Validation and Verification Report

ACR925 Finite Carbon– Batchawana Bay Forest IFM

Astina Forest AG &

Finite Carbon, LLC

October 2, 2025

TÜV SÜD America Inc.

750 Main Street, Suite 200

Grand Junction, Colorado 81501

(970) 241-9298

Website

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

Finite Carbon, LLC (Finite) contracted with TÜV SÜD America Inc. (TÜV SÜD), to perform the validation and verification of ACR925 Finite Carbon – Batchawana Bay Forest IFM Project (Project) for the reporting period of May 15, 2023 - December 31, 2023 and a crediting period of May 15, 2023 – May 14, 2043 under the ACR program. Finite acts as the project developer for the landowner and project proponent Astina Forest AG (Astina). This report is documentation of validation and verification activities performed by TÜV SÜD for the Project. For the validation, TÜV SÜD reviewed the project information as described in the GHG Project Plan and its appendices. For the verification, TÜV SÜD ensured that the GHG statement was materially correct, that the data provided to TÜV SÜD was well documented, and that if Finite made any material errors, that these errors were corrected.

1.1 OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the validation are to evaluate:

- Conformance to the ACR standard and the approved ACR Methodology for Improved Forest Management on Canadian Forestlands (Methodology).
- GHG emissions reduction project planning information and documentation in accordance with the applicable ACR-approved methodology, including the project description, physical infrastructure, activities, technologies, and processes of the Project, baseline, eligibility criteria, monitoring and reporting procedures, process information, source identification/counts, operational details, and quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) procedures.
- Reported GHG baseline, ex ante estimated project emissions and emissions reductions/removal enhancements, leakage assessment, and impermanence risk assessment and mitigation (if applicable).

The objectives of the verification are to evaluate:

- The emissions reductions and to ensure that the statement is materially correct.
- The data provided to TÜV SÜD can be documented and if errors or omissions are detected, they be corrected.

TÜV SÜD retains all data and documents for seven years after the end of the project reporting period or for the duration required by ACR, whichever is longer.

1.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Project is located on approximately 21,567 hectares in Ontario, Canada. This property is owned by Astina Forest AG. The Project ensures long-term sustainable management of the forests.

1.3 Responsible Party

Project Proponent
Astina Forest AG
6062 Hwy 17
Goulais River, ON P0S 1E0 Canada
Pat Rosebrook

Project Developer
Finite Carbon, LLC
435 Devon Park Drive, 700 Building
Wayne, PA 19807
Jemina Coutu

1.4 Validation and Verification Team

Lead Validator and Verifier: Christian Eggleton
Team Members: Tim Facemire, Thomas Christopher, Vitor Aguiar, Benjamin Miller
Independent Reviewer: Zach Eyler

1.5 Validation and Verification Criteria

1.5.1 Validation and Verification Standards, Guidelines, and Tools

- ACR Standard, Version 8.0 (July, 2023)
- ACR Validation and Verification Standard Version 1.1 (May, 2018)
- Improved Forest Management on Canadian Forestlands v.1.0, September 2021
- Improved Forest Management on Canadian Forestlands, Errata & Clarifications, January 1, 2024
- ACR Tool for Risk Analysis and Buffer Determination, v1.0
- ISO 14064-3:2019 "Greenhouse gases – Part 3: Specification with guidance for the validation and verification of greenhouse gas statements"
    - ACR925 Batchawana Bay_GHG Project Plan_v1.3_20250926_Signed.pdf
        - Verification only

1.5.2 Level of Assurance

The verification was conducted to a reasonable level of assurance.

1.5.3 Materiality

The verification was conducted to ACR's required materiality threshold of +/-5% of the GHG project's emissions reductions or removal enhancements.

2 VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION PROCESS

As the first step in validation/verification activities, the Lead Validator/Verifier developed a Validation/Verification Plan to be followed throughout the validation and verification. The plan included the following activities:

- TÜV SÜD completed a COI form for the validation and for verification on May 20, 2024 to identify any potential conflict of interest with the Project or Project Developer. The COI form was approved by ACR on May 22, 2024.
- TÜV SÜD and Finite held a validation and verification kick-off meeting on May 31, 2024. During the kick-off meeting TÜV SÜD reviewed the validation and verification objectives and process, reviewed the schedule, and submitted an initial document request.
- TÜV SÜD performed a strategic analysis and risk assessment of the received data and support documents to understand the scope and areas of potential risk in the GHG emissions reductions.
- TÜV SÜD developed a validation/verification plan and risk-based evidence gathering plan based upon the strategic analysis and risk assessment. The validation/verification plan and evidence gathering plan were used throughout the process and were revised as needed based upon additional risk assessments.
- The validation/verification team conducted the site visit to the Project to verify the inventory quality and forest management practices from June 10-14, 2024. During the site visit the Verification Team performed key personnel interviews, conducted 90% t-test of inventory plots, conducted reconnaissance of the Project area boundary, observed elements of natural forest management, and observed harvest locations (if applicable) during and preceding the reporting period.
    - The site visit was attended by the following verification team personnel:
        - TÜV SÜD:
            - Thomas Christopher
            - Tim Facemire
    - During the site visit, the Verification team met with the following individuals:
        - Finite
            - Brian Sharer
            - Jacob Handel
            - Matt Smith
            - Jemina Coutu
        - Blackbird (Manager of Project)
            - Pat Rosebrook
            - Clyde Bridge
- TÜV SÜD performed a risk-based desktop review of the submitted validation/verification documents. The desktop review included an assessment of the GHG calculation methods and inputs, source data completeness, data management system and monitoring systems and eligibility documentation.
- TÜV SÜD conducted interviews and had conversations with Project personnel during the verification. Personnel interviewed include:
    - Jemina Coutu – Finite

    - Brian Sharer – Finite
- TÜV SÜD submitted requests for corrective actions, non-material findings, additional documentation, and clarifications as necessary to Finite throughout the validation/verification.
- TÜV SÜD's independent reviewer conducted a review of the validation/verification evidence gathering plan, validation/verification report, and verification opinion.
- TÜV SÜD issued a final validation/verification report, verification opinion, and List of Findings.
- TÜV SÜD held an exit meeting with Finite.

3 VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION FINDINGS

3.1 PROJECT BOUNDARY AND ACTIVITIES

The Project entails improved forest management on approximately 21,567 hectares in Ontario, Canada. GHG emission reductions for the Project are quantified by comparing actual onsite carbon stocks against modeled baseline onsite carbon stocks and baseline carbon in harvested wood products. The difference in these Project and baseline carbon stocks year over year is the basis for calculating the Project's primary goal of maintaining and enhancing forest GHG pools.

The Project's temporal boundary is the crediting period from May 15, 2023 – May 14, 2043.

3.2 GHG SOURCES SINKS, AND RESERVOIRS

Table 1 shows the GHG emission sources included in the project boundary based on the Methodology. RCE confirmed that the GHG Project Plan appropriately identifies the offset project boundary and includes all relevant SSRs.

Table 1. GHG Emissions Sources

Source	GHG	Description
Above-ground biomass	CO_2	Major carbon pool for project activity
Below-ground biomass	CO_2	Major carbon pool for project activity
Harvest wood products	CO_2	Major carbon pool for project activity
Market Effects	CO_2	Reductions in project outputs due to project activity may be compensated by other entities in the marketplace. Those emissions must be included in the quantification of project benefits.

3.3 ELIGIBILITY

3.3.1 ACR Eligibility

TÜV SÜD confirmed the following ACR eligibility criteria listed in the ACR Standard, Version 8.0 by reviewing the project proponent's GHG Project Plan, Monitoring Report, and calculations as well as other supporting documentation described throughout this report (a full list of documents reviewed is in Appendix A).

- Start Date: The project start date is May 15, 2023.

- Minimum Project Term: The minimum project term is 40 years.
- Crediting Period: The crediting period is 20 years as specified by the Methodology, from May 15, 2023 – May 14, 2043.
- Real: TÜV SÜD confirmed that the GHG reductions follow the ACR methodology and are verifiable.
- Emission or Removal Origin: TÜV SÜD confirmed that Astina Forest AG owns and has control over or documented effective control over the GHG sources/sinks from which the emissions reductions or removals originate.
- Offset Title: TÜV SÜD confirmed that all Project lands are owned directly by the Project Proponent (Astina), which holds full legal title.
- Additional: TÜV SÜD confirmed that the project is additional as described in Section 3.4.
- Regulatory Compliance: TÜV SÜD confirmed that the Project was in compliance with all applicable regulations.
- Permanent: TÜV SÜD confirmed that the Project correctly applied the ACR Tool for Risk Analysis and Buffer Determination to account for permanence. A total risk score of 18% was confirmed.
- Net of Leakage: TÜV SÜD confirmed that the Project correctly accounted for leakage per the Methodology.
- Independently Validated and Verified: TÜV SÜD is a third-party validation and verification body that the project proponent has contracted to validate and verify the Project.
- Environmental and Community Assessments: TÜV SÜD reviewed project impacts as described in section 3.6 of this report.

3.3.2 Methodology Eligibility

TÜV SÜD reviewed the Project against the ACR Methodology eligibility and applicability conditions and confirmed the following:

- The Project is located on private, non-crown forestland.
- Astina controls the timber rights on the forestland and can legally harvest.
- The Project property was not harvested in the first reporting period.
- The Project does not use non-native species where adequately stocked native stands were converted for forestry or other land uses after 1997.
- The Project has not drained or flooded wetlands on or after the project start date.
- Astina owns all land and timber rights on the Project area.
- The Project's stocking levels will increase well above the baseline conditions for the duration of the Project and by the end of the Crediting Period.

3.4 ADDITIONALITY

The Project meets the requirements for the demonstration of additionality specified by the ACR Standard and the Methodology.

3.4.1 Regulatory Surplus Test

TÜV SÜD confirmed that there are no existing laws, regulations, statutes, legal rulings, or other regulatory frameworks in effect as of the start date that requires the Project activity and the associated GHG emissions reductions; thus, the Project passes the regulatory surplus test.

3.4.2 Common Practice Test

The Project area is similar to surrounding private forestland that is regularly harvested as it reaches viable diameter thresholds and has a history of some timber harvesting.

The project's geographic region for timber production extends in all directions. Throughout this private forestland is regularly cut, often through shelterwood, heavy and light thins and clear-cutting, and is managed to maximize NPV of the asset. Wood products including sawtimber and pulpwood are distributed to mills throughout this region and demand is strong and steady.

3.4.3 Implementation Barriers Test

The Project chose to assess the financial barriers test per the ACR Standard and Methodology. TÜV SÜD confirmed that carbon funding is reasonably expected to incentivize the Project's implementation. Due to the Project being implemented, Astina loses the ability to monetize timber harvests at a rate similar to business-as-usual practices during the life of the Project. The Proponent provided a financial assessment comparison of NPV between the baseline scenario with harvesting and the project scenario including revenue from carbon credits. The baseline scenario NPV was significantly greater demonstrating that carbon funding is integral to the project activity.

3.5 Permanence

TÜV SÜD confirmed that the Project correctly applied the ACR Tool for Risk Analysis and Buffer Determination to account for permanence. A total risk score of 18% was confirmed.

3.6 Environmental and Community Impacts

The GHG Project Plan includes a summary of the Project activity's net positive environmental and community impacts and sustainable development goals, that can be found in ACR925-ESI-Assessment-Repot-v2.0-20250827.pdf and ACR925-SDG-Cont-Report-AFOLU-Project-v3.0_20250828.pdf. The Project will provide habitat protection for wildlife, plant species, and trees, water quality protection and protection from soil erosion and degradation among other benefits. The Project is not expected to cause any negative environmental impacts. Sustainable Development Goals listed are 6, 13, 15 and 3.

3.7 Local Stakeholder Consultation

As a private landowner, the Proponent was not required to disseminate information to local stakeholders or gathering comments on the project.

3.8 Monitoring Plan

The GHG Project Plan includes a Monitoring Plan that identifies all monitored data and parameters. TÜV SÜD confirmed that the monitoring parameters and approaches conform to the methods required by the

Methodology. The plan includes all relevant data parameters and appropriately identifies units of measurements, data sources, methodologies, uncertainty, monitoring frequency and procedures, and QA/QC procedures. After discussions with the Proponent and developer and reviews of project documents, TÜV SÜD determined that the Monitoring Plan accurately reflects how Project data is monitored and recorded and there are no deviations relevant to the Project activity against the requirements of the Methodology. The Proponent implemented the monitoring plan as stated in the GHG Project Plan during Project activities.

3.9 Baseline Scenario

The Project's baseline scenario represents a moderately intense harvest regime, targeted to maximize net present value at a 6% discount rate as a private industrial landowner. The baseline scenario applies harvesting across the Project area as allowed by the Methodology to maximize NPV.

The Project's baseline model simulates a range of harvest types and rotation lengths based on legal requirements and simulated growth within each stratum. The objective of modeling was to determine possible timber harvests in the project area over 100 years within the framework of legal and reasonable harvest constraints.

Stands were modeled for different prescriptions, including no-harvest, shelterwood harvest, heavy and light thin, and clearcut, with restrictions on diameter class and retention.

The Proponent utilized the USDA's Forest Vegetation Simulator (FVS) Ontario variant to model harvests and yields. Growth models were calibrated using site index values calculated from tree core analysis within the project area. TÜV SÜD reviewed the Site Index calculations and confirmed that a reasonable species and site index for the region was assigned on an individual plot basis to appropriately calibrate growth. The process was confirmed to be consistently and systematically applied to each plot.

TÜV SÜD reviewed the resulting baseline outputs to ensure that they reflected the modeling objectives and the legal additionality requirements. The model grows trees and volumes at a reasonable rate compared to regional averages.

3.10 On-site Inventory Verification Check

In preparation for and during the site visits, the Verification Team reviewed evidence necessary to verify Project inventory estimates.

The Project inventory consists of three forested strata which TÜV SÜD sampled using a random sampling method.

The current inventory contains 212 permanent, fixed-radius plots. At each plot location, trees were measured in two nested plots: a larger 1/33.35th hectare plot with radius of 9.77 meters, and a smaller 1/400.27th hectare plot with radius of 2.82 meters. The larger plot measured all living and standing dead trees greater than or equal to 12.7 centimeter DBH while the smaller, nested plot measured all living trees between 2-12.7 centimeters. Additionally, standing dead trees had to meet or exceed a height of 1.3 meters.

Given this sample design and Project size, the Verification Team was required to achieve a minimum of 15 successful plots within the project to successfully verify inventory stocking levels. The Verification Team successfully verified site data after measuring a total of 15 site plots. The Project passed the t-test during the site visit.

Project Area

During the site visit, the Verification Team conducted boundary-line reconnaissance by visiting Project boundary edge lines and points, plotting edge points with GPS receivers, and determining whether there were discrepancies with the digital Project boundary files provided by the Proponent and the physical boundary witnessed on site. This was done to determine the risk that Project area inaccuracies could contribute to a material misstatement in Project emission reductions. To the extent feasible, the Verification Team confirmed that the Project area boundary and timber sale boundaries were appropriate and accurate.

3.11 Project Data and GHG Emissions Reduction Statement

TÜV SÜD reviewed the GHG Project Plan and Project data and calculations to ensure that appropriate equations were used in calculating baseline emissions, project emissions, and net emissions reductions.

3.11.1 Baseline Emissions

TÜV SÜD confirmed that the baseline emissions were correctly calculated. Baseline emissions were calculated by reviewing input and output files for every FVS baseline modeling prescription, including forest codes, diameter breaks, merchantability thresholds, rotation lengths, regen/spouting, FVS harvest triggers on individual plots, site indices, treelists, and plotlists modeled over 100 years. The output workbook (ACR925 Batchawana Bay_GHGPP_Calculations_v4.1_20250620_FINAL.xls) was then independently recreated in the data checks confirming proper calculation of assigned plot level outputs allocated to prescription based independently confirmed SMZ constrained and unconstrained acres. These values were then compiled into yearly baseline values for live and dead as reflected in the ERT monitoring calculation sheet. A secondary output of this process was the 100 years of modeled harvesting based off Best Management Practices (BMP) constrained acreages which was then run through the prescribed harvested wood product calculations customized for the project region(s). These calculations were made on 20-year time intervals as well as 100-year intervals and they were appropriately incorporated into the ERT monitoring calc sheet. See additional information relevant information in section 3.9.

3.11.2 Project Emissions

TÜV SÜD confirmed that the project emissions were correctly calculated. The methods to confirm project emissions follow what is described in section 3.11.1 above.

3.11.3 Emissions Reductions

TÜV SÜD verified that the Proponent calculated emission reductions according to relevant Methodology equations and that the methods are included in the GHG Project Plan.

TÜV SÜD recalculated emission reductions for the first reporting period according to the equations defined in the Methodology and the GHG Project Plan and found the Project statement to be free of material misstatement.

TÜV SÜD also recalculated and confirmed the uncertainty assessment for the Project. The uncertainty calculation is the compiled square roots of the summed errors of the strata using a 90% confidence interval. TÜV SÜD confirmed that the live, dead, and total uncertainty for the reporting period onsite carbon stocks was accurate.

3.11.4 Leakage Assessment

TÜV SÜD recalculated and confirmed the leakage for the project in accordance with the ACR Validation and Verification Standard version 1.1 section 6.F and 9.H.

4 VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION RESULTS

TÜV SÜD developed a combined List of Findings for both the validation and verification. The List of Findings noted all corrective action requests (CARs), non-material findings (NMs), additional documentation requests (ADRs), and clarification requests (CRs), as necessary. The Proponent appropriately responded to all items in the List of Findings. The List of Findings is provided as Appendix B.

5 VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

TÜV SÜD conducted a risk-based analysis of the ACR925 Finite – Batchawana Bay Forest IFM Project GHG statement including a strategic review of the Project data and evidence. Preparation and fair presentation of the GHG statement in accordance with the criteria is the responsibility of Astina:

- GHG-related activity: improved forest management of forest land on the Project area
- GHG statement: May 15, 2023 – December 31, 2023
- Criteria:
    - ACR Standard, Version 8.0 (July, 2023) (validation and verification)
    - ACR Validation and Verification Standard Version 1.1 (May 31, 2018)
    - Improved Forest Management on Canadian Forestlands v.1.0, September 2021
    - Improved Forest Management on Canadian Forestlands, Errata & Clarifications, January 1, 2024
    - ACR Tool for Risk Analysis and Buffer Determination, v1.0
    - ISO 14064-3:2019 “Greenhouse gases – Part 3: Specification with guidance for the validation and verification of greenhouse gas statements”
    - ACR925 Batchawana Bay_GHG Project Plan_v1.3_20250926_Signed.pdf
        - Verification only

The data and information supporting the GHG statement were historical in nature.

TÜV SÜD has ensured the Proponent's effective use of controls related to the GHG statement. TÜV SÜD concludes that there is sufficient and appropriate evidence to support the Proponent's GHG statement and is issuing a Positive Opinion.

TÜV SÜD confirms that the GHG statement has been prepared:

- Without material discrepancy,
- In accordance with all applicable criteria, and
- Verified to a reasonable level of assurance.

The verified emission reductions are listed in Table 2. While TÜV SÜD confirmed the emission reduction calculations and the total emission reductions to be correct and within the materiality threshold, the values in Table 2 are summary data only with significant figures rounded for summary purposes in this report.

Table 2. Total ERTs

SECTION VI: GHG STATEMENT (APPLICABLE FOR VERIFICATION OPINIONS) *Omit or provide additional rows for Vintages as needed*					
ALL GHG PROJECTS		**AFOLU & GEOLOGIC SEQUESTRATION PROJECTS ONLY**			
Vintage	Total ERRs	Removals Subset of Total ERRs (if applicable)	Emission Reductions Subset of Total ERRs (if applicable)	Buffer Pool / Reserve Account Contribution (if applicable)	Net ERRs (if applicable)
2023	339,461	109,459	230,002	61,103	278,358
TOTALS*	339,461	109,459	230,002	61,103	278,358
*Totals may not sum due to rounding					

Note: Totals might not sum due to rounding.

Lead Validator and Verifier

Christian Eggleton

Independent Reviewer

Zach Eyler

APPENDIX A—DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Number	Name
1	ACR925 Tree-level AG and Plot-level BG Recalculation series
2	Li et al., 2003
3	Astina 2024 Property Ownership Tax Documentation
4	Appendix_B_InventorySpecifications
5	Tree Core Photos (108)
6	BatchwanaBay_rawdata
7	Astina_Plots shapefile
8	Astina_ProjectArea shapefile
9	ACR925 RP1 Carbon Calculations v 1.0 series
10	Figure A-1. Vicinity Map with Latitude and Longitude
11	Figure A-2. Regional Hydrology Map
12	Figure A-3. Canopy Cover Map
13	Figure A-4. Topography Map
14	Figure A-5. Roads Map
15	Figure A-6. Ownership Map
16	Wildfire Hazard Potential Map
17	Batchawana_Bay_MillCapacityAnalysis series
18	ACR925 GHG Project Plan_series
19	ACR925 GHGPP Calculations v2.0_series
20	ACR925 RP1 Monitoring Report_1.1_series
21	Astina_Master_PlotGrid shapefile
22	Astina_ProjectArea_Strata_SMZ shapefile
23	ACR925 Batchawana Bay Baseline Harvest Schedule Calculation v1.0_series
24	ACR925 Batchawana Bay Baseline Regeneration Workup v1.0_series
25	ACR925 Batchawana Bay FVS Keyword v 1.0_series
26	ACR925 Batchawana Bay Site Index Workup v1.0_series
27	ACR925 RP1 Carbon Calculations v 1.0 series
28	ACR925_Batchawana_Bay Modeling
29	FVS .out files (4)
30	ACR925 Batchawana Bay FVS Input DB v1.0 series
31	ACR925 Batchawana Bay FVS Output DB v1.0 series
32	Chapeskie, David John, et al_CR33_FCResponse
33	ACR925 ADR6_v3.0_20250317_Submission
34	BatchwanaBay_v3.0_20250310_ADR3_CR10_CR22_FCResponse_Submission
35	CR9_Astina CheckCruise Notes
36	ADR3_Completed Tally Sheets_230901
37	ACR925 Batchawana Bay Cut List Tree List Product Recalculation series
38	ACR925 Snag Model Calculations Worksheet v4.0_series

39 ACR925 RP1 Monitoring Report V1.0_20250623
40 ACR925 Batchawana Bay_ GHG Project Plan_v5.0_20250623
41 ACR925 Batchawana Bay_GHGPP_Calculations_v4.1_20250620_FINAL
42 ACR925 Batchawana Bay_ GHG Project Plan_20250904_v1.2.pdf
43 ACR925 RP1 Monitoring Report V2.2_20250821_Signed.pdf
44 ACR925-ESI-Assessment-Repot-v2.0-20250827.pdf
45 ACR925-SDG-Cont-Report-AFOLU-Project-v3.0_20250828.pdf
46 Attachment_A_20250821.pdf
47 Figure A-1. Vicinity Map with Latitude and Longitude.pdf
48 ACR925 Batchawana Bay_GHG Project Plan_v1.3_20250926_Signed.pdf
49 ACR925 RP1 Monitoring Report v3.0_20250926_Signed.pdf

APPENDIX B—LIST OF FINDINGS

Includes Corrective Action Requests (CAR), Non-Material Findings (NMs), Additional Documentation Requests (ADR), and Clarification Requests (CR), as necessary.

Project Log version:	5.0
Project Name:	Batchewana Bay (Astina) IFM
Project ID:	ACR 925
Client/OPO:	Finite Carbon

Finding	Section of Regulation or CDP	OPO/GHG Response.xlsx	TCN VCR Response.xlsx	Additional OPO/GHGResponse.xlsx	Additional TCN VCR Response.xlsx	Additional OPO/OPO Response.xlsx	Additional TCN VCR Response.xlsx			Open or Closed
Correction Active Request, Non-Material Finding, Additional Documentation Request, or Clarification Request ID										
CAR 1										
CAR 2										
CAR 3										
Met 1										
Met 2										
Met 3										
ADR 1	Please provide the original plot grid shapefile as it appears it was made in a different projection that the one that it is currently in.	2.2		Thank you for providing the original master plot grid, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.						Closed
ADR 2	Please provide the an measured inertial quantification and subsequent plot/strata level statistics.	4.2		Thank you for this information, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.						Closed
ADR 3	Please provide the cruise cards associated with the plots captured on tab '2019 F.	6.6	Cruise Cards associated with the plots captured on tab '2019 F' are saved as '2019_Completed Tally Sheets_20200922' attached.	Thank you for this additional documentation, there are some discrepancies that need clarification. It appears that almost all measurements on Plot 65 do not match the recorded data, along with other smaller issues. See tab 'ADR 3' for additional details.	Plot 65: Was a check cruise plot, see tab 'ADR 3 for the check cruise plot card which matches tree data provided in '4OPO3 Batchewanday_rawdata_v2-1_20200121_CR22_FCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx' Plot 127 and 129: Have updated the raw tree list (which incorporates correction made for CR 10 and 22 as well) in 'Batchewanday_rawdata_v3-0_20200327_CR22_FCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx' as they were incorrectly input in the digital inventory deliverable from plot cards as noted on tab 'ADR 3'. When incorporating changes from ADR 3, DBH and DT will 22, there are de minimus stand changes for between 2019 through 2119 for TPA, BA, QMD and AGB between (0.85% and -0.151%. See 'Batchewanday_rawdata_v3-0_20200327_4OPO3_CR22_FCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx' for updated 'VS_Summary_Eval_Metrics outputs comparison.xlsx tab 'List of Findings'. Data entry errors in provided inventory felt under the category of measurement error as per the methodology. Reliability of project inventory has already been confirmed by the site visit. Our incorporation of the data with small errors fixed in the workbook referenced above confirms this. No correction in project modelling outputs is	Thank you for the confirmation on plot 65, plot 127 and plot 129. Updating an inventory with corrected values is a standard practice and is not considered a material issue. Here, there appears to be multiple versions of the same inventory with different values between the inventory being sent in and outside different aspects of tree quantification (uncertainties, start stocks, baseline/project model start points). Please update the suite of calculations and documentation off of a single inventory.	Thank you for making these changes, they have been confirmed. This item may be closed.				Closed
ADR 4	Please provide the source of the data used for the removal of watercourses from the GIS.	5.2	Primary watercourse GIS layers were provided by the client. Based on provincial enhanced forest inventory data. Additionally a slope based buffer was applied to these layers to allow for riparian management stocktake of prescriptions. Client provided watercourse GIS data has been provided. See '4OPO3 Batchewana Bay Watercourse Shapefiles_v1-1_20200122_ADR4_FCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx	Provincial data appears to be pay-to-access, as the provided layers match imagery and contour, this item may be closed.						Closed
ADR 5	Please provide evidence of either entity-wide management certification, an ACR approved long-term forest management plan, historical records over a ten-year average, or an FMP showing no deviations.	6.6	As per ACR IFM Canada Methodology V 1.3 Section 6.6. As of the project start date the Project Proponent has enrolled all of their forested landholdings in the ACR carbon project and halted all harvest activities. If the Project Proponent later in the project life cycle were to commence commercial harvesting activities, then ACR requirements required within the methodology would	Thank you for the clarification, this item may be closed.						Closed
ADR 6	Please provide more documentation/context to the values captured in the "Timber Pricing" tab of '6OPO3_Batchewana_Bay Modeling'.	2.4	From: ACR925 GHG Project Plan_20200820 Submission.xlsx Upward revenue of 1.1 & Timber pricing Timber revenue estimates were derived from Black Bird Management Ltd. Provided internal quarterly reports with log sales for the previous 5 years prior to the initial reporting period. These reports contained specific species product types, volumes sold and were categorized to represent applicable stumpage prices.	Thank you, the quarterly reports are requested to affirm the applicable stumpage prices.	See 'ACR925 ADR6_v1-0_20200317_Submission.xlsx' which has the product breakdown timber pricing from Astina's internal quarterly reports averaged between 2018-2022. Matching exactly with '6OPO3_Batchawana_Bay Modeling' Timber Pricing tab, including conservatively pricing 'Other Products' (Cants's 'Hard Wood Pulp' See tab 'ADR6' for comparison.	Thank you for providing this information, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.					Closed
ADR 7	Please provide the information of the local forest practice inspector.	5.4	There is no requirement to identify local forest practice inspectors in section 5.4 of the methodology.	Archive is no harvesting on property's at this time, this item may be closed.						Closed
ADR 8	Within the file structure there are unpopulated subfolders, please provide information to populate these folders. 'Appendix_2_ManagementPlan', 'Appendix_4_PermitCertificates', 'Appendix_5_CommonProofsOfFact', 'Appendix_6_LegalF and 'Attachments'.	3.1	A standard file template structure for deliverables was used for this project. Appendix 0, 4, 6, 7, and 'Attachments' folders were included in the case of future needs for them in following reporting periods. We can remove them if needed, but leaving them in place for continued organizational integrity of parent/child future	Thank you for the clarification, this item may be closed.						Closed
ADR 9	Upon review of '6OPO3 Batchewana Bay Rawtree Harvest Schedule Calculation v2-0_20200328' there does not appear to be a 'BL_Cutsite' tab as seen in the original calculation. It is from the tab that we derive the number of harvested and product types to be modelled. Additionally, in '4OPO4 PolyTree, needed for the number of harvested and product types to be modelled from the 'ML_Report' tab. Please provide this document or clarify the source of the product distribution.	6.2	CVS equations are undefined within the Canadian ACR protocol. As such, take volume to a 7" top used to quantify the amount of carbon in log not in the mill. Our "OPHEXCH" calculations are based on cubic meter volumes as reported by FVS then transformed to carbon via wood density factors, conversion to biomass, and then finally to carbon. The breakdown of OPHEXCH into product classes is thus immaterial in this case because there is no effect on project ERT calculations—even 1.5 Gt can be entirely omitted from workbook if needed. Harvested wood product breakdown was derived from Stern et al. (2006) table on p.21 of the methodology.	I apologize for the misunderstanding, the purpose of this request was to affirm that the transformational process being used after FVS outputs are generated is accurate, and reasonable, can be independently confirmed when there are changes into the inputs of the baseline model. The previously requested tab appeared to be an integral intermediary step in this quantification and that is why it is requested.	Thank you for providing this document. Upon review of the '6OPO3 Batchewana Bay Cut Lst Tree List Product Breakdown 20201021' the 'perfectCalculate' tab given table hasn't been referenced, which is causing differences that need clarification.		In the updated supplementary file '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Cut List Tree List Product Recalculation 20200828' all good tables have been updated with the results of the updated baseline run (see CR 48)	Thank you for updating all of this data, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.			Closed
CR 1	Trees0-1752 on Plot 138 is a 12.75cm tree that is being provided the small tree plot multiplier in 'FL_Treetag_CanadianSlidingb' tab of '6OPO3 Tree-level GIS and Plot-level BG Recalculation 20200202'. Please clarify.	3.3	This tree was recorded as 12.8 cm in the project inventory, placing it in the small tree plot. The inventory data was incorporated in "6OPO3 Tree-level GIS and Plot-level BG Recalculation 20200202.xlsx" tool then diameters and heights were converted to metric units. Trees were then assigned to small tree plots if they were less than 12.5 cm in DBH. When we execute our grow and degrow processes to project field-collected inventory formats or backward to the bounds of reporting periods, we simply grow/degrow tree level data diameters and heights and do not attempt to re-compile plots if trees fall above or below diameter limits in the small tree plot.	Thank you for the clarification, this has been confirmed. This item may be closed.						Closed
CR 2	There appears to be an inconsistent use of constants within the '6OPO3 Tree-level GIS and Plot-level BG Recalculation 20200202' document. They include: From kg to lbs is 2.20462262, but from lbs to metric is 2204.6 in columns AN-AO of 'FL_Treetag_CanadianSliding' tab From cu. to lbs. is 2.4725816 col. K, but 2.472054 in col. O of 'TNAD>45 Plots and BG' tab. Please clarify the correct number of significant figures used in actual quantifications for the verifier to independently recreate.	3.3	Calculations on the '6OPO3 Tree-level GIS and Plot-level BG Recalculation" spreadsheet are with the 4Th carbon tool have been revised to consistently use 2.4725816 as the acre to hectare conversion and 2.2046 lbs./kg. Please see '6OPO3 Tree-level GIS and Plot-level BG Recalculation 12152020.xlsx" included with the updated baseline modeling package.	Thank you for making this change, it has been confirmed This item may be closed.						Closed
CR 3	The Live belowground calculations for H50 and 50 seem to the 'TNAD>45 Plots and BG' tabs appear to be applied on a plot level instead of a tree level, please clarify/confirm.	3.3	This is correct. the reporting was conceived this way to illustrate the application of the cr et al (2003) methods at a reasonable scale representing forest-wide conditions such as area (i.e all of Lagacauk). Reporting at the strata level in our estimation does not capture plot variability within the strata (i.e. difference in % live-based vs. % softwood) while making calculations at the individual tree-level using Lint al's recommendations as trees are either 100% hardwood or 100% softwood. To obtain tree-level BG carbon estimates, plot-level BG carbon is allocated to individual trees (both TPA and MortTPA although below-ground standing dead is not included in 4TMS tabs) at the plot level according to their relative contribution to plot BA. References: Li, Zhang, et al. "Belowground biomass dynamics in the Carbon Budget Model of the Canadian Forest Sector: recent improvements and implications for the estimation of NPP and NEP." Canadian journal of forest research 33.1 (2003): 126-136.	Thank you for the clarification, this aligns with the research in the referenced paper. This item may be closed.						Closed
CR 4	Upon review of the 'TPA' and 'MortTPA' fields in sub. -04-16 of 'SL_Treetag_CanadianSliding' when multiplied by their respective SampWeights do not appear to multiply to the intended TPA for the radius of plots described in the inventory manual. See tab 'CR 4' for a recreation of the math, please	3.3	The larger tree plot size was calculated using the circular area of the 9.77 m plot radius while the small tree plot size was assumed to be exactly 10m^2. Revised 6OPO3* materials have been compiled using both plot sizes calculated from their plot radii, which result in slightly larger areas than 400m^2 and 25m^2 for the large and	Thank you for the clarification and modification, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.						Closed
CR 5	There is a variation in quantification between the calculations completed on the 'TNAD>45 Plots and BG' tab and the plot level outlines in the 'TNAC_PLC_Raw' tabs in '6OPO3 Tree-level GIS and Plot-level BG Recalculation 20200202'. The 'TNAC_PLC_Raw' tab also seems to correlate to the 'PLC_PP Est_RAW' tab from '6OPO3 PP1 Carbon Calculations v 1-0 20200202'. The verifier has high concurrence with the data on the 'TNAD>45 Plots and BG' tab, please see tab 'CR 5' for additional details where the verifier has made some independent plot-level calcs. There are differences as high as 20% of stock carbon and this appears to correlate most to plots with large quantities of standing dead. Please clarify this variation in calculation between tabs and confirm the source data of the plot level carbon for comparison on the site visit.	3.3	This variation in quantification between the calculations completed on the 'TNAD>45 Plots and BG' tab and the plot level outlines in the 'TNAC_PLC_Raw' tabs in '6OPO3 Tree-level GIS and Plot-level BG Recalculation 20200202'. This 'TNAC_PLC_Raw' tab also seems to correlate to the 'PLC_PP Est_RAW' tab from '6OPO3 PP1 Carbon Calculations v 1-0 20200202' The reason for the discrepancy is because standing dead/other ground is not an acceptable carbon pool under ACR Canada 1.0 methodology, so it is not included in the 4TMS totals. Standing dead below-ground is calculated in the 'TLC Yield v&SVMDEC_BGCCEquip_and if this is added back into the totals in VVR's calcs in column P, we have perfect concurrence.	Thank you for the clarification and apologies for the oversight, this has been confirmed. This item may be closed.						Closed
CR 6	Upon review of the 'Growing Season' tab in '6OPO3 PP1 Carbon Calculations v 1-0 20200202' the average inventory date does not appear to be the correct representation with an earlied- inv date of 7/29, and an oldest inv date of 8/30. Please clarify.	3.3	August 31, 2019 is the average inventory date of all plots collected. More inventory plots were collected towards the end of the inventory period than the beginning.	Upon further review, there is an error in the inventory date of one of the plots (plot '78 inventoried 7/23/2019) which is altering the average inventory date. See tab 'CR 6', please clarify.	Error is due to a typo originating on first Submission.xlsx of 'Batchewanday_rawdata' inventory input. Effect of the error appears limited to 'Plots' tabs of '6OPO3 Batchewanday_rawdata_v3-1_20200327_CR22_FCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx'. Actual inventory date is July 16, 2019 (shown in tally sheet captured in 'CR6'). Plot '78 inventory year was already corrected to 2019 throughout '6OPO3 Batchewanday_rawdata_v3-1_20200121_CR22_FCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx' worksheets. The average inventory date remains August 12, 2019.	Apologies for the confusion, but no, it has not been corrected in the referenced document. We have replicated the average inventory date calculation in cells M5 and N5 of tab 'CR 6' of this document. At this time, the average inventory date of N2:5 is being calculated with the inclusion of a date that hasn't occurred yet. Whereas with the actual inventory date, as the developer has confirmed of 7/26/2019, the averaged date calculation should be N2:4. Please update the average inventory date calculation in the 'Growing Season' tab of the above mentioned 'Batchawanday_rawdata_v4-0_20200327_CR22_FCResponse_Submission'. Please correct this error in any/all documents that are used in carbon calculations.	Plot 78 inventory date has been corrected to 7/26/2019 yielding an average inventory date of 08/06/2019. Project has been remodelled using an amended average inventory date of 08/06/2019.	Thank you for making this change, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.				Closed
CR 7	Is a comparison between the diameter growth increment calculated from 'FLC_2020' and 'FLC_2021' in '6OPO3 PP1 Carbon Calculations v 1-0 20200202' and the 'DIC' fields' 'FVS_Treelist_PP1Inventory' filtered on 2020 of the '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay PP1 Output DB v1-0 20200202'. It appears that the 5(5' values are not representative of the diameter-inside-growth as expected, i.e. smaller than the 10 year increment). A tab 'CR 7' has been added showing this issue.	4.5	In the re-submitted '6OPO3 GHGPP Calculations v2-1_20200213_Submission.xlsx" worksheet, keys have been provided on the "FLC_SVTStart", "FLC_SVTEnd", "FLC_2020" and "FLC_2020" cells, with additional calculation columns in "FLC_SVTStart" and "FLC_SVTEnd" to demonstrate the implementation of tree-level diameter annual increment as a function of DBH growth. "DIC" is an internal calculation provided by FVS and does not impact the calculation of delta-c fo for our sub-annual grow and degrow processes.	Thank you for the clarification, this has been confirmed and replicated. This item is to be closed.						Closed
CR 8	Upon review of the tabs 'FLC_2020' and 'FLC_2030' of the '6OPO3 Carbon Calculations v 1-0_20200202', there are a large number of dead trees that are missing from 2021 to 2053. This appears to be directly correlated with the 'Field-Tot-dawn model, if this is the case please provide a long analysis which shows the diminished MortTPa for the retained trees. Please clarify.	4.5	Please see supplemental spreadsheet "6OPO3 Snag Model Calculations Worksheet 20200130.xlsx" in the updated Baseline Modeling Package for the requested analysis and demonstration.	Thank you for this document, it appears that there is no degradation of dead stocks within the initial 97 degrowth/grow model. This item may be closed.						Closed
CR 9	Per the inventory audit (GA/QC) section of 'Appendix_3_InventorySpecifications' there is a 10% audit of the plots, with each cruiser being assessed a minimum of 5 randomly selected plots. Was this 10/QC check completed, please clarify with supporting documentation.	6	There were a total of 22 check cruises on 6 cruisers. The cruisers had at least 5 check plots completed (50% or more). One cruiser (Pat Robinson) was on vacation for 2 weeks and had 3 checks completed on his plots. The majority of inventory plots were completed by the other cruisers. See 'CR9_Astina Check Cruise Notes' for supporting documentation' which was received from the check cruise contractor.	Thank you for the documentation and the clarification this has been confirmed. This item may be closed.						Closed
CR 10	Upon review of the 'FL_Workup_All' tab of '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Site Index Workup v 1-0_20200203' clarification is needed. Paper birch (ep0 90) does not match the paper. The years to add for species White Cedar (9B), Tamarack (F11), and White Pine (P15) is a dynamic value per the paper., why is a single value being used?	3.3	The '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Site Index Workup_v1-3_20200130_CR10_FCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx' has been updated to reflect species used for site index inputs.	Upon review of '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Site Index Workup_v1-3_20200130_CR10_FCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx' four of the species in question have been dropped due to sample size, yet the issue of dynamic age shift applies to the remaining entries of White cedar See the screen capture on the tab 'CR 10', please clarify.	See "FL_Pivot - SITECODE keywords' tab has been updated to account for dynamic White cedar age formula as requested. Changes are reflected on '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Site Index Workup_v4-0_20200327_Submission.xlsx' See 'Last_Updated' tab for set PSS_East_Summary comparison after re-running the updated keywords for CE. When incorporating changes from 6OPO3 _CE_Inputs_v3-0_20200327_CR22.xlsx, there are minimus stand changes from inventory for 2020 through 2119. TPA, BA, QMD and SBA have differences ranging from 0.003% and -0.151%. See '6OPO3_GHG_CR22_CR22' for updated FVS_Summary_East_Metrics outputs. To note, FVS_Summary_East_Metrics outputs are in metric however our tables are headed in imperial variable names, ie. TPA is the	Upon review of '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Site Index Workup_v4-0_20200327_Submission' on the 'FL_Workup_All' tab, which is the source of the 'FL_Pivot - SITECODE keywords' tab, there is only a single value (15) used in the calculation of site index for 'CW', were in cell 'F7. This does not match the Common paper. Please see the screen capture on tab 'CR10' for more information.	Apologies to the VVR, updates were not carried through to final calculations. Changes are reflected in '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Site Index Workup 4.0 20200331'.	Thank you for making this change, unfortunately in '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Site Index Workup_v4-0_20200331_FCResponse' tab 'FL_Workup_All' the wrong value (F: 7=F, column M) indexed of 15yrs to P6 in 40s, column O for white cedar, is being used in the final 5 calculation (column AB).	These appears to be confusion regarding updated functionality in '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Site Index Workup_v5-0_20200515_FCResponse'. The VVR suggests that it is calculated in column AB, however, carriage is calculation are calculated in column AI (AF for metric conversion). Total Age (column AC) is calculated by summing volume 7 + AA + AB. Column AA reflects age corrections only for non-cedar trees whereas column AB reflects age corrections only for cedar trees. FC believes this to be a correct application of dynamic age calculations. Calculations are recreated in tab C10. NAR: The issue was addressed on a 09/29/2020 call and both parties agreed the issue stems from different methodology of dynamic age calculations (having dynamic age limits on 40s age vs 70 height). Consensus was reached to proceed with a straight based method also employed in '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Site Index Workup_v5-0_20200515_FCResponse'	This has been confirmed. This item may be closed.	Closed
CR 11	Upon review of the 'FL_Workup_All' tab of '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Site Index Workup v 1-0_20200203' it appears that increment(7D5) is being classed as a 'white elm'/'american elm'. Please clarify.	3.3	FL_Workup_All' tab has been updated to reflect increment (or Eastern Hop-hornbeam) in '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Site Index Workup_v1-2_20200130_CR10_FCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx' This is the correct species which had been misidentified.	Upon review of '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Site Index Workup_v1-2_20200130_CR10_FCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx' the species is removed on plot 168 has been removed entirely from the workbook due to lack of other plot samples. Therefore, this issue no longer noticed						Closed
CR 12	Upon review of the 'FL_Pivot - SITECODE keywords' tab of '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Site Index Workup v 1-0_20200203' it is unclear how the acceptable site index ranges were determined for inclusion into the model, please clarify.	3.3	Acceptable site index ranges were included in the model if they had an more on site samples between the updated calculations, but not the species within space "ice". There are 5 measurements related to this species, why has this been excluded from site index quantification, see tab 'CR 12' please clarify.	Thank you for the clarification, this has been confirmed and replicated by the verifier. This item may be closed.	In addition to mapping 5 or more samples taken during inventory we also doubled trees outside of the ranges between -1yrs to +5% at -10m' of 50 to 100 to remove immature/senescent samples taken during the inventory. Three of the white spruce were over -100' top in 6% of -10m'. '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Site Index Workup_v5-0_20200327_Submission.xlsx' has been updated to reflect the updated fit metric	Thank you for the clarification, this has been confirmed and replicated by the verifier.					Closed
CR 13	Upon review of the 'BuffersProd' tab in '6OPO3 GHGPP Calculations v2-0_20200302_Submission.xlsx' it appears there is an analysis of the risk based off of averages that is not incorporated into the buffer value. Please clarify.	Risk Tool	Project fire risk rating was assessed using a simple layer that assigns a fire risk rating at 100 m pixel resolution. Proportional fire risk rating displayed in '6OPO3 GHGPP Calculations v2-0_20200302_Submission.xlsx' workbook 'Buffer Prod' tab within the fire Risk Rating Calculation table (cell A17:D18) and weighted by risk rating guidance outlined in 'ACR Tool for Risk Analysis and Buffer Determination V1.0'. Based on ACR GIS calculations, project weighted average fire risk is determined to be 1.96% (cell D18). Project fire risk is rounded to 3% and incorporated into total buffer value calculations via cell H13. These calculations are directly carried over to '6OPO3 GHGPP Calculations v2-1_20200213_Submission.xlsx'	Thank you for the clarification in regards to rounding. It has been confirmed as conservative. this item may be closed.						Closed
CR 14	Upon review of the 'BufferProd' tab in '6OPO3 GHGPP Calculations v2-0_20200302_Submission.xlsx' the default value of 0% for diseases and pests is claimed, but upon review of the pest layers connected with a 20 km buffer there appears to be concerns related to two insects. Additional information is included on tab 'CR 14'. Please clarify.	Risk Tool	Guidance derived from 'ACR Tool for Risk Analysis and Buffer Determination V1.0' states that an 8% risk rating is applied if disease or pest disturbance is present at "epidemic" levels. 2017-2021 pest and disease infestations were reviewed for the Project Area. Based on the data, there is no evidence of "epidemic" level infestations or of historical disease and infestation damage rates as indicative "epidemic" risk levels as are understood the	Thank you for the clarification in regards to pest severity, the verifier agrees. This item may be closed.						Closed
CR 15	In 'ACR925 Batchawana Bay Rawtree Harvest Schedule Calculation v1-0_20200302' on the 'WoodlandAreaAnalysis' tab columns O, the CaR's is not consistent in 4.7% please clarify the source of this value.	5.3	The code: last per-unit conservation factor of 4% has been established as an appropriate conversion factor for Lake States projects under the California 2015 ROP, and Petite Carbon has been using this standard for several years. See Smith, J. E., Heath, L. S., Skog, K. E., & Birdsey, R. A. (2006). Methods for calculating forest ecosystem and Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station, 2012. for more details (available online at https://www.fs.usda.gov/treesearch/pubs/24, ev24	Thank you for the explanation in regards to this constant, it has been confirmed. As this province of Canada borders this region this item may be closed.						Closed
CR 16	In 'ACR925 Batchawana Bay Rawtree Harvest Schedule Calculation v1-0_20200302' the pivot table in the 'HarvestSchedule' tab does not appear to correlate to the data and columns captured in the source tab 'WoodlandAreaAnalysis' tab column A:AB. Please clarify.	5.3	We have confirmed that the "Harvest Schedule" pivot table in the updated baseline harvest schedule calculations workbook "ACR925 Batchawana Bay Rawtree Harvest Schedule Calculation v1-1_20201008" refers to the appropriate columns in 'WoodlandAreaAnalysis'	Thank you for making this change, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.						Closed
CR 17	The harvest volumes within the '4HVSUM' errors have been updated in the workbook "6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Rawtree Harvest Schedule Calculation v1-2_20201028"	5.3	The formula columns within the '4HVSUM' errors have been updated in the workbook "6OPO3 Batchawana Bay Rawtree Harvest Schedule Calculation v1-2_20201028" tab that are calculating as a '#VALUE' when there should be values. Nondivided data has been provided on the tab 'CR 17'. Please clarify.	Thank you for making this change, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.						Closed
CR 18	In Section 5.1.1.2 Step 3 the wood product classpercentages are using the default table in the methodology. Please clarify why regionally specific data wasn't used.	5.1.1.2	Errors were experienced while using Kershaw JA, Richards E, Larsen J. 2007. A product ratio calculator for northeastern tree species application specified in the ACR methodology would not allow for large batch processing of both standing and cutlist product class percentages owing to input maximums of 999 tree records. Thus, the default table was used to allow for batch processing of all tree records in the inventory dataset. Given to file we elected a single product classes delineated in the methodology. ACR Methodology page 60 reference 37: Chen L, Colombo SJ, Ter-Mikaelian MT, Heath LS. 2008. Future carbon storage in harvested wood products from Ontario's Crown forests. Can J For Res 38:1567-1580	Thank you for the explanation, proper execution of this process has been confirmed, this item may be closed.						Closed
CR 19	Upon review of 'Batchawana_Bay_MillSpeciesAnalysis' there are 2 mills incorporated into the analysis that has end use of 'domestic pellets'. Please clarify how it is appropriate to include these mills in the justification of demand/capacity of baseline long term HWPs.	5.1	The 2 pellet mills have been removed from the mill capacity analysis. Approximately 24,000 cords of capacity were removed which has negligible effect on baseline HWP demand. See '6OPO3 Batchawana_Bay_MillCapacityAnalysis_ v2-1_20200213_CR20_FCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx'	Thank you for removing these mills from the analysis, this has been confirmed. This item may be closed.						Closed
CR 20	Upon review of 'Batchawana_Bay_MillCapacityAnalysis' there are only 11 mills within the 200 km range based off the coordinates provided in the '6OPO3 Mill Locations' tab. Of these 11 mills, 1 is pellet, and the remaining mills do not appear to work with pulpwood, archaic products are only lumber and veneer. Please clarify how this reduced capacity facilitates the scale and products of the proposed baseline (ok Tab 'CR 20' has been included showing this issue.	5.1	C.C Woodstock outputs in MS_20 product '6 were matched closely to CP quarterly reports. Cross-check between Forestteam and actual sales have ~80 output and Astina quarterly reports. Cut and delivered comparisons	The Response also provided does not necessarily ameliorate the concerns originally posed by the verifier. Real, the new analysis '6OPO3 Batchawana_Bay_MillSpeciesAnalysis_v2-1_20200123_CR20_FCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx' includes 11 mills to meet the pulpwood component that was previously missing. All three mills, MI53988, MI53989, and MI53993 are within the 200km radius from the project area, and thus exceed the 200km 'approximate maximum economical haul distance'. Please provide additional clarification on the relationship between wood demand and baseline harvesting particularly in regards to pulp demand.	The initial capacity analysis was mislabelled as a 200 km and actually was completed with a 250 km range. This range has 16 mills with the two pellet mills removed with an approximate capacity of 1,690,426 cords. As denoted in the workbook the forest manager for the project area has communicated that 250km is the economic haul range for mill deliveries. In addition Bil Lovgrove Railyard in Sault Ste. Marie for the past decade has shipped pulp produced to mills in Michigan, Wisconsin, Quebec, and Ontario, primarily to Verso/Billerud Canton Mill in Escanaba, Michigan. These mills are within the 250 km range and have a yearly capacity of 1,800,000 green tonnes. See '6OPO3 Batchawana_Bay_MillExportAnalysis_ v3-0_20200317_CR20_FCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx'.	Thank you for the additional information and clarification, and for updating the GHG Appendix, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.						Closed
CR 21	In reviewing the GIS, roads are cut out of the project area, including logging roads that connect to public roads. There are some areas that have extensive roads and landings that have not been cut out, please clarify. See tab 'CR 21' for more details.	5.2	Primary and secondary roads were provided by the client. They were removed either by buffering or erasing. Codes for those road being "RCLEM", "BRD and under. In addition some roads denoted as maintenance in provincial forest Resource Inventory data from 2007 and 2013 was removed.	Archive do not appear to be any permanent roads incorporated into the project area, and the sampling frame could have sampled some of these areas without walkthrough constraints, this is a non-issue. This item may be closed.						Closed
CR 22	Delineation of roads and right of ways are only as accurate as the landscape/application allows for, with the inventory specifications noting obvious walkthrough plots will be denoted in the GIS plot layer. However, if a plot is not marked as one on the GIS plot layer but it still meets the definition the cruisers are to implement the walkthrough technique. As there were no systemic issues present on such plots, on the ground call by the cruisers indicates the correct application of the walkthrough method on plot 49	5.2		Plot 49 appears to be close to a watercourse boundary that could justify the walkthrough method applied. This part of this item is closed. The data captured on the "trees tab of '6OPO3 Batchawanday_rawdata_v3-1_20200121_CR22_FCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx' shows that tree 2 is "7.35m from pin", and that tree 3 is "14.66m from the pin (on road) 85". Meaning the cruisers called this tree a walkthrough incorrectly. Please update the metric to ensure this incorrectly doubled tree, or provide an updated GIS sale which cuts out this road area from the stocked control boundary.	We apologize, but we are not seeing this update in either, Batchawanday_rawdata_v3-2_20200327_CR22_FCResponse_Submission' or '6OPO3 Batchawanday_rawdata_v2-1_20200121_CR22_FCResponse_Submission'. A screenshot has been included in tab 'CR 22 (2)'. This tree is still included in the plot level calculations in '6OPO3 Tree-level GIS and Plot-level BG Recalculation 12152020'. Also, in looking at the '6OPO3 Rawtree Modelling Package v2-1_20200213' tree still resides in the documents there. Please clarify.	The double tree has been removed from modelling calculations and can be confirmed in '6OPO3 Batchawana Bay_ rawdata_v6-0_20200327_ 6OPO3 Tree-level GIS and Plot-level BG Recalculation_v2-0_20200327_ and '6OPO2_ Rawtree_Modelling Package_v2-0_20200302'.	Thank you for removing this tree from the data, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.			Closed

CR-23	Upon review of the 4 documents in the TVS Outs' subfolder, it is not clear if "Sprouting" has been turned on, please clarify.	3.2	Sprouting is turned only default in the PVS-ON variant. Evidence of sprouting can be seen by examining the tables in the PVS produced "...OUT" text files under the headings "REGENERATION FROM STUMP & ROOT SPROUTS" found throughout output files from the baseline with prescriptions where harvesting has occurred.	Thank you for the additional information, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-24	Upon review of the .out file, "D35e6ca8-7690-4a93-99dc-f2e4a8a78b0a0", three plots are receiving the silvanut prescription, but it is not clear if any of them are receiving a second entry as stated in section 4.1.3.7.1 of the SIMS Plan upon review of their summary statistics tables, please clarify. Also, there appears to be a Warning associated with this prescription which might be leading to the discrepancy identified. Screenshots have been included in sub 'CR-24'.	3.2	The TVS runs for classical yields are used to extract post-harvest stand information for silvacultu structure. The post-harvest output of the year 1 cohorts in PVS form the basis of regenerated stand yields which are applied after a clearcut at any time during the 100-year planning horizon. Clearcuts are applied to "grow only" or "-32" Goods, at which point the regenerated stand yield is applied. The W40N960 message shown on tab CR-24 appears after all 61558 keywords when the 2nd field in the keywords.txt isn't 0. There is no effect on the successful implementation of regeneration as intended in our PVS runs.	Thank you for the clarification, this condition is not an issue. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-25	Upon review of the .out file, "D35e6ca8-7690-4a93-99dc-f2e4a8a78b0a0", there is a prescription occurring that has not been described within Section 3.3.3.7.1 of the SIMS Plan. The progression is a thin cluster of trees >12.7, a thin below of all trees but 80 of 12, and then a second thin above of trees >12.7, screenshots of this are included in the tab 'CR-25'. Please clarify.	3.2	This prescription reflects an initial overstory removal, followed by another shelterwood +/- overstory removal cycle. This sequence, symbolized by "CRR" in the Woodstock outputs, is a subset of the general regime, as described in 3.3.7.3 Harvest Prescriptions. For clarification purposes, this version of the sequence has been broken out as a separate description in the GHGPP plan document.	Thank you for including this additional prescription description, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-26	Upon review of the .out file, "D35e6ca8-7690-4a93-99dc-f2e4a8a78b0a0", there is a prescription occurring that has not been described within Section 3.3.3.7.1 of the SIMS Plan. The prescription is a thin below of trees >12.7, a thin below of all trees but 80 of 12, and then a second thin above of trees >12.7, screenshots of this are included in the tab 'CR-26'. Please clarify.	3.2	This prescription type was not chosen by the Woodstock solver in the baseline optimization. The "right thin" prescription description has been removed from the GHGPP plan document.	Thank you for removing this description as it is not modelled, this has been confirmed. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-27	In 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay Baseline Harvest Schedule Calculation v1.0_20210323' there are tabs that are evaluations of projects that are not Batchawana Bay, or include notes referencing 420790, or that 'may include: 'Woodland Thermal', 'BL_CutList', 'BL_Treelist', and the entirety of 'CONDITIONS' and 'pathDEFINITIONS'. As well, there are tabs that have 'REFs' in their values, "Woodstockinputs". Please clarify.	3.2	ACR01 Batchawana Bay Baseline Harvest Schedule Calculation v2.0_20220108 workbook has been updated to reflect all applicable references.	Thank you for updating this document, other inquiries are tracked in other items. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-28	In the 'SIMZ & RAW' tab of 'ACR01_Batchawana_Bay Modelling' document the 'Nurturana Zone'	3.1	The 'nurtural zone' described is to be implemented on Areas of Concerns (AOCs) which only are established on known lands. When not identified, best management practice for riparian areas are 3 meter no-harvest zones per 'Code of Practice for Timber Management Operations in Riparian Areas'	Thank you for the additional information, the reference has been assessed and confirmed. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-29	Per 'A Silvicultural Guide to Managing Southern Ontario Forests' the Technical Terms as published by the government on Ontario's MNR, Table 4.1.1 includes BMPs in relation to 'seeps, springs, streams (including intermittent)' and they have the suggested treatment of 'retain high canopy closure (e.g. at least 75%) in the vicinity of these areas'. This appears to contradict the Harvest Restrictions section of 'SIMZ & RAW' tab of 'ACR01_Batchawana_Bay Modelling' document. Please clarify.	3.1	These features are unmappable and wouldbe taken into consideration on a site by site basis during ground activities. The 'SIMZ & RAW' no harvest buffer would be applied to these areas allowing for 100% canopy closure.	Upon review, this kind of information would be assessed as a standard part of any harvests made on the property and the costs of these constraints are incorporated into the financial analysis. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-30	There are extensive recommendations in the silvicultural guide for silvicultural constraints in areas that include 'amphibian woodland breeding ponds', 'landbird migration stopover zones', 'reptile habitat', and 'specialized wildlife habitats' that do not appear to be addressed in the proposed baseline prescriptions. Please clarify how the BMPs for these areas are incorporated into the model.	3.1	These recommendations are retained specifically to assessed restrictions on operational activities. The baseline prescriptions would allow for these temporal constraints at the operational level to be met.	Upon review, this kind of information would be assessed as a standard part of any harvests made on the property and the costs of these constraints are incorporated into the financial analysis. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-31	In the case of a 'disturbance' or an 'event' as detailed in the SIMS Plan, is there a minimum hectare threshold for incorporation into the project monitoring, please clarify.	3.1	As per the methodology and ACR 'Standard the threshold is based on GHG reductions and removals and does not have an area based threshold.	Thank you for the clarification and confirmation, this item may be closed.								Closed
CR-32	Are there any treatment exemptions/restrictions that would limit management that have not already been	3.2	The project area has no easements or encumbrances that would limit management activities.	Thank you for the confirmation, this item may be closed.								Closed
CR-33	Spraying is present on the property, have there been any considerations for the impact of spraying on tree growth, please clarify.	3.1	Batchawana Bay follows BMP's for spray production within the 'sugar bush' area of the project area. Sites following BMP's the literature suggests that spray production does not reduce growth when taking into consideration the reduction in competition for resources. The BMP's for spray production in these areas has ruled out near-by marsh sites in sugar bush operations when compared against unmanaged stands. Reference: Chapeskie, David Jobe, et al. A guide to improving and maintaining sugar bush health and productivity. OMAFRA, 2009. page 93.	Thank you for the additional information, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-34	Is the project enrolled in any other environmental asset programs for non-carbon benefits.	ACR Standard	Yes, confirmed with landowner in communications prior to site visit	Thank you for the confirmation, this item may be closed.								Closed
CR-35	On 'WS_All_Report' in 'ACR01 GHGPP Calculations v1.0_20210820_Submission.xlsx' the majority of fields are labeled/detailed as zeros, but the quantities appear to correlate to hectares. Please clarify which values are completed on a per acre basis and which are completed on a per hectare basis.	3.2	Da "WS_All_Report" in "ACR01 GHGPP Calculations v1.0_20210820_Submission.xlsx .All values are completed on a per hectare basis. ACR01 GHGPP Calculations v1.1_20210323_ Submission.xlsx reflects the corrections	Thank you for the confirmation, this item may be closed.								Closed
CR-36	On 'A1-3.10 of the GHGI Plan, the sugar bush is available for harvest with the constraint that merchantable inventory is not to decline more than 10% over the first 20 years of the baseline. It appears at this time that the average hectares per 'Area this is 10a, with shelterwood exceeding 8ft	3.2	This constraint is based on merchantable inventory irrespective of the specific silviculture practiced within the sugarbush area. To demonstrate adherence to this constraint, additional fields have been added to the "WS_ALL_Report" tab in the GHGPP Calculations Workbook to show the baseline inventory merchantable	Thank you for making the change to facilitate this constraint, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed								Closed
CR-37	There are differences in merch between what was measured in the field and what was modelled in the carbon calculations. Please see tab 'CR 37' for an evaluation of these two data sets, "trees" tab of 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay_cruxdata_v1.0_20201113_CR22_PCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx' and "TLC_2020" of 'ACR01 GHGPP Calculations v1.1_20210114_Submission.xlsx' Upon further review, it appears that the 'Baseline' is pure check cruise for plot 6, but plot 38 has differences and was not a check cruise plot per 'QRA_Jubilee Check Cruise Status', please clarify.	6.2	Plot 38 was a check cruise plot but was missed in the list provided by the check cruiser. See tab 'CR 37' for a screenshot for plot 38's check cruise plot card which shows the corrected measurements noted in 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay_cruxdata_v2.1_20210323_CR22_PCResponse.xlsx_Submission.xlsx' and "TLC_2020" of 'ACR01 GHGPP Calculations v2.1_20210323_Submission.xlsx'	Thank you for providing this information. Upon further review, it appears that the measurements for plot 38 per cruise were used in the quantification of inventory statistics, yet the post-cruise measurements were used for start and GDR's carbon. As well, the date of the check cruise has not been incorporated into the growingDegree date calculation weight. Please clarify.	Plot 38 has been updated to reflect the post-cruise measurements and date in 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay_cruxdata_v2.2_20210323'. All modelling calculations have been completed incorporating these changes including growingDegree date calculations in 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay_GHGPP_Calculations_v1.0_20210323'	Thank you for making this change, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.							Closed
CR-38	Upon review of 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay Baseline Harvest Schedule Calculation v2.0_20210108' the values captured in rows 13-16 of the 'WS_Report' tab end up to a larger value than their presumed source value, row 12. Please clarify.	3.3	The slight differences between GHGECSM (Row 12) and its component parts (Rows 13-16), the natural GHGECSM and its components are all between 0.998867114 and 1.000369914 over the entire modeling period. These are de minimis errors caused by various data transformations from PVS processing to yield creation to mathematical operations performed within Woodstock. The underlying methodology to separate out the components is sound. However, unlike our LULUCF and ERR projects, there is not a defined set of equations in the Canada ACR 1.0 protocol to calculate GUI - the tools nature to a .0 " cap used to quantify the amount of carbon to log's sent to the mill. Our "GHGECSM" calculations are based on cubic meter volumes as reported by PVS then transformed to carbon via wood density factors, conversion to biomass, and then finally to CO2e. As such, the GHGECSM and its 4 components are all based on the same volumes, and thus should be equal to one again (BTI calculations – rows 13-16 are for entirely deferred from wasi Round if needed. Harvested wood product breakdown was derived from Dhenet al. (2006) table snip 41 of the methodology.	Apologies, the wood product outputs from woodstock are directly used to calculate the baseline 20 year average HWPs as calculated in the rows 17 and 18 of the "BTI_LINC_CORE" tab of 'ACR01 GHGPP Calculations v1.1_20210114_Submission' document which influences yearly BTI's. Minor discrepancies may be found acceptable, when they may be confirmed by the verifier, please see tab'R 5. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-39	The verifier has never perfect concurrence in the as-inventoried treefol quantification (0.999999 vs a true and plot level component confirming the verifier is calculating tree and plot calculcorrectly. The upon review of the SIMS carbon calculation results in 'ACR01 GHGPP Calculations v2.1_20210114_Submission.xlsx' for the grown forward (GSPH) and degrown (Bal) data the verifier is calculating different plot level values that need clarification (even incorporating the incorrect average inventory data from CR 5). As example plot of the degrown Start data is provided in tab 'CR 39' please clarify the source of this discrepancy as developer calculation steps are not provided for assessment.	6.2	Verifier calculations appear to be applying incorrect defect deductions in some instances. See tab 'CR 39_1' for corrected verifier calculations with visible formulas. 'CR 39_1' demonstrates miscalculations affecting trees 45_2 and 35_7. Correcting for these errors, plot level developer-verifier calculated value concurrence increases to a 0.9998. The corrected calculations return a 0.9997-0.9998 for the sample plot. The developer suggests that this be considered a de minimus difference in calculation, likely due to accumulated rounding errors.	Thank you for this mathematical illustration. It appear the issue is directly related to the source of defect and its impact on the carbon treefols. For the inventory statistics (as measured) treefol the verifier has concurrence with "TRAC_PLC_Raw" tab of 'ACR01 Tree-level GIS and Plot-level BIC Recalculation 12152020' which, in the example of plot 35 has 3 trees with defect 7, 1, and 1. Yet, in the 'BatchawaBay_cruxdata_v3.0_20210323'_CR22_PCResponse_Submission' on plot 35, there are 4 trees with defect 1, 7, 2, 7, and 1. Between the two referenced treefol verbose another contradiction in the data workup on the Lorf tab 'CR 39_2', which has 3 trees with defect 0.5, 7, 1 and 1. What treefol is supposed to be used for carbon calculation, and should be the same core treefol for as measured inventory statistics, start time sales, and GDR's tree	Updates to correct the inventory data regarding defects have can be noted in 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay_cruxdata_v3.0_20210323'. All modelling calculations have been completed incorporating these changes were in 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay_GHGPP_Calculations_v3.0_20210323'	Thank you for making this change, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.							Closed
CR-40	Upon review of 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay Baseline Harvest Schedule Calculation v2.1_20210323' the values captured in rows 27 and 28 of the 'WS_Report' tab are both labelled 'Versions By Region CC' yet row 28 appears to represent hectares within the GSPH prescription. Please clarify.	3.1	Row 28 Description field should read: "Hectares By Region GSPH. " Row 27 is accurately labelled as identified as CC region. Analysis is shown in "CR-40" tab of this workbook. Correction is made in 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay Baseline Harvest Schedule Calculation v3.0_20210717_Submission.xlsx'	Thank you for making this change, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-41	Upon review of 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay Baseline Harvest Schedule Calculation v2.0_20210108' a plot of the 'CONS' tab and the resulting 'WS_Report' tab appear to show information that does not align with reality. The values in rows 23-28 seem to suggest that in period 7 and every period thereafter there is only 582 hectares of the 01 prescription and 21,000 hectares of harvest, occurring every year. Please clarify and provide documentation necessary to understand the yearly prescriptions hectares applied.	3.1	Rows 23-28 denote the hectarage allocated to a specific management regime whether or not it is harvested during that period. In period 7, only 1,898.4 ha is actually harvested (as determined by summing "WS_Report" rows 19-22).	Thank you for the clarification, rows 23-28 will be ignored by the verifier. There are other sources of information that will be used to affirm baseline prescriptions, therefore, this item may be closed.								Closed
CR-42	Per the 'WS_Report' tab, total project carbon stocks are reduced from an initial value of 6,888,665 to 6,592,665 in an 8 year period, or a 50% decrease in stocks. Please clarify the plausibility of this cut intensity and ongoing the political, social, and operational barriers not captured as legal constraints	3.1	The Algoma Forest lies immediately adjacent to the ACR01 project area boundary, providing the best indication of baseline management practice feasibility. As it relates to a managed crown forest, the Algoma Forest Management Plan must undergo heavy scrutiny to ensure practices and outcomes align with political, social, and operational realities of the region. The developer proposes that, if project baselines yield outcomes similar to Algoma forest management goals, the project baseline may be accepted as reasonable. The Algoma FMP shows an extensive shelterwood harvest regime targeting maple-dominant stands along the ACR01-Algoma border for the 2020-2030 harvest planning period (Algoma Forest Management Inc. [CFMS], 2020a, 2020b). Shelterwood harvests in the region target a 30%-60% reduction in crown closure and post-harvest BA of 12 m2/ha to 16 m2/ha (Algoma Forest Management Inc. [CFMS], 2020a). These treatments are dynamic and may target residual BA as low as 6 m2/ha when warranted by stand quality (CFMS, 2020c). Similar to Algoma, the ACR01 harvest prescriptions shown in "Silvicultural Label" 'Blackland_ModellingAssumptions_withWS'!A1:Ra_20210501" also recognize a 12 m2/ha BA target under shelterwood regimes with the option to increase intensity to 6 m2/ha residual BA in historical scenarios. Across period 0-8, project baseline BA (shown in "WS_Report" row 30) reaches a minimum at 15.19 m2/ha—only 0.8 m2/ha below Algoma shelterwood targets. The project baseline is therefore in close accordance with both harvest practices and outcomes deployed on its neighboring land base. Residual BA targets have been further confirmed by testimony from the 8th managing foresters. References shown on 'CR-42'	Thank you for providing this information, and real world support for the proposed baseline management scenario. The project constraints appear to fall within the realm of the Algoma forest project, therefore, this item may be closed.								Closed
CR-43	Upon review of the 'Woodstockinputs' tab in 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay Baseline Harvest Schedule Calculation v2.0_20210117,' there appears to be extra data that does not come from the original source data (CONS) in rows 3332 to 3363. This is important to note because the post-table on the 'GrowersShedule' tab goes to row 3832, which is not inclusive of the full dataset (which appears to include ACT's data), nor inclusive of only the original source data. Please clarify.	3.1	In the updated supplementary file 'ACR01BatchawanaBay Baseline Harvest Schedule Calculation v3.1_20210607' all ranges and pivot tables have been updated with the results of the updated baseline run (see CR-18).	Thank you for making this change, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-44	Upon review of the 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay_GHGPP_Calculations_v4.0_20210331_PCResponse' tab 'WS_All_Report' has not been updated since the last run as the Scenario listed in cell A1 is the ACR01v3.0 version, which is being used to inform modelling. Please clarify/update this document to the most recent modelling outputs (at the time of this date the current is 20/03/2021).	3.1	The "ACR01 Batchawana Bay_GHGPP_Calculations_v4.1_20210630_FINAL" including the "WS_All_Report" tab has been updated to reflect the current version of the model's run outputs from 06/28/2021, with updated modeling volumes modelled (See CR-18).	Thank you for making this change, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-45	In 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay Baseline Harvest Schedule Calculation v4.0_20210331' the pivot table on the 'pathCONS' tab (row 5119) is not inclusive of the entire dataset on the 'CONS' tab (row 53834). Please check.	3.1	In the updated supplementary file 'ACR01BatchawanaBay Baseline Harvest Schedule Calculation v4.1_20210630' all ranges and pivot tables have been updated with the results of the updated baseline run (see CR-18).	Thank you for making this change, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-46	After review, the verifier is calculating comparable 'HWPCSN' values for most reporting periods in the 'WS_Report' tab of 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay_GHGPP_Calculations_v4.0_20210331' and 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay Baseline Harvest Schedule Calculation v4.0_20210331'. How does the verifier retrieve and/or function model outputs, as some data appears to be missing (CR-43) and it does not follow the same pattern of calculation as the CONS model outputs, please clarify.	3.1	In the updated supplementary file 'ACR01BatchawanaBay Baseline Harvest Schedule Calculation v4.1_20210630' all ranges and pivot tables have been updated with the results of the updated baseline run (see CR-18).	Thank you for making this change, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-47	In the 'WoodstockInputs' tab of 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay Baseline Harvest Schedule Calculation v4.0_20210331' the values for the used harvest are being divided by 70, yet in the 'ReCalcLoLoLo' tab of 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay Cut List Tree Lab Product Recalculation 20210331' the value used for used conversion is 79. The value of 79 was affirmed previously in item CR-15. Please clarify.	3.1	The conversion factor has been updated in the supplementary file 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay Baseline Harvest Schedule Calculation v4.1_20210630'	Thank you for making this change, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.								Closed
CR-48	In the 'DATL_LINC_CORE' tab of 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay_GHGPP_Calculations_v4.1_20210331_PCResponse' the baseline model output values (cells A19:K30) being used for the first crediting period (which ends 12/31/2021) is pulling from 'WS_All_Report' tab column K. When the versioning issue is resolved (CR-43), there are baseline values generated in column O (D4:D9) which show the resulting standing baseline carbon from the initial harvest cuts in the first crediting period. Please clarify why there are 1.5 years worth of baseline stock reductions being captured between the project start date, and the GSPH's date, i.e. May to December 2019.	3.1	The Woodstock yield are synchronized so that the values of Column E on the tab "WS_All_Report" represent degrown BTI Stock (12/31/2020). please see tab "GrowingReserve" for details) data for both inventory and harvest volumes. Successive columns represent an annual year's growth, meaning that Column F would add the 2020 growing season's worth of growth, which represents the BTI End date (12/31/2020). please see tab "GrowingReserve" for details). Therefore, successive reporting periods represent 1 year of annual growth with the exception of the first period, which is 1.5 years of growth between the BTI End / BTI Start, or year end 2019/beginning of year 2020.). Upon review of the 'ACR01 Batchawana Bay_GHGPP_Calculations_v4.1_20210630_FINAL' the OPO agrees that this convention allowed a double harvest in BTI, one representing BTI Start ecological inventory, and 1 representing BTI End inventory. The OPO has conservatively adjusted the BTI harvest level constraint (comprised of harvests occurring in Column E and Column F) to one half the annual maximum harvest level constraint used in successive years (e.g. columns G and afterwards) to account for this phenomenon. Relevant supporting worksheets and the GHGPP document have been adjusted to reflect this change, and the baseline .DAT files and input and output databases have been updated to reflect the new set of prescriptions chosen. Note that the "degrown yield-y-pass forward 1 year" ingest to BTI End "project" carbon stocks in Column F are different than the BTI End project carbon stocks, which are based on growing the "inventory" data forward, reported in Cells E19:E30 on tab "DTRL_LINC_CORE", due to growth dynamics in BTI. The data in cells E19:E26 has been field-verified already and are our attestation for BTI End stocks. For conservativeness' sake, as "degrown yield-y-pass forward " tend to be more conservative than inventory-yields grown forward over time and to maintain consistency with the baseline, reporting of carbon stocks (from BTI End in the BTI's_LINC_CORE tab are based on the same "degrown to BTI Stock" starting inventories as the baseline.	Thank you for making this change, it has been confirmed. This item may be closed.								Closed
Recommendations for Improvement												
2												
3												