independent review of documentation, that project is not located on public or tribal lands
B	4%	Confirmation, through independent review of documentation, that project is not located on public or tribal lands
C	2%	Confirmation, through independent review of documentation, that the project is not located outside the United States
D	-3%	Confirmation, through independent review of documentation, that the full project area is covered under a conservation easement and regular onsite monitoring activities are taking place
E	2%	Confirmation, through independent review of documentation, that project is located in low fire risk region.
F	8%	Confirmation, through independent review of documentation, that the project area is within a gypsy moth infestation ‘hot-spot’. NOTE: An

		interview with a local forester confirmed that no disturbances due to diseases/pests occurred during the reporting period.
G	0%	Confirmation, through independent review of documentation, that project is not a wetland project or a forest project where more than 60% of the project area is not a forested wetland
H	2%	Confirmation that default value has been applied in the risk assessment calculation

4 Conclusion

The audit team asserts, with no qualifications or limitations, that the quantification of GHG emission reductions and/or removal enhancements, as reported in the MR, conforms to the verification criteria and is without material discrepancy.

On the basis of the information made available to SCS and the analyses completed during the verification, SCS was able to reach a positive opinion, with a reasonable level of assurance, that the emission reductions represented by the Project Proponent during the monitoring period of 17 March 2020 to 16 March 2021 are free from material misstatement and in conformance with the assessment criteria.

The following provides a summary of the ERT issuance for the current Reporting Period with the Leakage deduction included and the Buffer deduction excluded:



Annual Emission Reduction in Metric Tons (tCO ₂ e)				
Reporting Period	Vintage	Start Date	End Date	Gross GHG Emission Reductions (tCO ₂ e)
4	2020	17 March 2020	31 December 2020	40,089
4	2021	1 January 2021	16 March 2021	10,368
Total				50,457

Note: final numbers are rounded for simplicity.

The following provides a summary of the ERT issuance for the current Reporting Period with the Leakage and the Buffer deduction included (Buffer credits shown separately):

Annual Emission Reduction in Metric Tons (tCO ₂ e)					
Reporting Period	Vintage	Start Date	End Date	Net GHG Emission Reductions (tCO ₂ e)	Quantity of Buffer Credits (tCO ₂ e)
4	2020	17 March 2020	31 December 2020	32,472	7,617
4	2021	1 January 2021	16 March 2021	8,398	1,970
Total				40,870	9,587

Note: final numbers are rounded for simplicity.

Lead Auditor Approval	 Doug Baldwin, 11 August 2021
Internal Reviewer Approval	 Michael Hoe, 27 August 2021

Appendix A: List of Findings

Please see Section 2.5 above for a description of the findings issuance process and the categories of findings issued. It should be noted that all language under “Project Personnel Response” is a verbatim transcription of responses provided to the findings by project personnel.

NCR 1 Dated 24 Jun 2021

Standard Reference: ACR Monitoring Report Template v3.0

Document Reference: Hawk Mountain Monitoring Report_03_31_2021_Signed.pdf

Finding: Section IV(2) of the ACR Monitoring Report Template requires the following “Populate the below table with the total tCO₂e for each applicable carbon pool (adding rows as needed for additional relevant carbon pools)”. The carbon pools listed in the table include standing live, standing dead, below ground live, soil, and harvested wood products (tCO₂e). However, in Section IV(2) of the submitted monitoring report (v3), the reported Standing live value includes both the standing live and the below ground live CO₂e and is therefore is not in conformance with the requirements of this table.

Project Personnel Response: This has been corrected in the Monitoring Report.

Auditor Response: The correct aboveground and belowground live carbon stocks are now reported in the updated monitoring report 'DRAFT HawkMtn_RP4_MonitoringReport_07_07_2021.pdf'. I verified RP4's numbers by multiplying the total area by above and belowground live averages carbon stock reported in 'HawkMountain_RP4_CO2_031921.xlsx' at Hawk Mountain\RP4\ClientSubmissions\Calculations. Finding is closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA): C

NCR 2 Dated 24 Jun 2021

Standard Reference: ACR Monitoring Report Template v3.0

Document Reference: Hawk Mountain Monitoring Report_03_31_2021_Signed.pdf;

HawkMountain_RP4_CO2_031921.xlsx, Stats_RP, cell M3;

HawkMountain_RP4_ERT_HWP_03_29_21.xlsx, Baseline_Project_40YR_CO2, cell F40

Finding: Section VI(2) requires the following "Provide a summary calculation of project emissions; attach as an appendix, a spreadsheet documenting project emissions quantification." The description for quantifying project emissions for RP4 in Section VI(2), point 2 of the submitted monitoring report states: "For live carbon stocks in RP4, annual growth was derived assuming linear growth during the 5-year projection interval (i.e. annual growth was calculated as total live CO2/acre at end of the 5-year interval minus total live CO2/acre at the beginning of the 5-year interval, reported in the Baseline_Project_40YR_CO2 tab of the HawkMountain_RP_ERT_HWP workbook, divided by 5)." This is the procedure which was carried out in previous reporting periods for this project, for which SCS audited. However, this procedure as described in the monitoring report was not what was implemented for RP4. Rather, the per area project emissions were quantified in "HawkMountain_RP4_CO2_031921.xlsx" sheet "Stats_RP" cell M3 by growing individual trees (see sheet "RP_TreeList" in same workbook), quantifying per-tree carbon stocks, aggregating them to plot-level CO2 stocks, and then averaging the plot-level data into a CO2/acre value. The stated methods in the submitted monitoring report for calculating CO2/acre differ from what was conducted for this reporting period, and thus is not in conformance with the Monitoring Report template requirements.

Project Personnel Response: The annual monitoring is intended to match the exact carbon calculation methodology for growing live trees as in all of our other projects and which was originally stated in the Monitoring Reports for the first and second reporting period:

"1. April 2017 inventory data were entered into FVS-NE and grown for 10 years with no management (with "NoTriple" keyworded to track individual trees and permit cross-referencing to raw inventory dataset). 2. For each live tree (ascribed a unique identifier), annual diameter growth was derived assuming linear growth during the 10-year projection interval (i.e. for dbh, annual growth calculated as dbh at end of 10-year interval minus dbh at beginning of 10-year interval, reported in the FVS Treelist output, divided by 10). 3. For each live tree, diameter data from the April 2017 inventory were grown referencing the annual rates derived in step 2 above, adding two years of annual growth (i.e. two growing seasons) from the Mar 2017 measurement value. 4. Carbon stocks were recalculated using the grown data. No harvests or significant disturbances took place during the intervening period."

The monitoring report has been updated.

Auditor Response: The updated monitoring report 'DRAFT

HawkMtn_RP4_MonitoringReport_07_07_2021.pdf' correctly states how carbon stocks have been calculated for this reporting period. The Project Response is correct in that this method was used and validated during RP1, and ACR is aware of the shift back to using this method for the current reporting period as evidenced in the document 'ACRGuidance_Hawk Mountain - Quantitative Methodology Clarification.pdf' (available in Hawk Mountain\RP4\ClientSubmissions\ReportingForms). ACR also approves of this shift, given that the methodology was applied in RP1. This finding is closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA): M/C

NCR 3 Dated 24 Jun 2021

Standard Reference: ACR Standard v5.0

Document Reference: Hawk Mountain Monitoring Report_03_31_2021_Signed.pdf;

HawkMountain_RP4_CO2_031921.xlsx, Stats_RP, cell M3;

HawkMountain_RP4_ERT_HWP_03_29_21.xlsx, Baseline_Project_40YR_CO2, cell F40

Finding: The ACR Standard v5.0 in Section 2.A (Table 1) states for the Consistency principle: "Enable meaningful comparisons in GHG-related information. Use consistent methodologies for meaningful comparisons of emissions over time. Transparently document any changes to the data, boundary, methods, or any other relevant factors." Section 6.D in the ACR Standard states: "ACR will permit project-specific deviations to an existing approved methodology where they do not negatively affect the conservativeness of an approved methodology's approach to the quantification of GHG emissions reductions and removal enhancements." The methods for calculating CO2/acre during this monitoring period in "HawkMountain_RP4_CO2_031921.xlsx" sheet "Stats_RP" (see Finding 2 above) differ from the procedure that was conducted for previous reporting periods. In previous monitoring periods, the annual growth was derived assuming linear growth during the 5-year projection interval (i.e. annual growth was calculated as total live CO2/acre at end of the 5-year interval minus total live CO2/acre at the beginning of the 5-year interval, which is described in the Monitoring Report for RP4 and previous monitoring periods. Had this procedure been carried out for RP4, it would have resulted in a significantly lower estimate of total live tree carbon for this monitoring period. As a result this deviation is not conservative, and thus not in conformance with the standard.

Project Personnel Response: As stated above, we are reverting to the intended growth calculations. This has been discussed with and approved by ACR, and the guidance has been provided. This reversion has been documented in the updated monitoring report, Section VII.1, at the request of ACR.

Auditor Response: The audit team acknowledges that ACR has approved the shift back to methods used in RP1. We appreciate the update in the monitoring report in Section VII.1. See our response to Finding 2 for more details regarding our response to this issue. This finding is closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA): M/C

NCR 4 Dated 24 Jun 2021

Standard Reference: Improved Forest Management V1.3- Errata & Clarification

Document Reference: HawkMountain_RP4_ERT_HWP_03_29_21.xlsx, ACR_IFM_ERT_Calcs, cells G54, H60, G69, H75

Finding: The ACR IFM v1.3 Errata and Clarifications in Section G states "ERT's by vintage shall then be determined by prorating Reporting Period calendar days within vintage year t (21), applying the non-permanence buffer deduction (Equation 22) and subtracting ERT's by vintage year from the non-permanence buffer deduction (Equation 23). Buffer pool ERTs will be deposited by vintage, if this is the risk management option the Project Proponent has chosen." The per-vintage calculation of ERT quantities in workbook "HawkMountain_RP4_ERT_HWP_03_29_21.xlsx" sheet "ACR_IFM_ERT_Calcs" cells G54, H60, G69, H75 does not use the correct number of days for each vintage when dividing the total ERT quantity into vintage-specific quantities.

Project Personnel Response: The number of days used in determining vintage allocations has been corrected.

Auditor Response: The updated calculation workbook

'HawkMountain_RP4_ERT_HWP_07_07_21.xlsx' now shows the correct vintage allocation using the appropriate number of days for each vintage. The vintage allocations are now correctly reported in 'DRAFT HawkMtn_RP4_MonitoringReport_07_07_2021.pdf'. Finding is closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA): C

OBS 5 Dated 9 Aug 2021

Standard Reference: ACR Monitoring Report Template v3.0

Document Reference: DRAFT HawkMtn_RP4_MonitoringReport_07_07_2021.pdf

Finding: The latest version of the monitoring report is a draft and has not been signed. The client must submit a final version of the report that is signed before the verification can be completed.

Project Personnel Response:

Auditor Response:

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):