



**Validation report form for
GS programme of activities
(Version 03.0)**

Complete this form in accordance with the instructions attached at the end of this form.

BASIC INFORMATION

Title of the programme of activities (PoA)	Improved cook stoves and sustainable charcoal initiative (GS ID 7776)
Version number of the validation report	Version 1.3
Completion date of the validation report	08/04/201
Version number of PoA-DD to which this validation report applies	Version 05, 02/04/2021
Date when PoA-DD was uploaded for global stakeholder consultation	NA
Coordinating/managing entity (CME)	Nature Club of Rajasthan
Host Parties	India
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	AMS.II.G Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass --- Version 12.0 AMS-III.BG. Emission reduction through sustainable charcoal production and consumption --- Version 3.0 AMS-I.E. Switch from non-renewable biomass for thermal applications by the user --- Version 11.0
Mandatory sectoral scopes	Sector 3: Energy Demand Sector 5: Chemical Industries Sector 1: Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)
Conditional sectoral scopes, if applicable	Not applicable
Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE	EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited (E-0062) Report no: ESSPL/GS/2018/208
Name, position and signature of the approver of the validation report	 K.Suryanarayana Murthy, Managing Director (approver of this report)

SECTION A.Executive summary

>>

Atmosfair gGmbH (hereinafter referred to as “Atmosfair”) on behalf of Nature Club of Rajasthan has contracted EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as EPIC) for validation of the PoA project titled “Improved cook stoves and sustainable charcoal initiative”. Nature Club of Rajasthan is the coordinating/management entity (CME) is responsible for developing and overseeing the PoA whereas atmosfair is the project participant. The purpose of the proposed national level Programme of Activities (PoA) is to reduce fuel wood consumption of traditional stove users by disseminating improved cook stoves, mainly micro wood gasifier stoves (hereinafter referred to as project cookstoves or improved cookstoves) and the consumption of conventional charcoal by traditional charcoal users shall be reduced by providing them charcoal generated in project cook stoves. The PoA also reduces fuel wood consumption by providing users with 100% renewable biomass as a fuel, such as waste wood from plantations in India. This shall not only contribute to natural resource conservation, but also reduce air pollution and facilitate the abatement of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Carbon revenues shall enable the CME to meet the PoA management costs and undertake each CPA on a wide scale, thus helping the proposed programme to achieve its potential to encompass the entire sector on a national scale.

This report summarizes the findings of the validation of the project, performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for CDM, GS4GG Requirements as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM rules and modalities as agreed in the Bonn Agreement, the Marrakech Accords and the CDM Executive Board’s decisions. The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided EPIC with sufficient evidence to determine the project’s fulfilment of all the stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all applicable GS4GG requirements (GS principles and Requirements v1.2, GS Activity Requirements v1.2, GS Product requirements v1.2, GS Safeguarding principles and requirements v1.2)^{1/1}.

The validation team based on the recommendations in the Validation and Verification Standard for Project Activity, version 2.0 (VVS-PoA), GS4GG requirements and employed a risk based approach in the validation, focusing on the identification of significant risks and reliability of project, monitoring plan and generations of GS-VERs. The validation is not meant to provide any consulting towards the client. However, stated request for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the project design.

SECTION B.Validation team, technical reviewer and approver

B.1.Validation team members

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)	Involvement in			
						Desk/document review	On-site inspection	Interview(s)	Validation findings
1.	Lead Auditor	IR	D	Siddaramu	EPIC	√	x	√	√
2.	Technical Expert	ER	A	Kamath	EPIC	√	x	√	√

B.2.Technical reviewer and approver of the validation report

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)
1.	Technical reviewer	IR	Radhamadhavan	Vijayaraghavan	EPIC
2.	Technical Expert	ER	S	Ranganathan	EPIC
3.	Approver	IR	Murthy	K. Suryanarayana	EPIC

SECTION C.Means of validation

C.1.Desk/document review

>>

As a first step, the validation team has reviewed the PoA-DD version 1.0^{/2/} and additional background documents submitted by the project participant. Based on the review, the validation team has issued corrective action requests/ clarification requests. As a result of these findings, the PP has revised the PoA-DD Version 05, 02/04/2021^{/3/} (hereinafter referred to as final PoA-DD). The resolution of the findings by the validation is presented in Appendix 4 of this report.

C.2.On-site inspection

Duration of on-site inspection: 12/11/2020 and 13/11/2020*				
No.	Activity performed	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	➤ General information about the project. ➤ Chronology of Events/ Implementation cycle of the project activity. ➤ Barriers faced/overcome in the processes (additionality) ➤ Local Stakeholder consultation processes ➤ Legal/ Statutory Clearances and Agreements Signed ➤ Baseline determination ➤ Application of appropriate Methodology ➤ Operation and maintenance Procedures ➤ Technical details of project ➤ Data monitoring and storage practices ➤ Calibration and maintenance requirement of the equipment ➤ Monitoring Methodology ➤ Review of the implementation status of the project activity. ➤ Review of applicability conditions of the applied GS baseline and monitoring methodology and applicable methodological tools. ➤ Check on applicable national policies and regulations and their eventual impacts in terms of changing of the baseline scenario ad baseline emissions. ➤ Validation of the values of ex-ante determined parameters. ➤ Review of the Monitoring plan. ➤ Validation of Stakeholder Consultation by interviewing the stakeholders. ➤ Validation of Sustainable Development Monitoring Plan and mitigation measures. ➤ Validation of the scores of the Sustainable Development indicators. ➤ Validation of Sustainable Development Assessment. ➤ Validation of Sustainable Development indicators with respect to the level of risk associated with the Safeguarding Principles of the ➤ Do-No Harm Assessment (DNHA).	West Bengal, India	12/11/2020 and 13/11/2020	Lead Auditor

Note:* Remote audit i.e., through discussion with PP/CME and householder's through tele calls

No physical on-site inspection (with presence of the EPIC verification team) was conducted as part of the performed verification assessment.

Regardless of none of the conditions/requirements which are established by paragraph 339 of the CDM-VVS-PA were valid/applicable for the particular case of the validation assessment, it was anyway previously mutually agreed between EPIC and atmosfair that an on-site inspection to the project site was to be performed as part of the validation assessment.

Due to the travelling restrictions related to the COVID-19 pandemic, the EPIC validation team proposed to the PP i.e., atmosfair to as an alternative, consider postponing such on-site visit by taking into account not only travelling restriction related official decisions and recommendations from local authorities, but also related travelling restriction policy announced by EPIC's office due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Finally by taking into consideration all guidance and requirements of the GS board agreed relaxing of the rule requiring mandatory on-site inspection by VVBs because of COVID-19 pandemic; EPIC verification team thus performed its document review and interviews with representatives of the project participant (of which details are included in Sections D.1 and D.3 respectively) by incorporating the following additional checking's/assessments as complementary auditing measures.

Remote (online) watching by the EPIC validation team of live video^{/12/} produced by member of project operational staff located on-site (allowing remote complete and comprehensive assessment and observations for the project activity):

The previous concluded CDM validation assessment for the project activity was also performed by EPIC, it is relevant to note that, as outlined in the CDM validation report, the appointed EPIC verification team previously performed a complete on-site inspection to the project site on 06/09/2019. Thus, by taking into consideration guidance and requirements of the GS recently agreed relaxing of the rule requiring mandatory on-site inspection by VVBs because of COVID-19 pandemic as well as by taking into consideration principles and guidance from the GS requirements and CDM-VVS-PA, it is reasonable to assume that related findings and observations previously gathered by the EPIC validation team while performing such on-site inspection to the project activity on 06/09/2019 are, upon a certain limit, also representative and relevant in the context of the validation assessment (for which a physical on-site inspection was not performed due to travelling restrictions associated the COVID-19 pandemic).

Based on its accumulated expertise and experience not only with previous CDM validation assessments for the project activity, but also with GS assessments for other similar project-based initiatives, it is EPIC opinion that objectives to be expected for a physical on-site inspection to the project site were sufficiently reached by the EPIC verification team through (i) watching online (and later re-watching for further assessment/review) of the live video produced on-site by project operational staff 12/11/2020 and (ii) by consideration by the EPIC validation team of findings and observations from the CDM validation assessment for the project activity (including inter-alia, all findings and observations resulted from the previously performed physical on-site inspection to the project activity on 06/09/2019).

In summary, by taking all above-presented aspects into account vis-à-vis applicable requirements established in GS/CDM-VVS-PA (version 02.0) and by also taking into account the GS recently agreed relaxing of the rule requiring mandatory on-site inspection by VVBs because of COVID-19 pandemic; the EPIC validation team judged that performing the above-described additional checking's/assessments (complementary auditing measures) instead of performing the physical on-site inspection to the project site is deemed acceptable and sufficient to have the overall quality and completeness of the performed validation assessment not being negatively affected.

C.3.Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member	
	Last name	First name	Affiliation				
1.	Banerjee	Moulindu	Project Cookstove assembler-Sapient Infotech	12/11/2020 and 13/11/2020	As above	Audit team	
2.	Datta	Sanjeev					
3.	Banerjee	Sudhir					
4.	Singh	Ananda	Kasturi Consultancy	13/11/2020	As above		
5.	Sharma	Dr. Ritu Raj	Head-Nature Club of Rajasthan				
6.	Mikolajewski	Dr.Katrin	atmosfair	13/11/2020	As above		

Households interviewed during remote audit

Sl	Cook Stove	Name	Date	Questions raised
----	------------	------	------	------------------

GS-PoA-VAL-FORM

no.	Serial number			
1	A34540	Pancha Khan	12/11/2020 and 13/11/2020	1.Stove used before project stove 2.Family members 3.How did he/she came to know about project stove 4.Use of project stove from 5.Fuel wood collection and/or purchase? 6.Meals cooked per day 7.Charcoal production per month 8.Repair/replacement after stove purchase? 9.Advantages/disadvantages of project stove (i.e., Feedback on stove)
2	A34542	Swapam Hazra		
3	A34550	Sukummar Halder		
4	A34569	Malati Hazra		
5	A34577	Jaydeb Hazra		
6	IN00022	Dipankar Dolui		
7	IN00024	ARJUN ADHIKARY		
8	IN00090	GOUR BANERJEE		
9	IN00091	BASUDEB MAL		
10	IN00094	NABO DOLUI		
11	A60935	BIKASH GHORA		
12	A60905	BAPI GHORA		
13	A60930	LALITA MONDAL		
14	A60922	ARUN MANNA		
15	A60900	DINO BONDHU DAS		
16	L1555	ROMESH DHALI		
17	L1560	BISWANATH DHARA		
18	L1660	SRIKANTA BAG		
19	L1680	JITEN DOLUI		
20	L1725	BISHNU DOLUI		
21	A80385	BAPI GHOSH		
22	A80392	UTTAM RUIDAS		
23	A80475	SWAPAN RUIDAS		
24	A80484	MALOTI GHOSH		

C.4.Sampling approach

>>

The validation team used acceptance sampling approach for checking the operational status of the Top-Lit Up-Draft (TLUD) Improved Cook Stoves (ICS). A sample size of 22 was required, based on an AQL of 0.5% and UQL of 15%, the producer risk used is 5% and consumer risk used was 15%. In accordance with the para Table.2 on page no.13 of "Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities", version 08.0^(4/).

The validation team interviewed 24 households (randomly selected households from the list) and 02 non-ICS in Howrah and Purba Medinipur districts of West Bengal. It was observed that all the TLUD ICS were working in good condition and no discrepant records were observed with the database records. Thus PP's set of records has been accepted.

C.5.Clarification requests (CLs), corrective action requests (CARs) and forward action requests (FARs) raised

Areas of validation of compliance	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Programme of activities	-	-	-
Identification of programme type	-	-	-
Description of PoA	CL01, CL06, CL11 and CL12	CAR02	-
Management system	CL03	-	-
Demonstration of additionality of PoA	-	-	-
Start date and duration of PoA	-	-	-
Environmental impacts	-	-	-
Socio-economic impacts	-	-	-
Local stakeholder consultation	-	-	-
Sustainable development co-benefits	-	-	-
Approval	-	-	-
Authorization	-	-	-
Modalities of communication	-	-	-
Stakeholder consultation	CL05	-	-
Generic component project activities	-	-	-
General description of generic CPA	-	-	-
Selection of methodologies and standardized baselines	-	-	-
•Deviation from methodologies and/or methodological tools	-	-	-
•Clarification on applicability of methodology, tool and/or standardized baseline	-	-	-
Application of methodologies and standardized baselines	-	-	-
•General	-	CAR03	-
•Project boundary, sources and GHGs	-	-	-
•Baseline scenario	-	-	-
•Estimation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals	CL04 and CL07	-	-
•Monitoring plan	CL13	-	-
Crediting period type and duration	-	-	-
Eligibility criteria for inclusion of CPAs	-	-	-
Others (please specify)	-	-	-
•Cookstoves repair/replacement procedure	CL02	-	-
•Double counting	CL08	-	-
•Disposal of scraps/waste	CL09	-	-

•SDG Indicators	CL10 and CL14	-	-
•Documents/Records	-	CAR01	-
Total	14	03	00

SECTION D.Validation findings

D.1.Programme of activities

D.1.1.Identification of programme type

Means of validation	As per para 37 of VVS-PoA v2.0, the validation team determined whether the proposed GS PoA will include only non-A/R CPAs or A/R CPAs. The validation by document review and discussion with PP/CME checked the project type. The validation team determined whether the PoA-DD is completed using the valid version of the applicable Gold Standard for the Global Goals “Key Project Information & Programme Design Document (PoA-DD), version v. 1.1, Publication Date 14.10.2020” ^{5/} . The validation team has checked whether all the sections of the project design document form follows the guidelines provided in the template itself and found ok.
Findings	CAR02 is raised in this section.
Conclusion	The purpose of the proposed National level Programme of Activities (PoA) is to reduce fuel wood consumption of traditional stove users by disseminating project cook stoves and the the consumption of conventional charcoal by traditional charcoal users shall be reduced by providing them charcoal generated in project coostoves. The PoA also reduces fuel wood consumption by providing cookstove users with 100% renewable biomass as a fuel, such as waste wood from plantations in India. Since the source of renewable biomass is not known to CME as on today, CME mentioned that renewable biomass would fit in one of the five conditions as specified in the Glossary of CDM terms v10.0 ^{6/} . CME has implemented two specific case CPAs so far which are based on generic CPA no 2 where renewable biomass was not considered. The validation team has accepted the argument of CME regarding source/definition of renewable biomass. The validation team has reviewed the PoA DD and confirmed that the PoA would include non-A/R CPAs only. Refer Appendix 5 and 7 of this report for more details. The validation team concludes that the project design document provides all the information in accordance with the valid version of the “Key Project Information & Programme Design Document (PoA-DD), version v. 1.1, Publication Date 14.10.2020” and the instructions therein for filling.

D.1.2.Description of PoA

Means of validation	As per para 38 to 43 of VVS-PoA v2.0, the validation team has determined whether the description of the proposed GS project activity in the PoA PDD is accurate, complete, and provides an understanding of the proposed GS PoA.
Findings	CL01, CL02, CL06, CL08. CL09, CL11 and CL12 were raised in this section.
Conclusion	The purpose of the proposed national level Programme of Activities (PoA) is to reduce fuel wood consumption of traditional stove users by disseminating project cook stoves and the the consumption of conventional charcoal by traditional charcoal users shall be reduced by providing them charcoal generated in project cook stoves. The PoA also reduces fuel wood consumption by providing users with 100% renewable biomass as a fuel, such as waste wood from plantations in India. The validation team has confirmed correctness and accuracy of project design of major equipments, processes, energy requirements of the PoA. The validation team based on the review of PoA- DD, has confirmed the PoA contains 3 generic CPAs. The description of the same is briefed below. <u>Generic CPA no 1:</u> This aims at reducing the fuel wood consumption by supplying improved cook

	stoves to the targeted households replacing the traditional cook stoves. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.II. G v120.0⁷⁷. The improved cook stoves would also generate charcoal as a by-product. The households would then supply/sale charcoal to the charcoal users/retailers. This would reduce the generation and consumption of conventional charcoal. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.III. BG v3.0⁷⁷. The households may also be provided with renewable biomass such as waste wood, pellets to operate the improved cook stoves. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.I.E v11.0⁷⁷. Generic CPA no 2: This aims at reducing the fuel wood consumption by supplying improved cook stoves to the targeted households replacing the traditional cook stoves. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.II. G v12.0. The improved cook stoves would also generate charcoal as a by-product. The households would then supply/sale charcoal to the charcoal users/retailers. This would reduce the generation and consumption of conventional charcoal. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.III. BG v3.0. In this generic CPA, the households may or may not be provided with renewable biomass such as waste wood, pellets to operate the improved cook stoves. So no emission reduction would be claimed under AMS.I.E v11.0. Generic CPA no 3: This aims at reducing the fuel wood consumption by supplying improved cook stoves to the targeted households replacing the traditional cook stoves. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.II. G v12.0. In this generic CPA, the charcoal may or may not be generated from the improved cook stoves. Even charcoal is generated, it would not be supplied to the charcoal users/ retailers. So no emission reduction would be claimed under AMS.III.BG. v3.0. In this generic CPA, the households may or may not be provided with renewable biomass such as waste wood, pellets to operate the improved cook stoves. So no emission reduction would be claimed under AMS.I.E v11.0. Refer Appendix 5 and 7 of this report for more details.
--	---

D.1.3.Management system

Means of validation	As per para 44 of VVS-PoA v2.0, the validation checked if the proposed is implemented and operated in accordance with the criteria and terms set out in the present PoA DD and the corresponding generic CPA-DDs.
Findings	CL03 was raised in this section.
Conclusion	The proposed project is implemented and operated in accordance with the criteria and terms set out in the PoA DD. The validation team has checked the role of CME, PP and project owner for each CPA and confirmed that the management system is implementable and accepted. CME has taken efforts for training and capacity development for personnel implementing the PoA and CPAs, procedures are framed for technical review of inclusion of CPAs and to avoid double counting (e.g. to avoid the case of including a new CPA that has already been registered either as a GS project activity or as a CPA of another PoA). Records and documentation control process for each CPA under the PoA are robust. Hence accepted. Refer Appendix 5 and 7 of this report for more details.

D.1.4.Demonstration of additionality of PoA

Means of validation	As per para 45 of VVS-PoA v2.0, the validation team assessed whether the additionality of the proposed GS PoA was demonstrated in accordance with the "CDM project standard for programme of activities" v2.0.
Findings	No CAR/CL/FAR is raised in this section.
Conclusion	Refer Appendix 5 and 7 of this report for more details.

D.1.5.Start date and duration of PoA

Means of validation	As per para 46 to 50 of VVS-PoA v2.0, the validation team determined whether the start date and duration of a proposed GS PoA comply with the relevant provisions in the "CDM project standard for programmes of activities v2.0". Start Date of the PoA (first notification of prior consideration Form to UNFCCC) ^{/8/} , now this is kept as the start date of the project activity in line with Section 4.1.40 of the "GS4GG Principles and Requirements, version 1.2".
Findings	No CAR/CL/FAR was raised in this section
Conclusion	As per the Glossary of CDM terms version 10.0, start date of the PoA is the date on which the CME officially notifies the secretariat and the DNA of their intention to seek the CDM status or the date of publication of the PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation. The CME has chosen date of notification to DNA and UNFCCC for determining the start date of the PoA i.e., 7 th June 2018 ¹ . The validation team has accepted the date of notification as the start date of the proposed PoA project activity by reviewing the UNFCCC website and email sent to both UNFCCC & DNA. The expected operational lifetime is 28 years from the date of start date of the PoA. Refer Appendix 5 and 7 of this report for more details.

D.1.6.Environmental impacts

Means of validation	As per paragraph 51 to 55 of VVS-PoA version 2.0, the validation team has determined whether the PPs conducted an analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed GS project activity including transboundary impacts, and whether those impacts are considered significant by them.
Findings	No CAR/CL/FAR was raised in this section
Conclusion	Demonstration of whether EIA is required or not for the project is conducted at PoA level. In accordance with Federal Republic of India regulations ^{/9/} , an EIA is not required for the distribution and implementation of improved cookstoves, the substitution of conventional charcoal and the substitution of non-renewable biomass. The validation team has reviewed the MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS notification and found that the cookstove technology are not included. Hence EIA is not required for this PoA. Appendix 5 and 7 of this report for more details.

D.1.7.Socio-economic impacts

Means of validation	As per para 56&57 of VVS-PoA version 2.0, the validation team determined whether the analysis of socio-economic impacts and, if applicable, a socio-economic impact assessment was conducted for the whole PoA or will be conducted at the CPA level.
Findings	No CAR/CL/FAR is raised in this section
Conclusion	The validation team determined the analysis of socio-economic impacts are not required to be conducted for this kind of project as well. Hence accepted at the PoA level. The socio-economic impacts analysis is conducted at the PoA level. In accordance with Federal Republic of India regulations ^{/9/} , a socio-economic impacts analysis is not required for the distribution and implementation of improved cookstoves, the substitution of conventional charcoal and the substitution of non-renewable biomass;. The validation team has reviewed the MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT

¹ As per PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITY REQUIREMENTS, Version 1.2 - Published October 2019

3. START DATE, DURATION AND CREDITING PERIOD

3.1.1 The PoA start date for a Gold Standard voluntary PoA is the date when the PoA Design Consultation Report is submitted for Gold Standard Review. This event is the time of first submission of the PoA. The start date for a CDM Gold Standard PoA follows the definition of start date of a CDM PoA

	AND FORESTS notification and found that the technology in question are not included. Hence socio-economic impacts analysis is not required for this PoA. Appendix 5 and 7 of this report for more details.
--	--

D.1.8. Local stakeholder consultation

Means of validation	As per the para 58 to 66 of VVS for PoA version 2.0, the validation team has determined whether the PPs completed a local stakeholder consultation process and that due steps were taken to engage stakeholders and solicit comments for the proposed GS project activity.
Findings	CL05 was raised in this section
Conclusion	PP has conducted local stakeholder consultations on both levels: the PoA and the VPA level. The PoA Design Consultation on the PoA level has taken place from 03/09/2018- 03/11/2018. The Design Consultation Report was checked and found ok. The VPA stakeholder consultation took place on 12/08/2018. Both reports were submitted to the Gold Standard.

D.1.9. Sustainable development co-benefits

Means of validation	Since it is a Gold Standard project, will be assessed by as per Gold Standard sustainable indicators.
Findings	CL10 and CL14 were raised in this section
Conclusion	The validation team by discussion with PP/CME and document review, confirms that Sustainable development co-benefits are reported in PoA-DD. Further, it is also confirmed that PP/CME will monitor the sustainable development co-benefits of the following SDG's indicators; 1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere 7. Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all 8. Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all 13. Climate Action

D.1.10. Approval

Means of validation	Not applicable, as its a Gold Standard project DNA approval is not mandatory
Findings	No CAR/CL/FAR is raised in this section
Conclusion	Not applicable

D.1.11. Authorization

Means of validation	Nature Club of Rajasthan, Sapient Infotech and atmosfair have an agreement to their participation in this project.
Findings	No CAR/CL/FAR is raised in this section
Conclusion	The validation team checked all the agreements and the agreements clearly indicate their authorization to participate in this project. Atmosfair has the legal ownership on the verified emission reduction based on contracts between the end users, atmosfair and the CME.

D.1.12. Modalities of communication

Means of validation	Not applicable
Findings	Not applicable
Conclusion	Not applicable

D.1.13. Global stakeholder consultation

Means of validation	Not applicable
Findings	Not applicable
Conclusion	Not applicable

D.2.Generic component project activities**D.2.1.General description of generic CPA**

Means of validation	As per paragraph 90 & 91 of VVS-PoA version 2.0, the validation team has determined whether the description of the proposed GS project activity in the PoA PDD is accurate, complete, and provides an understanding of the proposed GS CPA
Findings	No CAR/CL/FAR is raised in this section
Conclusion	The purpose of the proposed national level Programme of Activities (PoA) is to reduce fuel wood consumption of traditional stove users by disseminating improved cook stoves and the the consumption of conventional charcoal by traditional charcoal users shall be reduced by providing them charcoal generated in micro wood gasifier stoves. The PoA also reduces fuel wood consumption by providing ICS users with 100% renewable biomass as a fuel, such as waste wood from plantations in India. Refer Appendix 5 and 7 of this report for more details.

D.2.2.Selection of methodologies and standardized baselines**D.2.2.1.Deviation from methodologies and/or methodological tools**

Means of validation	As per paragraph 93-95 of VVS-PoA version 2.0, the validation has determined whether the PP deviated from the approved baseline and monitoring methodology and/or methodological tool.
Findings	No CAR/CL/FAR is raised in this section
Conclusion	There is no deviation from the applied methodology.

D.2.2.2.Clarification on applicability of methodology, tool and/or standardized baseline

Means of validation	As per paragraph 96 of VVS-PoA version 2.0, the validation team has determined to ensure that the request is not submitted with the intention of revising an approved methodology, an approved tool and/or an approved standardized baseline to expand its applicability.
Findings	No CAR/CL/FAR is raised in this section
Conclusion	There is no such request.

D.2.3. Application of methodologies and standardized baselines**D.2.3.1.General**

Means of validation	As per paragraph 97 to 104 of VVS-PoA version 2.0, the validation has determined whether the baseline and monitoring methodology selected by the PPs are the valid versions of those approved by the EB and has checked that the selected baseline and monitoring methodology is applicable to the proposed GS project activity and that the selected version is valid at the time of submission of the proposed GS project activity for registration.
Findings	No CAR/CL/FAR is raised in this section
Conclusion	Refer Appendix 5 and 7 of this report for details.

D.2.3.2.Project boundary, sources and GHGs

Means of validation	As per paragraph 105 to 110 of VVS-PoA version 2.0, the validation team has determined whether all main GHG emission sources, the physical delineation of the proposed GS project activity and other relevant project and baseline emission sources covered in the selected methodology and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline are included within the project boundary for the purpose of calculating project and baseline emissions for the proposed GS project activity.
Findings	No CAR/CL/FAR is raised in this section
Conclusion	Refer Appendix 5 and 7 of this report for more details.

D.2.3.3. Baseline scenario

Means of validation	As per paragraph 111 to 121 of VVS-PoA version 2.0, the validation team has determined whether the baseline identified for the proposed GS project activity is the scenario that reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that would occur in the absence of the project activity and determined whether any procedure contained in the methodology to identify the most reasonable baseline scenario has been correctly applied. Refer Appendix 5 and 7 of this report for more details.
Findings	No CAR/CL/FAR is raised in this section
Conclusion	Refer Appendix 5 and 7 of this report for more details.

D.2.3.4. Estimation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals

Means of validation	As per para 122 to 126 of VVS-PoA version 2.0, the validation team determined whether the description of how to undertake the ex-ante and ex post calculations of baseline, project and leakage GHG emissions as well as GHG emission reductions to be achieved by each of the corresponding CPAs is in accordance with the applied methodologies including applicable tools and, where applicable, the applied standardized baselines and the “Standard: Sampling and surveys for GS project activities and programme of activities” v8.0.
Findings	CL04 and CL07 were raised in this section
Conclusion	Refer Appendix 6 of this report for more details.

D.2.3.5. Monitoring plan

Means of validation	As per paragraph 127 to 134 of VVS-PoA version 2.0, the validation team has determined whether the description of the monitoring plan included in the PDD complies with the approved monitoring methodology including applicable tools and, where applicable, the “Standard for sampling and surveys for GS project activities and programme of activities” version 8.0; confirmed whether the PPs have chosen to delay the submission of the monitoring plan for the proposed GS project activity.
Findings	CL13 was raised in this section
Conclusion	Refer Appendix 6 of this report for more details.

D.2.4. Crediting period type and duration

Means of validation	As per para 135 of VVS-PoA version 2.0, the validation team has determined whether the coordinating/managing entity defined the type and duration of the crediting period applicable to all corresponding CPAs in accordance with the relevant requirements in the “CDM project standard for programmes of activities” v2.0.
Findings	No CAR/CL/FAR is raised in this section
Conclusion	The validation team has accepted the the type (renewable) and duration of the crediting period (7 years) applicable to all corresponding CPAs in accordance with the relevant requirements in the “CDM project standard for programmes of activities” v2.0.

D.2.5. Eligibility criteria for inclusion of CPAs

No.	Eligibility criterion - Category/Required condition	Means of validation	Findings	Conclusion
1.	The PoA contains three generic CPAs. The validation of eligibility criteria for inclusion of each CPA is reported in Appendix 5 and 7 of this report in detail.	Refer Appendix 5 and 7 of this report for details	No CAR/CL/FAR is raised in this section	Refer Appendix 5 and 7 of this report for details

SECTION E. Internal quality control

>>

After the completion of assessment by the validation team all the relevant documentation is submitted to a qualified, Independent Technical reviewer as part of EPIC' internal quality control system. A Technical reviewer team is appointed to review the draft final validation report (Draft FVR). The comments made by the Technical reviewer team are taken into consideration and incorporated in the final FVR. The technical reviewer team assesses whether all the reporting requirements have been fulfilled and whether all the issues raised were closed satisfactorily by the validation team with justification. The technical review process can also raise issues in this regard which is resolved further by the validation team to the satisfaction of the technical reviewer. The technical reviewer team either accepts or rejects the report made by the validation team. The final report (after resolutions of all findings) is then submitted to the Head-operations for review and approval.

SECTION F.Validation opinion

>>

Atmosfair, the PP, has contracted EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited on behalf of Nature Club of Rajasthan for validation of the PoA project titled "Improved cook stoves and sustainable charcoal initiative". Nature Club of Rajasthan, the coordinating/management entity (CME), is responsible for developing and overseeing the PoA. The purpose of the proposed national level Programme of Activities (PoA) is to reduce fuel wood consumption of traditional stove users by disseminating improved cook stoves and the consumption of conventional charcoal by traditional charcoal users shall be reduced by providing them charcoal generated in project cook stoves. The PoA also reduces fuel wood consumption by providing ICS users with 100% renewable biomass as a fuel.

This report summarizes the findings of the validation of the project, performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for CDM, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM rules and modalities as agreed in the Bonn Agreement, the Marrakech Accords and the CDM Executive Board's decisions and GS requirements. The Sustainable Development Monitoring Plan and Sustainable Development indicators comply with the applicable requirements of Gold Standard.

The purpose of a validation is to have an independent third party assessment of the project design, applicability of the project under the methodologies, baseline of the project, additionality, monitoring plan, emission reduction calculation etc and the project's compliance with relevant UNFCCC and host country criteria. The validation is a requirement for all CDM projects and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of certified emission reductions (CERs)/GS-VERs. The validation team has employed a risk-based approach in the validation based on the recommendations in the Validation and Verification Standard for Programme of Activities version 2.0 (VVS-PoA^{1/}), focusing on the identification of significant risks for project implementation and the generation of CERs. The validation team has confirmed that the proposed CDM PoA would achieve the anticipated GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals stated in the generic CPA-DDs.

Project title:	Improved cook stoves and sustainable charcoal initiative
PoA-DD	Version 5.0 , dated 02/04/2021
Sector and applied methodology	Sector 3: Energy Demand AMS.II.G Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass --- Version 12.0 Sector 5: Chemical Industries AMS-III.BG. Emission reduction through sustainable charcoal production and consumption --- Version 3.0 Sector 1: Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources) AMS-I.E.Switch from non-renewable biomass for thermal applications by the user --- Version 11.0

Appendix 1.Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full Texts
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reductions
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EB	Executive Board
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ER	External Resources
GHG	Green House Gas
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IR	Internal Resources
MoC	Modalities of Communication
NCV	Net Calorific Value
PCP	Project Cycle Procedure
PDD	Project Design Document
PLC	Private Limited Company
UNFCCC	United Nations Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard
WBT	Water Boiling Test

Appendix 2.Competence of team member and technical reviewers

The following validation team has been assigned to carry out the validation of the project.

Name	Dr. D. Siddaramu	Kamath. A	Mr. R. Vijayaraghavan & Mr. S. Ranganathan
Role	Lead Auditor	Technical expert	Technical Reviewer
Competence in the TA	Sector 1, 3	Sector 5	Sector 1,3, 5
Responsibility	Doc review, Interview, DVR preparation, DVR resolution, FVR preparation	Project technical findings	Technical review

A brief summary of the personnel involved in the validation is indicated below.

Dr. D. Siddaramu holds a M.Sc., Ph.D in Environmental Science, with over 16 years of experience. A qualified Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Lead Auditor, successfully registered more than 30 projects with United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and Verified Carbon Standard registry (VCS) registry; well versed with both National and International legal regime. Has hands on experience in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) studies pertaining to different Ecosystem; monitoring, collection & analyzing environmental samples and conducting socio-economic surveys; data analysis. Conducting CDM/VCS audits, preparation of validation protocols and reports. He is qualified for Sector 1 based on CDM accreditation requirements and qualified lead auditor as per GS4GG EPIC accreditation. Verified GS project (GS ID 2898 and GS6155) and validated (GS ID 6356 and GS5562)

Mr A. Kamath holds a B. Tech Chemical engineering. He holds a B.Tech chemical engineering Degree. He has more than twenty years of work experience in chemical industries sector. His expertise relates to technical advisory, consulting, erection and commissioning and operational aspects. He is qualified as a sectoral expert for sector 5 related to chemical industries in accordance with procedures of EPIC Sustainability Services Pvt. Ltd.

Mr. R. Vijayaraghavan holds BE in Mechanical Engineering, M. Tech in Energy Conservation and Management and MBA in Technology Management. He is certified as Energy Auditor by Bureau of Energy Efficiency (BEE), Government of India. He has 11 years of working experience in energy sector including 6 years as validator. He has successfully completed around hundred CDM, VCS/GS projects. He has been qualified as Lead Auditor for Sectoral Scope 1, 3 and 13.

Mr. S. Ranganathan, holds a Bachelor's Degree in Chemical Engineering and has done diploma course in Management and completed the graduate ship course in Industrial Engineering and has an overall working experience of around thirty two years with twenty four years" experience in Chemical process industry (fertilizer & petrochemical manufacturing) covering production, technical services including energy audits and efficiency studies, waste heat -recovery, efficiency studies of boilers,vpower plants, safety audits and pollution control activities including waste water treatment, project management, corporate planning, sales, logistics in fertilizer & petrochemical industry. With respect to the thermal power plant the job assignment included the monitoring of flue gas exit temperatures, excess air used efficiency of fuel additives, condition of boiler refractory, insulation of steam lines etc. The experience also includes 5 years in process design & engineering for chemical process industry. He is qualified validator, verifier and technical reviewer and has eight years experience working with leading certification bodies. He is involved in the validation/verification of over 100 projects in various roles. He is a qualified expert for sectoral scope 5 in accordance with procedures of EPIC sustainability services Pvt. Ltd.

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1	UNFCCC	Validation and Verification Standard for PoA v2.0 https://cdm.unfccc.int/sunsetcms/storage/contents/stored-file-20181221092105818/Reg_stan06v02.pdf Project Standard for PoA v2.0 https://cdm.unfccc.int/sunsetcms/storage/contents/stored-file-20181221092036152/Reg_stan03v02.pdf Project cycle procedure for PoA v2.0 https://cdm.unfccc.int/sunsetcms/storage/contents/stored-file-20181221092012422/PC_proc02v02.pdf Standard Documents For Gold Standard For The Global Goals https://www.goldstandard.org/project-developers/standard-documents	1	Publicly available
2	PP/CME	Project Design Document for PoA v1.0	2	CME
3	PP/CME	Project Design Document for PoA v5.0	3	CME
4	UNFCCC	Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities https://cdm.unfccc.int/filestorage/e/x/t/extfile-20191129115244333-Meth_stan05.pdf/Meth_stan05.pdf?t=a3p8cW54eHUyfDCsxUn_Uz496RzACNQvt_He	4	Publicly available
5	GS	Key Project Information & Programme Design Document (PoA-DD), version v. 1.1, Publication Date 14.10.2020	5	Publicly available
6	UNFCCC	Glossary of CDM terms v10.0 https://cdm.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/R0EBM36GQ81S7TVFCIPHINKA2D4O5ZX	6	Publicly available
7	UNFCCC	Applied Methodologies; AMS.II.G Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass --- Version 12.0 https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/HLXIKEIBAXB4EHO24H5IAB824MBD8 AMS.III.BG Emission reduction through sustainable charcoal production and consumption --- Version 3.0 https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/MVOAXD3LGD4ZJEKEERCT39ZLJ3JZA0 AMS.I.E Switch from non-renewable biomass for thermal applications by the user --- Version 11.0 https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/IO5FJLJFWT91R6B8SO5BC7TXSK27I2	7	Publicly available
8	PP/CME	Prior consideration notification sent to UNFCCC and host DNA https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/PriorCDM/notifications/index_html Prior consideration notification email to UNFCCC and host DNA	8	PP/CME
9	MoEF	Federal Republic of India regulations on requirement of EIA for	9	Publicly

		cookstove projects http://moef.nic.in/legis/eia/so1533.pdf		available
10	MMSME	Ministry of Micro, Small, Medium Enterprises test report (Stove efficiency report)	10	CME
11	FSI	Forest report dated 2001	11	CME
12	CME	Beneficiary agreement with households	12	CME
13	UNFCCC	TOOL “Project and leakage emissions from biomass” v4.0 https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools/am-tool-16-v4.pdf	13	Publicly available
14	UNFCCC	Calculation of the fraction of non-renewable biomass” v2.0 https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools/am-tool-30-v2.0.pdf	14	Publicly available
15	UNFCCC	Standard for application of the global warming potentials to CDM PA and PoA for the second commitment period of the Kyoto protocol” Version 1.0 (EB 69 Annex 3) https://cdm.unfccc.int/faq/Reference/Standards/meth/reg_stan02.pdf Decision 4/CMP 7 http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2011/cmp7/eng/10a01.pdf#page=23 Table 2.14 of the errata to the contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC https://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/errata/rata_errata.html (Evidence for Global Warming potential for methane)	15	Publicly available
16	UNFCCC	Tool- Demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities v12.0 https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools/am-tool-21-v12.pdf Tool- Demonstration of additionality of microscale project activities v9.0 https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools/am-tool-19-v9.pdf Tool- Assessment of debundling for small scale project activities v4.0 https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools/am-tool-20-v1.pdf CME letter dated 11 th Dec 2019	16	Publicly available
17	Clean Cooking Alliance	Water Boiling Test protocol version 4.2.3 https://www.cleancookingalliance.org/binary-data/DOCUMENT/file/000/000/399-1.pdf	17	Publicly available

Appendix 4. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests

Table 1. CL from this validation

CL ID	01	Section no.	Document Review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of CL				
It is not indicated in the PoA-DD, whether the implementation of the project activity results in technology transfer to the host country. Clarify				
Project participant response				Date: 08/01/2021
<i>PP clarified in the PoA DD, that the PoA-DD is open for several stove designs, some of these stoves might be imported to the host country, or production lines for such stoves might be established in the future. The TLUD Gasifier stove is fabricated in India. As such there is no technology transfer to the host country.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
-				
DOE assessment				Date: 15/01/2021
The response by PP is accepted, hence CL01 is closed.				

CL ID	02	Section no.	Document review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of CL				
Indicate the cookstoves repair/replacement procedure in PoA-DD.				
Project participant response				Date: 08/01/2021
<i>PP indicated the procedure for the cookstove repair/replacement in the PoA DD Section B.3.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
-				
DOE assessment				Date: 15/01/2021
The revised PDD section B.3 is now has the cookstoves repair/replacement procedure. Hence CL02 is closed				

CL ID	03	Section no.	Document review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of CL				
PP to include an illustration of the organizational structure, including a clear description of roles and responsibilities (viz., Atmosfair gGmbH, Nature Club of Rajasthan, Sapient, Kastury Consultancy etc.,).				
Project participant response				Date: 08/01/2021
<i>The PoA is open for many project partners taking on different responsibilities in the different CPAs. A general organizational structure is included in the PoA DD section SECTION C:Management system. PP inserted the name of the CME in the structure.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
-				
DOE assessment				Date: 15/01/2021
An illustration of the organizational structure is now provided in Section C of the revised PDD, hence CL03 is closed				

CL ID	04	Section no.	Document review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of CL				
Justification on the suitability and conservativeness of baseline Survey and submit the baseline survey results excel sheet with formula for verification.				
Project participant response				Date: 08/01/2021
<i>No baseline survey was undertaken for this PoA.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
-				
DOE assessment				Date: 15/01/2021
PP has taken option 3: WBT as per methodology, so no baseline survey is required. Hence CL04 is closed				

CL ID	05	Section no.	Document review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of CL				
In Stakeholder Consultation Report, Version no.: 1 (Dated: 14.09.2018) under section A.2 (page no.2) it is indicated that "10 th of September 2018: Start of distribution of TLUD stoves". But, PoA-DD does not mention the same, clarify				
Project participant response				Date: 08/01/2021
<i>The information that stove distribution started on 10th of September 2018 was added in the PoA DD section A.1.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
-				
DOE assessment				Date: 15/01/2021
The timeline of the project is now indicated in section A.1 of the revised, checked and found ok. Hence CL05 is closed				

CL ID	06	Section no.	Document review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of CL				
Please indicate timeline of key events leading up to the project implementation in PoA-DD				
Project participant response				Date: 08/01/2021
<i>PP included a timeline of key events in Section A of the PoA DD.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
-				
DOE assessment				Date: 15/01/2021
The timeline of the project is now indicated in section A.1 of the revised, checked and found ok. Hence CL06 is closed				

CL ID	07	Section no.	Document review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of CL				
PP is requested to clarify if use of different fuels (i.e., Kerosene, LPG, Electricity, etc.) is foreseen and in this case how the diversity is managed in the calculations of emission reduction and clarify how the ERs are estimated if traditional/old cook stoves are still in use.				
Project participant response				Date: 08/01/2021
<i>The stoves introduced under this PoA shall all be biomass fired efficient cookstoves.</i>				

Documentation provided by project participant	
-	
DOE assessment	Date: 15/01/2021
The confirmation by PP that “stoves introduced under this PoA shall all be biomass fired efficient cookstoves”, hence CL07 is closed.	

CL ID	08	Section no.	Document review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of CL				
Procedure adopted to avoid double counting				
Project participant response				Date: 08/01/2021
The CME implemented several procedures to avoid double counting of CERs: -Each stove has a unique number labelling. -Stove users will sign agreements stating that they will not claim ER for the use of the stove and replacement of renewable biomass through renewable biomass provided under this CPA. -Charcoal users will sign agreements stating that they will not claim ER for the use of the charcoal provided under this CPA.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
-				
DOE assessment				Date: 15/01/2021
The procedure adopted by PP to avoid double counting is accepted, hence CL08 is closed				

CL ID	09	Section no.	Document review	Date: 08/01/2021
Description of CL				
Clarify on the procedure adapted for disposal of scraps/waste generated during the manufacturing of cookstoves.				
Project participant response				Date: 08/01/2021
Waste and scrapes generated during the manufacturing process are minimized through the procurement of prefabricated metal parts. All remaining waste and scraps are sold to scrap dealers who recycle and disposed according to the Indian laws.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
-				
DOE assessment				Date: 15/01/2021
The response PP on waste/scrap handling is accepted. Hence CL09 closed.				

CL ID	10	Section no.	Document review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of CL				
1)For SDG 1, CME to confirm whether the money/fuel saved will result in uplifting the population from the poverty line. A more detailed assessment is required at household level if this indicator is chosen to be used. 2)For SDG 5, CME to explain whether the time saved by the women can be used for activities that are chosen by women themselves. CME shall note that in order to claim SDG 5 impact, it is important that the time saved is not used for activities not chosen by women. 3)For SDG 8, CME shall explain whether the jobs created are temporary or permanent or both. Please also confirm if the wages are as per National wage levels. 4)For SDG 7, CME to explain how affordable and clean energy is monitored				

Project participant response	Date: 08/01/2021
1)The money/fuel saved for fuel wood and the additional income generated by the charcoal sales will alleviate the poverty pressure on the households. The project needs to contribute to the SDG target, but not necessarily lead to the target fulfillment. On the CPA level there will be an ex-ante estimated for SDG 1. E.g. in 2,715 INR per year per household for CPA1. 2)The PoA DD only lists SDGs 1, 7, 8 and 13. SGD 5 is not included as a monitored SDG in the PoA DD. 3)The jobs created under the PoA will be both permanent and temporary. Permanent jobs can be created in the management of the Project, temporary jobs may be created in the charcoal collection or the stove production. Wages are as per National wage level. The wage list has been provided to the DOE. 4)The access to affordable and clean energy is monitored by the number of cookstoves distributed under the project. Each improved cookstove is an affordable clean energy device, since it is sold to a subsidized prize and provides cleaner energy compared to the traditional stoves.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
-	
DOE assessment	Date: 15/01/2021
The clarification by PP on the SDGs (i.e., 1, 7, 8 and 13) used as an indicator in the project is accepted. Hence CL10 is closed	

CL ID	11	Section no.	Document review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of CL				
Sapient Infotech is indicated as Project Participant in Stakeholder Consultation Report, Version no.: 1 (Dated: 14.09.2018) under section A.2 and in PoA-DD section A.1, it is indicated that ".....Sapient Infotech, who will e.g. manufacture and distribute stoves at the local level". Clarify on the role/responsibility of Saipent Infotech in the project and submit MoU/Agreement with CME.				
Project participant response				Date: 08/01/2021
Sapient Infotech will amongst others manufacture and distribute stoves for the PoA at the local level. Sapient is no official project participant but project implementation partner. Agreement with Sapient Infotech was provided to the DOE.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
-				
DOE assessment				Date: 15/01/2021
The clarification by PP on Sapient Infotech that they are only a manufacturer and distributor of stoves at the local level, accordingly section C of the revised PDD is updated. Hence accepted and closed.				

CL ID	12	Section no.	Document review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of CL				
PP clarify whether any Government approvals were undertaken at any step from sourcing raw materials, manufacturing stoves to the installation of stoves at the end users premises.				
Project participant response				Date: 08/01/2021
No government approvals were required for the stove production or the implementation of the Project. The project is also registered as a CDM Project and thus holds a Letter of Approval from the Indian Ministry of Environment and Forest and Climate Change (CDM DNA). The LoA was provided to the DOE. There is only a requirement of obtaining a Trade License from the local rural government a copy of the same is attached herewith.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
-				

DOE assessment	Date: 15/01/2021
The clarification by PP on the Government approvals for the project is accepted. Hence CL12 is closed	

CL ID	13	Section no.	Document review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of CL				
The relevant targets/indicators chosen in Section B.6.1 shall also be discussed in connection with the project activity. It shall be briefly discussed as how they are relevant considering the case of project activity.				
Project participant response				Date: 08/01/2021
<i>PP added a more detailed description on the relevant effects of the project activity on the respective targets/indicators in Section B.6.1 of the CPA-DD.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
-				
DOE assessment				Date: 15/01/2021
The clarification by PP on the relevant targets/indicators chosen for the project and its confirmation that “a more detailed description on the relevant effects of the project activity on the respective targets/indicators in Section B.6.1 of the CPA-DD” is accepted. Hence CL13 is closed				

CL ID	14	Section no.	Document review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of CL				
The "estimated amount of SDG impact certified" has not been provided for SDGs on the cover page. Hence additional information shall be provided inline with the PDD filling guidelines.				
Project participant response				Date: 08/01/2021
<i>The “estimated amount of SDG impact certified” has been provided on the cover page of the CPA-DD, no such section is foreseen on the PoA level.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
-				
DOE assessment				Date: 15/01/2021
The response by PP is accepted, hence CL14 is closed				

CL ID	15	Section no.	Document review	Date: 25/01/2021
Description of CL				
Please clarify, why CME has not conducted a local Stakeholder Consultation at PoA level. (Refer: As per PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITY REQUIREMENTS, Version 1.2 Published October 2019. 6. STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION 6.1.1 The CME shall conduct the local Stakeholder Consultation at both the PoA and the VPA/CPA level. The CME may seek exception by providing convincing justifications validated by Validation/Verification Body (VVB) and approved by Gold Standard at the PoA Design Certification stage as to why demonstration of programme level stakeholder consultation is sufficient for proposed PoA. 6.1.2 The PoA level consultation i.e., PoA Design Consultation is mandatory and is conducted to obtain feedback from governments, relevant national authorities, NGO communities, and other stakeholders on the design of the PoA. The PoA design consultation does not necessarily require a live meeting. The CME shall make use of the design consultation template to document the PoA Design Consultation).				
Project participant response				Date: 02/02/2021
PP conducted local stakeholder consultations on both levels: the PoA and the VPA/CPA level. The PoA Design Consultation on the PoA level has taken place from 03/09/2018- 03/11/2018. The Design Consultation Report was provided to the DOE. The VPA/CPA stakeholder consultation took place on 12/08/2018. The LSC Report was provided to the DOE. Both reports were submitted to the Gold Standard.				

Documentation provided by project participant	
GS Design Consultation Report	
DOE assessment	Date: 03/02/2021
The clarification by PP is accepted, the LSC Report was checked and found ok, hence CL15 is closed.	

Table 2.CAR from this validation

CAR ID	01	Section no.	Document review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of CAR				
The PP to submit the following records/documents for verification 1)Declaration that the GS project activity is not part of any other certification scheme 2)MoU between households and CME for ownership of GHGs 3)Signed Official Development Assistance (ODA) form 4)Document to support Technical life of cook stove 5)Grievance mechanism records (if any) 6)Testing reports/Technical specification of cook stoves to be distributed and 7)Training records of staff 8)SD Matrix 9)Do No Harm Assessment 10)Stakeholder consultation process records [includes Stakeholder Feedback Round (SFR)] 11)Project Baseline survey and additionality documents				
Project participant response				Date: 08/01/2021
<i>PP submitted all applicable requested documents.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
1)Declaration certification scheme 2)Example end user agreements as MoU between households and CME for ownership of GHGs 3)ODA-Declaration_KaMi_21072020 4)Manufacturers Specification to support Technical life of cook stove 5)No grievance received 6)Sapient Stove_Efficiency test MSME and Manufacturers Specification 7)Training records of staff 8)Local Stakeholder report containing SD Matrix, Do No Harm Assessment and Stakeholder consultation process records [includes Stakeholder Feedback Round (SFR)]				
DOE assessment				Date: 15/01/2021
The requested documents are submitted by PP, the validation team checked and found ok. Hence CAR01 is closed				

CAR ID	02	Section no.	Document review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of CL				
PP to update the PoA-DD to latest template available on GS website "Key Project Information & Programme Design Document (PoA-DD), VERSION v. 1.1, PUBLICATION DATE 14.10.2020"				
Project participant response				Date: 08/01/2021
The PoA-DD has been update to the latest version of PoA template available on GS website				
Documentation provided by project participant				

DOE assessment	Date: 08/01/2021
Now the PoA-DD is updated to the latest version of PoA template available on GS website. Hence CAR02 is closed.	

CAR ID	03	Section no.	Document review	Date: 25/01/2021
Description of CL				
The applied methodology, AMS-II.G “Energy Efficiency Measures in Thermal Applications of Non-Renewable Biomass” version 12 and AMS-I.E, version 11: “Switch from Non-renewable biomass for thermal applications by the users” are the latest available. Accordingly update				
Project participant response				Date: 02/02/2021
The PoA DD has been update to the latest version of the Methodology AMS-II.G version 12.0 and AMS-I.E, version 11.0.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
DOE assessment				Date: 03/02/2021
Now the PoA-DD is updated to the latest version of applied methodology, AMS-II.G i.e., version12 available on CDM website. Hence CAR03 is closed.				

Table 3.FAR from this validation

FAR ID	NIL	Section No.	Document review	Date: 17/11/2020
Description of FAR				
-				
Project participant response				Date: 02/02/2021
-				
Documentation provided by project participant				
-				
DOE assessment				Date: 03/02/2021
-				

Appendix 5: Applicability conditions of methodologies used for generic CPAs

Generic CPA no 1:

Applicable conditions –AMS.II.G	Validation opinion of how the CPA would comply with the methodology.
1.This methodology comprises efficiency improvements in thermal applications of nonrenewable biomass. Examples of applicable technologies and measures include the introduction of high efficiency biomass fired project devices (cookstoves or ovens or dryers) to replace the existing devices and/or energy efficiency improvements in existing biomass fired cookstoves or ovens or dryers	The purpose of the CPA no 1 is the distribution of efficient cook stoves (micro gasifier stoves) displaces traditional wood stoves which constitute the baseline scenario. Condition 1 is satisfied.
2.In the case of cookstoves, the methodology is applicable to the introduction of single pot or multi pot portable or in-situ cookstoves with rated efficiency of at least 20 per cent. The Water Boiling Test (WBT) method shall be used to test the efficiency of the cookstove to meet this eligibility requirement, following the requirements indicated in “Data / Parameter table 11” which details the options for testing and certification as well as supporting documentation (e.g. certificate issued by third party or test results) that needs to be presented to the validating DOE	The top-lit updraft gasifier is a micro-kiln used to produce heat for cooking with charcoal as by product. It is introduction of single pot portable one weighing 8 kg only. The validation team has seen the working of the project cookstove during onsite visit. The stove is commonly constructed with two concentric cylindrical containers (referred to as canisters). The inner cylinder is the fuel pot. The fuel pot has holes in the base. These holes are the primary air inlet. The fuel pot also has holes on the neck, serving as a secondary air inlet. The outer cylinder has holes near the bottom on the sides. During combustion, air enters these holes by natural air draft as designed. The end user fills the fuelwood pot up to the neck, just below the secondary air inlet holes. The user ignites the top layer of fuel for the pyrolysis to start. Air then flows in through the primary and secondary air inlets. The primary inlet helps the draft of pyrolysed wood gas flow up. The secondary air inlet blows hot air by the time it travels around the fuel pot. The secondary inlet above the fuel layer helps burn the wood gas. The stove pyrolyzes fuelwood and uses a reburner to eliminate volatile byproducts of pyrolyzation. The validation team has reviewed the Ministry of Micro, Small, Medium Enterprises test report^{/10/} and observed that efficiency of the project cookstoves is 27.7%. Hence accepted. Condition 2 is satisfied
3.The aggregate energy savings of a single project activity shall not exceed the equivalent of 60 GWh per year or 180 GWh thermal per year in fuel input	The capacity of each project cookstove is less than 1800 MWh_{th} per year. As the generic CPA consists solely of units that qualify as “microscale CDM units” as defined in Microscale additionality, as per para 46 of AMS.II.G v12.0, the conditions to ensure that CPAs that will be included meet the small-scale or microscale thresholds and remain within those thresholds throughout the crediting period of the

	CPAs are not required. <u>Note:</u> This is not a microscale GS project considering the definition of microscale as per GS requirements
4.Non-renewable biomass has been used in the project region since 31 December 1989, using survey methods or referring to published literature, official reports or statistics	The validation team reviewed the state of forest report ^{11/} dated 2001 and found that non renewable biomass has been used since 1951. Hence accepted. Condition 4 is satisfied.
5.For cases where the biomass is sourced from renewable sources, the project participants should use a corresponding Type I methodology	Generally conventional non renewable fuelwood would be used in the project cook stoves distributed. However, if it is replaced by renewable biomass, additional ER will be calculated based on AMS-I.E version 11 (Type I methodology).
6.If the project device requires a specific fuel for this device (e.g. briquettes, pellets, woodchips), the consumption of the fuel should be monitored during the crediting period.	The fuel consumption is monitored in the crediting period.
Applicable conditions –AMS.III.BG	Validation opinion of how the CPA would comply with the methodology.
1.This methodology is applicable to project activities that displace the use of nonrenewable biomass in the production of charcoal supplied to identified consumers for thermal applications included in the project boundary	Charcoal is produced from the project cookstove displaces use of non-renewable biomass. The charcoal is supplied to identified consumers (SMEs, charcoal traders. Condition 1 is satisfied.
2.This methodology is also applicable to charcoal generated as a by-product in microgasifier stoves using woody biomass for households cooking when used in conjunction with “AMS-II.G: Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass”. Auxiliary power consumption in a blower or fan for forced convection is not covered by the methodology	The purpose of the CPA is the distribution of improved cook stoves displaces traditional wood stoves which constitute the baseline scenario. Charcoal is the by product from the project cookstoves. Only natural air will be used for primary and secondary air in the cookstove. Condition 2 is satisfied.
3.End users of charcoal shall be: (i) households; or (ii) small and medium enterprises (SMEs); or (iii) a group of households served by a charcoal market (e.g. charcoal consuming urban areas). End users do not include large scale industries	The charcoal is supplied to identified consumers (SMEs, charcoal traders). The validation team has reviewed one agreement ^{12/} between households and charcoal vendors where it is written that charcoal would not be sold to large scale industry. Condition 3 is satisfied
4.Measures such as contractual agreements shall be implemented to avoid potential double counting because of potential claims of emission reductions by the end users. These measures shall be described in the Project Design Document (PDD)	Agreements ^{12/} will be signed between CME and households/SME. The rights of carbon credit lies with the CME only. Condition 4 is satisfied
5.Project activity, except for the case indicated in paragraph 3 above, shall introduce efficient charcoal production technologies using biomass feedstock such as biomass residues to displace the production of charcoal in unimproved traditional kilns by the informal sector thereby leading to emission reductions. Charcoal production facility may include briquetting facility for the agglomeration of smaller biomass particles. Methane produced during charcoaling process is either: (a) captured and destructed or gainfully used for heat or electricity; or	Not applicable as charcoal is produced in the project cook stoves (microgasifier) as a by product. Condition 5 is not applicable.

(b) not captured and not destructed. Examples of these technologies include but are not limited to: (a) Retort sedentary kilns which capture the pyrolysis gas; captured gas may be gainfully used for example as a fuel for pre-heating the facility or for wood drying or for production of heat and/or power; (b) Improved sedentary kilns without the capture of pyrolysis gas; (c) Casamance kilns	
6. Project kilns not equipped with capture and destruction of the pyrolysis gases are not eligible to claim emission reductions on account of avoidance of methane emissions from the project activity under this methodology. It is assumed that methane emissions in the project equals to methane emissions in the baseline charcoal generation process.	The validation team has seen the working of the project cookstove during onsite visit. The stove is commonly constructed with two concentric cylindrical containers (referred to as canisters). The inner cylinder is the fuel pot. The fuel pot has holes in the base. These holes are the primary air inlet. The fuel pot also has holes on the neck, serving as a secondary air inlet. The outer cylinder has holes near the bottom on the sides. During combustion, air enters these holes by natural air draft as designed. The end user fills the fuelwood pot up to the neck, just below the secondary air inlet holes. The user ignites the top layer of fuel for the pyrolysis to start. Air then flows in through the primary and secondary air inlets. The primary inlet helps the draft of pyrolysed wood gas flow up. The secondary air inlet blows hot air by the time it travels around the fuel pot. The secondary inlet above the fuel layer helps burn the wood gas. The stove pyrolyzes fuelwood and uses a reburner to eliminate volatile byproducts of pyrolyzation. Since pyrolysis gases are captured in the cook stoves. Condition 6 is satisfied.
7. The project activity shall install and operate new (Greenfield) charcoal production facilities characterized by a new investment; replacement and retrofit of existing facilities is not eligible under this methodology. Provisions of "General guidelines for SSC CDM methodologies" shall be applied to demonstrate that the most plausible baseline scenario is the production of charcoal in unimproved traditional kilns by the informal sector.	The project activity would install and operate new improved cook stoves in the households. Charcoal is the by-product. The validation team has checked one cookstove whose cost of production is Indian Rupee 2650. As demonstrated in the baseline section, baseline scenario is the production of charcoal in unimproved traditional kilns by the informal sector. Condition 7 is satisfied.
8. Charcoal manufacturing equipment transferred from existing or decommissioned charcoal production facilities are not eligible.	Newly manufactured project cook stoves would be sold to the endusers. Hence condition 8 is not applicable.
9. The biomass utilized by the project activity shall not be chemically processed (e.g. esterification to produce biodiesel, degumming and/or neutralization by chemical reagents) prior to the pyrolysis, but it may be processed mechanically (e.g. pressing, filtering, agglomeration) or thermally (e.g. drying, roasting).	Biomass utilized by the project activity is not chemically processed in the project cookstoves. Generally conventional non renewable fuelwood would be used in the project cook stoves distributed. However, if it is replaced by renewable biomass, additional ER will be calculated based on AMS-I.E version 11 (Type I methodology).
10. Biomass used by the project facilities is not stored for more than one year. No storage of the	Biomass is not stored for more than one year. Hence accepted.

biomass is done in anaerobic conditions.	
11. The embedded energy in charcoal produced as by-product in micro-gasifier stoves as indicated in paragraph 3 above shall be neglected when performing water boiling test as per AMS-II.G (see paragraph 17 of AMS-II.G, version 6) to ensure that efficiency estimates are conservative.	The embedded energy in charcoal production would be neglected while calculating the thermal efficiency from WBT test.
Applicable conditions –AMS.I.E	Validation opinion of how the CPA would comply with the methodology.
1.This methodology comprises of activities to displace the use of non-renewable biomass by introducing renewable energy technologies. Examples of these technologies include, but are not limited to biogas stoves, bio-ethanol stoves, solar cookers, passive solar homes	The purpose of the CPA is the distribution of efficient cook stoves (micro gasifier stoves) displaces traditional wood stoves which constitute the baseline scenario. Condition 1 is satisfied.
2.Project participants are able to show that non-renewable biomass has been used since 31 December 1989, using survey methods or referring to published literature, official reports or statistics	The validation team reviewed the state of forest report ^{11/} dated 2001 and found that non renewable biomass has been used since 1951. Hence accepted. Condition 2 is satisfied.
3.The methodology is applicable for technologies displacing use of non-renewable biomass by renewable energy	The purpose of the CPA no 1 is the distribution of efficient cook stoves (micro gasifier stoves) which uses renewable biomass. It displaces traditional wood stoves which constitute the baseline scenario. This uses non renewable biomass. Condition 3 is satisfied.
4.Project participants or coordinating and managing entities shall describe in the PDD/PoA-DD how the double counting of emission reductions has been addressed (e.g. between end users, distributors and producers of stoves).	CME would provide contract ^{12/} between CME and households(endusers). One of the clause is about the right to claim carbon credit. As per the agreement, the rights of claim of carbon credit lies with the CME only. The households cede the rights to the CME. The validation team has reviewed one agreement ^{12/} where stove unique id, date of sale, Name and address of the enduser with GPS are recorded. Condition 4 is satisfied.
5.For project activities introducing bio-ethanol cookstoves, project participants or coordinating and managing entities shall demonstrate that the bioethanol cookstoves are designed, constructed and operated to the requirements (e.g. with regard to safety) of a relevant national or local standard or comparable literature. Latest guidelines issued by a relevant national authority or an international organisation may also be used.	PoA did not constitute bio ethanol cookstoves. Condition 5 is not applicable.

Generic CPA no 2:

Applicable conditions –AMS.II.G	Validation opinion of how the CPA would comply with the methodology.
1.This methodology comprises efficiency improvements in thermal applications of nonrenewable biomass. Examples of applicable technologies and measures include the introduction of high efficiency biomass fired project devices (cookstoves or ovens or dryers) to replace the existing devices and/or energy	The purpose of the CPA no 2 is the distribution of improved cook stoves displaces traditional wood stoves which constitute the baseline scenario. Condition 1 is satisfied.

efficiency improvements in existing biomass fired cookstoves or ovens or dryers	
2. In the case of cookstoves, the methodology is applicable to the introduction of single pot or multi pot portable or in-situ cookstoves with rated efficiency of at least 20 per cent. The Water Boiling Test (WBT) method shall be used to test the efficiency of the cookstove to meet this eligibility requirement, following the requirements indicated in "Data / Parameter table 11" which details the options for testing and certification as well as supporting documentation (e.g. certificate issued by third party or test results) that needs to be presented to the validating DOE	The top-lit updraft gasifier is a micro-kiln used to produce heat for cooking with charcoal as by product. It is introduction of single pot portable one weighing 8 kg only. The validation team has seen the working of the project cookstove during onsite visit. The stove is commonly constructed with two concentric cylindrical containers (referred to as canisters). The inner cylinder is the fuel pot. The fuel pot has holes in the base. These holes are the primary air inlet. The fuel pot also has holes on the neck, serving as a secondary air inlet. The outer cylinder has holes near the bottom on the sides. During combustion, air enters these holes by natural air draft as designed. The end user fills the fuelwood pot up to the neck, just below the secondary air inlet holes. The user ignites the top layer of fuel for the pyrolysis to start. Air then flows in through the primary and secondary air inlets. The primary inlet helps the draft of pyrolysed wood gas flow up. The secondary air inlet blows hot air by the time it travels around the fuel pot. The secondary inlet above the fuel layer helps burn the wood gas. The stove pyrolyzes fuelwood and uses a reburner to eliminate volatile byproducts of pyrolyzation. The validation team has reviewed the Ministry of Micro, Small, Medium Enterprises test report^{10/} and observed that efficiency of the project cookstoves is 27.7%. Hence accepted. Condition 2 is satisfied
3. The aggregate energy savings of a single project activity shall not exceed the equivalent of 60 GWh per year or 180 GWh thermal per year in fuel input	The capacity of each project cookstove is less than 1800 MWh_{th} per year. As the generic CPA consists solely of units that qualify as "microscale CDM units" as defined in Microscale additionality, as per para 46 of AMS.II.G v12.0, the conditions to ensure that CPAs that will be included meet the small-scale or microscale thresholds and remain within those thresholds throughout the crediting period of the CPAs are not required. <u>Note:</u> This is not a microscale GS project considering the definition of microscale as per GS requirements
4. Non-renewable biomass has been used in the project region since 31 December 1989, using survey methods or referring to published literature, official reports or statistics	The validation team reviewed the state of forest report ^{11/} dated 2001 and found that non renewable biomass has been used since 1951. Hence accepted. Condition 4 is satisfied.
5. For cases where the biomass is sourced from renewable sources, the project participants should use a corresponding Type I methodology	Generally conventional non renewable fuelwood would be used in the project cook stoves distributed. Hence the condition is not applicable.
6. If the project device requires a specific fuel for this device (e.g. briquettes, pellets, woodchips), the consumption of the fuel should be monitored during the crediting period.	The fuel consumption is monitored in the crediting period.

Applicable conditions –AMS.III.BG	Validation opinion of how the CPA would comply with the methodology.
1.This methodology is applicable to project activities that displace the use of nonrenewable biomass in the production of charcoal supplied to identified consumers for thermal applications included in the project boundary	Charcoal is produced from the project cookstove displaces use of non-renewable biomass. The charcoal is supplied to identified consumers (SMEs, charcoal traders. Condition 1 is satisfied.
2.This methodology is also applicable to charcoal generated as a by-product in microgasifier stoves using woody biomass for households cooking when used in conjunction with “AMS-II.G: Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass”. Auxiliary power consumption in a blower or fan for forced convection is not covered by the methodology	The purpose of the CPA no 2 is the distribution of improved cook stoves displaces traditional wood stoves which constitute the baseline scenario. Charcoal is the by product from the project cookstoves. Only natural air will be used for primary and secondary air in the project cookstove. Condition 2 is satisfied.
3.End users of charcoal shall be: (i) households; or (ii) small and medium enterprises (SMEs); or (iii) a group of households served by a charcoal market (e.g. charcoal consuming urban areas). End users do not include large scale industries	The charcoal is supplied to identified consumers (SMEs, charcoal traders). The validation team has reviewed one agreement ^{12/} between households and charcoal vendors where it is written that charcoal would not be sold to large scale industry. Condition 3 is satisfied
4.Measures such as contractual agreements shall be implemented to avoid potential double counting because of potential claims of emission reductions by the end users. These measures shall be described in the Project Design Document (PDD)	Agreements ^{12/} will be signed between CME and households/SME. The rights of carbon credit lies with the CME only. Condition 4 is satisfied
5.Project activity, except for the case indicated in paragraph 3 above, shall introduce efficient charcoal production technologies using biomass feedstock such as biomass residues to displace the production of charcoal in unimproved traditional kilns by the informal sector thereby leading to emission reductions. Charcoal production facility may include briquetting facility for the agglomeration of smaller biomass particles. Methane produced during charcoaling process is either: (a) captured and destructed or gainfully used for heat or electricity; or (b) not captured and not destructed. Examples of these technologies include but are not limited to: (a) Retort sedentary kilns which capture the pyrolysis gas; captured gas may be gainfully used for example as a fuel for pre-heating the facility or for wood drying or for production of heat and/or power; (b) Improved sedentary kilns without the capture of pyrolysis gas; (c) Casamance kilns	Not applicable as charcoal is produced in the project cook stoves as a by product. Condition 5 is not applicable.
6.Project kilns not equipped with capture and destruction of the pyrolysis gases are not eligible to claim emission reductions on account of avoidance of methane emissions from the project activity under	The validation team has seen the working of the project cookstove during onsite visit. The stove is commonly constructed with two concentric cylindrical containers (referred to as canisters).

this methodology. It is assumed that methane emissions in the project equals to methane emissions in the baseline charcoal generation process.	The inner cylinder is the fuel pot. The fuel pot has holes in the base. These holes are the primary air inlet. The fuel pot also has holes on the neck, serving as a secondary air inlet. The outer cylinder has holes near the bottom on the sides. During combustion, air enters these holes by natural air draft as designed. The end user fills the fuelwood pot up to the neck, just below the secondary air inlet holes. The user ignites the top layer of fuel for the pyrolysis to start. Air then flows in through the primary and secondary air inlets. The primary inlet helps the draft of pyrolysed wood gas flow up. The secondary air inlet blows hot air by the time it travels around the fuel pot. The secondary inlet above the fuel layer helps burn the wood gas. The stove pyrolyzes fuelwood and uses a reburner to eliminate volatile byproducts of pyrolyzation. Since pyrolysis gases are captured in the cook stoves. Condition 6 is satisfied.
7. The project activity shall install and operate new (Greenfield) charcoal production facilities characterized by a new investment; replacement and retrofit of existing facilities is not eligible under this methodology. Provisions of “General guidelines for SSC CDM methodologies” shall be applied to demonstrate that the most plausible baseline scenario is the production of charcoal in unimproved traditional kilns by the informal sector.	The project activity would install and operate new improved cook stoves in the households. Charcoal is the by-product. The validation team has checked one cookstove whose cost of production is Indian Rupee 2650. As demonstrated in the baseline section, baseline scenario is the production of charcoal in unimproved traditional kilns by the informal sector. Condition 7 is satisfied.
8. Charcoal manufacturing equipment transferred from existing or decommissioned charcoal production facilities are not eligible.	Newly manufactured project cook stoves would be sold to the endusers. Hence condition 8 is not applicable.
9. The biomass utilized by the project activity shall not be chemically processed (e.g. esterification to produce biodiesel, degumming and/or neutralization by chemical reagents) prior to the pyrolysis, but it may be processed mechanically (e.g. pressing, filtering, agglomeration) or thermally (e.g. drying, roasting).	Biomass utilized by the project activity is not chemically processed in the project cookstoves. Generally conventional non renewable fuelwood would be used in the project cook stoves distributed.
10. Biomass used by the project facilities is not stored for more than one year. No storage of the biomass is done in anaerobic conditions.	Biomass is not stored for more than one year. Hence accepted.
11. The embedded energy in charcoal produced as by-product in micro-gasifier stoves as indicated in paragraph 3 above shall be neglected when performing water boiling test as per AMS-II.G (see paragraph 17 of AMS-II.G, version 6) to ensure that efficiency estimates are conservative.	The embedded energy in charcoal production would be neglected while calculating the thermal efficiency from WBT test.

Generic CPA no 3:

Applicable conditions –AMS.II.G	Validation opinion of how the CPA would comply with the methodology.
1.This methodology comprises efficiency	The purpose of the CPA no 3 is the distribution of

improvements in thermal applications of nonrenewable biomass. Examples of applicable technologies and measures include the introduction of high efficiency biomass fired project devices (cookstoves or ovens or dryers) to replace the existing devices and/or energy efficiency improvements in existing biomass fired cookstoves or ovens or dryers	improved cook stoves displaces traditional wood stoves which constitute the baseline scenario. Condition 1 is satisfied.
2.In the case of cookstoves, the methodology is applicable to the introduction of single pot or multi pot portable or in-situ cookstoves with rated efficiency of at least 20 per cent. The Water Boiling Test (WBT) method shall be used to test the efficiency of the cookstove to meet this eligibility requirement, following the requirements indicated in "Data / Parameter table 11" which details the options for testing and certification as well as supporting documentation (e.g. certificate issued by third party or test results) that needs to be presented to the validating DOE	The project cookstove distributed would be single pot or multi pot with efficiency more than 20%. Condition 2 is satisfied
3.The aggregate energy savings of a single project activity shall not exceed the equivalent of 60 GWh per year or 180 GWh thermal per year in fuel input	The capacity of each project cookstove is less than 1800 MWh _{th} per year. As the generic CPA consists solely of units that qualify as "microscale CDM units" as defined in Microscale additionality, as per para 46 of AMS.II.G v12.0, the conditions to ensure that CPAs that will be included meet the small-scale or microscale thresholds and remain within those thresholds throughout the crediting period of the CPAs are not required. <u>Note:</u> This is not a microscale GS project considering the definition of microscale as per GS requirements
4.Non-renewable biomass has been used in the project region since 31 December 1989, using survey methods or referring to published literature, official reports or statistics	The validation team reviewed the state of forest report ^{11/} dated 2001 and found that non renewable biomass has been used since 1951. Hence accepted. Condition 4 is satisfied.
5.For cases where the biomass is sourced from renewable sources, the project participants should use a corresponding Type I methodology	Generally conventional non renewable fuelwood would be used in the project cook stoves distributed. Hence the condition 5 is not applicable.
6.If the project device requires a specific fuel for this device (e.g. briquettes, pellets, woodchips), the consumption of the fuel should be monitored during the crediting period.	The fuel consumption is monitored in the crediting period.

Appendix 6: Calculation of Emission reduction

Generic CPA no 1:

Emission reduction achieved by the generic CPA 1 ($ER_{CPA1,y}$)	<u>Generic CPA no 1:</u> This CPA aims at reducing the fuel wood consumption by supplying improved cook stoves to the targeted households replacing the traditional cook stoves. The emission reduction from this component is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.II. G v12.0. The improved cook stoves would also generate charcoal as a by-product. The households would then supply/sale charcoal to the charcoal users/retailers. This would reduce the generation and consumption of conventional charcoal. The emission reduction from this component is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.III. BG v3.0. The households may also be provided with renewable biomass such as waste wood, pellets to operate the improved cook stoves. The emission reduction from this component is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.I.E v11.0. Hence, $ER_{CPA1,y} = ER_{AMS.II.G} + ER_{AMS.III.BG} + ER_{AMS.I.E}$ Where $ER_{AMS.II.G}$ - Emission reduction from AMS.II.G component $ER_{AMS.III.BG}$ - Emission reduction from AMS.III. BG v3.0 component $ER_{AMS.I.E}$ - Emission reduction from AMS.I.E v11.0 component. The validation of emission reduction calculation for this CPA is detailed below.
Emission reduction from AMS.II.G component ($ER_{AMS.II.G}$)	As per para 24 of AMS.II.G v12.0, it is assumed that in the absence of the project activity, the baseline scenario would be the projected use of fossil fuels to meet similar thermal energy needs as those provided by the project devices. As per para 24/equation 1 of AMS.II.G v12.0, emission reduction is calculated as below $ER_{AMS.II.G,y} = \sum \sum ER_{y,i,j} - LE_y$ Where i-Indices for the situation where more than one type of project device is introduced to replace the pre-project devices j-Indices for the situation where there is more than one batch of project device $ER_{y,i,j}$ -Emission reductions by project device of type i and batch j during year y LE_y -Leakage emissions in the year y The validation of each is detailed below
Emission reductions by project device of type i and batch j during year y ($ER_{y,i,j}$)	As per equation 2 of AMS.II.G v12.0, $ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,savings,i,y} \times N_{y,i,j} \times \mu_y \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{biomass} \times EF_{projected\ fossil\ fuel}$ Where

	$B_{y,savings,i,y}$ -Quantity of woody biomass that is saved in tonnes per cookstove device of type i and batch j during year y $N_{y,i,j}$ -Number of project devices of type i and batch j operating during year y μ_y -Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y $f_{NRB,y}$ -Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass $NCV_{biomass}$ -Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted $EF_{projected\ fossil\ fuel}$ -Emission factor for the fossil fuels projected to be used for substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers The validation of each is detailed below.
Quantity of woody biomass that is saved in tonnes per cookstove device of type i and batch j during year y ($B_{y,savings,i,y}$)	As per para 28 of AMS.II.G, $B_{y,savings,i,y}$ due to implementation of efficient thermal devices is estimated as per the four options. The validation team has checked the PoA-DD wherein CME has opted for option 3 (Water boiling test). As per para 32 of AMS.II.G v12.0, Under option 3, there are two equations (equation 7 and equation 8). CME considered equation 8. As per equation 7, $B_{y,savings,i,y} = B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey} \times (\eta_{new,i,j} / \eta_{old,i,j} - 1)$ Where $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ -Quantity of woody biomass used by project devices in tonnes per device of type i and batch j $\eta_{new,i,j}$ -Efficiency of the project device i and batch j $\eta_{old,i,j}$ -Efficiency of the old devices being replaced by project devices of type i and batch j The monitoring approach is valid for the PoA level which is in line with para 45 of AMS.II.G v12.0. The validation of each is detailed below.
Quantity of woody biomass used by project devices in tonnes per device of type i and batch j ($B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$) (monitored parameter)	As per para 34 of AMS.II.G v12.0, the calculations in the equations above assume that there is only one device per household. Since the CME is planned to disseminate project cookstove to households at a subsidised price, as a matter of policy, it would provide one project cookstove only to a household. However, if future CME decided to provide project cook stoves to community or schools, then the same would be adjusted accordingly as per the methodology. No charcoal would be used in the baseline or project cookstove, so para 30 is not applicable. The lifetime of the project cookstove is 7 years as per the manufacturer specification. As per table 18 of AMS.II.G v12.0, the parameter shall be calculated in the first year of the introduction of the devices (e.g. during the first year of the crediting period, $y=1$) through sample measurement campaigns at representative households and/or sample survey. As per the PoA-DD, it would be calculated through sample survey based on number of canisters used per week (fillings) and weight of each canister(load).

	$B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ = number of canisters used per week x weight of each canister or $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey} = fillings_{y=1} * load_{y=1}$ Number of canisters would be determined by monitoring survey and weight of canister would be determined during WBT test. Only calibrated equipments would be used for measurements.
Efficiency of the project device i and batch j ($\eta_{new,i,j}$) (monitoring parameter) Loss of efficiency is determined from one of the options a,b,c,d	As per table 14 of AMS.II.G v12.0, Efficiency shall be measured/estimated as per the following: 1.The efficiency of the project devices shall be based on certification by a national standards body or an appropriate certifying agent recognized by that body As per the PoA-DD, the efficiency is tested and confirmed by the testing center of the Ministry of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises. As per table 14 of AMS.II.G v12.0, the sampling test of stoves by such certification bodies/agents or manufacturers shall be conducted following a 90/10 precision in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities. However, the following simplified approach may be used, when the efficient cookstoves are produced by a manufacturer with a good quality management system in place to ensure that the individual equipment produced do not vary beyond the range of acceptance limits (e.g. characteristics such as materials, critical dimensions): (i) Conduct a sample test on three cookstoves with three tests conducted for each stove. The test can be carried out by project proponents by themselves or stove manufacturers; (ii) If the standard deviation of the nine test results indicated above is very small and 90/10 precision requirement is met (in this case, the value of the t-distribution for 90 per cent confidence shall be used instead of Z value), the efficiency determined is acceptable, otherwise more sample tests would be required until 90/10 precision is met. The loss of efficiency will be determined as per one of the 4 options as specified in para 37a,b,c,d. The parameter is measured by dedicated trained monitoring team based on WBT test under field conditions if option c is chosen. The efficiency of the project devices of the first batch will be monitored annually following the Water Boiling Test protocol version 4.2.3⁽¹⁷⁾. WBT would not account of quantity of charcoal generated. WBTs will be conducted on randomly selected project cookstoves; the sample size of project cookstove testes will be large enough to meet the 90/10 requirements of the methodology. The validation team has interviewed the CME and accepted the monitoring approach as robust/feasible. As per para 37 of AMS.II.G, the loss in efficiency of the project devices i in each batch j due to aging shall be accounted during the monitoring period y. As option 3 was selected, the CME may choose any option mentioned in para 37 to account for the loss in

	efficiency. The option shall be identified and fixed ex ante in the PDD at the time of registration. As per the PoA-DD, CME has opted for option C i.e., Determination of the rate of efficiency drop for a representative sample of the first batch of project device i in year y and assume that same rate of loss in efficiency applies to all other batches. In other words, it may be assumed that the degradation of efficiency measured in a representative sample of the first batch of project devices i apply to all subsequent batches. The efficiency of the project devices in the first batch has to be monitored annually through representative samples and this rate of loss in efficiency may be applied correspondingly to all batches.
Efficiency of the old devices being replaced by project devices of type i and batch j ($\eta_{old,i,j}$) = 10% (monitored parameter)	As per table 9 of AMS.II.G v12.0, it can be fixed for each individual household as default value. The validation team has interviewed the CME and accepted the value as correct.
Number of project devices of type i and batch j operating during year y ($N_{y,i,j}$) (monitored parameter) Statistically adjusted drop out from total population of ICS in period y ($DO_{II,G,y}$) (monitored parameter)	As per table 11 of AMS.II.G v12.0, it shall be determined measured directly or based on a representative sample. Sampling standard shall be used for determining the sample size to achieve 90/10 confidence precision. If the survey shows 10% as non-operating, then an adjustment factor of 0.9 shall be applied to number of project devices commissioned in a particular batch. As per the PoA-DD, $N_{y,i,j} = N_{soldtotaly,i,j} \times d_{average,y} / mplength_y$ Where $N_{soldtotaly,i,j}$ -total number of ICS type i and batch j sold within monitoring period y It will be measured number of sales contracts stored and the corresponding number of entries of ICS sold in the database $d_{average,y}$ - average number of days the ICS sold in period y were operational in period y, derived from sales dates on sales contracts $mplength_y$ - length of monitoring period y Statistically adjusted drop out from total population of ICS in period y ($DO_{II,G,y}$) will be determined through sampling survey by dedicated monitoring team. This will be measured every two years as per the PoA-DD. The validation team has specified the sampling plan for this parameter which is correct, feasible.
Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y (μ_y) =1 (monitored parameter)	As per table 12 of AMS.II.G v12.0, as equation 7 is used for calculating $B_{y,savings}$, $\mu_y=1$. Hence accepted by the validation team.
Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass ($f_{NRB,y}$) (ex-ante parameter)	It will be determined as per the requirements of tool "Calculation of the fraction of non-renewable biomass" v2.0.^{/16/} As per para 8 of the tool, f_{NRB} is calculated as follows. $f_{NRB} = NRB / (NRB + RB)$

	where NRB -Quantity of non-renewable biomass in the country/region or project area RB - Quantity of renewable biomass in the country/region or project area As per para 16 of the tool, the value of fNRB for the country/region or project area shall be calculated ex ante i.e fNRB value is determined once at the validation stage, thus no monitoring and recalculation of the fNRB value during the crediting period is required. As per the PoA-DD, it will be determined for every CPA before validation. This is in line with para 27 of AMS.II.G v12.0.
Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted ($NCV_{biomass}$) =0.0156 TJ/tonne of wood (ex-ante parameter)	It is sourced from para 24/equation 2 of AMS.II.G. Hence accepted.
Emission factor for the fossil fuels projected to be used for substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers ($EF_{projected_fossil\ fuel}$) =63.7 tCO₂/TJ	It is sourced from para 24/equation 2 of AMS.II.G. Hence accepted.
Emission reductions by project device of type i and batch j during year y ($ER_{y,i,j}$)	As per equation 2 of AMS.II.G v12.0, $ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,savings,i,j} \times N_{0,i,j} \times n_{y,i,j} \times \mu_y \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{biomass} \times EF_{projected_fossil\ fuel}$ Where: $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ = Quantity of woody biomass that is saved per cookstove device of type i and batch j during year y (tonnes) $f_{NRB,y}$ = Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass (fraction or %) $NCV_{biomass}$ = Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted (IPCC default for wood fuel, 0.0156 TJ/tonne, based on the gross weight of the wood that is 'air-dried') $EF_{projected_fossilfuel}$ = Emission factor of fossil fuels projected to be used to substitute non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers (tCO₂e/TJ). $N_{0,i,j}$ = Number of project devices of type i and batch j commissioned (number) $n_{y,i,j}$ = Proportion of commissioned project devices of type i and batch j ($N_{0,i,j}$) that remain operating in year y (fraction) μ_y = Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y
Leakage emissions per year (LE_y)	As per para 41 of AMS.II.G v12.0, Leakage related to the non-renewable woody biomass saved by the project activity shall be assessed based on ex post surveys of users and the areas from which this woody biomass is sourced. Alternatively, $B_{y,savings,i,y}$ is

	multiplied by a net to gross adjustment factor of 0.95 to account for leakages, in which case surveys are not required. As per para 41 of AMS.II.G v12.0, $B_{y,savings,i,y}$ is multiplied by a net to gross adjustment factor of 0.95 to account for leakages. As per para 42, Project activities switching from baseline device using firewood to efficient project device using charcoal or switching from firewood to efficient project device using processed biomass (briquette, pellets, and woodchips) shall take into account the leakage effects related to the charcoal or processed biomass production. Since this is not the case in this PoA, leakage from this source is zero.
Emission reductions by project device of type i and batch j during year y ($ER_{y,i,j}$)	As per equation 2 of AMS.II.G v12.0 can be written as $ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,savings,i,j} \times N_{0,i,j} \times n_{y,i,j} \times \mu_y \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{biomass} \times EF_{projected_fossil\ fuel}$ Where: $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ = Quantity of woody biomass that is saved per cookstove device of type i and batch j during year y (tonnes) $f_{NRB,y}$ = Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass (fraction or %) $NCV_{biomass}$ = Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted (IPCC default for wood fuel, 0.0156 TJ/tonne, based on the gross weight of the wood that is 'air-dried') $EF_{projected_fossilfuel}$ = Emission factor of fossil fuels projected to be used to substitute non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers (tCO₂e/TJ). $N_{0,i,j}$ = Number⁷ of project devices of type i and batch j commissioned (number) $n_{y,i,j}$ = Proportion of commissioned project devices of type i and batch j ($N_{0,i,j}$) that remain operating in year y (fraction) μ_y = Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y
Rated thermal capacity as per manufacturer specification (ex-ante parameter)	This is sourced from technical specification of project cookstove. Hence accepted.
Number of hours of utilization of the device during the year y (monitoring parameter)	As per table 10 of AMS.II.G v12.0, this parameter is monitored at least once in every two years. The biennial survey shall follow a 95 per cent confidence interval and a 10 per cent margin of error.
Life span	As per table 18 of AMS.II.G v12.0, since option 3 is chosen by the CME for determining $B_{y,savings,y}$, the operating life time of the project device. should be

	monitored. Hence accepted.
Date of commissioning of batch <i>j</i>	As per table 19 of AMS.II.G v12.0, to establish the date of commissioning, the CME may opt to group the devices in “batches” and the latest date of commissioning of a device within the batch shall be used as the date of commissioning for the entire batch. Hence accepted.
Date of commissioning of project device <i>i</i>	It is determined at the time of sale of project cookstove. It is fixed and recorded at the time of distribution of project cookstove.
Emission reduction from AMS.III. BG v3.0 component ($ER_{AMS.III. BG,y}$)	As per para 21 of AMS.III.BG v3.0, for the project technology equipped with capture and destruction of the pyrolysis gases, including micro-gasifier, emission reductions are calculated as follows. $ER_{AMS.III. BG,y} = \sum Q_{CCP,i,y} \times [(CF \times NCV_{wood} \times NCV_{charcoal,i} / NCV_{charcoal,default} \times f_{NRB,BL,wood} \times EF_{projected_fossil\ fuel}) + (SMG_{y,b} - M_d) \times (1 - f_{NRB,BL,wood}) \times GWP_{CH_4}] - PE_{y,fugitive} - PE_{y,flaring} - PE_{FF,y} - PE_{El,y} - PE_{BC,y}$ Where $Q_{CCP,i,y}$ -Quantity of charcoal type <i>i</i> produced and used in year <i>y</i> CF-Default wood to charcoal conversion factor NCV_{wood} -Net calorific value of wood $NCV_{charcoal,i}$ -Net calorific value of the charcoal type <i>i</i> produced during the project $NCV_{charcoal,default}$ -Default net calorific value of charcoal $f_{NRB,BL,wood}$ -Fraction of biomass of type <i>i</i> used in the absence of the project activity that can be established as non-renewable biomass $EF_{projected_fossil\ fuel}$ -Emission factor for the substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers $SMG_{y,b}$ -Specific methane generation for the baseline charcoal generation process in the year <i>y</i> M_d -Factor to account for any legal requirement for capture and destruction of methane in the charcoal production facility GWP_{CH_4} -Global warming potential of methane applicable to the crediting period $PE_{y,fugitive}$ -Fugitive emissions from operation of charcoal producing facility $PE_{y,flaring}$ -Emissions due to the flare inefficiency in the project charcoal manufacturing plant in the year <i>y</i> $PE_{FF,y}$ -Project emissions due to fossil fuel consumption in charcoal production facilities in year <i>y</i> $PE_{El,y}$ -Project emissions due to electricity consumption in charcoal production facilities in year <i>y</i> $PE_{BC,y}$ -Project emissions due to biomass cultivation in year <i>y</i> The validation of the same is detailed below.
Quantity of charcoal type <i>i</i> produced and used in year <i>y</i> ($Q_{CCP,i,y}$) (monitored parameter)	As per table 7 of AMS.III.BG v3.0, The parameter can be monitored according to one of the following options: Option1: Direct measurement (e.g. use of a scale) of the weight of charcoal products supplied;

	Option 2: Calculation of the total weight of charcoal supplied; based on the total number of bags supplied and the average weight of charcoal product per bag. The weight of charcoal products per bag is determined on sample basis in accordance with the sampling standard (e.g. using systematic sampling method). Option 2 can only be used if Option 1 is not available. Charcoal generated from only woody biomass is eligible for the case of micro-gasifier As per the PoA-DD, the parameter will be monitored according to one of the following options: Option1: Direct measurement (e.g. use of a scale) of the weight of charcoal products supplied; at the site of the charcoal users or retailers Option 2: Calculation of the total weight of charcoal supplied; based on the total number of bags supplied (e.g. using systematic sampling method). Option 2 will only be used if Option 1 is not available. $Q_{CCP,i,y}$ will be derived from invoices/receipts of sales of charcoal generated in the CPA to charcoal users and retailers. If feasible, the weight of charcoal delivered will be indicated on invoices, requiring the availability of calibrated weighbridges or other scales. Where invoicing to charcoal buyers cannot be based on the exact weight but on the number of bags delivered, the following formula will apply: $Q_{CCP,i,y} = \text{weightbags}_{y,i} * \text{nbags}_{y,i}$ Where: $\text{weightbags}_{y,i}$ - average weight of bags of charcoal type i in period y This will be determined on sample basis in accordance with the sampling standard $\text{nbags}_{y,i}$ -total number of bags of charcoal type i in period y This will be determined based on invoices/receipts of charcoal buyers. Charcoal is sold to households, SMEs, group of households served by a charcoal market.
Default wood to charcoal conversion factor (CF) =6 (ex-ante parameter)	It is sourced from table 1 of AMS.III.BG. It is fixed for the crediting period.
Net calorific value of wood (NCV_{wood})=0.015 TJ/tonne of wood	It is sourced from table 2 of AMS.III.BG. It is fixed for the crediting period.
Net calorific value of the charcoal type i produced during the project (NCV_{charcoal})=29.5 GJ/tonne (monitored parameter)	As per table 8 of AMS.III.BG, it will be monitored through two options available to the CME. As per option 1, during the first year of the crediting period measurement on the charcoal calorific value of charcoal produced in the cookstove will be undertaken in laboratories according to relevant national/international standards. Samples will be taken monthly during one year from the stocks of

	charcoal collected from users before selling it to charcoal users/retailers. . As per the table, in case of charcoal generated from micro gasifier, Option 1 above or option 2 in 'appendix 1 of AMS.III.BG can be used. As per option 1-deemed value, equation 1 of appendix of AMS.III.BG, for For the charcoal from coconut husks, bamboo and other purely woody source of biomass, $NCV_{\text{charcoal}} = 29.5$ GJ/tonne. Since the monitoring procedure is deemed feasible, the validation team has accepted the same.
Default net calorific value of charcoal ($NCV_{\text{charcoal, default}} = 29.5$ GJ/tonne)	As per table 3, it can be determined based on appendix of AMS.III.BG. As per appendix, option 1, $NCV_{\text{charcoal, default}} = 29.5$ GJ/tonne
Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass ($f_{\text{NRB, BL, wood}}$) (ex-ante parameter)	As per equation 1 of AMS.III.BG, it will be determined as per procedure mentioned in AMS.I.E v9.0. As per table 10 of AMS.I.E, it will be determined as per the requirements of tool "Calculation of the fraction of non-renewable biomass" v2.0^{16/}. As per para 8 of the tool, fNRB is calculated as follows. $f_{\text{NRB}} = \text{NRB} / (\text{NRB} + \text{RB})$ where NRB -Quantity of non-renewable biomass in the country/region or project area RB - Quantity of renewable biomass in the country/region or project area As per para 16 of the tool, the value of fNRB for the country/region or project area shall be calculated ex ante i.e fNRB value is determined once at the validation stage, thus no monitoring and recalculation of the fNRB value during the crediting period is required. As per the PoA-DD, it will be determined for every CPA before validation. This is in line with para 35 of AMS.I.E v9.0.
Emission factor for the substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers ($EF_{\text{projected_fossil fuel}} = 81.6$ tCO₂/TJ) (ex-ante parameter)	It is sourced from table 4 of AMS.III.BG v3.0.
Specific methane generation for the baseline charcoal generation process in the year y ($SMG_{y,b} = 0.03$ t_{CH₄}/t_{charcoal}) (ex-ante parameter)	It is sourced from equation 1 of AMS.III.BG v3.0.
Factor to account for any legal requirement for capture and destruction of methane in the charcoal production facility ($M_d = 0$) (ex-ante parameter)	As per table 6 of AMS.III.BG, for micro gasifier, it is zero.
Global warming potential of methane applicable to the crediting period ($GWP_{\text{CH}_4} = 25$ tCO₂e/tCH₄) (ex-ante parameter)	CME has considered GWP of methane post 2012 as 25 which is accepted for the second commitment period which is in accordance with decision 4/CMP 7 as prescribed by the "Standard for application of the

	global warming potentials to CDM PA and PoA for the second commitment period of the Kyoto protocol ^{17/n} Version 1.0 (EB 69 Annex 3). Decision 4/CMP 7 refers to table 2.14 of the errata to the contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC and time horizon of 100 years.
Fugitive emissions from operation of charcoal producing facility ($PE_{\text{fugitive},y}$)	As per para 22/equation 2 of AMS.III.BG, $PE_{\text{fugitive},y} = Q_{\text{CCP},i,y} \times GWP_{\text{CH}_4} \times SMG_{y,b} \times f$ Where $Q_{\text{CCP},i,y}$ - Quantity of charcoal type i produced and used in year y GWP_{CH_4} - Global warming potential of methane applicable to the crediting period $SMG_{y,b}$ - Specific methane generation for the baseline charcoal generation process in the year y f - fraction attributed to project charcoal production technology
Quantity of charcoal type i produced and used in year y ($Q_{\text{CCP},i,y}$)	It is already validated as above
Global warming potential of methane applicable to the crediting period (GWP_{CH_4}) = 25 tCO ₂ e/tCH ₄	It is already validated as above
Specific methane generation for the baseline charcoal generation process in the year y ($SMG_{y,b}$) = 0.03 tCH ₄ /t _{charcoal} (ex-ante parameter)	It is already validated as above
Fraction attributed to project charcoal production technology (f) = 0.1 (ex-ante parameter)	As per para 22 of AMS.III.BG, $f = 0.1$
Emissions due to the flare inefficiency in the project charcoal manufacturing plant in the year y ($PE_{\text{flaring},y}$) = 0 tCO ₂ e/ year	As per para 22 of AMS.III.BG v3.0, emissions due to the flare inefficiency in the project charcoal manufacturing plant in the year y determined in accordance with the procedure provided in AMS-III.K. In case captured pyrolysis gas is gainfully used (e.g. as fuel for pre-heating the facility, or for wood drying, or used for production of heat and/or power as in the case of micro-gasifier), then it can be taken as zero.
Project emissions due to fossil fuel consumption in charcoal production facilities in year y ($PE_{\text{FF},y}$) = 0 tCO ₂ e/year	Since there will be no fossil fuel involved in the microgasifier, $PE_{\text{FF},y} = 0$
Project emissions due to electricity consumption in charcoal production facilities in year y ($PE_{\text{El},y}$) = 0 tCO ₂ e/year	Since there will be no electricity involved in the microgasifier, $PE_{\text{FF},y} = 0$
Project emissions due to biomass cultivation in year y ($PE_{\text{BC},y}$)	$PE_{\text{BC},y}$ is not applicable since no biomass will be cultivated for charcoal production since it is produced as a by-product of daily cooking
Leakage emissions (LE_y) = 0 tCO ₂ e/year	As per para 25 of AMS.III.BG v3.0, General guidance on leakage in biomass project activities v3.0 shall be followed to quantify leakages pertaining

	to the use of biomass residues. As per the guidance on leakage in biomass project activities, CME assumed the following 1. Biomass type is biomass from forests. 2. Activity or source =New forest The validation team has accepted the same. For this category, there are two types of emission sources that are potentially significant attributable to the project. 1. Leakage emission due to shift of pre-project activities 2. Leakage emission related to the production of biomass. Since the land was not used or land use did not change due to the implementation of the project activity, the validation team accepted that leakage due to shifts in pre-project activities is zero. Since the project did not use biomass residues for production of biomass, leakage due to production of biomass is also zero. There is no competing use of biomass relevant to the project. Hence leakage is zero.
Emission reduction from AMS.I.E v11.0 component ($ER_{y,AMS.I.E}$)	As per para 29/equation 6 of AMS.I.E v11.0, emission reductions from the use of renewable biomass is calculated as follows $ER_y = BE_y - PE_y - LE_y$ Where BE_y-Baseline emissions PE_y-Project emissions LE_y- Leakage emissions The validation of the same is detailed below.
Baseline emissions (BE_y)	As per para 25/equation 1 of AMS.I.E v11.0, $BE_y = B_y \times f_{NRB} \times NCV_{biomass} \times EF_{projected\ fossil\ fuel}$ Where B_y-Quantity of woody biomass that is substituted or displaced f_{NRB} -Fraction of woody biomass used in the absence of the project activity in year y that can be established as non-renewable biomass $NCV_{biomass}$- Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted $EF_{projected\ fossil\ fuel}$-Emission factor for the substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers The validation of the same is detailed below.
Quantity of woody biomass that is substituted or displaced (B_y)	As per the PoA-DD, if conventional fuel used in some or all of the project cook stoves distributed is replaced by renewable biomass, additional ER are possible. In a CPA it may also be specified that no ERs are claimed from the use of renewable biomass as fuel. As per para 29 of AMS.I.E, B_y is determined based on four options. CME has chosen equation 2. B_y is calculated as the product of the number of households multiplied by the estimate of average

	annual consumption of woody biomass per household that is displaced by the project activity. The average annual consumption of woody biomass per ICS is already monitored as per the requirements of AMS-II.G, as $B_{y=1,new,i,survey}$. Where RB is completely replacing fuelwood used in the ICS, $B_{i,E,y}$ can be determined as: As per equation 2, $B_y = B_{y=1,new,i,survey} \times N_{i,E,y}$ Where $B_{y=1,new,i,survey}$ -Quantity of woody biomass used by project devices in tonnes per device of type i and batch j $N_{i,E,y}$ - Number of appliances exclusively burning renewable biomass The validation of the same is detailed below.
Quantity of woody biomass used by project devices in tonnes per device of type i and batch j ($B_{y=1,new,i,survey}$) (monitored parameter)	It is already validated under AMS.II.G component.
Number of appliances exclusively burning renewable biomass ($N_{i,E,y}$) (monitored parameter)	As per the PoA-DD, $N_{i,E,y}$ will be determined from a database including all ICS users provided with RB during period y . $N_{i,E,y}$ will be a subset of $N_{y,i,j}$, i.e., only ICS users that are also considered for $ER_{II.G,y}$ will be considered for $ER_{i,E,y}$.
Fraction of woody biomass used in the absence of the project activity in year y that can be established as non-renewable biomass (f_{NRB})	It is already validated as above
Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted ($NCV_{biomass}$) =0.0156 TJ/tonne	It is already validated as above
Emission factor for the substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers ($EF_{projected\ fossil\ fuel}$)=63.7 tCO₂/TJ	It is already validated as above
Project emissions (PE_y)	As per para 36 of AMS.I.E v11.0, project emissions from cultivation, use and processing of biomass shall be calculated using the latest version of "TOOL16: Project and leakage emissions from biomass" v4.0^{/13/}. The following sources to be considered. 1.CO₂ emissions from on-site consumption of fossil fuels due to the project activity ($PE_{FF,y}$) 2.CO₂ emissions from electricity consumption by the project activity ($PE_{EC,y}$) 3.Methane emission from solid waste disposal or waste water ($PE_{CH4,y}$) 4.Project emissions related to cultivation of feedstock ($PE_{feedstock,y}$) 5.Project emissions from transportation ($PE_{transporation,y}$)
CO₂ emissions from on-site consumption of fossil fuels due to the project activity ($PE_{FF,y}$) =0 tCO₂e /year	Since there is no fossil fuel used in the project cookstove, $PE_{FF,y}$ =0

CO2 emissions from electricity consumption by the project activity ($PE_{EC,y}$) =0 tCO2e/year	Since there is no electricity used in the project cookstove, $PE_{EC,y}$ =0
Methane emission from solid waste disposal or waste water ($PE_{CH_4,y}$) =0 tCO2e/year	Since biomass is not stored for long time, $PE_{CH_4,y}$ = 0 tCO2e
Project emissions related to cultivation of feedstock($PE_{feedstock,y}$) =0 tCO2e/year	Since there is no cultivation of feedstock, $PE_{feedstock,y}$ =0 tCO2e
Project emissions from transportation ($PE_{transporation,y}$) =0 tCO2e/year	Since the biomass is sourced locally, distance would be less than 200 km, hence $PE_{transporation,y}$ =0
Project emissions (PE_y) =0 tCO2e/year	As per para 36 of AMS.I.E v11.0, project emissions from cultivation, use and processing of biomass shall be calculated using the latest version of "TOOL16: Project and leakage emissions from biomass" v4.0 ^{/18/} .
Leakage emisisions (LE_y)=5% of BE_y	As per para 38&39 of AMS.I.E, the use/diversion of non-renewable woody biomass saved under the project activity by non-project households/users that previously used renewable energy sources. If this leakage assessment quantifies an increase in the use of non-renewable woody biomass used by the non-project households/users that is attributable to the project activity, then B_y is adjusted to account for the quantified leakage. Alternatively, B_y is multiplied by a net to gross adjustment factor of 0.95 to account for leakages, in which case surveys are not required.
Emission reduction from AMS.I.E v9.0 component ($ER_{y,AMS.I.E}$)	As per para 42/equation 11 of AMS.I.E v11.0, emission reductions from the use of renewable biomass is calculated as follows $ER_y = BE_y - PE_y - LE_y$
Emission reduction achieved by the generic CPA 1 ($ER_{CPA1,y}$)	$ER_{CPA1,y} = ER_{AMS.II.G} + ER_{AMS.III.BG} + ER_{AMS.I.E}$

Generic CPA no 2:

Emission reduction achieved by the generic CPA 2 ($ER_{CPA2,y}$)	<u>Generic CPA no 2:</u> This CPA aims at reducing the fuel wood consumption by supplying improved cook stoves to the targeted households replacing the traditional cook stoves. The emission reduction from this component is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.II. G v12.0. The improved cook stoves would also generate charcoal as a by-product. The households would then supply/sale charcoal to the charcoal users/retailers. This would reduce the generation and consumption of conventional charcoal. The emission reduction from this component is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.III. BG v3.0. Hence, $ER_{CPA1,y} = ER_{AMS.II.G} + ER_{AMS.III.BG}$ Where $ER_{AMS.II.G}$ - Emission reduction from AMS.II.G component $ER_{AMS.III.BG}$ - Emission reduction from AMS.III. BG v3.0 component The validation of emission reduction calculation for
--	---

	this CPA is detailed below.
Emission reduction from AMS.II.G component ($ER_{AMS.II.G}$)	As per para 23of AMS.II.G v12.0, it is assumed that in the absence of the project activity, the baseline scenario would be the projected use of fossil fuels to meet similar thermal energy needs as those provided by the project devices. As per para 24/equation 1 of AMS.II.G v12.0, emission reduction is calculated as below $ER_{AMS.II.G,y} = \sum \sum ER_{y,i,j} - LE_y$ Where i-Indices for the situation where more than one type of project device is introduced to replace the pre-project devices j-Indices for the situation where there is more than one batch of project device $ER_{y,i,j}$ -Emission reductions by project device of type i and batch j during year y LE_y -Leakage emissions in the year y The validation of each is detailed below
Emission reductions by project device of type i and batch j during year y ($ER_{y,i,j}$)	As per equation 2 of AMS.II.G v12.0, $ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,savings,i,y} \times N_{y,i,j} \times \mu_y \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{biomass} \times EF_{\text{projected fossil fuel}}$ Where $B_{y,savings,i,y}$ -Quantity of woody biomass that is saved in tonnes per cookstove device of type i and batch j during year y $N_{y,i,j}$ -Number of project devices of type i and batch j operating during year y μ_y -Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y $f_{NRB,y}$ -Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass $NCV_{biomass}$ -Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted $EF_{\text{projected fossil fuel}}$ -Emission factor for the fossil fuels projected to be used for substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers The validation of each is detailed below.
Quantity of woody biomass that is saved in tonnes per cookstove device of type i and batch j during year y ($B_{y,savings,i,y}$)	As per para 28 of AMS.II.G, $B_{y,savings,i,y}$ due to implementation of efficient thermal devices is estimated as per the four options. The validation team has checked the PoA-DD wherein CME has opted for option 3 (Water boiling test). As per para 32 of AMS.II.G v12.0, Under option 3, there are two equations (equation 7 and equation 8). CME considered equation 8. As per equation 8, $B_{y,savings,i,y} = B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey} \times (\eta_{new,i,j} / \eta_{old,i,j} - 1)$ Where $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ -Quantity of woody biomass used by project devices in tonnes per device of type i and batch j $\eta_{new,i,j}$ -Efficiency of the project device i and batch j $\eta_{old,i,j}$ -Efficiency of the old devices being replaced by project devices of type i and batch j The monitoring approach is valid for the PoA level which is in line with para 45 of AMS.II.G v12.0. The validation of each is detailed below.

Quantity of woody biomass used by project devices in tonnes per device of type i and batch j ($B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$) (monitored parameter)	As per para 34 of AMS.II.G v12.0, the calculations in the equations above assume that there is only one device per household. Since the CME is planned to disseminate project cookstove to households at a subsidised price, as a matter of policy, it would provide one project cookstove only to a household. However, if future CME decided to provide cook stoves to community or schools, the same would be adjusted according to the methodologies. No charcoal would be used in the baseline or project cookstove, so para 30 is not applicable. The lifetime of the project cookstove is 7 years as per the manufacturer specification. As per table 18 of AMS.II.G v12.0, the parameter shall be calculated in the first year of the introduction of the devices (e.g. during the first year of the crediting period, $y=1$) through sample measurement campaigns at representative households and/or sample survey. As per the PoA-DD, it would be calculated through sample survey based on number of canisters used per week (fillings) and weight of each canister(load). $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ = number of canisters used per week x weight of each canister or $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey} = \text{fillings}_{y=1} * \text{load}_{y=1}$ Number of canisters would be determined by monitoring survey and weight of canister would be determined during WBT test. Only calibrated equipments would be used for measurements.
Efficiency of the project device i and batch j ($\eta_{new,i,j}$) (monitoring parameter) Loss of efficiency is determined from options a,b,c,d	As per table 14 of AMS.II.G v12.0, Efficiency shall be measured/estimated as per the following: 1.The efficiency of the project devices shall be based on certification by a national standards body or an appropriate certifying agent recognized by that body As per the PoA-DD, the efficiency is tested and confirmed by the testing center of the Ministry of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises. As per table 14 of AMS.II.G v12.0, the sampling test of stoves by such certification bodies/agents or manufacturers shall be conducted following a 90/10 precision in accordance with the "Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities"^{7/} v7.0. However, the following simplified approach may be used, when the efficient cookstoves are produced by a manufacturer with a good quality management system in place to ensure that the individual equipment produced do not vary beyond the range of acceptance limits (e.g. characteristics such as materials, critical dimensions): (i) Conduct a sample test on three cookstoves with three tests conducted for each stove. The test can be carried out by project proponents by themselves or stove manufacturers; (ii) If the standard deviation of the nine test results indicated above is very small and 90/10 precision requirement is met (in this case, the value of the t-distribution for 90 per cent confidence shall be used instead of Z value), the efficiency determined is

	acceptable, otherwise more sample tests would be required until 90/10 precision is met. The loss of efficiency will be determined as per one of the 4 options as specified in para 37a,b,c,d. The parameter is measured by dedicated trained monitoring team based on WBT test under field conditions if option c is chosen. The efficiency of the project devices of the first batch will be monitored annually following the Water Boiling Test protocol version 4.2.3^{17/}. WBT would not account of quantity of charcoal generated. WBTs will be conducted on randomly selected project cookstoves; the sample size of project cookstove testes will be large enough to meet the 90/10 requirements of the methodology. The validation team has interviewed the CME and accepted the monitoring approach as robust/feasible. As per para 37 of AMS.II.G, the loss in efficiency of the project devices i in each batch j due to aging shall be accounted during the monitoring period y. As option 3 was selected, the CME may choose any option mentioned in para 37 to account for the loss in efficiency. The option shall be identified and fixed ex ante in the PDD at the time of registration. As per the PoA-DD, CME has opted for option C i.e., Determination of the rate of efficiency drop for a representative sample of the first batch of project device i in year y and assume that same rate of loss in efficiency applies to all other batches. In other words, it may be assumed that the degradation of efficiency measured in a representative sample of the first batch of project devices i apply to all subsequent batches. The efficiency of the project devices in the first batch has to be monitored annually through representative samples and this rate of loss in efficiency may be applied correspondingly to all batches.
Efficiency of the old devices being replaced by project devices of type i and batch j ($\eta_{old,i,j}$) = 10% (monitored parameter)	As per table 9 of AMS.II.G v12.0, it can be fixed for each individual household as default value. The validation team has interviewed the CME and accepted the value as correct.
Number of project devices of type i and batch j operating during year y ($N_{y,i,j}$) (monitored parameter) Statistically adjusted drop out from total population of ICS in period y ($DO_{II,G,y}$) (monitored parameter)	As per table 11 of AMS.II.G v12.0, it shall be determined measured directly or based on a representative sample. Sampling standard shall be used for determining the sample size to achieve 90/10 confidence precision. If the survey shows 10% as non-operating, then an adjustment factor of 0.9 shall be applied to number of project devices commissioned in a particular batch. As per the PoA-DD, $N_{y,i,j} = N_{soldtotaly,i,j} \times d_{average,y} / mlength_y$ Where $N_{soldtotaly,i,j}$ -total number of ICS type i and batch j sold within monitoring period y It will be measured number of sales contracts stored and the corresponding number of entries of ICS sold in the database

	$d_{average,y}$ - average number of days the ICS sold in period y were operational in period y, derived from sales dates on sales contracts $m_{length,y}$ - length of monitoring period y Statistically adjusted drop out from total population of ICS in period y ($DO_{II,G,y}$) will be determined through sampling survey by dedicated monitoring team. This will be measured every two years as per the PoA-DD. The validation team has specified the sampling plan for this parameter which is correct, feasible.
Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y (μ_y) =1 (monitored parameter)	As per table 9 of AMS.II.G v12.0, as equation 7 is used for calculating $B_{y,savings}$, $\mu_y=1$. Hence accepted by the validation team.
Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass ($f_{NRB,y}$) (ex-ante parameter)	It will be determined as per the requirements of tool "Calculation of the fraction of non-renewable biomass" v2.0^{16/}. As per para 8 of the tool, f_{NRB} is calculated as follows. $f_{NRB} = NRB / (NRB + RB)$ where NRB - Quantity of non-renewable biomass in the country/region or project area RB - Quantity of renewable biomass in the country/region or project area As per para 16 of the tool, the value of f_{NRB} for the country/region or project area shall be calculated ex ante i.e f_{NRB} value is determined once at the validation stage, thus no monitoring and recalculation of the f_{NRB} value during the crediting period is required. As per the PoA-DD, it will be determined for every CPA before validation. This is in line with para 27 of AMS.II.G v12.0.
Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted ($NCV_{biomass}$) =0.0156 TJ/tonne of wood (ex-ante parameter)	It is sourced from para 24/equation 2 of AMS.II.G. Hence accepted.
Emission factor for the fossil fuels projected to be used for substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers ($EF_{projected_fossil\ fuel}$) =63.7 tCO2/TJ	It is sourced from para 24/equation 2 of AMS.II.G. Hence accepted.
Emission reductions by project device of type i and batch j during year y ($ER_{y,i,j}$)	As per equation 2 of AMS.II.G v12.0, $ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,savings,i,j} \times N_{o,i,j} \times n_{y,i,j} \times \mu_y \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{biomass} \times EF_{projected_fossil\ fuel}$ Where: $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ = Quantity of woody biomass that is saved per cookstove device of type i and batch j during year y (tonnes) $f_{NRB,y}$ = Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass (fraction or %) $NCV_{biomass}$ = Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted (IPCC default for

	wood fuel, 0.0156 TJ/tonne, based on the gross weight of the wood that is 'air-dried') $EF_{\text{projected_fossilfuel}}$ = Emission factor of fossil fuels projected to be used to substitute non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers (tCO₂e/TJ). $N_{0,i,j}$ = Number₇ of project devices of type i and batch j commissioned (number) $n_{y,i,j}$ = Proportion of commissioned project devices of type i and batch j ($N_{0,i,j}$) that remain operating in year y (fraction) μ_y = Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y
Leakage emissions per year (LE _y)	As per para 41 of AMS.II.G v12.0, Leakage related to the non-renewable woody biomass saved by the project activity shall be assessed based on ex post surveys of users and the areas from which this woody biomass is sourced. Alternatively, $B_{y,\text{savings},i,y}$ is multiplied by a net to gross adjustment factor of 0.95 to account for leakages, in which case surveys are not required. As per para 41 of AMS.II.G v12.0, $B_{y,\text{savings},i,y}$ is multiplied by a net to gross adjustment factor of 0.95 to account for leakages. As per para 42, Project activities switching from baseline device using firewood to efficient project device using charcoal or switching from firewood to efficient project device using processed biomass (briquette, pellets, and woodchips) shall take into account the leakage effects related to the charcoal or processed biomass production. Since this is not the case in this PoA, leakage from this source is zero.
Emission reductions by project device of type i and batch j during year y (ER _{y,i,j})	As per equation 2 of AMS.II.G v12.0 can be written as $ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,\text{savings},i,y} \times 0.95 \times N_{y,i,j} \times \mu_y \times f_{\text{NRB},y} \times \text{NCV}_{\text{biomass}} \times EF_{\text{projected fossil fuel}}$
Rated thermal capacity as per manufacturer specification (ex-ante parameter)	This is sourced from technical specification of project cookstove. Hence accepted.
Number of hours of utilization of the device during the year y (monitoring parameter)	As per table 10 of AMS.II.G v12.0, this parameter is monitored at least once in every two years. The biennial survey shall follow a 95 per cent confidence interval and a 10 per cent margin of error.
Life span	As per table 18 of AMS.II.G v12.0, since option 3 is chosen by the CME for determining $B_{y,\text{savings},y}$, the operating life time of the project device. should be monitored. Hence accepted.
Date of commissioning of batch j	As per table 19 of AMS.II.G v12.0, to establish the date of commissioning, the CME may opt to group the devices in "batches" and the latest date of commissioning of a device within the batch shall be

	used as the date of commissioning for the entire batch. Hence accepted.
Date of commissioning of project device <i>i</i>	It is determined at the time of sale of project cookstove. It is fixed and recorded at the time of distribution of project cookstove.
Emission reduction from AMS.III. BG v3.0 component ($ER_{AMS.III. BG,y}$)	As per para 21 of AMS.III.BG v3.0, for the project technology equipped with capture and destruction of the pyrolysis gases, including micro-gasifier, emission reductions are calculated as follows. $ER_{AMS.III. BG,y} = \sum Q_{CCP,i,y} \times [(CF \times NCV_{wood} \times NCV_{charcoal,i} / NCV_{charcoal,default} \times f_{NRB,BL,wood} \times EF_{projected_fossil\ fuel} + (SMG_{y,b} - M_d) \times (1 - f_{NRB,BL,wood}) \times GWP_{CH4}] - PE_{y,fugitive} - PE_{y,flaring} - PE_{FF,y} - PE_{EI,y} - PE_{BC,y}$ Where $Q_{CCP,i,y}$ -Quantity of charcoal type <i>i</i> produced and used in year <i>y</i> CF-Default wood to charcoal conversion factor NCV_{wood} -Net calorific value of wood $NCV_{charcoal,i}$ -Net calorific value of the charcoal type <i>i</i> produced during the project $NCV_{charcoal,default}$ -Default net calorific value of charcoal $f_{NRB,BL,wood}$ -Fraction of biomass of type <i>i</i> used in the absence of the project activity that can be established as non-renewable biomass $EF_{projected_fossil\ fuel}$ -Emission factor for the substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers $SMG_{y,b}$ -Specific methane generation for the baseline charcoal generation process in the year <i>y</i> M_d -Factor to account for any legal requirement for capture and destruction of methane in the charcoal production facility GWP_{CH4} -Global warming potential of methane applicable to the crediting period $PE_{y,fugitive}$ -Fugitive emissions from operation of charcoal producing facility $PE_{y,flaring}$ -Emissions due to the flare inefficiency in the project charcoal manufacturing plant in the year <i>y</i> $PE_{FF,y}$ -Project emissions due to fossil fuel consumption in charcoal production facilities in year <i>y</i> $PE_{EI,y}$ -Project emissions due to electricity consumption in charcoal production facilities in year <i>y</i> $PE_{BC,y}$ -Project emissions due to biomass cultivation in year <i>y</i> The validation of the same is detailed below.
Quantity of charcoal type <i>i</i> produced and used in year <i>y</i> ($Q_{CCP,i,y}$) (monitored parameter)	As per table 7 of AMS.III.BG v3.0, The parameter can be monitored according to one of the following options: Option1: Direct measurement (e.g. use of a scale) of the weight of charcoal products supplied; Option 2: Calculation of the total weight of charcoal supplied; based on the total number of bags supplied and the average weight of charcoal product per bag. The weight of charcoal products per bag is determined on sample basis in accordance with the sampling standard (e.g. using systematic sampling

	method). Option 2 can only be used if Option 1 is not available. Charcoal generated from only woody biomass is eligible for the case of micro-gasifier As per the PoA-DD, the parameter will be monitored according to one of the following options: Option1: Direct measurement (e.g. use of a scale) of the weight of charcoal products supplied; at the site of the charcoal users or retailers Option 2: Calculation of the total weight of charcoal supplied; based on the total number of bags supplied (e.g. using systematic sampling method). Option 2 will only be used if Option 1 is not available. $Q_{CCP,i,y}$ will be derived from invoices/receipts of sales of charcoal generated in the CPA to charcoal users and retailers. If feasible, the weight of charcoal delivered will be indicated on invoices, requiring the availability of calibrated weighbridges or other scales. Where invoicing to charcoal buyers cannot be based on the exact weight but on the number of bags delivered, the following formula will apply: $Q_{CCP,i,y} = \text{weightbags}_{y,i} * \text{nbags}_{y,i}$ Where: $\text{weightbags}_{y,i}$ - average weight of bags of charcoal type i in period y This will be determined on sample basis in accordance with the sampling standard $\text{nbags}_{y,i}$ - total number of bags of charcoal type i in period y This will be determined based on invoices/receipts of charcoal buyers. Charcoal is sold to households, SMEs, group of households served by a charcoal market.
Default wood to charcoal conversion factor (CF) =6 (ex-ante parameter)	It is sourced from table 1 of AMS.III.BG. It is fixed for the crediting period.
Net calorific value of wood (NCV_{wood})=0.015 TJ/tonne of wood	It is sourced from table 2 of AMS.III.BG. It is fixed for the crediting period.
Net calorific value of the charcoal type i produced during the project (NCV_{charcoal})=29.5 GJ/tonne (monitored parameter)	As per table 8 of AMS.III.BG, it will be monitored through two options available to the CME. As per option 1, during the first year of the crediting period measurement on the charcoal calorific value of charcoal produced in the cookstove will be undertaken in laboratories according to relevant national/international standards. Samples will be taken monthly during one year from the stocks of charcoal collected from users before selling it to charcoal users/retailers. . As per the table, in case of charcoal generated from micro gasifier, Option 1 above or option 2 in 'appendix 1 of AMS.III.BG can be used. As per option 1-deemed value, equation 1 of

	appendix of AMS.III.BG, for For the charcoal from coconut husks, bamboo and other purely woody source of biomass, $NCV_{\text{charcoal}} = 29.5$ GJ/tonne. Since the monitoring procedure is deemed feasible, the validation team has accepted the same.
Default net calorific value of charcoal ($NCV_{\text{charcoal, default}} = 29.5$ GJ/tonne)	As per table 3, it can be determined based on appendix of AMS.III.BG. As per appendix, option 1, $NCV_{\text{charcoal, default}} = 29.5$ GJ/tonne
Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass ($f_{\text{NRB, BL, wood}}$) (ex-ante parameter)	As per equation 1 of AMS.III.BG, it will be determined as per procedure mentioned in AMS.I.E v9.0. As per table 10 of AMS.I.E, it will be determined as per the requirements of tool "Calculation of the fraction of non-renewable biomass" v2.0^{14/}. As per para 8 of the tool, f_{NRB} is calculated as follows. $f_{\text{NRB}} = \text{NRB} / (\text{NRB} + \text{RB})$ where NRB -Quantity of non-renewable biomass in the country/region or project area RB - Quantity of renewable biomass in the country/region or project area As per para 16 of the tool, the value of f_{NRB} for the country/region or project area shall be calculated ex ante i.e f_{NRB} value is determined once at the validation stage, thus no monitoring and recalculation of the f_{NRB} value during the crediting period is required. As per the PoA-DD, it will be determined for every CPA before validation. This is in line with para 35 of AMS.I.E v9.0.
Emission factor for the substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers ($EF_{\text{projected_fossil fuel}} = 81.6$ tCO₂/TJ) (ex-ante parameter)	It is sourced from table 4 of AMS.III.BG v3.0.
Specific methane generation for the baseline charcoal generation process in the year y ($SMG_{y,b} = 0.03$ t_{CH₄}/t_{charcoal}) (ex-ante parameter)	It is sourced from equation 1 of AMS.III.BG v3.0.
Factor to account for any legal requirement for capture and destruction of methane in the charcoal production facility ($M_d = 0$) (ex-ante parameter)	As per table 6 of AMS.III.BG, for micro gasifier, it is zero.
Global warming potential of methane applicable to the crediting period ($GWP_{\text{CH}_4} = 25$ tCO₂e/tCH₄) (ex-ante parameter)	CME has considered GWP of methane post 2012 as 25 which is accepted for the second commitment period which is in accordance with decision 4/CMP 7 as prescribed by the "Standard for application of the global warming potentials to CDM PA and PoA for the second commitment period of the Kyoto protocol"^{15/} Version 1.0 (EB 69 Annex 3). Decision 4/CMP 7 refers to table 2.14 of the errata to the contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC and time horizon of 100 years.

Fugitive emissions from operation of charcoal producing facility ($PE_{fugitive,y}$)	As per para 22/equation 2 of AMS.III.BG, $PE_{fugitive,y} = Q_{CCP,i,y} \times GWP_{CH_4} \times SMG_{y,b} \times f$ Where $Q_{CCP,i,y}$ - Quantity of charcoal type i produced and used in year y GWP_{CH_4} - Global warming potential of methane applicable to the crediting period $SMG_{y,b}$ - Specific methane generation for the baseline charcoal generation process in the year y f -fraction attributed to project charcoal production technology
Quantity of charcoal type i produced and used in year y ($Q_{CCP,i,y}$)	It is already validated as above
Global warming potential of methane applicable to the crediting period (GWP_{CH_4}) =25 tCO ₂ e/tCH ₄	It is already validated as above
Specific methane generation for the baseline charcoal generation process in the year y ($SMG_{y,b}$) =0.03 t _{CH₄} /t _{charcoal} (ex-ante parameter)	It is already validated as above
Fraction attributed to project charcoal production technology (f) =0.1 (ex-ante parameter)	As per para 22 of AMS.III.BG, $f=0.1$
Emissions due to the flare inefficiency in the project charcoal manufacturing plant in the year y ($PE_{flaring,y}$) =0 tCO ₂ e/ year	As per para 22 of AMS.III.BG v3.0, emissions due to the flare inefficiency in the project charcoal manufacturing plant in the year y determined in accordance with the procedure provided in AMS-III.K. In case captured pyrolysis gas is gainfully used (e.g. as fuel for pre-heating the facility, or for wood drying, or used for production of heat and/or power as in the case of micro-gasifier), then it can be taken as zero.
Project emissions due to fossil fuel consumption in charcoal production facilities in year y ($PE_{FF,y}$)=0 tCO ₂ e/year	Since there will be no fossil fuel involved in the microgasifier, $PE_{FF,y}=0$
Project emissions due to electricity consumption in charcoal production facilities in year y ($PE_{El,y}$)=0 tCO ₂ e/year	Since there will be no electricity involved in the microgasifier, $PE_{FF,y}=0$
Project emissions due to biomass cultivation in year y ($PE_{BC,y}$)	$PE_{BC,y}$ is not applicable since no biomass will be cultivated for charcoal production since it is produced as a by-product of daily cooking
Leakage emissions (LE_y)=0 tCO ₂ e/year	As per para 25 of AMS.III.BG v3.0, General guidance on leakage in biomass project activities v3.0 shall be followed to quantify leakages pertaining to the use of biomass residues. As per the guidance on leakage in biomass project activities, CME assumed the following 1. Biomass type is biomass from forests. 2. Activity or source =New forest The validation team has accepted the same. For this category, there are two types of emission sources that are potentially significant attributable to the project.

	1. Leakage emission due to shift of pre-project activities 2. Leakage emission related to the production of biomass. Since the land was not used or land use did not change due to the implementation of the project activity, the validation team accepted that leakage due to shifts in pre-project activities is zero. Since the project did not use biomass residues for production of biomass, leakage due to production of biomass is also zero. There is no competing use of biomass relevant to the project. Hence leakage is zero.
Emission reduction achieved by the generic CPA 1 ($ER_{CPA2,y}$)	$ER_{CPA2,y} = ER_{AMS.II.G} + ER_{AMS.III.BG}$

Generic CPA no 3:

Emission reduction achieved by the generic CPA 3 ($ER_{CPA3,y}$)	Generic CPA no 3: This CPA aims at reducing the fuel wood consumption by supplying improved cook stoves to the targeted households replacing the traditional cook stoves. The emission reduction from this component is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.II. G v12.0. Hence, $ER_{CPA3,y} = ER_{AMS.II.G}$ Where $ER_{AMS.II.G}$ - Emission reduction from AMS.II.G component The validation of emission reduction calculation for this CPA is detailed below.
Emission reduction from AMS.II.G component ($ER_{AMS.II.G}$)	As per para 23 of AMS.II.G v12.0, it is assumed that in the absence of the project activity, the baseline scenario would be the projected use of fossil fuels to meet similar thermal energy needs as those provided by the project devices. As per para 24/equation 1 of AMS.II.G v12.0, emission reduction is calculated as below $ER_{AMS.II.G,y} = \sum \sum ER_{y,i,j} - LE_y$ Where i-Indices for the situation where more than one type of project device is introduced to replace the pre-project devices j-Indices for the situation where there is more than one batch of project device $ER_{y,i,j}$ -Emission reductions by project device of type i and batch j during year y LE_y -Leakage emissions in the year y The validation of each is detailed below
Emission reductions by project device of type i and batch j during year y ($ER_{y,i,j}$)	As per equation 2 of AMS.II.G v12.0, $ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,savings,i,y} \times N_{y,i,j} \times \mu_y \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{biomass} \times EF_{projected\ fossil\ fuel}$ Where $B_{y,savings,i,y}$ -Quantity of woody biomass that is saved in tonnes per cookstove device of type i and batch j during year y

	$N_{y,i,j}$ -Number of project devices of type i and batch j operating during year y μ_y -Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y $f_{NRB,y}$ -Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass $NCV_{biomass}$ -Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted $EF_{projected\ fossil\ fuel}$ -Emission factor for the fossil fuels projected to be used for substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers The validation of each is detailed below.
Quantity of woody biomass that is saved in tonnes per cookstove device of type i and batch j during year y ($B_{y,savings,i,y}$)	As per para 28 of AMS.II.G, $B_{y,savings,i,y}$ due to implementation of efficient thermal devices is estimated as per the four options. The validation team has checked the PoA-DD wherein CME has opted for option 3 (Water boiling test). As per para 32 of AMS.II.G v12.0, Under option 3, there are two equations (equation 7 and equation 8). CME considered equation 8. As per equation 8, $B_{y,savings,i,y} = B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey} \times (\eta_{new,i,j} / \eta_{old,i,j} - 1)$ Where $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ -Quantity of woody biomass used by project devices in tonnes per device of type i and batch j $\eta_{new,i,j}$ -Efficiency of the project device i and batch j $\eta_{old,i,j}$ -Efficiency of the old devices being replaced by project devices of type i and batch j The monitoring approach is valid for the PoA level which is in line with para 45 of AMS.II.G v10.0. The validation of each is detailed below.
Quantity of woody biomass used by project devices in tonnes per device of type i and batch j ($B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$) (monitored parameter)	As per para 34 of AMS.II.G v12.0, the calculations in the equations above assume that there is only one device per household. Since the CME is planned to disseminate project cookstove to households at a subsidised price, as a matter of policy, it would provide one project cookstove only to a household. However, if future CME decided to provide project cook stoves to community or schools, the same would be adjusted accordingly as per the methodology. No charcoal would be used in the baseline or project cookstove, so para 30 is not applicable. The lifetime of the project cookstove is 7 years as per the manufacturer specification. As per table 18 of AMS.II.G v10.0, the parameter shall be calculated in the first year of the introduction of the devices (e.g. during the first year of the crediting period, $y=1$) through sample measurement campaigns at representative households and/or sample survey. As per the PoA-DD, it would be calculated through sample survey based on number of canisters used per week (fillings) and weight of each canister(load). $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ = number of canisters used per week x weight of each canister or $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey} = fillings_{y=1} *$

	load_{y=1} Number of canisters would be determined by monitoring survey and weight of canister would be determined during WBT test. Only calibrated equipments would be used for measurements.
Efficiency of the project device i and batch j ($\eta_{new,i,j}$) (monitoring parameter) Loss of efficiency is determined from options a,b,c,d	As per table 14 of AMS.II.G v12.0, Efficiency shall be measured/estimated as per the following: 1.The efficiency of the project devices shall be based on certification by a national standards body or an appropriate certifying agent recognized by that body As per the PoA-DD, the efficiency is tested and confirmed by the testing center of the Ministry of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises. As per table 14 of AMS.II.G v12.0, the sampling test of stoves by such certification bodies/agents or manufacturers shall be conducted following a 90/10 precision in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities. However, the following simplified approach may be used, when the efficient cookstoves are produced by a manufacturer with a good quality management system in place to ensure that the individual equipment produced do not vary beyond the range of acceptance limits (e.g. characteristics such as materials, critical dimensions): (i) Conduct a sample test on three cookstoves with three tests conducted for each stove. The test can be carried out by project proponents by themselves or stove manufacturers; (ii) If the standard deviation of the nine test results indicated above is very small and 90/10 precision requirement is met (in this case, the value of the t-distribution for 90 per cent confidence shall be used instead of Z value), the efficiency determined is acceptable, otherwise more sample tests would be required until 90/10 precision is met. The loss of efficiency will be determined as per one of the 4 options as specified in para 37a,b,c,d. The parameter is measured by dedicated trained monitoring team based on WBT test under field conditions if option c is chosen.. The efficiency of the project devices of the first batch will be monitored annually following the Water Boiling Test protocol version 4.2.3. WBT would not account of quantity of charcoal generated. WBTs will be conducted on randomly selected project cookstoves; the sample size of project cookstove testes will be large enough to meet the 90/10 requirements of the methodology. The validation team has interviewed the CME and accepted the monitoring approach as robust/feasible. As per para 37 of AMS.II.G, the loss in efficiency of the project devices i in each batch j due to aging shall be accounted during the monitoring period y. As option 3 was selected, the CME may choose any option mentioned in para 37 to account for the loss in efficiency. The option shall be identified and fixed ex ante in the PDD at the time of registration. As per the PoA-DD, CME has opted for option C i.e., Determination of the rate of efficiency drop for a

	representative sample of the first batch of project device i in year y and assume that same rate of loss in efficiency applies to all other batches. In other words, it may be assumed that the degradation of efficiency measured in a representative sample of the first batch of project devices i apply to all subsequent batches. The efficiency of the project devices in the first batch has to be monitored annually through representative samples and this rate of loss in efficiency may be applied correspondingly to all batches.
Efficiency of the old devices being replaced by project devices of type i and batch j ($\eta_{old,i,j}$) = 10% (monitored parameter)	As per table 17 of AMS.II.G v12.0, it can be fixed for each individual household as default value. The validation team has interviewed the CME and accepted the value as correct.
Number of project devices of type i and batch j operating during year y ($N_{y,i,j}$) (monitored parameter) Statistically adjusted drop out from total population of ICS in period y ($DO_{II,G,y}$) (monitored parameter)	As per table 8 of AMS.II.G v12.0, it shall be determined measured directly or based on a representative sample. Sampling standard shall be used for determining the sample size to achieve 90/10 confidence precision. If the survey shows 10% as non-operating, then an adjustment factor of 0.9 shall be applied to number of project devices commissioned in a particular batch. As per the PoA-DD, $N_{y,i,j} = N_{soldtotaly,i,j} \times d_{average,y} / mlength_y$ Where $N_{soldtotaly,i,j}$ -total number of ICS type i and batch j sold within monitoring period y It will be measured number of sales contracts stored and the corresponding number of entries of ICS sold in the database $d_{average,y}$ - average number of days the ICS sold in period y were operational in period y, derived from sales dates on sales contracts $mlength_y$ - length of monitoring period y Statistically adjusted drop out from total population of ICS in period y ($DO_{II,G,y}$) will be determined through sampling survey by dedicated monitoring team. This will be measured every two years as per the PoA-DD. The validation team has specified the sampling plan for this parameter which is correct, feasible.
Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y (μ_y) =1 (monitored parameter)	As per table 12 of AMS.II.G v12.0, as equation 8 is used for calculating $B_{y,savings}$, $\mu_y=1$. Hence accepted by the validation team.
Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass ($f_{NRB,y}$) (ex-ante parameter)	It will be determined as per the requirements of tool "Calculation of the fraction of non-renewable biomass" v2.0^{14/}. As per para 8 of the tool, f_{NRB} is calculated as follows. $f_{NRB} = NRB / (NRB + RB)$ where NRB -Quantity of non-renewable biomass in the country/region or project area RB - Quantity of renewable biomass in the country/region or project area

	As per para 16 of the tool, the value of fNRB for the country/region or project area shall be calculated ex ante i.e fNRB value is determined once at the validation stage, thus no monitoring and recalculation of the fNRB value during the crediting period is required. As per the PoA-DD, it will be determined for every CPA before validation. This is in line with para 44 & para 45 of AMS.II.G v12.0.
Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted ($NCV_{biomass}$) =0.0156 TJ/tonne of wood (ex-ante parameter)	It is sourced from para 24/equation 2 of AMS.II.G. Hence accepted.
Emission factor for the fossil fuels projected to be used for substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers ($EF_{projected_fossil\ fuel}$) =63.7 tCO₂/TJ	It is sourced from para 24/equation 2 of AMS.II.G. Hence accepted.
Emission reductions by project device of type <i>i</i> and batch <i>j</i> during year <i>y</i> ($ER_{y,i,j}$)	As per equation 2 of AMS.II.G v12.0, $ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,savings,i,j} \times N_{0,i,j} \times n_{y,i,j} \times \mu_y \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{biomass} \times EF_{projected_fossil\ fuel}$ Where: $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ = Quantity of woody biomass that is saved per cookstove device of type <i>i</i> and batch <i>j</i> during year <i>y</i> (tonnes) $f_{NRB,y}$ = Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass⁶ (fraction or %) $NCV_{biomass}$ = Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted (IPCC default for wood fuel, 0.0156 TJ/tonne, based on the gross weight of the wood that is 'air-dried') $EF_{projected_fossilfuel}$ = Emission factor of fossil fuels projected to be used to substitute non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers (tCO₂e/TJ). $N_{0,i,j}$ = Number⁷ of project devices of type <i>i</i> and batch <i>j</i> commissioned (number) $n_{y,i,j}$ = Proportion of commissioned project devices of type <i>i</i> and batch <i>j</i> ($N_{0,i,j}$) that remain operating in year <i>y</i> (fraction) μ_y = Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year <i>y</i>
Leakage emissions per year (LE_y)	As per para 41 of AMS.II.G v12.0, Leakage related to the non-renewable woody biomass saved by the project activity shall be assessed based on ex post surveys of users and the areas from which this woody biomass is sourced. Alternatively, $B_{y,savings,i,y}$ is multiplied by a net to gross adjustment factor of 0.95 to account for leakages, in which case surveys are not required. As per para 43 of AMS.II.G v12.0, $B_{y,savings,i,y}$ is

	multiplied by a net to gross adjustment factor of 0.95 to account for leakages. As per para 41, Project activities switching from baseline device using firewood to efficient project device using charcoal or switching from firewood to efficient project device using processed biomass (briquette, pellets, and woodchips) shall take into account the leakage effects related to the charcoal or processed biomass production. Since this is not the case in this PoA, leakage from this source is zero.
Emission reductions by project device of type i and batch j during year y ($ER_{y,i,j}$)	As per equation 2 of AMS.II.G v12.0 can be written as $ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,savings,i,j} \times N_{0,i,j} \times n_{y,i,j} \times \mu_y \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{biomass} \times EF_{projected_fossil\ fuel}$ Where: $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ = Quantity of woody biomass that is saved per cookstove device of type i and batch j during year y (tonnes) $f_{NRB,y}$ = Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass₆ (fraction or %) $NCV_{biomass}$ = Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted (IPCC default for wood fuel, 0.0156 TJ/tonne, based on the gross weight of the wood that is 'air-dried') $EF_{projected_fossil\ fuel}$ = Emission factor of fossil fuels projected to be used to substitute non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers (tCO₂e/TJ). $N_{0,i,j}$ = Number₇ of project devices of type i and batch j commissioned (number) $n_{y,i,j}$ = Proportion of commissioned project devices of type i and batch j ($N_{0,i,j}$) that remain operating in year y (fraction) μ_y = Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y
Rated thermal capacity as per manufacturer specification (ex-ante parameter)	This is sourced from technical specification of project cookstove. Hence accepted.
Number of hours of utilization of the device during the year y (monitoring parameter)	As per table 10 of AMS.II.G v12.0, this parameter is monitored at least once in every two years. The biennial survey shall follow a 95 per cent confidence interval and a 10 per cent margin of error.
Life span	As per table 18 of AMS.II.G v12.0, since option 3 is chosen by the CME for determining $B_{y,savings,y}$, the operating life time of the project device. should be monitored. Hence accepted.
Date of commissioning of batch j	As per table 19 of AMS.II.G v12.0, to establish the date of commissioning, the CME may opt to group the devices in "batches" and the latest date of commissioning of a device within the batch shall be used as the date of commissioning for the entire

	batch. Hence accepted.
Date of commissioning of project device i	It is determined at the time of sale of project cookstove. It is fixed and recorded at the time of distribution of project cookstove.
Emission reduction achieved by the generic CPA 3 ($ER_{CPA3,y}$)	$ER_{CPA3,y} = ER_{AMS,II,G}$

Appendix 7: Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
1. EFFECTIVE DATE, SCOPE AND APPLICABILITY 1.1 EFFECTIVE DATE 1.1.1 Gold Standard for the Global Goals is effective for all projects seeking Gold Standard Certification as of 24th October 2019. For projects applying previous versions of Gold Standard please refer to the Transition Requirements.	The project has applied Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements^{/1/} v1.2. Hence accepted.
1.2 SCOPE 1.2.1 The Principles & Requirements set out in this document are applicable to all Project Developers and the Projects or Programmes* for which Gold Standard Certification is sought. It also represents the Requirements against which Gold Standard Validation and Verification Bodies (hereafter VVBs) shall Validate or Verify the Project, in conjunction with the Validation & Verification Body Requirements and any applicable Conformity Criteria. <i>*Note that for brevity, the standard refers to Projects throughout the text; this may be read as Projects, Programmes or interventions unless explicitly stated.</i>	The scope of the work is validation of design certification of the project. PP has satisfied all the requirements of this Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements^{/1/} v1.2.
1.2.2 The Requirements shall be applied as per the relevant sections contained within this document and those associated or referenced.	The scope of the work is validation opinion of design certification of the project. Hence requirements pertaining to validation of design certification applies to the project.
1.2.3 From time to time Gold Standard may issue updates, changes, clarifications or corrections to the Requirements. These shall be published to the Gold Standard Website. Gold Standard provides notice of all such changes and specific dates for implementation and applicability. It is the responsibility of the Project Developer to remain up to date and to apply all such updates as required for its Project by checking the rule updates section in the Gold Standard Website, regardless of whether a notification of change has been received.	PP has applied all the latest version of the GS requirements (v1.2) and its associated requirements. Hence accepted.
1.2.4 Stakeholders may submit suggested updates, edits, changes or additions to Gold Standard for the Global Goals by sending an email to help@goldstandard.org.	This is not relevant to the scope of the project.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
Such requests shall be considered as per the Standards Setting Procedure. Gold Standard reserves the right to accept or reject such submissions at its own discretion.	
1.2.5 In some circumstances Gold Standard allows modules or elements from other, partner or endorsed Standards (for example Fairtrade, FSC, CDM) to be considered as evidence that may be used to demonstrate conformity to certain Gold Standard Requirements. In such cases the Gold Standard Requirements still apply but, to help streamline processes and for practicality, shared evidence may be provided.	PP has applied under GS and CDM GHG programs. PP has applied CDM approved AMS.II.G v12.0, AMS.III.BG v3.0, AMS.I.E v11.0 for emission reduction calculation. For additionality, PP has used small scale and microscale additionality tool to demonstrate additionality.
1.2.6 The Gold Standard rules are interpreted in accordance with the Standard's core principles of fairness, reliability, conservativeness and pragmatism.	The validation team has also interpreted the Gold Standard rules in accordance with the core principles of fairness, reliability, conservativeness and pragmatism.
1.3 APPLICABILITY 1.3.1 All Projects shall apply the Principles & Requirements and any associated documents.	The project has applied Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2. Hence accepted.
1.3.2 All Projects shall also apply the Activity Requirements related to the project type – unless stated otherwise. If no Activity Requirements exist for the proposed project type, then the Requirements shall be as per this document.	PP has satisfied the requirements “GS Community Services activity requirements” v1.2. The validation opinion of the same is detailed in Appendix 8 of this report.
1.3.3 In addition to 1.3.1 and 1.3.2, Projects that seek issuance of Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products shall also follow the applicable Gold Standard Approved Impact Quantification Methodology and related Product Requirements.	PP has applied CDM approved AMS.II.G v12.0, AMS.III.BG v3.0, AMS.I.E v11.0 for emission reduction calculation. PP did not follow the applicable Gold Standard Approved Impact Quantification Methodology. PP has satisfied “GHG emissions reduction & sequestration product requirements” v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019. The validation opinion of the same is detailed in Appendix 9 of this report.
2. CERTIFICATION TYPES This section provides an overview of the types of Gold Standard Certification outcomes. It should be read in conjunction with the Claims Guidelines which provides further guidance as to the application and communication around Gold Standard Project and Impact Certification.	The project has applied for GS design certification/ Impact certification. The validation opinion of the Claims Guidelines is detailed in Appendix 10 of this report. .
2.1 GOLD STANDARD CERTIFIED PROJECT DESIGN 2.1.1 Gold Standard Certified Project Design status is achieved by successfully undergoing Validation and Design Review (Design Certification), which means: (a) The project design and planning has met Gold Standard for Global Goals Requirements, including Safeguarding Principles, Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement, and Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) requirements and has developed a	The project is undergoing project design status only. The scope of the EPIC's validation process involves how the project design and planning is going to meet Gold Standard for Global Goals Requirements, including Safeguarding Principles, Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement, and Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) requirements. PP has developed a compliant Monitoring Plan to be used during the crediting period.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
compliant Monitoring Plan.	
(b) The project design, monitoring plan and ex-ante impact assessment have been validated by an accredited, approved third party VVB. (c) Following this, the project has been reviewed by Gold Standard and is subject to an over-arching independent review by the Gold Standard Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and NGO Supporters. (d) It does not mean or imply that any impacts have been realised or will be realised or have been verified by a VVB or certified by Gold Standard. (e) To certify that impacts have been realised, a project shall undergo Performance Certification.	EPIC has been accredited by GS for validation of projects undergoing project design status. EPIC accredited for validation of community services projects. https://www.goldstandard.org/resources/approved-auditors
2.2 GOLD STANDARD CERTIFIED PROJECT 2.2.1 Gold Standard Certified Project status is achieved by successfully undergoing Verification and performance review (Performance Certification), which means: (a) The project has followed a Monitoring Plan approved at the time of Design Certification and has submitted Monitoring Report for Verification. (b) The project and its Certified SDG Impacts have been validated and verified as required by an accredited, approved third party VVB. (c) Following this, the project has been reviewed by Gold Standard and is subject to an over-arching independent review by the Gold Standard Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and NGO Supporters. (d) Any Certified SDG Impacts stated to have been achieved are real. (e) A project may be issued Certified Impact Statements and Products such as Gold Standard Verified Emission Reductions (VERs). This is subject to successful Performance Certification of the Project's conformity to applicable Gold Standard Impact Quantification Methodology and Product Requirements. (f) The Project is also able to promote its claims in accordance with the Claims Guidelines.	The project is undergoing project design status only. The scope of the EPIC's validation process involves how the project design and planning is going to meet Gold Standard for Global Goals Requirements.
2.2.2 All projects from Listed status and beyond, including Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products are captured on the Gold Standard Impact Registry and are publicly and transparently available to all to review.	The project is listed on GS website. https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects/details/2621
2.3 STACKING 2.3.1 The Project Developer may potentially	PP has applied CDM approved AMS.II.G v120.0, AMS.III.BG v3.0, AMS.I.E v11.0 for emission reduction

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
pursue any number and combination of Certified Impact Statements or Products, provided that: (a) All Requirements in this document and in the applicable Gold Standard approved Methodology and/or Product Requirements are fully met.	calculation. PP did not follow the applicable Gold Standard Approved Impact Quantification Methodology. PP has satisfied "GHG emissions reduction & sequestration product requirements" v1.2 effective 24th October 2019. The validation opinion of the same is detailed in Appendix 9 of this report
(b) The Methodology and/or Product Requirements do not stipulate that the issuance of a given combination of Impact Statements and Products is ineligible under Gold Standard. Such details are confirmed within the specific guidelines, Impact Quantification Methodologies or Product Requirements.	Since the applied methodology and/or Product Requirements do not stipulate that the issuance of a given combination of Impact Statements and Products is ineligible under Gold Standard, the validation team has accepted.
(c) All necessary legal terms and conditions are fully executed and complied with. It is noted that certain Product Requirements may impose particular legal requirements/come with Product-specific terms and conditions and other legal documents, that shall be completed.	PP has satisfied "GHG emissions reduction & sequestration product requirements" v1.2 effective 24th October 2019. The validation opinion of the same is detailed in Appendix 9 of this report. All necessary legal terms and conditions are fully executed and complied with by the project.
2.3.2 Project Developers and funders/buyers of Impact Statements and Products shall adhere to the Claims Guidelines as appropriate to the status of the Project. This defines and directs the use of claims made in relation to Gold Standard Certification.	The project has applied for GS design certification/ Impact certification. The validation opinion of the GS Claims Guidelines is detailed in Appendix 10 of this report.
2.3.3 It is possible to change the project design after Design Certification to include more Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products as part of the Project (Annex A). However Impact Statements or Products for previously issued monitoring periods cannot be retroactively issued, unless stated otherwise in Activity or Product Requirements.	The scope of the validation involves design certification only and there is no project design change. Hence this is not applicable and requirements of Annex A of Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2.
3. GENERAL ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA 3.1.1 The following General Eligibility Criteria applies to all projects seeking Gold Standard Certification: (a) Types of Project: Eligible projects shall include physical action/implementation on the ground. Pre-identified eligible project types are identified in the Eligibility Principles and Requirements section.	The purpose of the proposed national level Programme of Activities (PoA) is to reduce fuel wood consumption of traditional stove users by disseminating project cook stoves and the the consumption of conventional charcoal by traditional charcoal users shall be reduced by providing them charcoal generated in project cook stoves. The PoA also reduces fuel wood consumption by providing users with 100% renewable biomass as a fuel, such as waste wood from plantations in India. The validation team has confirmed correctness and accuracy of project design of major equipments, processes, energy requirements of the PoA. The validation team based on the review of PoA- DD, has confirmed the PoA contains 3 generic CPAs. The description of the same is briefed below. <u>Generic CPA no 1:</u> This aims at reducing the fuel wood consumption by supplying improved cook stoves to the targeted households replacing the traditional cook stoves. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
	the applied methodology AMS.II. G v12.0. The improved cook stoves would also generate charcoal as a by-product. The households would then supply/sale charcoal to the charcoal users/retailers. This would reduce the generation and consumption of conventional charcoal. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.III. BG v3.0. The households may also be provided with renewable biomass such as waste wood, pellets to operate the improved cook stoves. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.I.E v11.0. Generic CPA no 2: This aims at reducing the fuel wood consumption by supplying improved cook stoves to the targeted households replacing the traditional cook stoves. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.II. G v12.0. The improved cook stoves would also generate charcoal as a by-product. The households would then supply/sale charcoal to the charcoal users/retailers. This would reduce the generation and consumption of conventional charcoal. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.III. BG v3.0. In this generic CPA, the households may or may not be provided with renewable biomass such as waste wood, pellets to operate the improved cook stoves. So no emission reduction would be claimed under AMS.I.E v11.0. Generic CPA no 3: This aims at reducing the fuel wood consumption by supplying improved cook stoves to the targeted households replacing the traditional cook stoves. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.II. G v12.0. In this generic CPA, the charcoal may or may not be generated from the improved cook stoves. Even charcoal is generated, it would not be supplied to the charcoal users/ retailers. So no emission reduction would be claimed under AMS.III.BG. v3.0. In this generic CPA, the households may or may not be provided with renewable biomass such as waste wood, pellets to operate the improved cook stoves. So no emission reduction would be claimed under AMS.I.E v11.0. Hence this project as treated as community services projects. The validation opinion of the eligibility is detailed in the Eligibility Principles and Requirements section below.
(b) Location of Project: Projects may be located in any part of the world.	The project is located in India.
(c) Project Area, Project Boundary and Scale: The	The project area is located in India.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
Project Area and Project Boundary shall be defined. Projects may be developed at any scale although certain rules, requirements and limitations may apply under specific Activity Requirements, Impact Quantification Methodologies and Products Requirements. In order to avoid double counting the Project shall not be included in any other voluntary or compliance standards programme unless approved by Gold Standard (for example through dual certification). Also, if the Project Area overlaps with that of another Gold Standard or other voluntary or compliance standard programme of a similar nature, the project shall demonstrate that there is no double counting of impacts at design and performance certification (for example use of similar technology or practices through which the potential arises for double counting or mis-estimation of impacts amongst projects).	For all the three generic CPAs: The validated team has reviewed the PoA-DD under relevant section project boundary and accepted the source and sink of the CPAs. Scenario mentioned in the relevant sections (under project boundary section and baseline section for each generic CPA) is consistent. Since the thermal capacity of each cook stove is less than the threshold limit, this is considered as microscale project. The project is not part of any project already registered or undergoing validation. The project is applied for design certification from gold standard and CDM for GS-VER only. Hence there is no double counting. <u>Note:</u> This is not a microscale GS project considering the definition of microscale as per GS requirements
(d) Host Country Requirements: Projects shall be in compliance with applicable Host Country's legal, environmental, ecological and social regulations.	Demonstration of whether EIA is required or not for the project is conducted at PoA level. The validation team has reviewed the Schedule 1 of the EIA notification 2006, given by the Ministry of Environment and Forests under the Environment (Protection) Act 1986. As per this notification, the PoA doesn't fall under the list of activities requiring EIA. The validation team concludes that the environmental impact by the project activity need not be assessed by the PP/CME. The project activity does not cause adverse environmental impacts and there are no regulations in the host country, India to conduct the EIA for the project activity. The same is confirmed from the EIA notification 2006. (http://moef.nic.in/legis/eia/so1533.pdf) The validation team has reviewed the MSME certificate for cookstove thermal efficiency, hence accepted that production and usage of cookstove does not violate any host country environmental policies.
(e) Contact Details: As part of the Project Documentation the Project Developer shall provide (i) name and (ii) contact details of all Project Participants; AND in case of an organisation (iii) the legal registration details and (iv) documentation by the governing jurisdiction that proves that the entity is in good standing (defined as being a legal or other appropriate entity registered in or allowed to operate within the required jurisdiction and with no evidence of insolvency or legal/criminal notices placed against it or any of its Directors). Gold Standard retains the right (at its own discretion) to refuse use of the Standard where reputational concerns are highlighted.	The validation team has reviewed the final PDD and accepted that all details are given in the PDD are correct.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
(f) Legal Ownership: Full and uncontested legal ownership of any Products that are generated under Gold Standard Certification, (for example carbon credits) shall be demonstrated. Where such ownership is transferred from project beneficiaries this must be demonstrated transparently and with full, prior and informed consent (FPIC). Note that for certain Project types there is a requirement for full and uncontested legal land title/tenure to be demonstrated. These are contained within specific Activity or Product Requirements. All projects shall immediately report to Gold Standard any land title/tenure disputes arising.	Nature Club of Rajasthan (CME)/atmosfair (PP) own the project and responsibility and carbon credit lies with the PP only. The validation team has observed by reviewing the beneficiary agreement with the households wherein households agreed to cede rights in claiming carbon credits to PP only. There is no dispute between households and CME/PP.
(g) Other Rights: As well as legal title and ownership, the Project Developer shall also demonstrate where required uncontested legal rights and/or permissions concerning changes in use of other resources required to service the Project (<i>for example, access rights, water rights etc.</i>). Any known disputes or contested rights must be declared immediately to Gold Standard by the Project Developer and resolved prior to further project implementation in affected areas.	Nature Club of Rajasthan (CME)/atmosfair (PP) own the project and responsibility and carbon credit lies with the PP only. There is no disputes between the PP and the households.
(h) Official Development Assistance (ODA) Declaration: All Project Developers applying for project activities located in a country named by the OECD Development Assistance Committee's ODA recipient list and seeking Gold Standard Certification for carbon credits shall declare the Official Development Assistance (ODA) support. The Project Developer shall follow the GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements and submit the declaration at the time of Design Certification. http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/DAC-List-of-ODA-Recipients-for-reporting-2018-and-2019-flows.pdf http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/DAC-List-of-ODA-Recipients-for-reporting-2020-flows.pdf	The capital investment of the project is ensured by the PP itself using loans and equity. Hence there is no ODA involved. The validation team has reviewed the ODA declaration also.
4. ELIGIBILITY PRINCIPLES AND REQUIREMENTS 4.1.1 In order to achieve Certification with Gold Standard, all Projects shall contribute to the Vision and Mission of Gold Standard, applied specifically through the following Eligibility Principles and Requirements. Principle 1: Contribution to Climate Security & Sustainable Development	The purpose of the project is distribution of project cook stoves to the households. Hence this project as treated as community services projects. So the project is eligible under GS Community Services Activity Requirements v1.2. The emission benchmark (baseline) is the usage of traditional cookstoves using non renewable biomass. Project contributes positively to Climate Security &

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
Projects shall be of a type pre-identified as eligible or shall submit to Gold Standard for approval of eligibility. • Projects shall define their Baseline Scenario and Project Scenario. • Projects shall contribute positively to Climate Security & Sustainable Development. These positive impacts are considered against the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).	Sustainable Development. SDGs applied by the project are 1 – Goal 1; Target 1.1.; Indicator: Income generated by the sales of the charcoal 2 – Goal 7; Target 7.1.; Indicator: Increase in number of households using clean cooking devices such as Improved Cook Stoves 3 – Goal 8; Target 8.5.; Indicator: Number of jobs created by the project activity 4 – Goal 13; Target 13.2.; Indicator: GHG emissions saved annually through the project as contribution to a low greenhouse gas emission development path of India The validation opinion of the SDG impacts is detailed in Appendix 11 of this report.
4.1.2 By successfully following these requirements and procedures: (a) The Project is demonstrated to either be of an eligible type under Gold Standard for the Global Goals or has sought and obtained approval from Gold Standard to proceed as a new project type. (b) The Project demonstrates its proposed contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals, meaning at least an impact on SDG 13 plus two other SDGs. (c) The Project includes the above points (a & b) in its Project Documentation, including the Monitoring & Reporting Plan.	The Project is demonstrated (as above) to be of an eligible type under Gold Standard for the Global Goals The Project demonstrates its proposed contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals, meaning at least an impact on SDG 13 plus two other SDGs. The PDD includes the above two points in the Monitoring & Reporting Plan.
(a) ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES 4.1.3 A Project type is automatically eligible for Gold Standard Certification if there are Gold Standard approved Activity Requirements and/or Impact Quantification Methodologies associated with it or it's referenced in the Gold Standard Product Requirements. These are published to the Gold Standard website and shall be followed where provided for a given Project type.	The purpose of the project is distribution of project cook stoves to the households. Hence this project is treated as community services projects. So the project is eligible under GS Community Services Activity Requirements v1.2. Hence the project is automatically eligible for Gold Standard Certification.
4.1.4 For Project types that are not automatically eligible, a Project Developer may submit to Gold Standard for approval. This shall be done, at a minimum, as part of the Preliminary Review, though it is recommended to engage with Gold Standard earlier to establish the criteria and requirements for approval.	Since the project is automatically eligible for Gold Standard Certification, this is not relevant.
4.1.5 Project types applying for Gold Standard approval are referred to the Gold Standard Vision and Mission. The Project Developer shall demonstrate how the Project would contribute to these and how the Gold Standard for the Global Goals Requirements would be met in their application for approval.	Since the project is automatically eligible for Gold Standard Certification, this is not relevant.
4.1.6 In reviewing a new Project type for approval,	Since the project is automatically eligible for Gold

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
Gold Standard may establish new Requirements to be met by the Project in order to achieve Design Certification and ongoing Certified Project status. Where required, Gold Standard shall engage expert peer reviewers to establish these requirements, at the Project Developer's expense.	Standard Certification, this is not relevant.
4.1.7 Gold Standard does not support Project types associated with geo-engineering or energy generated from fossil fuel or nuclear, fossil fuel switch, or any project that supports, enhances or prolongs such energy generation. In certain cases, concerning energy efficiency involving fossil fuels (<i>for example, LPG stoves</i>), an exception is made and captured in the relevant Activity Requirements, Approved Methodology and/or Product Requirements.	The purpose of the project is distribution of project cook stoves to the households. Hence this project as treated as community services projects. Hence accepted.
(b) BASELINE AND PROJECT SCENARIOS 4.1.8 The Project shall define both the Baseline and Project Scenarios. These are defined as follows: (a) Baseline Scenario: The Baseline Scenario is defined as the reasonable, conservative scenario that would exist in the absence of the project. While setting the Baseline Scenario, the Project Developer shall consider the relevant applicable legislation and how effectively these are enforced. (b) Project Scenario: The Project Scenario is defined as the scenario that will exist once the Project is implemented and operational. Note that while not defined as a scenario, a consideration of the implementation and decommissioning phases (where relevant) of the project is also an important requirement within the Safeguarding Principles and Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement procedures.	The purpose of the project is distribution of project cook stoves to the households. Hence this project as treated as community services projects. So the project is eligible under GS Community Services Activity Requirements v1.2. In the absence of the PoA, the households would use the traditional cook stoves using non renewable biomass.
4.1.9 The defined Baseline and Project Scenarios shall be included in the project documentation and used to inform the other Principles outlined in this Section.	PP mentioned the baseline scenario and project scenario in the PDD.
4.1.10 Certain Impact Quantification methodologies allow projects to account Suppressed Demand scenario when establishing a baseline. In such cases, the application of Suppressed Demand baseline is limited to Small Scale Projects (as defined in the relevant Activity Requirements, Product Requirements and/or Methodology). Where a Suppressed Demand baseline is applied, it is not possible to 'stack' Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products as the definition of baseline may be contradictory.	The project applied CDM small scale methodology AMS.II.G v12.0, AMS.III.BG v3.0, AMS.I.E v11.0. For all the three generic CPAs: CME did not foresee future anthropogenic emissions by sources are projected to rise above current baseline levels due to the specific circumstances of the host Party. For this PoA, the minimum level to meet basic human needs is cooking for the entire family throughout the year. Since the minimum level to meet basic human needs would be met in the absence of the project activity using traditional cook stoves with non-renewable fuelwood anyway. The validation team has accepted there is no need to revision the methodologies. The validation opinion on applicable conditions of applied methodologies is detailed in Appendix 5 of this report.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
	Hence the project can stack Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products.
4.1.11 For Projects seeking Certified Impact Statements and/or Products, Gold Standard rules allow for the consideration of several potential design scenarios in the project documentation, as long as all aspects of each potential scenario are discussed in a satisfactory way. For example, additionality shall be demonstrated for each one of the potential scenarios, and stakeholder inputs must be gathered for each potential scenario. Other relevant aspects include the scale of the project, the validity/applicability of the applied methodology, and the assessment of sustainable development criteria including Safeguarding principles assessment. All potential scenarios must be Validated by the VVB and the actual scenario must be chosen before the first Verification.	The purpose of the project is distribution of project cook stoves to the households. The additionality, stakeholder consultation and other aspects like the scale of the project, the validity/applicability of the applied methodology, and the assessment of sustainable development criteria including Safeguarding principles assessment are based on this project scenario only.
(c) CONTRIBUTION TO CLIMATE SECURITY & SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT 4.1.12 All Projects shall demonstrate a clear, direct contribution to sustainable development, defined as making demonstrable, positive impacts on at least three Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), one of which must be SDG 13 (defined herein as Emissions Reductions or Removals and/or Adaptation to climate change). These are referred to as SDG Impacts.	Project contributes positively to Climate Security & Sustainable Development. SDGs applied by the project are 1 – Goal 1; Target 1.1.; Indicator: Income generated by the sales of the charcoal 2 – Goal 7; Target 7.1.; Indicator: Increase in number of households using clean cooking devices such as Improved Cook Stoves 3 – Goal 8; Target 8.5.; Indicator: Number of jobs created by the project activity 4 – Goal 13; Target 13.2.; Indicator: GHG emissions saved annually through the project as contribution to a low greenhouse gas emission development path of India The validation opinion of the SDG impacts are detailed in Appendix 11 of this report.
4.1.13 SDG Impacts shall be a primary effect – an intentional, direct effect of the project and shall not be ‘one off’ or an effect generated in design, construction, distribution, start-up or decommissioning of the Project.	SDG positive impacts are primary in effect. It provides income to the households by selling charcoal. Households are using clean cooking devices. It creates employment for those who collect charcoal, for those who are working in the cookstove assembling unit. It gives direct employment to the local people. It would also achieve emission reduction
4.1.14 The Project shall identify the potential SDG Impacts provided by the Project by comparing the Project Scenario to the Baseline Scenario (note that multiple baseline scenarios may be relevant depending on the SDG impacts and/or methodologies followed). The SDG Impacts shall be demonstrated as making a positive effect beyond what would reasonably be expected to occur in the Baseline Scenario.	SDG positive impacts are primary in effect. It provides income to the households by selling charcoal. Households are using clean cooking devices. It creates employment for those who collect charcoal, for those who are working in the cookstove assembling unit. It gives direct employment to the local people. It would also achieve emission reduction
4.1.15 The Project shall identify the relevant monitoring indicators and/or monitoring parameters and define the monitoring approach in the Project Design Document to inform future Monitoring	PP has used Option 1 – For identified SDG Impacts the Project Developer shall review the SDG targets and indicators from the latest internationally adopted version.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
Reports. 4.1.16 To demonstrate SDG impacts, the Project may choose any of the following options (a) Option 1 – For identified SDG Impacts the Project Developer shall review the SDG targets and indicators from the relevant National SDG Indicators, or in their absence, the latest internationally adopted version or the latest version 'under consideration' where indicators are not yet fully adopted. The Project Developer shall select the most relevant SDG targets and indicators to the chosen SDGs or propose indicators with justification and information that, when combined, demonstrate how the Project positively impacts the chosen SDGs and corresponding targets. (b) Option 2 – Follow a Gold Standard Approved SDG Tool for the demonstration of SDG Impacts. (c) Option 3 – Follow a Gold Standard Approved Methodology, published or referenced via the Gold Standard website. These are typically used by Project Developers to achieve issuance of Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products.	
4.1.17 For option 3, any one or more of the minimum three SDG Impacts chosen by the Project Developer may be undertaken by following a Gold Standard Approved Methodology. Project Developers may submit a methodology for review and approval by Gold Standard. Refer to the Impact Quantification methodology approval procedure for details. Note that it is possible to develop a Project and a Methodology concurrently.	PP has used Option 1 – For identified SDG Impacts the Project Developer shall review the SDG targets and indicators from the latest internationally adopted version. Project contributes positively to Climate Security & Sustainable Development. SDGs applied by the project are 1 – Goal 1; Target 1.1.; Indicator: Income generated by the sales of the charcoal 2 – Goal 7; Target 7.1.; Indicator: Increase in number of households using clean cooking devices such as Improved Cook Stoves 3 – Goal 8; Target 8.5.; Indicator: Number of jobs created by the project activity 4 – Goal 13; Target 13.2.; Indicator: GHG emissions saved annually through the project as contribution to a low greenhouse gas emission development path of India
4.1.18 Projects shall seek Expert Stakeholder opinion and recommendation for certain SDG Impacts. Those SDGs requiring Expert Stakeholder opinion are pre-identified in specific Activity Requirements and Safeguarding Principles and Requirements, though Gold Standard reserves the right to require an Expert Stakeholder comment or an adjustment of the SDG Impact claimed to safeguard credibility. For new project types, these shall be decided upon by Gold Standard prior to or during Preliminary Review. When, Expert Stakeholder opinion and recommendation is required, the Project Developer shall demonstrate that the Expert Stakeholder has	GS preliminary review done

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
confirmed that the impact is real and that any recommendations have been considered and incorporated into the project design.	
Principle 2: Safeguarding Principles Projects shall conduct a Safeguarding Principles Assessment and conform to Gold Standard Safeguarding Principles and Requirements. 4.1.19 By successfully following these Requirements and Procedures: (a) The Project completes a Safeguarding Principles Assessment as per Safeguarding Principles and Requirements to define the relevance of the different Requirements to the Project (note, further guidance is also provided in specific Activity Requirements). (b) The Project demonstrates how all relevant Requirements are met. (c) The Project includes above points (a & b) in the Project Design Document, including the Monitoring & Reporting Plan.	The validation opinion of the GS Safeguarding Principles Assessment is detailed in Appendix 11 of this report. The PDD includes the points 'a' and 'b' in the monitoring plan. Hence accepted.
(a) SAFEGUARDING PRINCIPLES ASSESSMENT 4.1.20 Referring to the Gold Standard Safeguarding Principles & Requirements document – all Projects shall undertake an upfront assessment against the Gold Standard Safeguarding Principles and implement their Project in accordance with the stated requirements. The assessment shall apply to the Project Scenario, although assessment questions and Requirements involve a comparison to the Baseline Scenario(s) and/or the implementation or decommissioning phases of a Project. 4.1.21 A number of Safeguarding Principles require the opinion and recommendations of an Expert Stakeholder. These are pre-identified in the Safeguarding Principles & Requirements Procedure and in relevant Activity Requirements. 4.1.22 The Safeguarding Principles Assessment and evidence of conformity to the associated Requirements shall be included in the Project Design Document, including the proposed monitoring parameters in the Monitoring & Reporting Plan. The Monitoring & Reporting Plan shall capture any parameters that are required to be monitored and reported upon and/or reassessed in the future, in line with the Safeguarding Principles & Requirements. This shall be used to inform the ongoing Monitoring Reports, Verification and Performance Review.	The validation opinion of the GS Safeguarding Principles Assessment is detailed in Appendix 11 of this report.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
4.1.23 The Monitoring Report shall include reporting on Safeguarding Principles and the associated monitoring parameters, as applicable.	
Principle 3: Stakeholder Inclusivity Projects shall identify and engage Relevant Stakeholders and seek Expert Stakeholder input where necessary in the design, planning and implementation of the Project. Project design shall reflect the views and inputs of stakeholders and ongoing feedback shall be sought, captured and acted upon throughout the life of the Project. 4.1.24 By successfully following these Requirements and Procedures: (a) The Project demonstrates how it has identified, engaged and consulted with relevant stakeholders. Where required, expert stakeholders are engaged in the process. (b) The Project demonstrates the records of the consultation and how the outcomes of the consultation have positively influenced the project design and implementation. (c) The Project demonstrates that stakeholder concerns have been addressed and any disputes have been resolved. (d) The Project demonstrates that an appropriate system for the ongoing capture, recording and responding to stakeholder concerns is developed. (e) The Project includes the above points (a to d) in the Project Design Document, including the Monitoring & Reporting Plan.	The validation opinion of the Stakeholder Inclusivity requirement is detailed in Appendix 13 of this report. The PDD includes the points 'a' to 'd' in the LSC section. Hence accepted.
(a) STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION & ENGAGEMENT 4.1.25 All Projects shall conduct Stakeholder Consultation and an ongoing engagement process. The Stakeholder Consultation shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements outlined in this section and Gold Standard Stakeholder Consultation & Engagement Requirements. 4.1.26 The Stakeholder Consultation shall comprise of a minimum of two rounds of consultation including one mandatory physical meeting and one stakeholder feedback round lasting for at least two months and these consultations shall be open to anyone wishing to attend. 4.1.27 The Project Developer shall identify and inform all relevant (local, affected and interested) stakeholders, including relevant local and national authorities, the Gold Standard Secretariat and all Gold Standard NGO Supporters active in the host	The validation opinion of the Stakeholder Inclusivity requirement is detailed in Appendix 13 of this report.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
country of the Project. 4.1.28 The Stakeholder Consultation shall be conducted prior to the start date of the Project. If the Consultation is conducted after the start date, the Project Developer shall provide further explanation of how comments received during the consultation are taken into account and implement a Grievance Mechanism in line with the Stakeholder Consultation & Engagement Requirements. 4.1.29 The Project Developer shall share the information on the Project's objective, scale and duration, contribution to sustainable development and compliance with safeguards to ensure that stakeholders are actively involved in the Project from the beginning thus enabling stakeholders to influence the project design and implementation.	
4.1.30 In addition to seeking the views of relevant (interested and affected) stakeholder inputs, certain Safeguarding Principles and SDG Impacts may require the opinion and recommendations of Expert Stakeholders. These are stated in specific Activity Requirements or in the Safeguarding Principles & Requirements. The Project shall demonstrate how the opinions and recommendations of Expert Stakeholders are incorporated into the project design. The feedback from Expert Stakeholders may be sought any time during the project design and consultations, but it is recommended that they are sought during the first phase of consultation. 4.1.31 Where a given Safeguarding Requirement, SDG Impact or other topic requires the input of independent Expert Stakeholder(s), this appointment shall be made directly by the Project Developer. A signed statement from the appointed Expert Stakeholders confirming that they have no conflict of interest or other financial interest in the Project, Project Developer or associated organisations shall be provided to Gold Standard.	The validation opinion of the Stakeholder Inclusivity requirement is detailed in Appendix 13 of this report.
4.1.32 Expert Stakeholders are not necessarily required to attend face-to-face consultation meetings but must be provided with sufficient information to form opinions and recommendations concerning the Project. Unedited written feedback from Expert Stakeholder(s) along with evidence as to how the feedback has been addressed and incorporated into the Project design shall be provided for Validation. 4.1.33 Where the VVBs and/or Gold Standard deem it necessary, further queries shall be raised with the Expert Stakeholder who shall be retained by the Project Developer accordingly.	The validation opinion of the Stakeholder Inclusivity requirement is detailed in Appendix 13 of this report.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
4.1.34 The Project shall have a formal input, feedback and grievance mechanism in place and the grievance mechanism shall be discussed during the Stakeholder Consultations as per Stakeholder Consultation & Engagement Requirements.	
4.1.35 The project shall prepare the Stakeholder consultation report of the consultation process, including consultation feedback and how this was incorporated into the design of the Project. The Stakeholder consultation report shall be submitted to Gold Standard within three months of the event (though this date may be after the Project Start Date). 4.1.36 The Monitoring Report shall include an update on stakeholder feedback received during the period and any actions taken in response. It shall also review the relative successes and failures of the ongoing stakeholder feedback mechanism and any proposals for improvement.	The validation opinion of the Stakeholder Inclusivity requirement is detailed in Appendix 13 of this report.
Principle 4: Demonstration of real outcomes: Projects shall: • Design and develop an upfront Project Design Document (PDD), incorporating a Monitoring & Reporting Plan. • Undergo Design Certification (comprising Validation and Design Review). • Undertake monitoring in accordance with the Monitoring & Reporting Plan and produce Annual Reports and Monitoring Reports. • Undergo Performance Certification (comprising Verification and Performance Review) in order to achieve Gold Standard Certified Project status and to issue Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements and Gold Standard Certified Products where sought. • Undergo Gold Standard Design Certification Renewal in order to remain at the Certified Project status and to continue to seek Gold Standard Certified Products and Impact Statements where sought.	PP has already prepared the PDD and is now undergoing design certification.
4.1.37 This Principle represents the Gold Standard Project Cycle and the timescales and frequency for Certification. Refer to Project Cycle Section for requirements and procedure for Design Certification, Performance Certification, and Design Certification Renewal including the third party VVB audit.	The validation opinion of the timescales of the project is detailed in project cycle section as below.
4.1.38 By successfully following the Procedures and applicable Requirements included the Project Cycle Section, the Project demonstrates real and verified outcomes and are able to issue the relevant Certified Impact Statements and/or	The validation opinion of the timescales of the project is detailed in project cycle section as below.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
Products.	
(a) PROJECT START DATE 4.1.39 The Project start date is the earliest date on which the Project Developer has committed to expenditures related to the implementation of the Project. This does not include the purchase or option to purchase the land upon which a Project is intended to take place.	07/06/2018; Start Date of the PoA (first notification of prior consideration Form to UNFCCC)
4.1.40 Examples of the start date may include the date on which contracts have been signed for equipment or construction/operation services required for the Project. Minor pre-project expenses, such as the contracting of services/payment of fees for feasibility studies or preliminary surveys, shall not be considered in the determination of the start date as they do not necessarily indicate the commencement of implementation of the Project. For distributed technology projects, the start date is the date of implementation of the first unit under the project. 4.1.41 Note that the Project start date definition and requirements may differ under certain Activity or Product Requirements.	07/06/2018; Start Date of the PoA (first notification of prior consideration Form to UNFCCC)
4.1.42 The project start date and the stakeholder consultation date determines the project as (a) Regular Projects, for which the Stakeholder Consultation (1st round) has been conducted before the Project Start Date. (b) Retroactive Projects, for which the Stakeholder Consultation (1st round) is conducted after the Project Start Date.	As per the Glossary of CDM terms version 10.0, start date of the PoA is the date on which the CME officially notifies the secretariat and the DNA of their intention to seek the CDM status or the date of publication of the PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation. The CME has chosen date of notification to DNA and UNFCCC for determining the start date of the PoA i.e., 7 th June 2018 ² . The validation team has accepted the date of notification as the start date of the proposed PoA project activity by reviewing the UNFCCC website and email sent to both UNFCCC & DNA.
(b) DEVELOPMENT OF MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN 4.1.43 Projects shall produce a Monitoring & Reporting Plan as part of the Project Design Document that includes a detailed approach on the following: (a) Monitoring and reporting of parameters identified for positive SDG Impacts and associated targets. (b) Monitoring and reporting of parameters associated with any Requirements and re-assessments highlighted by the Safeguarding	The validation team has reviewed the PDD and accepted that monitoring and reporting plan is described in the PDD.

² As per **PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITY REQUIREMENTS, Version 1.2 - Published October 2019**

3. START DATE, DURATION AND CREDITING PERIOD

3.1.1 The PoA start date for a Gold Standard voluntary PoA is the date when the PoA Design Consultation Report is submitted for Gold Standard Review. This event is the time of first submission of the PoA. The start date for a CDM Gold Standard PoA follows the definition of start date of a CDM PoA

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
Principles Assessment. (c) Monitoring and reporting of Stakeholder Engagement, feedback, grievances and any action taken, including as recommended by any Expert Stakeholder. (d) Any monitoring requirements and parameters in any Gold Standard Approved Methodology, Tool and/or Product Requirements selected. 4.1.44 For each monitored parameter from (a) to (d) above the following information shall be provided in the Monitoring Plan: (a) Metric or variable that shall be monitored and reported. (b) Frequency of monitoring and reporting against each parameter. (c) Method of collection of information and identification and details of the organisation or individuals involved in the collection. (d) Any quality control approaches for the proposed data collection and reporting. (e) Any ethical restrictions on the collection and/or reporting of collected information. 4.1.45 The Project Monitoring & Reporting Plan shall be presented as part of the Project Documentation for Validation and shall form the basis of ongoing Monitoring Reports that shall be presented for Verification.	
Principle 5: Financial Additionality & Ongoing Financial Need All Projects must demonstrate impacts that are additional as compared to their baseline scenario (i.e. the benefits of the Project are beyond a business-as-usual scenario) as covered in Principle 1, above. In addition, Projects following certain certification pathways (i.e. those seeking to use certification to attract finance or issue market products through the issuance of Gold Standard Certified Products or Impact Statements) shall demonstrate Financial Additionality and Ongoing Financial Need. 4.1.46 By successfully following the Procedures and Requirements in this Section the Project demonstrates Financial Additionality and is therefore able to issue relevant Certified Impact Statements and/or Products.	The project has demonstrated impacts that are additional as compared to their baseline scenario (i.e. the benefits of the Project are beyond a business-as-usual scenario). CME has used Small scale and microscale additionality tool for demonstrating additionality. The validation opinion of the same is detailed in Appendix 7 of this report. Since additionality is demonstrated successfully, project is therefore able to issue relevant Certified Impact Statements and/or Products during its actual implementation.
(a) FINANCIAL ADDITIONALITY 4.1.47 All Gold Standard Projects seeking the issuance of Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products shall be demonstrated to	The project has demonstrated impacts that are additional as compared to their baseline scenario (i.e. the benefits of the Project are beyond a business-as-usual scenario). CME has used Small scale and

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
be additional, meaning that their impact in terms of climate security (mitigation or adaptation) and sustainable development are beyond those that would have occurred in the absence of the certified Gold Standard project. In specific Project types, the application of the Requirements in this section is determined under the relevant Activity Requirements and Product Requirements.	microscale additionality tool for demonstrating additionality. The validation opinion of the same is detailed in Appendix 7 of this report.
4.1.48 Additionality tools: (a) Gold Standard Projects shall use either a UNFCCC-approved or a Gold Standard-approved additionality tool to demonstrate project additionality, with the exception of specific Activity or Product Requirements as stated in the relevant documentation. Where appropriate under specific Activity Requirements, small-scale Gold Standard Projects can use the latest version of the CDM “Methodological Tool - Demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities” to demonstrate additionality (b) Version of tool: The latest version of the additionality tool available at the time of first submission to Gold Standard shall be applied. This tool may be used by the Project until the Project completes Design Certification. (c) New additionality tools: Proposals may be made for new Gold Standard additionality tools. Gold Standard reserves the right to require changes to proposed additionality tools, seek clarification, or reject proposed additionality tools if insufficient progress is made on requested changes. New approaches for additionality demonstration may also be submitted to Gold Standard for approval as part of a new SDG Impact Quantification Methodology.	For additionality, CME has used Small scale and microscale additionality tool for demonstrating additionality. The validation team checked the project additionality as per Tool21 i.e., “Methodological tool - Demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities”^{16/}. As per Appendix. Provisions of small-scale and microscale tools for automatic additionality Figure 1. Criteria for automatic additionality using provisions of small-scale (SSC) or microscale (MSC) additionally tools of Tool21 The project activities are solely composed of isolated units where the users of the technology/measure are households or communities or institutions and where each unit results in ≤ 600 MWh of energy savings per year or ≤ 600 tonnes of emission reductions per year. PP/CME has agreed to demonstrated in the CPA-DD registered under this PoA in order to qualify for automatic additionality. For all three generic CPA: The validation team has observed that the technology in question is biomass based micro-gasifier cook stoves (with portable or in-situ cook stoves with rated efficiency of more than 20% with charcoal as by-product) and services in question is distribution of such cook stoves for cooking purpose to the intended beneficiaries. The validation team has accepted the argument of CME that CME would demonstrate the technology penetration in the host country is equal to or less than 5% at the CPA level at the time of inclusion of each CPA. The validation team has understood that penetration refers to proportion of stock of functional equipment at the user end. The validation team has accepted the type of documents such as official reports, literature, industry reports or survey results (Type of sampling: stratified random sampling; Parameter in interest being proportion (yes or no), confidence/precision being 90/10) to be used for demonstrating the penetration rate. The validation team has accepted the timing of data used that CME would use the most recent data available at the time of submission of the CPA inclusion, and the data vintage used would not include data older than three years prior to (a) the start date of the PoA or (b) the start of validation/inclusion of CPAs, whichever is earlier. The validation team has accepted the final PoA-DD as it now in line with para 12 of Tool- “Demonstration of additionality of microscale project activities” v9.0.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
	Hence the validation team has accepted that energy efficiency unit can be treated as microscale units upon demonstration of technology penetration rate by the CME as above. <u>Note:</u> This is not a microscale GS project considering the definition of microscale as per GS requirements
4.1.49 Prior Consideration: The following requirements are applicable for the demonstration of prior consideration of revenues from Gold Standard certification for standalone projects: (a) Regular projects are exempt from any kind of prior consideration of revenues from Gold Standard certification checks. (b) Retroactive projects shall submit the required documents for preliminary review (time of first submission) within one year of the project start date. Retroactive Project submitted at a date later than one year from the project start date will not be eligible for Gold Standard certification. (c) The prior consideration rule is also applicable to a Project that undergoes a design change. A project with a Certified Design requesting to include a new technology/measures shall submit the request for approval of design change to Gold Standard within one year of the start date of the proposed technology/ measures (design change component). If the developer fails to submit the request for approval within one year, the design change component shall not be eligible for Gold Standard Certification.	Condition (b) Retroactive projects The preliminary review (Completeness Check Pathway) was concluded and the project is listed on GS website https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects/details/2621
4.1.50 For PoA/VPAs (a) Regular VPAs are exempt from any kind of prior consideration of carbon revenue checks. (b) Retroactive VPAs with a project start date before or after the time of first submission of the PoA must submit the required documents for preliminary review within one year of its start date. Retroactive VPAs that are submitted at a date later than one year from the VPA start date will not be eligible for Gold Standard Certification.	Since this is a PoA/VPA project, this is relevant.
(b) ONGOING FINANCIAL NEED 4.1.51 All Gold Standard Projects (including those that transition from earlier versions) required to demonstrate Financial Additionality, as noted above, shall demonstrate Ongoing Financial Need for such mechanisms. 4.1.52 Ongoing Financial Need shall be demonstrated at Design Certification Renewal. The project shall provide a qualitative narrative, supported by an overview of project finances, that	For additionality, CME has used Small scale and microscale additionality tool for demonstrating additionality. Hence ongoing financial need is not required. The validation opinion of the same is detailed in Appendix 7 of this report.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
demonstrates how the finance derived Gold Standard Certification is material to the ongoing sustainability of the Project. The narrative may include, but not limited to the following; (a) Information highlighting the key categories and amounts or relative proportions (%) of project income and outgoings, including the relative proportion of certification related cost and revenue. (b) Description on how finance derived Gold Standard Certification contributes to or is being used to sustain or enhance the project. (c) Where no revenue is realised from Gold Standard certification during a given period, this would be considered a FAR for the next Issuance. 4.1.53 The submission of the information to demonstrate OFN is mandatory, however this information will not be used for formal decision making to decide whether a project shall renew or not. The information (a) shall be validated by the VVB to ensure its accuracy (b) may remain confidential (i.e. shall be submitted alongside other project documentation and not published to the Gold Standard Impact Registry), in recognition of the commercially sensitive nature of the information (c) shall satisfy the OFN requirements and no further information (beyond responding to clarification questions) will be requested	
(c) STACKING AND FINANCIAL ADDITIONALITY 4.1.54 Projects seeking to issue multiple different Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements and/or products ('stacking') shall demonstrate Financial Additionality as per above. Such Projects shall also provide qualitative, evidence-based justification of the need and value-add to the Project outcomes for each additional revenue stream.	For additionality, CME has used Small scale and microscale additionality tool for demonstrating additionality. Hence ongoing financial need is not required. The validation opinion of the same is detailed in Appendix 7 of this report.
(d) PROGRAMMES OF ACTIVITY (PoA) 4.1.55 The Gold Standard certification cycle is suitable for multi-phased programmes with multiple interventions with an extended implementation period within a sector or multiple sectors, as is typically the case in, for example, urban low-carbon growth programmes. 4.1.56 Programmes of Activity shall follow Programme of Activity Requirements. The Requirements in this document are applicable for a Programme where multiple individual activities are spread over space and time.	Since this is a PoA/VPA project, this is relevant.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
5. PROJECT CYCLE 5.1.1 Gold Standard for the Global Goals Project Certification is based on a five year renewable certification cycle, with key features as follows: (a) All Projects must LIST with the Gold Standard by undertaking a Preliminary Review and uploading Key Project Information, draft Project Design Document and completed Stakeholder Consultation Report.	This project is listed in Glod Standard project registry https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects/details/2621
(b) Projects may then seek Gold Standard Certified Design status by successfully completing Validation (within two years of the date of Listing) and a subsequent Design Review.	PP is seeking design certification status within two years from the listing date.
(c) New projects attaining Gold Standard Certified Design status then enter a five-year renewable certification cycle wherein for each five-year period they must undergo Verification and Performance Review to achieve and maintain Gold Standard Certified Project status and where sought Issuance of Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements and Products.	The validation team has understood the requirement after the project is attained design status.
(d) To retain Certified Design status at the fifth year, all projects must undergo Design Certification Renewal by updating information and the baseline, unless otherwise stated in relevant Activity or Product requirements.	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of project undergoing design certification. Hence this is not relevant.
(e) The number of Performance Certifications in a five-year certification cycle is not limited although it must take place at least once, no later than two years after Project implementation or Design Certification, whichever is later. In case of Design Certification Renewal, it must take place no later than two years after Design Certification Renewal.	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of project undergoing design certification. Hence this is not relevant.
(f) The Activity Requirements and/or Product Requirements governs the maximum number of Design Certification Renewals allowed for specific project types. In the absence of any such stated Requirement, a Project is limited to one Renewal (i.e. maximum 10 years certification).	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of project undergoing design certification. Hence this is not relevant.
(g) Specific requirements apply in areas such as conflict and emergency zones as per Annex B of this document.	The project is located in India which is not part of conflict or emergency zones. Hence Annex B requirements are not relevant for this project.
5.1.2 The following process flow shows the Project Cycle for a typical Project Certification: (a) PRELIMINARY REVIEW 5.1.3 The Preliminary Review (time of first submission) is conducted once at the outset (i.e., at an early stage of project design and before Listing on the Gold Standard Impact Registry, see below) of a Project.	The preliminary review was concluded and the project is listed on the GS website.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
During the Preliminary Review, Gold Standard conducts a desk review of the Key Project Information and Draft Project Design Document. This review considers whether the Project has the potential to conform to the Gold Standard Requirements and may therefore progress to Listed status.	
5.1.4 The Preliminary Review includes a desk review of the Project Eligibility Principles as well as the applicability of the methodology amongst other matters, based on the Key Project Information, draft PDD and Stakeholder Consultation Report. It involves one of the pathways below, dependent on the type of activity. Gold Standard shall decide which pathway a Project is required to undertake, though guidelines are provided as follows: (a) Pathway 1 – Completeness Check Pathway - This pathway is for regular and retroactive cycle, eligible project types unless otherwise stated in the Activity Requirements. Note that certain project types require certain details to be checked and resolved more thoroughly during the Completeness Check. These are stated in the Activity Requirements. The Completeness Check Pathway consists of a Preliminary Review period of 4 weeks, conducted by Gold Standard. (b) Pathway 2 – Detailed Preliminary Review – In this pathway, Gold Standard conducts a more thorough check of the project documentation. The application of a Detailed Preliminary Assessment is at the discretion of Gold Standard, though typically is required for early users of a new Project Type, Methodology or Product. The Detailed Preliminary Review Pathway consists of a Preliminary Review period of 4 weeks, conducted by Gold Standard.	The preliminary review (Completeness Check Pathway) was concluded and the project is listed GS website.
5.1.5 CARs/FARs/OBs may be raised during this review that must be addressed during Validation. However, matters pertaining to Eligibility Principles shall be addressed prior to Listing.	No outstanding issue
5.1.6 During the Preliminary Review step, Gold Standard may identify any further matters that require Expert Stakeholder opinion and recommendations not already pre-identified.	Preliminary review raised one FAR which is resolved successfully in this validation. This FAR pertains to requirement of expert stakeholder opinion for SDG impacts. Refer Appendix 4 of this report for details.
5.1.7 The Preliminary Assessment starts when the Project Developer has: (a) signed and submitted the Terms and Conditions AND	PP has done

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
(b) submitted the Project Documentation AND (c) paid the fee for the Preliminary Review, where required.	
5.1.8 The minimum requirements for submission of Project Documentation include Key Project Information and (a) A completed Stakeholder Consultation Report (b) A substantially completed Project Design Documentation submission that captures: i. Fully completed details required under Section – General Eligibility Criteria. ii. A substantially completed Safeguarding Principles Assessment (meaning the majority completed, including any key matters that relate to the project type or context) including any Expert Stakeholder opinions and recommendations. iii. Defined SDG Impacts including any Expert Stakeholder opinions and recommendations sought. iv. Confirmation of certification pathway and any Gold Standard Approved Methodologies and Product Requirements followed including a demonstration of Financial Additionality where required. v. A draft Monitoring Plan. 5.1.9 The Preliminary Review is intended as a guide to the Project Developer and does not represent a Certification review or result in Certification. It does not guarantee that a Project shall be successful in Validation or Design Review or ongoing Verification and Performance Review. Neither does it guarantee that further issues or alternative interpretation will arise later. The CARs, OBs and FARs are indicative only; further matters may be raised or interpreted differently by the VVB and/or Gold Standard during the Project Cycle.	PP has submitted draft PDD, LSC report, signed cover letter, signed terms & conditions.
5.1.10 The outcome of the Preliminary Review may be: (a) a successful Review without any likely or potential CARs, FARs or OBs identified, OR (b) a successful Review with likely or potential CARs, FAR s or OBs identified but that are not required to be resolved prior to Listing, OR (c) an unsuccessful Review with at least one potential Non Conformity (NC) identified.	No outstanding issue

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
With either outcome (a) or (b) the Project may progress to Listing, as per the Section below.	
5.1.11 With a successful Preliminary Review, the Project will obtain 'Listed' status in the Gold Standard Registry. This means that: (a) The Key Project Information, draft Project Design Documentation and supporting documentation are made publicly available, AND (b) The Project Developer may promote the Project according to the Claims Guidelines as appropriate for Listed status Projects. (c) The Project may proceed to Validation. 5.1.12 Listed status does not constitute or convey Certification and does not provide any guarantee that the Project will ultimately achieve Certification	No outstanding issue
(b) VALIDATION AND DESIGN REVIEW (DESIGN CERTIFICATION) 5.1.13 Validation may start after: (a) A project has achieved Listed status, AND (b) The Project Developer has contracted an eligible, approved VVB, AND (c) The Project Developer has submitted full Project Documentation and Supporting Documents to the VVB, AND (d) The Project Developer has notified Gold Standard of the commencement of Validation and the indicative date for completion and submission.	The project is listed on https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects/details/2621 The validation agreement between EPIC and PP signed on 7th June 2018. PP has submitted full documentation during the agreement signing with EPIC. The validation by EPIC was conducted in November 2020 (to CME office) by remote audit
5.1.14 Validation includes a site visit by a VVB who assesses the up-front design and monitoring plan for a Project against applicable Requirements. This includes Validation of: (a) The Project Documentation including the Project Design Document and Monitoring & Reporting Plan, including any updates to the Key Project Information after Listed Status has achieved. (b) Any supporting document and evidence to demonstrate conformity to all applicable Gold Standard Requirements. 5.1.15 The VVB is appointed directly by the Project Developer. A VVB shall be selected from the list of approved VVBs, eligible for the Project type and pathway proposed. The VVB appointment shall include for responding to any clarifications, queries, OBS, FARs and	The validation by EPIC was conducted in November 2020 (to CME office) by remote audit The validation agreement between EPIC and PP signed on 7th June 2018. The scope of EPIC involves validation of the Project Documentation including the Project Design Document and Monitoring & Reporting Plan, including any updates to the Key Project Information after Listed Status has achieved. The agreement is valid upto the project is registered or rejected.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
CARs raised by Gold Standard during Design Certification Review.	
5.1.16 The Project shall complete Validation (defined as the date of submission of Validation Report by the VVB) within two years of successful listing of the project. 5.1.17 Validation ends when VVB has submitted a final Validation Report with no open NCs and/or CARs, in the opinion of the VVB, to Gold Standard.	PP is seeking design certification status within two years from the listing date.
5.1.18 Design Review may start after: (a) a positive final Validation Report has been submitted for Gold Standard Review (or in the case of Internal Validation, a project is successfully validated), AND (b) the required fee is paid by the Project Developer 5.1.19 Design review is conducted by Gold Standard. It involves a review of all Project Documentation along with the Validation Report.	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of project undergoing design certification. Hence this is not relevant.
5.1.20 During Design Review, all project documentation is made available to the Gold Standard Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and NGO Supporters for review. 5.1.21 Design Review lasts for a minimum period of 4 weeks and is concluded when all CARs/CLs are successfully closed. The VVB shall be retained by the Project Developer to respond to clarification requests and CARs raised by Gold Standard. 5.1.22 During Design Review, new CARs, FARs and OBs may be raised by any party. If any new CARs or FARs are opened, these shall be addressed by either the Project Developer and/or the VVB.	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of project undergoing design certification. Hence this is not relevant. The validation agreement with EPIC is valid upto the project is registered or rejected.
5.1.23 The date of Design Certification is the last day of the 4 week Design Review period, even if the design review is concluded after this date. 5.1.24 A positive conclusion of the Design Review results in Gold Standard Certified Design status, which means that: (a) The Project Design Document, supporting documentation, Monitoring & Reporting Plan and final Validation Report shall be made public (unless otherwise agreed with Gold Standard, for example in the case of commercially or personal security sensitive information). (b) The Project becomes eligible for Performance Certification.	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of project undergoing design certification. Hence this is not relevant

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
(c) The Project Developer may promote the Project according to the Claims Guidelines as appropriate for Gold Standard Certified Design status Projects.	
(c) VERIFICATION & PERFORMANCE REVIEW (PERFORMANCE CERTIFICATION) 5.1.25 Verification may start after: (a) Project has achieved Gold Standard Certified Design status (it may also be combined with validation, see 'Combined Design and Performance Certification'), AND (b) The Project Developer has contracted an eligible VVB, AND (c) The Project Developer has submitted the Monitoring Report to the VVB, AND (d) The Project Developer has notified Gold Standard of the commencement of Verification.	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of project undergoing design certification. Hence this is not relevant
5.1.26 Verification includes a site visit by a VVB who assesses the following against all Gold Standard Requirements including applicable Activity Requirements, Gold Standard Methodology and Product Requirements: (a) The Monitoring Report (including any updates in Annual Reports) (b) All supporting evidence and documents included by the Project Developer to demonstrate conformity 5.1.27 The VVB is directly appointed by the Project Developer. A VVB shall be selected from the list of approved VVBs, eligible for the project type and pathway proposed. The VVB shall be retained by the Project Developer to review and respond to queries raised during the Performance Review.	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of project undergoing design certification. Hence this is not relevant
5.1.28 Unless otherwise stated (for example in an applied Methodology or Product Requirements), the same VVB may undertake Validation and Verification of a given Project. 5.1.29 Verification must occur at least once during the five-year Certification cycle with the first Verification completed within two years of project Implementation Date or Design Certification, whichever is later. The Project implementation date is defined as the date at which physical activity first becomes operational, for example, the commencement of energy generation or start of distribution of household technology. 5.1.30 Verification ends when the VVB has	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of project undergoing design certification. Hence this is not relevant

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
submitted a positive Verification Report to Gold Standard. A positive Verification Report shall have no pending or open CARs in the opinion of the GS-VVB. 5.1.31 The performance review starts after; (a) a positive final Verification Report is submitted for Gold Standard Review (or in the case of Internal Verification, a project is successfully verified), AND (b) the required fee is paid by the Project Developer 5.1.32 Performance review is conducted by Gold Standard following success completion of Verification. It involves a review of the Monitoring Report, and all supporting Evidence and documentation including the Verification Report. 5.1.33 During the Performance Review, all Project Documentation are also made available to Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and NGO Supporters for their review. 5.1.34 The Performance Review period lasts for minimum period of 3 weeks and is concluded when all CARs/CLs are successfully closed. The VVB shall be retained by the Project Developer to respond to clarification requests and CARs raised by Gold Standard. 5.1.35 During the Performance Review new CARs, FARs and OBs may be raised by any party, including Gold Standard. If any new CARs or FARs are opened, these shall be addressed by either the Project Developer and/or the VVB. 5.1.36 The positive conclusion of the Performance Review period shall result in Gold Standard Certified Project status, which means that: (a) The Project Documentation, supporting documentation and Verification Report are made public via the Impact Registry. (b) The Project can issue any Gold Standard Certified Products or Impact Statements upon payment of required fee. 5.1.37 The project may take into account retroactive period for performance Certification of Certified Impact Statement and /or Products. The maximum period for Retroactive Certification is two years prior to the date of Project Design Certification unless otherwise stated in a specific Methodology or Product Requirements.	

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
5.1.38 The project making changes to the registered project design (Annex A) may request Retroactive Certification for design change component for maximum two years prior to the date of Design Change Approval.	
(d) ANNUAL REPORTING 5.1.39 Transparent, annual update reports need to be provided for Projects that have achieved the Project Design Certification stage or have successfully transitioned to Gold Standard for the Global Goals. An annual report shall be submitted for each monitoring year by end of next calendar year for which verification is not completed. If a verification is in progress but not completed, then an Annual Report is still required by the end of calendar year. 5.1.40 Failure to provide Annual Reports as required shall result in the de-certification of the Project. 5.1.41 The Annual Report shall be submitted to Gold Standard which will be made publicly available. 5.1.42 The Annual Report shall focus on information since the last Annual Report or Verification Report as appropriate and provide following information (a) A summary of the recent activities, events and actions related to the Project, (b) A clear statement on how stakeholders may provide inputs/grievances, (c) A list of all inputs/grievances that have been received since the last Annual Report together with their respective answers/actions, (d) Any incidents or events that may impact the Outcomes/Impacts delivered to date (in terms of loss) or the ongoing Performance of the Project, (e) Any legal contest or dispute that has arisen, (f) Any updates to the Key Project Information, Project Design Document, Monitoring & Reporting Plan and any other supporting documentation, (g) A brief descriptive summary of all monitoring information collected during the year, (h) Any update of the 'Project Participants & Secured Titles' (in case of changes)	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of project undergoing design certification. Hence this is not relevant
5.1.43 The Project Developer shall attest to the accuracy of the information provided by its	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of project undergoing design certification. Hence this is not

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
signature on the Annual Report. The signatory shall be an individual with legal signing authority within the Project Developer's organisation. 5.1.44 Annual Reporting does not represent Certification nor any decision-making or agreement to any design change by Gold Standard. Annual Reporting is intended as an opportunity to share progress and track key updates and confirms to Gold Standard that the Project remains active. With formal review of conformity to Requirements; any changes in approach shall be undertaken at Performance Certification only.	relevant
(e) DESIGN CERTIFICATION RENEWAL 5.1.45 To maintain Gold Standard Certified Project status beyond five years, a Project must undergo Design Certification Renewal. This process shall begin (defined by the submission of a Renewal opinion by a VVB for Design Review to Gold Standard) no later than the last date of current certification cycle. Note that review of the Design Certification Renewal may complete after the last date of current crediting period. In this case, the renewal date shall be the first day after the end date of the current certification cycle. 5.1.46 Delay in the completion of re-validation beyond the last date of current certification cycle shall result in a reduction of any issuance of Certified Products and/or Impact Statements available during following certification cycle (for example, a delay of 1 year beyond the first cycle shall mean that no Certified Impact Statements shall be issued for the period of delay). 5.1.47 Design Certification Renewal follows the same process as Validation and Design Review (Design Certification) though the scope of assessment is limited to: (a) Changes in the Project as related to the General Eligibility Criteria (b) Incorporation of any relevant updates to the Gold Standard Requirements (c) Re-definition of Baseline Scenario and any impact of change on the Eligibility Principles, Criteria and Requirements (d) Any Gold Standard activity, product and methodology-specific Requirements (e) Demonstration of Ongoing Financial Need, where relevant – see Ongoing Financial Need	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of project undergoing design certification. Hence this is not relevant
5.1.48 A five - year Design Certification Renewal	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of project

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
cycle apply to all projects though some project types are allowed for automatic renewal for a given number of cycles and/or to remove the need for any or all of (a)-(e) above. Such exceptions are defined in applicable Activity and/or Product Requirements and/or Methodology. In the absence of any such stated requirements	undergoing design certification. Hence this is not relevant
(f) TRANSITION PROJECTS 5.1.49 Transition projects shall maintain their existing crediting cycle and maximum crediting periods upon transition to Gold Standard for Global Goals following GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration Product Requirements. 5.1.50 Transitioning projects, maintaining their existing crediting cycle shall undergo Performance Certification no later than the first two years after project implementation or design certification, whichever is later, and once every three years after that, unless the Verifier provides a convincing case for less frequent visits as part of the Verification Report	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of new & regular project undergoing design certification. Hence this is not relevant
(g) RETROACTIVE DESIGN CERTIFICATION 5.1.51 Retroactive Projects shall submit for Preliminary Review within one year of the Project Start Date. 5.1.52 For certain Methodologies and Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements, the Design Certification Requirements for a Retroactive Project may differ. Likewise, some Product Requirements require Prior Consideration of revenues in order to be eligible to receive an Issued Product and may limit or extend the maximum period of Certification prior to Design Certification.	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of new & regular project undergoing design certification. Hence this is not relevant
(h) COMBINING DESIGN CERTIFICATION AND FIRST PERFORMANCE CERTIFICATION 5.1.53 Project Developers may choose to combine Design Certification with their first Verification and Performance Review. The VVB may combine site visits/consider their reports concurrently. 5.1.54 Concurrent Design Review and Performance Review commences when the VVB submits positive Validation and Verification Reports at the same time to Gold Standard. 5.1.55 Following receipt of the VVB Reports, Gold Standard shall conduct a review that covers both the Design Review and the Performance Review following the process outlines above. In such cases, the Design Review lasts a minimum of six weeks. 5.1.56 Successful conclusion means both Design Certification and Performance Certification are approved concurrently including any issuance of	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of new & regular project undergoing design certification only. Hence this is not relevant

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
Gold Standard Certified Impact and/or Products.	
6. PROJECT DOCUMENTATION AND TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS 6.1.1 Projects shall provide evidence of conformity to the Requirements using approved Gold Standard Project templates except for supporting evidence and documents. The following project documentation and associated evidence and information are required at different stages of the project cycle. (a) Preliminary Review i. Key Project Information (see PDD Template) ii. Draft PDD including Safeguarding Principles Assessment, SDG Impacts identified and draft Monitoring & Reporting Plan iii. Stakeholder Consultation Report iv. Supporting evidence and documents such as maps, survey results or calculations v. Signed Cover Letter and Terms and Conditions (b) Validation and Design Review i. Completed PDD including Monitoring & Reporting Plan ii. Fully completed Stakeholder Consultation Report iii. Validation Report iv. Any Activity, Context, Methodology or Product Requirement specific documentation v. Supporting evidence and documents (c) Annual Reporting i. Completed Annual Report ii. Supporting evidence and documents (d) Verification and Performance Review i. Any updates to the Key Project Information, PDD and Monitoring & Reporting Plan ii. Any Context, Activity, Methodology and Product Requirement specific documentation iii. Verification Report iv. Supporting evidence and documents such as maps, survey results and/or calculations 6.1.2 The Project Developer shall open an account on the Impact Registry: (a) Project Documentation, PDD, Monitoring & Reporting Plan, Reports, supporting documentation and the VVB's Validation and Verification Reports shall be submitted to the Gold Standard Registry. Note that the VVB is responsible for uploading the final Validation or Verification Report. (b) All Project Documentation, except confidential information, shall be made publicly available	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of new & regular project undergoing design certification only. PP has submitted PDD, LSC report, emission reduction sheet etc.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
through the Impact Registry. (c) All information shall be submitted in English, OR a language that has been agreed upon by the Project Developer, the Gold Standard and the VVB. (d) Figures above one thousand shall be formatted with a comma (for example 1,000,000), and decimals will be separated by a point (for example 1.35). (e) Pictures, graphs, tables and supporting documents within Project Documentation shall be clearly marked with a unique ID. (f) Dates shall be included in the following format: DD/MM/YYYY (g) Maps, where required shall include: i. Name of the project ii. ID of the project iii. Legend iv. Printing date v. Scale vi. Direction of North vii. GPS coordinate system (e.g. WGS 84) viii. GPS grid ix. Infrastructure (roads, houses, etc.) and rivers x. Information on the satellite or aerial picture (date, resolutions, data source)	
7. NON-CONFORMITY 7.1.1 The Project Developer shall report any potential or actual Non-Conformity against the Requirements and any associated Guidelines, Tools or Methodologies immediately upon discovery (and no later than 30 days after the Non-Conformity event discovery). Potential or actual non-conformities may also be submitted to Gold Standard by any party at any time for review. 7.1.2 Gold Standard shall undertake a review of the Non-Conformity, including potentially commissioning an independent investigation and an expert peer review of any recommended action taken. During the investigation Gold Standard reserves the right to suspend activities related to Certification and/or Registry, including the assignment, transfer or retirement of Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products. 7.1.3 Gold Standard shall decide upon the action taken in response to a confirmed Non-Conformity. This may include; a requirement for immediate rectification or change, a suspension of a Project until rectification has been Verified or a removal of Gold Standard Certified Design status from the Project.	PP does not raise any non-conformity.

Gold Standard for the Global goals Principles and requirements v1.2	Validation opinion
Factors that influence Gold Standard's consideration of the severity of the issue shall include, but are not limited to: (a) If the issue is repeated/systematic or fundamental to the project. (b) If the issue has resulted in an inappropriate certification decision or over-issuance of Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products. (c) If the issue has continued over a longer period of time or affects a significant area or population. (d) If the issue has caused the endangerment of life, livelihoods, ecology or the environment. (e) If the Project Developer failed to notify Gold Standard, take appropriate steps to limit any damage or disruption caused or has attempted to cover up the issue.	

Appendix 8: GS Community Services Activity Requirements v1.2

GS Community Services Activity Requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
1. SCOPE AND APPLICABILITY 1.1.1 This Requirements document, hereafter "the CSA Requirements", provides necessary guidelines and requirements for Community Service Activities seeking certification of the project design and/or issue Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements and Products.	OK
1.1.2 The CSA Requirements document is designed to be read in conjunction with the Principles & Requirements and associated documents including Gold Standard Approved Methodologies and Product Requirements such as GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration Product Requirements, Renewable Energy Label Product Requirements	OK
1.1.3 In order to maintain the integrity of the standard, Gold Standard reserves the right to issue updates and changes, clarifications or corrections to its requirements. Typically, this will involve a notice period and guidance will be provided on how to apply the new rules and requirements. Likewise, the Gold Standard reserves the right to require additional information and evidence to be supplied by the Project Developer.	OK
2. ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES 2.1.1 All Community Service Activities (CSA – as defined in this document) for which Gold Standard certification is being sought shall fulfil the requirements as set out in this document and those referenced or associated.	OK
2.1.2 All CSA Projects shall lead to climate change mitigation and/or adaptation by providing or improving access to services/resources at the household or community ¹ or institution ² level. Eligible services include electricity and energy, water and sanitation, waste management, housing, etc. Note: Community refers to a group of people who live in the same area (such as a village, city, town, or neighbourhood) and share the services/resources. It shall be treated as guiding principle; the project proponent should refer to applicable rules, regulations, guidelines and official notifications of the host country in this regard. Community may include variety of end-users for example households, commercial facilities such as shops, public services, residential and commercial buildings, small, medium and micro enterprises (SMMEs), etc. Projects that do not include activities providing services or access to resources for identified user categories as listed here, for example industrial wastewater treatment projects, are not eligible for Gold Standard certification under CS Requirements. Institution refers to an establishment with a specific purpose that serves individuals or group of	The proposed project leads to climate change mitigation by providing TLUD Gasifier Cookstove. These TLUD Gasifier Cookstove allows for significant savings of firewood compared to traditional stoves and additionally generates charcoal. Thus the project provides access to services/resources at the household/community.

individuals within its premises such as a hospital, school, etc.	
2.1.3 In relation to the above, all Projects shall, therefore, conform to the Principles & Requirements (and associated documents).	Yes, this project conforms to the Principles & Requirements (and associated documents).
3. GENERAL ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA 3.1.1 Types of project – Pre-identified CSA project types are noted below. Project Developers may submit new project types to Gold Standard for approval following the Principles & Requirements. (a) Renewable energy: Renewable energy types such as solar (photovoltaic and solar thermal electricity generation), tidal/wave, wind, hydropower, geothermal, waste to energy and renewable biomass that are connected to mini grid ³ or off grid solutions for targeted users and/or applications. • Renewable projects supplying electricity to a national or a regional grid shall refer to Gold Standard Renewable Energy Activity Requirements. • Additional eligibility criteria for specific projects (e.g. Hydropower, biomass resources, etc.), are prescribed in Annex A of this document. Note: A mini-grid is defined as small-scale power system with a total capacity not exceeding 15 MW (i.e. the sum of installed capacities of all generators connected to the mini-grid is equal to or less than 15 MW) which is not connected to a national or a regional grid.	NA
(b) End-use energy efficiency: Project activities that reduce energy requirements as compared to baseline scenario without affecting the level and quality of services or products, where the end-user of the products and services are clearly identified and when the physical intervention is required at the user end. For example, efficient cooking, heating, lighting, etc. (c) Waste management and handling: All waste management activities that deliver energy or a usable product with sustainable development benefits such as composting, biogas etc. (d) Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH): WASH activities contributing to climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits	End-use energy efficiency. The proposed project disseminates improved cook stoves (i.e., TLUD Gasifier Cookstove), mainly micro wood gasifier stoves, at subsidized prices to reduce the fuel wood consumption of traditional stove users.
3.1.2 Project area, boundary and scale: Project Area and Boundary shall be defined in line with the applicable Impact Quantification Methodologies and Product Requirements. The definition of scale is the same for all Projects, except Microscale which is defined as: (a) CSA Project issuing emission reductions less than or equal to 10,000 tCO ₂ eq per annum (b) CSA Project seeking any Gold Standard Certified Impact or Product other than emission reductions and meeting one of the following criteria:	The PoA and all CPAs are implemented within the boundaries of the Republic of India. The capacity of each project cookstove is less than 1800 MWh_{th} per year. As the generic CPA consists solely of units that qualify as “microscale CDM units” as defined in Microscale additionality, as per para 46 of AMS.II.G v12.0, the conditions to ensure that CPAs that will be included meet the small-scale or microscale thresholds and remain within those thresholds throughout the crediting period of the CPAs are not required.

• Installed capacity less than equal to 2 MWe / 6 MWth that employs renewable energy as the primary technology • Energy savings at a scale of no more than 20 GWh per year where energy efficiency is the primary activity • Achieve GHG emissions reductions at a scale of no more than 20,000 tCO₂eq per annum where project activity type is not included in the above two criteria. (c) For the purpose of applying UNFCCC methodologies for quantification of GHG reductions, 'small scale' is defined as in CDM Modalities and Procedures for three projects types; Renewable Energy, Energy Efficiency and Others. Please refer to the GHG Emission Reductions and Sequestration Product Requirements for more information on the definition of 'small scale'.	
3.1.3 Certain Impact Quantification methodologies allow projects to account Suppressed Demand scenario when establishing a baseline. In such cases, the application of Suppressed Demand baseline is limited to Small Scale and Microscale Projects. Where a Suppressed Demand baseline is applied, it is not possible to 'stack' Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products as the definition of the baseline may be contradictory.	For all the three generic CPAs: CME did not foresee future anthropogenic emissions by sources are projected to rise above current baseline levels due to the specific circumstances of the host Party. For this PoA, the minimum level to meet basic human needs is cooking for the entire family throughout the year. Since the minimum level to meet basic human needs would be met in the absence of the project activity using traditional cook stoves with non-renewable fuelwood anyway. The validation team has accepted there is no need to revision the methodologies.
3.1.4 Legal ownership: (a) Projects involving the distribution of a large number of devices for services such as heating, cooking, lighting, electricity generation, water treatment technology such as water filter, etc. shall provide a clear description of the ownership of the Products that are generated under Gold Standard Certification all along the investment chain. In line with the FPIC requirement, the proofs that end-users are aware of and willing to give up their rights on Products shall be provided. (b) The transfer of Product ownership shall be discussed during local stakeholder consultations for projects.	Atmosfair has the legal ownership on the verified emission reduction based on contracts between the end users, atmosfair and the CME.
4. ELIGIBILITY PRINCIPLES AND REQUIREMENTS 4.1.1 This section describes the additional requirements and/or deviations from the Principles & Requirements. The CSA project seeking Gold Standard certification shall meet these additional requirements	OK
4.1.2 The Certification cycle for CSA Projects is as detailed in Principles & Requirements. Projects successfully completing Performance Certification	OK

shall be issued with Certified Impact Statement and/or Product as per the Gold Standard Claims Guidelines	
4.1.3 Impact Statements can be stacked for a single CSA project, however, there can additional requirements based on Product Requirements and such requirements should be applied and will supersede the generic requirements stated in this document	OK
Principle 3 – Stakeholder Inclusivity 4.1.4 CSA projects shall have specific stakeholder consultation requirements for certain project types including, but not limited to, hydropower and projects using biomass resource as given in Annex A of this document).	PP has conducted local stakeholder consultations on both levels i.e., PoA and VPA level. The PoA Design Consultation on the PoA level has taken place from 03/09/2018 - 03/11/2018. The Design Consultation Report was checked and found ok by validation team. The VPA stakeholder consultation took place on 12/08/2018. Both reports were submitted to the Gold Standard.
Principle 4 – Demonstration of Real Outcomes 4.1.5 New Projects may seek Certification and receive Issuance of Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products for a maximum of two Design Certification Renewal Cycles i.e., a total of 15 years issuance	Its POA validation.
4.1.6 Product Requirements with specific requirements for total issuance period shall supersede information in this document. 4.1.7 Design Certification Renewal in the case of CSA projects is mandatory every 5 years as per the Principles & Requirements. For the first renewal, CSA Projects are not required to reassess the Baseline Scenario	The duration of the proposed project is 10 years. PP has selected the crediting period to lasts 5 years and can be renewed two more times, up to 15 years.
Principle 5 – Financial Additionality & Ongoing Financial Need 4.1.8 All projects seeking the issuance of Certified Impact Statements and/or Products shall demonstrate Financial Additionality in accordance with the Principles & Requirements and the applicable Product requirements	Its a microscale project with CPAs comprising of only units of size $\leq$ MSC thresholds of $60\text{GWh}_{(\text{TH})}/\text{y}$
4.1.9 Projects that meet any of the following criteria are considered as deemed additional and therefore are not required to prove Financial Additionality at the time of Design Certification: (a) Positive list (Annex B of this document) (b) Projects located in LDC, SIDS, LLDC4 (c) Microscale projects Note: LLDC-List as per UN Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (Annex 1, 2 and 3).	As per tool21, ii) Does it involve distributed units ($\leq 1500\text{kW}$ or $\leq 600\text{ MWh/y}$ or $\leq 600\text{ tCO}_2\text{e/y}$ and end users are? The project distribution units (i.e., cookstoves) to Households/communities/SMEs are $\leq 1800\text{MWh}_{\text{th}}/\text{year}$. Hence project is additional.
4.1.10 All CSA projects shall demonstrate Ongoing Financial Need as per the Principles & Requirements.	NA

4.1.11 For stacked Gold Standard Certified Impacts the project developer shall demonstrate the impact of the additional revenue streams qualitatively (i.e. provide a definition of what further benefit the finance will bring).	NA
ANNEX B - POSITIVE LIST The positive list for Community Services projects consists of the following project types: 1.1.1 The following mini-grid connected or off-grid renewable electricity generation technologies: • Solar technologies (photovoltaic and solar thermal electricity generation); • Off-shore wind technologies; • Marine technologies (wave, tidal) • Building-integrated wind turbines or household rooftop wind turbines of a size up to 100 kW;	NA
1.1.2 The following mini-grid connected or off-grid electricity generation technologies where the individual units do not exceed the thresholds indicated in parentheses with the aggregate project installed capacity not exceeding the 15 MW threshold: • Micro/pico-hydro (with power plant size up to 100 kW); • Micro/pico-wind turbine (up to 100 kW); • PV-wind hybrid (up to 100 kW); • Geothermal (up to 200 kW); • Biomass gasification/biogas (up to 100 kW);	NA
1.1.3 Project activities solely composed of isolated units where the users of the technology/measure are households or communities or institutions and where each unit results in ≤ 600 MWh of energy savings per year or ≤ 600 tonnes of emission reductions per year.	NA
1.1.4 Rural electrification ¹⁵ project activities using renewable energy sources in countries with rural electrification rates less than 50%; the most recent available data on the electrification rates shall be used to demonstrate compliance with the 50 percent threshold. In no case shall data be used if older than three years from the date of commencement of validation of the project activity Note: ¹⁵ Rural electrification for the purpose of this document is defined as a project activity for supplying renewable electricity to facilities and energy consumers that do not have access to any electricity distribution system/network such as a national grid or regional grid. Such electricity end-use facilities may include but are not limited to households, public buildings, and/or small, medium and micro enterprises. Electricity uses may include but are not limited to interior lighting, street lighting, refrigeration, or agricultural water pumps.	NA
1.1.5 Project activities that involve technologies ¹⁶ and/or practices providing thermal energy to the user	The validation team has observed that the technology in question is biomass based micro

that have less than 20% adoption rate among the target users. The most recent available data on adoption rates shall be used to demonstrate compliance with the 20 per cent threshold in the target geographical area¹⁷. In no case shall data be used if older than three years from the date of commencement of validation of the project activity ¹⁶Examples of these technologies include but not limited to the introduction of improved biomass or fossil fuel cookstoves, ovens, dryers, space and water heaters (solar and otherwise), heat retention cookers, solar cookers, biodigesters, safe water supply and treatment technologies that displace the boiling of water, thermal insulation in cold climates, etc. ¹⁷Applicable geographical area – should be the entire host country. If the project participants opt to limit the applicable geographical area to a specific geographical area (such as province, region, etc.) within the host country, then they shall provide justification on the essential distinction between the identified specific geographical area and rest of the host country.	gasifier cook stoves (with portable or in-situ cook stoves with rated efficiency of more than 20% with charcoal as by-product) and services in question is distribution of such cook stoves for cooking purpose to the intended beneficiaries. The validation team has accepted the argument of CME that CME would demonstrate the technology penetration in the host country is equal to or less than 5% at the CPA level at the time of inclusion of each CPA. The validation team has understood that penetration refers to proportion of stock of functional equipment at the user end. The validation team has accepted the type of documents such as official reports, literature, industry reports or survey results (Type of sampling: stratified random sampling; Parameter in interest being proportion (yes or no), confidence/precision being 90/10) to be used for demonstrating the penetration rate. The validation team has accepted the timing of data used that CME would use the most recent data available at the time of submission of the CPA inclusion, and the data vintage used would not include data older than three years prior to (a) the start date of the PoA or (b) the start of validation/inclusion of CPAs, whichever is earlier. Hence the validation team has accepted that energy efficiency unit can be treated as microscale units upon demonstration of technology penetration rate by the CME as above. <u>Note:</u> This is not a microscale GS project considering the definition of microscale as per GS requirements
1.1.6 The positive list of technologies shall be reassessed every five years or as per GS discretion.	OK
1.1.7 Projects meeting the requirements listed in the CDM's Methodological tool: Positive list of technologies. The tool shall be read in conjunction with the Gold Standard Principles and Requirements, Renewable Energy Activity Requirement and Community Service Activity Requirements as applicable. Should there be a conflict, the eligibility requirements defined in the GS4GG standards will supersede. Please note, that under no circumstances should these conditions imply an exemption from the Gold Standard eligibility criteria related to the project types mentioned in the tool.	OK

Appendix 9: GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2

GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
1. SCOPE AND APPLICABILITY 1.1.1 This document represents the Product requirements for the issuance of Gold Standard Verified Emissions Reductions: • Gold Standard Verified Emission Reductions (GS-VERs) • Gold Standard labels for Certified Emission Reductions (GS-CERs) • Gold Standard Planned Emissions Reductions (PERs) for Land Use & Forests	PP is seeking Gold Standard Verified Emission Reductions (GS-CERs) from the proposed project. The scope of the EPIC is to validation of new & regular project undergoing design certification only.
1.1.2 Certain Requirements noted in this document are not applicable to Projects applying the Gold Standard Land Use & Forests Activity Requirements (hereafter "LUF requirements"), these are noted in brackets as (LUF – N/A) for ease.	The project scenario is the installation of improved cook stoves in the households. Hence this is treated as Community project. So requirements applicable to Land Use & Forests projects do not apply.
1.1.3 Claims made regarding Gold Standard Voluntary Emission Reductions (VERs), Certified Emission Reductions (CERs) or Planned Emission Reductions (PERs) shall be in line with the Claims Guideline.	PP is seeking Gold Standard Certified Emission Reductions (GS-CERs) from the proposed project. The validation opinion of the claims guidelines are detailed in Appendix 10 of this report.
1.1.4 Unless otherwise indicated, all projects applying these Requirements shall be consistent with applicable UNFCCC rules and requirements for Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) or Joint Implementation (JI) projects, as periodically updated	PP has applied AMS.II.G v12.0, AMS.III.BG v3.0 and AMS.I.E v11.0 for calculating emission reductions. For additionality, PP has used small scale and microscale additionality tool to demonstrate additionality.
2. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA 1. General Eligibility Criteria 2.1.1 Unless otherwise stated elsewhere in the Principles & Requirements, Projects involving a mix of eligible and ineligible components can only claim credits for the Emission Reductions and/or sequestration associated with the eligible component of the project.	The purpose of the proposed national level Programme of Activities (PoA) is to reduce fuel wood consumption of traditional stove users by disseminating project cook stoves and the the consumption of conventional charcoal by traditional charcoal users shall be reduced by providing them charcoal generated in project cook stoves. The PoA also reduces fuel wood consumption by providing users with 100% renewable biomass as a fuel, such as waste wood from plantations in India. The validation team has confirmed correctness and accuracy of project design of major equipments, processes, energy requirements of the PoA. The validation team based on the review of PoA- DD, has confirmed the PoA contains 3 generic CPAs. The description of the same is briefed below. <u>Generic CPA no 1:</u> This aims at reducing the fuel wood consumption by supplying improved cook stoves to the targeted households replacing the traditional cook stoves. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.II. G v12.0. The improved cook stoves would also generate charcoal as a by-product. The households would then supply/sale charcoal to the charcoal users/retailers. This would reduce the generation and consumption of

GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
	conventional charcoal. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.III. BG v3.0. The households may also be provided with renewable biomass such as waste wood, pellets to operate the improved cook stoves. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.I.E v11.0. Generic CPA no 2: This aims at reducing the fuel wood consumption by supplying improved cook stoves to the targeted households replacing the traditional cook stoves. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.II. G v12.0. The improved cook stoves would also generate charcoal as a by-product. The households would then supply/sale charcoal to the charcoal users/retailers. This would reduce the generation and consumption of conventional charcoal. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.III. BG v3.0. In this generic CPA, the households may or may not be provided with renewable biomass such as waste wood, pellets to operate the improved cook stoves. So no emission reduction would be claimed under AMS.I.E v11.0. Generic CPA no 3: This aims at reducing the fuel wood consumption by supplying improved cook stoves to the targeted households replacing the traditional cook stoves. The emission reduction from this activity is calculated using the applied methodology AMS.II. G v12.0. In this generic CPA, the charcoal may or may not be generated from the improved cook stoves. Even charcoal is generated, it would not be supplied to the charcoal users/retailers. So no emission reduction would be claimed under AMS.III.BG. v3.0. In this generic CPA, the households may or may not be provided with renewable biomass such as waste wood, pellets to operate the improved cook stoves. So no emission reduction would be claimed under AMS.I.E v11.0. The project type is eligible under GS Community service Activity Requirements^{/1/} v1.2. Hence this is treated as renewable project which is an eligible component.
2.1.2 Bundled Projects: Where Projects are submitted together for Gold Standard certification within a bundle, each Project shall individually be conform to the Gold Standard Requirements. Eligibility criteria with regards to the scale of the Project shall apply to the bundle as a whole and not to the individual Projects.	The proposed project is not a bundled project.
2.1.3 Programme of Activities (PoA): (LUF – N/A) Where a group of Projects is submitted together for	The proposed project is a PoA project.

GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 v1.2 effective 24th October 2019	Validation opinion
Gold Standard Design Certification within a Programme of Activities, each of these Projects shall confirm to the Gold Standard Requirements. A microscale project can only be part of a Microscale PoA.	
2. Location of Project 2.1.4 Gold Standard CDM Projects shall be located in a non-Annex I country, as defined by the UNFCCC. (LUF – N/A)	The project is located in India which is a non-Annex I country as per UNFCCC ^{17/} .
2.1.5 Gold Standard JI Projects shall be located in an Annex I country with a commitment inscribed in Annex B, as defined by the UNFCCC. (LUF – N/A)	The project is located in India which is a non-Annex I country as per UNFCCC. Hence requirements under Annex A and B of GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 does not apply.
2.1.6 Gold Standard VER Projects may be located in any host country or state. However, where host countries or states have mandatory operational schemes to reduce GHG emissions in any form (e.g. cap & trade, carbon tax etc.), Projects shall only be eligible if the Project Developer has either: (a) provided Gold Standard with satisfactory justification that no double counting of emission reductions occur or (b) has committed to retiring eligible units equal to the quantity of Gold Standard VERs. Refer to Annex A of this document.	The project is located in India which is a non-Annex I country as per UNFCCC. India does not have any mandatory operational schemes to reduce GHG emissions in any form. The validation team has reviewed the CDM website and confirmed the same. Hence requirements under Annex A of GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 does not apply.
3. Eligible Greenhouse Gases 2.1.7 Only Carbon Dioxide (CO ₂), Methane (CH ₄) and/or Nitrous Oxide (N ₂ O) are eligible for Gold Standard crediting, provided Projects comply with Gold Standard Requirements and eligibility criteria.	Only CO ₂ and CH ₄ are applicable for this project.
2.1.8 Projects involving the reduction of both eligible and non-eligible greenhouse gases shall be eligible under Gold Standard for the crediting of emission reductions associated with eligible gases only.	Only CO ₂ and CH ₄ are applicable for this project which is eligible gases.
4. Types of Project 2.1.9 The Following Project types are eligible for issuance of Gold Standard VERs: (a) Renewable Energy Supply: Project activities that generate and deliver energy services (e.g. mechanical work/electricity/heat) from non-fossil and renewable energy sources. (b) End-Use Energy Efficiency Improvement: Project activities that reduce energy requirements as compared to baseline scenario without affecting the level and quality of services or products, where the end user of the products and services are	The project scenario is the installation of improved & efficient cook stoves in the households. Hence this project is treated as end use energy efficiency improvement project. So project type b applies to the project and project types 'a, c, d' does not apply.

GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 v1.2 effective 24th October 2019	Validation opinion
clearly identified and when the physical intervention is required at the user end. For example, efficient cooking, heating, lighting, etc. (c) Waste Handling & Disposal: The waste handling and disposal category refers to all waste handling Projects that deliver an energy service (e.g. LFG with some of the recovered methane used for electricity generation) or a usable product with sustainable development benefits (e.g. composting). (d) Land Use and Forests: including Afforestation/Reforestation and Agriculture Projects (note – CDM LUF projects are not eligible for GS Labelling) Note that specific requirements apply with regards to the issuance of Gold Standard Labelled Renewable Energy Products and Gold Standard VERs.	
2.1.10 Co-issuance of Renewable Energy Attributes Certificates (REACs) with VERs for same MWh of electricity generated is not permitted. It is, however, possible for a Project to request issuance of either Gold Standard VERs and Gold Standard Labelled Renewable Energy Products – see the Renewable Energy Label Product Requirements for further details.	The project is seeking only GS-CERs only. The project does not involve any national or international RECs. Hence GS Renewable energy label requirements v1.2 does not apply for this project.
2.1.11 Furthermore, if the Project also applies the Gold Standard Renewable Energy Label Product Requirements then the Gold Standard Validation/Verification Body (hereafter VVB) shall check for double counting at both validation and verification stages by reviewing all relevant registries that could hold REACs from the considered project activity. The list of registries examined by the VVB shall be reported in the Validation Report and Verification Report. Refer to Renewable Energy Label Product Requirements for further details.	The project is seeking only GS-CERs only. The project does not involve any national or international RECs. Hence GS Renewable energy label requirements v1.2 does not apply for this project.
5. Official Development Assistance (ODA) Declaration 2.1.12 Projects are ineligible for carbon crediting under Gold Standard if the ODA assistance is provided to the project under the condition that the credits generated by the Project will be transferred, either directly or indirectly, to the donor country providing ODA support. The OECD defines Official Development Assistance (ODA) as financial flows: • To developing countries and multilateral institutions;	The capital investment of the project is ensured by the PP itself using loans and equity. Hence there is no ODA involved.

GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 v1.2 effective 24th October 2019	Validation opinion
• Provided by government agencies (e.g. USAID); • Whose main objective is the economic development and welfare of developing countries; and • That are concessional in character, conveying a grant element of at least 25%. 2.1.13 Project Developer submitting a Project located in a country named by the OECD Development Assistance Committee's ODA recipient list shall sign and submit the ODA Declaration.	
3. FINANCIAL ADDITIONALITY & ONGOING FINANCIAL NEED 6. General Requirement 3.1.1 All Gold Standard Project seeking the issuance of GSVERs or GSCERs shall be demonstrated to be additional, meaning that the Project shall reduce anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases below those that would have occurred in the absence of the proposed Project. The Gold Standard Project shall also demonstrate Ongoing Financial Need at Certification Renewal.	The project is seeking only GS-CERs only. The validation opinion of the additionality requirements are detailed in Appendix 7 of this report.
3.1.2 Gold Standard CDM and JI Projects are not required to carry out additional assessment for demonstration of additionality over and above what has been done for registration/determination with the CDM EB/JISC unless the Project falls into a category that is deemed non-Additional in an applicable Gold Standard Activity Requirement. In such cases the relevant Activity Requirement shall take precedence.	The project is applied for design certification under GS only. Hence the requirement is not relevant here.
7. Gold Standard VER Projects 3.1.3 The Requirements for the demonstration of Financial Additionality and Ongoing Financial Need are included in the Principles & Requirements and relevant Activity Requirements.	The validation opinion of the additionality requirements including ongoing financial needs requirements are detailed in Appendix 7 of this report.
3.1.4 If the stakeholder consultation for the Project was conducted after the start date of the Project, the Gold Standard reserves the right to require that the Project Developer demonstrate the revenues from carbon credits were seriously considered in the decision to implement the Project. Evidence to support carbon revenue consideration and continuous actions may include contracts, draft versions of Project information, correspondence with financial institutions or other stakeholders, minutes and notes of Board/Management meetings, agreements or negotiations with auditors, publications in newspapers.	PP has conducted local stakeholder consultations on both levels i.e., PoA and VPA level. The PoA Design Consultation on the PoA level has taken place from 03/09/2018 - 03/11/2018. The Design Consultation Report was checked and found ok by validation team. The VPA stakeholder consultation took place on 12/08/2018. Both reports were submitted to the Gold Standard.
4. ELIGIBLE METHODOLOGIES 4.1.1 Projects shall conform to the relevant Activity	The project is satisfied the requirements of Community Service Activity Requirements v1.2 (Refer Appendix 8

GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 v1.2 effective 24th October 2019	Validation opinion
Requirements and Gold Standard Approved Methodologies, including eligible CDM Methodologies.	of this report) and CDM approved methodologies AMS.II.G v12.0, AMS.III.BG v3.0 and AMS.I.E v11.0. (Refer Appendix 5 of this report)
8. CDM and JI Projects (LUF – N/A) 4.1.2 CDM and JI Projects shall use an approved UNFCCC CDM methodology to be eligible for Gold Standard Design Certification. All Project documentation shall apply the latest version of the methodology and applicable tools available at the time of first submission (preliminary review) of the Project to Gold Standard.	PP has applied CDM approved AMS.II.G v12.0 (valid since 14 December 2020), AMS.III.BG v3.0 (valid since valid 1 st June 2014) and AMS.I.E v11.0 (valid since 14 December 2020) for calculating emission reductions. For additionality, PP has used micro scale additionality tool (valid since 29 th November 2018) and small scale additionality tool (valid since 26 th April 2018). The preliminary review (Completeness Check Pathway) was concluded and the project is listed GS website https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects/details/2621 Hence accepted.
9. VER Projects 4.1.3 VER Projects shall use a Gold Standard Approved methodology or an eligible CDM methodology to be eligible for Gold Standard Design Certification. All project documentation shall apply the latest version of the methodology and applicable tools available at the time of first submission (preliminary review) of the Project to Gold Standard.	PP has applied CDM approved AMS.II.G v12.0 (valid since 14 December 2020), AMS.III.BG v3.0 (valid since valid 1 st June 2014) and AMS.I.E v11.0 (valid since 14 December 2020) for calculating emission reductions. For additionality, PP has used micro scale additionality tool (valid since 29 th November 2018) and small scale additionality tool (valid since 26 th April 2018). The preliminary review (Completeness Check Pathway) was concluded and the project is listed GS website https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects/details/2621 Hence accepted.
4.1.4 The methodology and tool version applied at the time of first submission may be used by the Project until it achieves Design Certification as long as the Project is submitted for validation within six months after the time of first submission for Preliminary Review. If this condition is not met, the latest version of the methodology and applicable tool(s) available at the time of submission for validation shall be applied.	PP has applied CDM approved AMS.II.G v12.0 (valid since 14 December 2020), AMS.III.BG v3.0 (valid since valid 1 st June 2014) and AMS.I.E v11.0 (valid since 14 December 2020) for calculating emission reductions. For additionality, PP has used micro scale additionality tool (valid since 29 th November 2018) and small scale additionality tool (valid since 26 th April 2018). The preliminary review (Completeness Check Pathway) was concluded and the project is listed GS website https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects/details/2621 Hence accepted.
10. Voluntary Programme of Activities (LUF – N/A) 4.1.5 VER Projects may use different methodologies under the same PoA. See Gold Standard for the Global Goals Programme of Activity Requirements.	The project is a PoA project. Hence the requirement is not applicable.
11. Data vintage: 4.1.6 When no specific guidance is provided on the valid reference point in time for data vintage, then the data available at the time of first submission of Project to Gold Standard are the ones to use.	All default values used are sourced from the applied methodologies.
4.1.7 All Projects (CDM / JI / VER) submitted for Gold Standard Design Certification shall apply the	All default values used are sourced from the applied methodologies.

GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 v1.2 effective 24th October 2019	Validation opinion
most recent data vintage for calculation of grid emission factor, available to project at the time of submission for validation, where required.	
5. PROJECT SCALE 12. Gold Standard CDM and JI Projects (LUF – N/A) 5.1.1 Gold Standard CDM or JI Projects may be 'large scale' or 'small scale' Projects. The applicability of methodologies is defined in accordance with UNFCCC rules. 5.1.2 Small scale Projects are defined as follows in UNFCCC rules: • Renewable energy Project capacity ≤ 15 MW • End-use energy efficiency project improvement ≤ 180 GWh_{th} • Waste handling & disposal project GHG reduction $\leq 60,000$ tCO_{2eq} per annum All Project exceeding the small scale thresholds are defined as large scale.	The project scenario is the installation of improved & efficient cook stoves in the households. Hence this project is treated as end use energy efficiency improvement project. Hence this project is considered to be small scale project.
5.1.3 Microscale CDM projects are defined based on individual unit threshold as defined by the CDM for e.g. in the case of distributed technology systems like domestic improved cookstoves and water filtration devices etc. • Renewable energy capacity/unit or installation ≤ 5 MW • End-use energy efficiency improvement/unit or installation ≤ 20 GWh_{th} • Waste handling & disposal GHG reduction $\leq 20,000$ tCO_{2eq} per annum per unit or installation	This project is considered to be small scale energy efficiency project. This project is a microscale project.
13. Gold Standard VER Projects 5.1.4 Standard VER Projects may be 'large scale', 'small scale' (for the applicability of methodologies and tools only) or 'microscale'. Scale is defined in the relevant Gold Standard Activity Requirements or where these do not exist then as follows: (a) 'Large scale' and 'small scale' projects are defined in accordance with UNFCCC rules, as explained above. (b) 'Microscale' Projects are those projects associated with annual emission reductions of less than or equal to 10,000 tCO_{2eq} in each year of the crediting period. It should be noted that the Gold Standard definition of 'microscale' projects is different from the CDM's definition of 'microscale' units. (c) In case of A/R Projects with a maximum project area of 500ha are classified under microscale.	The project scenario is the installation of improved & efficient cook stoves in the households. Hence this project is treated as end use energy efficiency improvement project. Hence this project is considered to be small scale project.
5.1.5 Projects with expected emission reductions exceeding the microscale eligibility threshold in	This project is a microscale CDM project.

GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 v1.2 effective 24th October 2019	Validation opinion
any of the years covered by the crediting period can still request for issuance, but the claimable emission reductions are capped at 10,000 tonnes of CO ₂ eq per year.	<u>Note:</u> This is not a microscale GS project considering the definition of microscale as per GS requirements
5.1.6 Where the maximum level of allowable annual emission reductions for a small scale or microscale Project has been exceeded during project operation, that Project shall only be eligible for Gold Standard CERs, ERUs or VERs up to the maximum number of allowable credits per year under that Project scale. No GSVERs can be claimed for emission reductions generated over and above what is credited under a small scale CDM or JI Project.	This project is a small scale or microscale project. Hence there is no cap on GS-CERs for this project. <u>Note:</u> This is not a microscale GS project considering the definition of microscale as per GS requirements
5.1.7 GSVERs may be claimed for eligible Project elements that are not covered by a CDM Project as long as the eligible elements are validated and verified separately as a VER Project.	The validation team has validated for the eligible elements of the project.
6. CREDITING CYCLE & ISSUANCE 14. Crediting Period 6.1.1 Gold Standard Projects that generate GHGs emission reductions are eligible to claim credits for no more than: (a) The maximum Certification Renewals/Cycles as stipulated in the relevant Activity Requirements OR (b) A maximum of one Certification Renewal Cycles (i.e. 10 years) in the absence of the Activity Requirements NOTE- Transition projects renewing their crediting period under Gold Standard for the Global Goals shall maintain their existing crediting cycle and maximum crediting periods following Transition Requirements.	The first crediting period of the project is for 5 years which is renewable twice. This is as per para 5.1.1 of GS Principles and Requirements v1.2
15. Crediting Period Start Date 6.1.2 The start date of the Gold Standard Crediting Period is the date of operation starts (start of planting for A/R Projects) or a maximum of two years prior to Gold Standard Design Certification, whichever occurs later. In case of A/R and Agriculture Projects it is maximum three years prior to Project Design Certification.	The start date of the crediting period is the date of operation starts or a maximum of two years prior to Gold Standard Design Certification, whichever occurs later.
6.1.3 In case the start date of the Gold Standard Crediting Period is after date of Project Design Certification then it may be postponed for one year without justification, or for up to two years if convincing justification is provided. The start date of the crediting period as mentioned in the registered PDD cannot be postponed by more than 2 years. (LUF – N/A)	This is not applicable.

GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 v1.2 effective 24th October 2019	Validation opinion
16. Retroactive crediting 6.1.4 Projects may be eligible for retroactive crediting for realised emission reductions prior to Gold Standard Design Certification for a maximum period of two years.	Not applicable
6.1.5 A/R and Agriculture Projects are eligible for retroactive crediting for maximum three years prior to Gold Standard Design Certification. Note - Retroactive crediting of 10 years for A/R Projects and 5 years for agriculture projects is allowed as an exception if time of first submission (preliminary review) was before January 1, 2016 for A/R Projects and January 1, 2017 for agriculture projects.	Not applicable
17. Aggregation of crediting periods (LUF – N/A) 6.1.6 Where a Gold Standard Project has been or is registered under one or more other voluntary carbon standards or certification schemes, the total aggregated crediting period under all schemes combined shall not exceed the standard crediting period allowed under Gold Standard. Gold Standard status shall immediately be withdrawn from any activities that are found to have violated this requirement and the Gold Standard reserves its right to pursue remedies in accordance with and pursuant to the Gold Standard Terms & Conditions.	The project is applied for GS-CER from GS only. Hence the condition is not relevant.
18. Issuance 6.1.7 Upon completion and approval of the Performance Review the Gold Standard shall certify the entire amount of emission reductions specified in the monitoring report and achieved by the Project. Certification of only part of total volume of emission reductions specified in the report approved by Gold Standard is not allowed. 6.1.8 Once issued, Gold Standard credits remain valid until they are permanently retired in the Gold Standard Impact Registry or until the time they are used for compliance or retired in an authorised registry (GSCERs). Once issued, GSCERs, or VERs cannot be retroactively cancelled.	The project is seeking design certification only under this scope of work.
19. Project design change 6.1.9 Permanent changes in project or PoA design shall be assessed as per Design Change Approval Procedures outlined in the Principles & Requirements.	The project is seeking design certification only under this scope of work. So project design change is not relevant.
20. CDM Project Cycle (LUF – N/A) 6.1.10 CDM Project Crediting Cycle: the project cycle shall mirror the CDM Cycle in terms of any Certification Renewals (e.g. 7 years) in order to continue issuing Gold Standard Labels. The projects shall provide a qualitative narrative to	The project is applied for design certification from GS only. Hence the condition is not applicable.

GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 v1.2 effective 24th October 2019	Validation opinion
demonstrate Ongoing Financial Need (OFN) at renewal of crediting cycle following the Principles & Requirements.	
6.1.11 CDM or JI Regular Cycle: Projects proceeding under the regular project cycle, the start date of the Gold Standard Crediting Period shall be the start date of the crediting period under CDM or JI or a maximum of two years prior to Gold Standard Project Design Certification, whichever occurs later.	The project is applied for design certification from GS only. Hence the start date of the Gold Standard Crediting Period shall be the start date of the crediting period under CDM or JI or a maximum of two years prior to Gold Standard Project Design Certification, whichever occurs later.
6.1.12 Pre CDM GSVERs for CDM or JI activities: Project Developers can claim pre-CDM GSVERs for a maximum of two years prior to the start of the CDM or JI crediting period (date of Design Certification/determination under UNFCCC) provided that the project enters into an agreement with the Gold Standard committing to surrender to the Gold Standard, for immediate retirement, CERs or ERUs that will be issued in respect of GHG Reductions generated by the Project during the CDM or JI crediting period in an amount equal to the Pre-CDM VERs or Pre-JI VERs. The agreement shall make use of the Emission Reduction Acquisition Agreement template and no delivery is required for a grace period of the initial two years of issuance after CDM Design Certification/JI determination.	The project is applied for design certification from GS only. Hence the condition is not relevant.
6.1.13 An eligible project may be submitted for Design Certification to both the Gold Standard CDM/JI stream and the Gold Standard VER stream in parallel. (a) If the proposed CDM/JI Project is successfully registered under the UNFCCC, Project Developer shall immediately inform The Gold Standard and the Gold Standard VER Project shall be cancelled. (b) If the proposed CDM/JI Project is rejected by the UNFCCC, Project Developer shall immediately inform the Gold Standard. Only if the Project was rejected due to inapplicability of the methodology, can continue to Design Certification under the GSVER stream.	The project is applied for design certification from GS only. Hence the condition is not relevant.
7. LAND USE & FORESTS SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS 7.1.1 Annex C contains a guideline that provides an overview of the issuance, transfer and retirement of Planned Emissions Reductions and GSVERs issued from Projects following the LUF Requirements.	The project scenario is the installation of improved & efficient cook stoves in the households. So this project is considered to be small scale energy efficiency project. Hence the condition under Annex C is not applicable.
21. Gold Standard Buffer 7.1.2 For projects applying the LUF Requirements, 20% of the issued PERs and GSVERs shall be transferred into the Gold Standard Buffer.	This project is considered to be small scale energy efficiency project. So the condition is not applicable.

GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 v1.2 effective 24th October 2019	Validation opinion
The transfer is distributed pro rata according to the vintage years. Upon written notice to the Gold Standard at or prior to issuance, the Project Developer may transfer issued GSVERs from other Gold Standard certified Projects to the Gold Standard Conformity Buffer in lieu of the carbon credits from the Project.	
22. Planned Emissions Reductions (PERs) 7.1.3 PERs may be issued by Projects following the LUF Requirements. They are subject to the following requirements: (a) PERs shall be issued only from project areas that have scientifically robust carbon modelling as required by the relevant Gold Standard Approved Methodology. (b) PERs shall be issued only from project areas where the VVB confirms, by certification, that trees have been planted or activity has taken place. (c) PERs shall be issued only after a successful Design Certification or subsequent Performance Certification. (d) 80% of the PERs shall be issued to the project's registry account according to their expected vintage years (years of delivery). The remaining 20% shall be issued to the Gold Standard Compliance Buffer. (e) All transfers and assignments of PERs shall be recorded in the Gold Standard Impact Registry. (f) After Performance Certification, where the effective emission reductions are verified, the PERs are converted into GSVERs, which are issued into the Gold Standard Impact Registry. (g) Project Developers shall transparently communicate the differences between PERs and GSVERs as described by the definitions of the Claims Guidelines.	This project is considered to be small scale energy efficiency project. So the condition is not applicable.
23. Issuance of PERs 7.1.4 After a successful Project Design Certification or subsequent Performance Certification, A/R Projects may issue PERs for maximum 5 years and Agriculture Projects may issue PERs upto 3 years.	This project is considered to be small scale energy efficiency project. So the condition is not applicable.
24. Carbon Performance 7.1.5 The Project Developer must ensure that the project carbon stocks are aligned with the number of issued PERs and GSVERs over time. This section also defines the activities that shall be implemented if the project carbon stocks decline below the levels of issued PERs and GSVERs. For the Performance Certification the project	This project is considered to be small scale energy efficiency project. So the condition is not applicable.

GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
owner shall provide documentation using the most recent version of the Carbon Performance template. (a) At any time during a crediting period, the Project Developer shall ensure that • the quantity of the PERs with respect to the project is equal or less than to the project's expected carbon stocks • the quantity of GSVERs with respect to the project is equal or higher (not less) to the project's expected carbon stocks. (b) Incidents, or events, that affect compliance with requirement (a) shall be reported to the Gold Standard. If they occur outside a certification process, the incidents or events shall be reported to the Gold Standard no more than 30 days after their discovery. The Carbon Performance template shall be used for this reporting. (c) If compliance with requirement (a) is not maintained, the project will be in a performance shortfall scenario. The Project Developer shall follow the requirements in the Performance Shortfall Guidelines and shall demonstrate to the Gold Standard how the project will realistically address the performance shortfall and recover appropriate levels of carbon stocks to comply with requirement (a). (d) The Project Developer shall use one or more of the following approaches according to the requirements in the Performance Shortfall Guidelines: • retiring/locking of PERs or GSVERs from the project which are not yet transferred or retired/locked • purchasing of GSVERs or GSCERs from any other Gold Standard projects (these can also be from non LUF project types such as renewable energy) • replanting of an appropriate planting area and recovery of the project carbon stocks over time • planting of new areas to generate further GSVERs 7.1.6 During the period where the project owner is not in compliance with requirement 7.5.1 (a), an equal number of PERs or GSVERs from the Gold	

GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 v1.2 effective 24th October 2019	Validation opinion
Standard Compliance Buffer will be put 'on-hold'. Further PERs or GSVERs shall only be issued for the project after the project owner has complied with requirement 7.5.1 (a). If after 5 years, the project developer cannot demonstrate that compliance with requirement 7.5.2 (a) will occur, the project owner shall follow the Non-Conformity process as per Principles & Requirements.	
25. Bundled Planned Emissions Reductions 7.1.7 Gold Standard allows for the 'bundling' of PERs with other GSVERs and GSCERs. The applicability, eligibility and Requirements can be found in the Gold Standard Bundled PER Guidelines & Requirements.	This project is considered to be small scale energy efficiency project. So the condition is not applicable.
8. GS-VVB REQUIREMENTS 8.1.1 Gold Standard Project Developers may use a GS-VVB as stated in the Gold Standard Validation & Verification Body Requirements.	EPIC is accredited to validate the project for design certification. https://www.goldstandard.org/resources/approved-auditors
8.1.2 VVB is required to conduct a site-visit as part of all Validation and Verification.	The validation team conducted a remote audit on 12/11/2020 and 13/11/2020 i.e., Remote audit i.e., through discussion with PP/CME and household's through tele calls
8.1.3 Gold Standard requirements for validation and verification site visits shall supersede the CDM requirements for GSCER projects, GSVER projects and any PoA. A CDM project or CDM PoA may be exempted from undertaking an audit site visit for CDM validation or CDM verification process but it shall comply with the Gold Standard requirements in order to pursue Gold Standard Design Certification and Performance Certification for issuance and labelling of CERs.	The validation team has visited the project site in October 2019 and February 2020.
8.1.4 Gold Standard Project administration is managed through The Gold Standard Impact Registry. All Project Developers seeking to apply for Design Certification under the Gold Standard CDM, JI or VER streams shall open an account in the Gold Standard Impact Registry. The appointed VVB shall have an approved account before they can audit a Gold Standard Project.	PP has the account in the Gold Standard Impact Registry. The project is listed on https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects/details/2621
9. UPGRADING FROM OTHER VOLUNTARY SCHEMES 26. Upgrading VERs to GSVERs 9.1.1 VER Projects registered, or to be registered, under another voluntary carbon crediting scheme may seek to upgrade a VER Project to a GSVER Project at any time during the crediting period with respect to future emission reductions, provided proof of the following is available:	The project is applied for design certification from GS only. Hence the condition is not relevant.

GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements v1.2 v1.2 effective 24th October 2019	Validation opinion
(a) The Project opts out from the other voluntary carbon crediting scheme and the emission reductions of a given vintage are claimed only once, under one single scheme; AND (b) The total duration of the crediting period including certification under other standard does not exceed the maximum crediting period allowed under Gold Standard as stated in the Principles & Requirements, Activity or Product Requirements.	
9.1.2 For an eligible project seeking Gold Standard certification, the Project Developer opts in for Gold Standard by delivering the full set of Gold Standard specific Project documentation, or the project documentation provided under the other voluntary scheme together with a report highlighting and discussing the gaps between the requirements of the other voluntary scheme and the Gold Standard requirements ("Gap Analysis Report"). This report shall be audited by a GSVVB.	The project is applied for design certification from GS only. Hence the condition is not relevant.
9.1.3 It is possible to upgrade an eligible LUF project from both CDM/JI & VERRA/CCBA to GSVERs. For transitions of LUF projects from other standards please contact the Gold Standard for eligibility check and certification procedure.	The project is applied for design certification from GS only. Hence the condition is not relevant.
27. Converting GSVER Project to GS CDM/JI Project during a crediting period (LUF – N/A) 9.1.4 Project Developers may seek to convert a GSVER Project to a Gold Standard CDM/JI Project at any time during the crediting period with respect to future emission reductions, provided the Project Developer either applies under the Gold Standard CDM/JI stream before any GSVERs have been issued, or enters into an agreement with The Gold Standard according to which they commit to surrender to The Gold Standard, for immediate retirement, CERs or ERUs that will be issued in respect of GHG Reductions generated by the Project in an amount equal to VERs already issued. The agreement shall make use of Emission Reduction Acquisition Agreement template.	The project is applied for design certification from GS only (GS-CER). Hence the condition is not relevant.
28. Converting GSCERs to GSVERs (LUF – N/A) 9.1.5 The Project Developer may choose to convert their issued GSCERs into GSVERs by following the applicable requirements and guidelines provided in Annex B.	The project is applied for design certification from GS only (GS-CER). Hence the condition under Annex B is not relevant.
29. Converting GS CDM Project to GSVER Project 9.1.6 The Project Developer may seek to convert a Gold Standard CDM Project to a GSVER Project by following applicable requirements and guidelines provided in Annex B.	The project is applied for design certification from GS only (GS-CER). Hence the condition under Annex B is not relevant.

Appendix 10: Claims guidelines-Gold Standard for the Global Goals

Claims guidelines-Gold Standard for the Global Goals	Validation opinion
PROJECT-LEVEL CERTIFICATION AND CLAIMS >>Design Certification: Successful completion of Gold Standard Project Design Certification means that a project can claim to have achieved 'Gold Standard Certified Project Design.' Gold Standard Project Design Certification means: The project design and planning has met the Gold Standard for the Global Goals Requirements, including Safeguarding Principles, Stakeholder Engagement, and Sustainable Development Goal requirements and has created a compliant Monitoring Plan. The project design and ex-ante impact assessment has been validated by an accredited, approved third party Gold Standard Validation and Verification Body (VVB). Following this the project has been reviewed by Gold Standard and is subject to over-arching independent review by the Gold Standard Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and NGO Supporters. It does NOT mean or imply: That any impacts have been realised or will be realised or that these have been verified by a VVB or certified by Gold Standard (see below).	The scope of the EPIC is to validation of new & regular project undergoing design certification. Only upon successful completion of Gold Standard Project Design Certification means that a project can claim to have achieved 'Gold Standard Certified Project Design.' The validation team has validated that the project design and planning has met the Gold Standard for the Global Goals Requirements, including Safeguarding Principles, Stakeholder Engagement, and Sustainable Development Goal requirements and has created a compliant Monitoring Plan. The validation team has validated the project design and ex-ante impact assessment.
IMPACT-LEVEL CERTIFICATION AND CLAIMS Gold Standard for the Global Goals specifies that all projects shall demonstrate a clear, direct contribution to sustainable development, defined as making demonstrable, positive contributions to at least three SDGs, one of which must be SDG 13, Climate Action	Project contributes positively to Climate Security & Sustainable Development. SDGs applied by the project are 1 – Goal 1; Target 1.1.; Indicator: Income generated by the sales of the charcoal 2 – Goal 7; Target 7.1.; Indicator: Increase in number of households using clean cooking devices such as Improved Cook Stoves 3 – Goal 8; Target 8.5.; Indicator: Number of jobs created by the project activity 4 – Goal 13; Target 13.2.; Indicator: GHG emissions saved annually through the project as contribution to a low greenhouse gas emission development path of India
Gold Standard Certified SDG Impacts must be a significant and primary effect of the projects and must be lasting. Certified SDG Impacts are third-party verified and certified by Gold Standard and are reported in the Project Impact Statement. Claims made around SDG impacts in project or funder communications should include an easily accessible footnote or hyperlink to a statement that describes the methodology for monitoring the benefits. When a project follows a Gold Standard-approved methodology and demonstrates Financial Need for a given Certified SDG Impact (for example, Gold Standard Verified Emission Reductions, Gold Standard-labeled Renewable Energy Certificates,	Project contributes positively to Climate Security & Sustainable Development. SDGs applied by the project are 1 – Goal 1; Target 1.1.; Indicator: Income generated by the sales of the charcoal 2 – Goal 7; Target 7.1.; Indicator: Increase in number of households using clean cooking devices such as Improved Cook Stoves 3 – Goal 8; Target 8.5.; Indicator: Number of jobs created by the project activity 4 – Goal 13; Target 13.2.; Indicator: GHG emissions saved annually through the project as contribution to a low greenhouse gas emission development path of India SDG positive impacts are primary in effect. It provides

Claims guidelines-Gold Standard for the Global Goals	Validation opinion
or Gold Standard ADALYs), these are issued as individually assignable and/or tradeable products and can be monetised or sold. These products are listed in the Gold Standard public registry and can be assigned to a funder or sponsor. These products also have additional rules or requirements governing their issuance, use, and claims; Please refer to Product Claims Guidelines. Projects and their funders are encouraged to use the logo for “Gold Standard Certified SDG Impacts” in their communications. Those that follow Gold Standard approved methodologies and demonstrate Financial Need may also use relevant SDG icons paired with the Gold Standard logo, as shown below, using SDG 3, Health as an example for projects that have issued ADALYs: >>Important note on management of health-related claims To ensure credibility and rigour and avoid over-claiming, making ANY health-related claims requires expert stakeholder input and clear academic justification. Absent of such substantiation, neither project nor funder shall make a claim to have improved health. For clean cooking and heating technologies that have neither applied the Gold Standard-approved ADALYs methodology nor provided expert stakeholder input and clear academic justification, the SDG contribution claims are limited to: “Many improved cookstoves are associated with reduced smoke, which can lessen exposure to dangerous indoor air pollution.”	improved cook stoves to the households. It gives direct employment to the local people. It would also achieve emission reduction. Since the project follows a CDM approved methodologies and demonstrates additionality for a given Certified SDG Impact (for example, Gold Standard Verified Emission Reductions), these can be issued as individually assignable and/or tradeable products and can be monetised or sold upon performance certification during the crediting period.
PRODUCT CLAIMS GUIDELINES FOR MONETISABLE ASSETS CERTIFIED SDG 13 IMPACTS – EMISSION REDUCTIONS These guidelines are applicable for climate mitigation claims for the following products: 1. Gold Standard Verified Emission Reductions (VERs) and Gold Standard labels for Certified Emission Reductions (CERs) 2. Gold Standard Planned Emission Reductions for sequestration Overview ‘Emissions Reductions’ represent the reduction or sequestration of one metric tonne of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂e). This ‘basket’ of gases within the ‘carbon dioxide equivalence’ includes Carbon Dioxide (CO₂), Methane (CH₄) and/or Nitrous Oxide (N₂O). Under Gold Standard for the Global Goals, the quantification and certification of tCO₂e and subsequent issuance of Gold Standard VERs or Gold Standard CERs represents a Certified SDG Impact to SDG 13[1] through its contribution to climate change mitigation. Under Gold Standard for the Global Goals, a limited number of Planned Emission Reductions	The validation team has validated that estimated Gold Standard Verified Emission Reductions (VERs). PP does not claim planned Emission Reduction. The proposed project does not involve any renewable energy product such as Renewable Energy Certificates. Hence GS Renewable Energy Label Product Requirements v1.2 does not apply for this project.

Claims guidelines-Gold Standard for the Global Goals	Validation opinion
may also be issued for certain project types. A Planned Emission Reduction represents the expected (i.e future) sequestration of 1 tonne of CO₂e. The Gold Standard Certified SDG Impact logo may be used in conjunction with issuance and funding of these products. 1. Product Claims – Gold Standard VERs and Gold Standard CER Labels For Project Developers: In addition to the allowed claims for being a Gold Standard Certified Project the project developer may also make the following claim: Project [NAME/NUMBER] made a contribution to SDG Target 13: issuing X,000 [Gold Standard VERs/ Gold Standard CERs] on [DATE]. This represents a direct and quantifiable impact on climate change mitigation, monitored, verified and certified by Gold Standard. For those retiring Gold Standard VERs and Gold Standard CER labels: These assets can be used in pursuit of ‘carbon neutral,’ ‘climate neutral,’ and ‘climate positive’ claims. In addition to the allowed claims for supporting a Gold Standard Certified Project, the funder may also make the following claim: Organisation X has made a contribution to SDG Target 13 by funding X,000 [Gold Standard VERs/Gold Standard CERs] on [DATE]. This represents a direct and quantifiable impact on climate change mitigation, monitored, verified and certified by Gold Standard. The buyer/retiree must not make claims for other Gold Standard Certified SDG Impacts that they have not directly funded (e.g., Black Carbon and/or ADALYs). They can, however, include a description of SDG Impacts as part of a project narrative, but must indicate clearly and precisely what their funds supported.	

Appendix 11: GS Safeguarding principles and Requirements

Safeguarding principles	Assessment questions	Assessment of relevance to the project - yes - potentially - no	Justification	Mitigation measure (if required)	Validation team conclusion
1. Social and Economic Safeguarding Principles					
Principle 1: Human Rights	Do the Project Developer and the Project disrespect internationally proclaimed human rights and are they complicit in violence or human rights abuses of any kind as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights The Project shall not discriminate with regards to participation and inclusion	No	The project is a voluntary action of the project developer and the partners. Users can freely decide if they want to buy a stove and thus be part of the project activity.	No	The project respects human rights in all points mentioned in the Safe Guarding Principles (version 1.1) of the Gold Standard for Global Goals. In particular India has ratified all necessary conventions on human rights. Hence accepted
Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Rights	Does the Project directly or indirectly lead to/contribute to adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women? e.g. Is there a possibility that the Project might: - reduce or put at risk women's access to or control of resources, entitlements and benefits? - adversely affect men and women in marginalised or vulnerable communities - is there an inequality between men and women in terms of benefitting more from the Project's activities?	No	The project will employ local women and distribute stoves to vulnerable communities.	No	The project does not reduce or put at risk women's access to or control of resources, entitlements and benefits. On the contrary, the project will have many benefits for women. This was checked and confirmed during the interview/discussions with Sapient Infotech.
	Does the project give women equal possibilities to participate in the project and in the consultation process (such as lack of time, child care duties, low literacy or educational levels, or societal discrimination)?	No	Especially women are involved in the project, since cooking is mainly done by women. Also in the factory, women will be employed. Literacy is not necessary, as the use of the stoves will be explained	No	The project takes into account the abilities of women or men to participate in the decisions/designs of the project's activity. This was checked and confirmed during the interview/

			vocally at the time of purchase and during the consultation meeting.		discussions
	Does the Project design contribute to an increase in women's workload that adds to their care responsibilities or that prevents them from engaging in other activities?	No	Through less time spent in wood collection and cooking the workload for women gets less.	No	The Project design does not contribute to an increase in women's workload that adds to their care responsibilities or that prevents them from engaging in other activities. This was checked and confirmed during the interview/discussions
	Is there likelihood that the proposed Project would expose women and girls to further risks or hazards?	No	Through the project activity, the risk of exposure to gender-based violence will reduce due to the reduction in fuel wood gathering time and distances travelled.	No	There is no likelihood that the proposed Project would expose women and girls to further risks or hazards. This was checked and confirmed during the interview/discussions
Principle 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions	The Project shall avoid community exposure to increased health risks and shall not adversely affect the health of the workers and the community.	No	The project is a household based clean cookstove project. Thus no increased health risks or negative effects on the workers or the community is expected. To the contrary, the clean cookstoves will improve air quality by reducing indoor air pollution while cooking. Also the project does not adversely influence the health of workers. Safety provisions are taken for the assembly of the cookstoves.	No	The project avoids community exposure to increased health risks and do not adversely affect the health of the workers and the community. The project does not expose women and girls to further risks or hazards. Women are consulted regarding the project and their comments are taking into account. This was checked and confirmed during the interview/discussions stakeholder.
Principle 4: Cultural	4.1 Sites of Cultural and Historical Heritage:	No	The project is a household based	No	This was checked and confirmed

Heritage, Indigenous Peoples, Displacement and Resettlement	Does the Project Area include sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g., knowledge, innovations, or practices)?		clean cookstove project, thus the project does not involve or be complicit in the alteration, damage or removal of any sites, objects or structures of significant cultural heritage. Cooking habits and dishes do not need to change.		during the interview/discussions stakeholder.
	4.2 Forced Eviction and Displacement Does the Project require or cause the physical or economic relocation of peoples (temporary or permanent, full or partial)?		The project is a household based clean cookstove project, thus the project does not involve physical or economic relocation of peoples		This was checked and confirmed during the interview/discussions stakeholder.
	4.3 Land Tenure and Other Rights Does the Project require any change to land tenure arrangements and/or other rights?		The project is a household based clean cookstove project, thus the project does not require change to land tenure arrangements and/or other rights		This was checked and confirmed during the interview/discussions stakeholder.
	4.4 Indigenous Peoples Are indigenous peoples present in or within the area of influence of the Project and/or is the Project located on land/territory claimed by indigenous peoples?		The project is a household based clean cookstove project, thus the project does not involve any land ownership. The project will make stoves available for all people living in the project region.		This was checked and confirmed during the interview/discussions stakeholder.
Principle 5: Corruption	Does the Project engage in, contribute to or reinforce corruption of any kind.	No	The project does not involve, is not complicit in, does not contribute inadvertently to and does not reinforce corruption or corrupt Projects.	No	The Project does not engage in, contribute to or reinforce corruption of any kind. This was checked and confirmed during the interview/discussions stakeholder.
Principle 6: Economic	2. The Projects shall consider economic	No	No risks are foreseen for the	No	This was checked and confirmed

Impacts	impacts and demonstrate a consideration of potential risks to the local economy and how these have been taken into account in Project design, implementation, operation and after the Project. Particular focus shall be given to vulnerable and marginalised social groups in targeted communities and that benefits are socially-inclusive and sustainable.		local economy through the realisation of the project, since stoves are not distributed for free but need be purchased by the users.		during the interview/discussions stakeholder.
Labour rights	1. The Project Developer shall ensure that there is no forced labour and that all employment is in compliance with national labour and occupational health and safety laws.	No	The project does not involve and is not complicit in any form of forced or compulsory labour. The project participants do not complicit in any form of forced or compulsory labour.	No	This was checked and confirmed during the interview/discussions stakeholder.
	2. Workers shall be able to establish and join labour organisations.	No	Each employee of the project is free to associate with whomever he wants.		This was checked and confirmed during the interview/discussions stakeholder.
	3. Working agreements with all individual workers shall be documented and implemented. These shall at minimum comprise: (a) Working hours (must not exceed 48 hours per week on a regular basis), AND (b) Duties and tasks, AND (c) Remuneration (must include provision for payment of overtime), AND (d) Modalities on health insurance, AND (e) Modalities on termination of the contract with provision for voluntary resignation by employee, AND (f) Provision for annual	No	Employees of the project will have working contracts with the local partners in the project country. The contracts will be according to the national regulations and is thus locally and culturally appropriate.		Agreements of all the individual workers involved in the project is being documented by CME. This was checked and confirmed during the interview/discussions stakeholder.

	leave of not less than 10 days per year, not including sick and casual leave.				
	5. Child labour, as defined by the ILO Minimum Age Convention is not allowed. The Project Developer shall use adequate and verifiable mechanisms for age verification in recruitment procedures. Exceptions are children for work on their families' property as long as: (a) Their compulsory schooling (minimum of 6 schooling years) is not hindered, AND (b) The tasks they perform do not harm their physical and mental development, AND (c) The opinions and recommendations of an Expert Stakeholder shall be sought and demonstrated as being included in the Project design.	No	Project participants and all involved parties do not employ children.		No Child labour is involved in the project. This was checked and confirmed during the interview/discussions stakeholder.
	6. The Project Developer shall ensure the use of appropriate equipment, training of workers, documentation and reporting of accidents and incidents, and emergency preparedness and response measures.	No	The project participants will provide appropriate equipment for assembly of the stoves as well as safety material (gloves, first aid kit). The project partners will provide and document training of workers employed in the project.		In order to enhance education of local staff and for professional purposes, Saipent is providing training about environmental stakes, climate change, and operational issues or potential improvement for all the employees. This was checked and confirmed during the interview/discussions stakeholder.
2. Environmental and Ecological Safeguarding Principles					
Principle 1: Climate and Energy	Will the Project increase greenhouse gas emissions over the Baseline Scenario?	No	The project does not lead to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions above	No	No, the Project will not increase greenhouse gas emissions over the Baseline Scenario.

GS-PoA-VAL-FORM

			the baseline emissions. The efficient cook stoves will reduce the release of CO ₂ emissions compared to the traditional three stone fires.		In fact it reduces the GHG's
	Will the Project use energy from a local grid or power supply (i.e., not connected to a national or regional grid) or fuel resource (such as wood, biomass) that provides for other local users?	No	The project does not use energy from the local grid or power supply that is also being used by other users; hence it does not affect the availability and reliability of energy supply to other users.	No	The project use fuel resource (wood), hence the Project will not use energy from a local grid or power supply
Principle 2: Water	Natural Water Patterns/ Flows Erosion and/or water body Instability	No	There will be no direct impact on the water body through the project.	No	The project will not have any impact on the water resources in the region.
Principle 3: Environment, ecology and land use	High Conservation Value Areas and Critical Habitats	No	There will be no direct impact on land use through the project. Positive effects on the environment and ecology have been discussed before.	No	No, does not lead to any changes to the surrounding environment

Appendix 12: Gender Equality Requirements and Guidelines

Gender Equality Requirements and Guidelines v1.1 effective from 1 st March 2018	Validation opinion
1.0 CERTIFICATION PATHWAYS 1.1 As outlined in the Gold Standard Gender Policy, gender certification is available at two levels. The first level is mandatory; the second level is optional. 1. Mandatory Gender-Sensitive Requirements – These requirements are mandatory for all projects (regardless of type of project) seeking Gold Standard certification. They include compliance with the Gender Safeguarding Principles and Requirements, and gender sensitive stakeholder consultations. 2. Optional Gender-Responsive Guidelines – These apply only to those projects that fulfill all the Gender Sensitive Requirements and further seek gender certification at the performance level. These projects must proactively conduct gender analysis and undertake actions to intentionally address gender gaps and contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment. Such projects are then eligible to obtain Gold Standard Certified SDG Impacts under SDG 5 (as well as other relevant SDGs). 1.2 The Gender Equality Requirements & Guidelines will apply to all new projects that are seeking certification under the Gold Standard for Global Goals (GS4GG). These Requirements & Guidelines will not apply retroactively to projects registered with previous versions of Gold Standard and transitioning to GS4GG.	PP has opted for mandatory gender sensitive requirements. Since the project is regular/new project seeking certification under the GS for Global goals, Gender Equality Requirements & Guidelines will apply. The below section reports how the project satisfies Gender Equality Requirements & Guidelines (steps 1 to 3 only).
2.0 GENDER SENSITIVE REQUIREMENTS (STEPS 1-3) 2.1 STEP 1: BASIC CONTEXT 2.1.1 Provide evidence that the Project concept and design covers the overall societal context from a gendered perspective. 2.1.1.1 Align the project to the Gold Standard Gender Policy. WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT? The main objective of the Gender Policy is to strengthen the Gold Standard and its stakeholders' responsiveness to the multiple, culturally-derived principles of gender equality and women's empowerment and to address and account for the links between gender equality, natural resources management and environmental sustainability. REQUIREMENTS The Gender Policy applies to all projects applying for Gold Standard certification, spells out the principles for achieving Gender Responsive certification at the performance level, and through supporting technical guidance on gender, solidifies the operational requirements for stakeholder involvement and partnership in the design, implementation, and evaluation of projects. Question 1: Does the project reflect the key issues and	Ok

Gender Equality Requirements and Guidelines v1.1 effective from 1 st March 2018	Validation opinion
requirements of Gender Sensitive design and implementation as outlined in the Gender Policy? Explain how.	
2.1.1.2 Conduct background gender research and align project to existing national policies, strategies, and best practices Question 2: Does the project align with existing country policies, strategies and best practices? Explain how.	Ok
2.2 STEP 2: APPLY GOLD STANDARD SAFEGUARDING PRINCIPLES REQUIREMENTS Apply the Gold Standard Safeguarding Principles & Requirements and take note of the gender guidelines and examples provided in the guidance notes. Country-level safeguards shall supersede the Gold Standard Requirements if they go beyond Gold Standard Requirements Question 3: Does the project address the questions raised in the Gold Standard Safeguarding Principles & Requirements document? Explain how. 2.2.1 Gold Standard may direct/support whether an expert stakeholder opinion (with a specific emphasis on gender and environment expertise) is required to support the gender safeguards assessment process depending on project type, scale and context.	The validation opinion of the questions raised in the Gold Standard Safeguarding Principles & requirements document is detailed in Appendix 11 of this report.
2.3 STEP 3: CONDUCT STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS Apply the Gold Standard Stakeholder Consultation & Engagement Procedure, Requirements & Guidelines and take note of the gender guidelines. Question 4: Does the project apply the Gold Standard Stakeholder Consultation & Engagement Procedure, Requirements & Guidelines? Explain how.	The validation team has reviewed the LSC report and accepted that it follows the Stakeholder Consultation & Engagement Procedure, Requirements & Guidelines v1.2.

Appendix 13: Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion																							
1. SCOPE AND APPLICABILITY 1.1.1 The aim of the stakeholder consultation is to engage affected stakeholders and to discuss potential environmental, social and economic impacts (both positive contributions and potential risks) that projects may have during design, planning and implementation and to establish an ongoing mechanism for feedback.	PP has conducted local stakeholder consultations on both levels i.e., PoA and VPA level. The PoA Design Consultation on the PoA level has taken place from 03/09/2018 - 03/11/2018. The Design Consultation Report was checked and found ok by validation team. The VPA stakeholder consultation took place on 12/08/2018. Both reports were submitted to the Gold Standard.																							
1.1.2 All Gold Standard projects shall “take gender issues into account”. This requires local stakeholder consultation processes to reach a wide range of community representatives in ways that ensure equal and effective participation of both women and men, and that gender issues are fully factored into comprehensive social and environmental impact assessments. Project Developers are referred to the Gold Standard Gender Equality Requirements & Guidelines and Gender Policy	PP has conducted a LSC meeting especially for women to ensure equal participation. The validation opinion of Gold Standard Gender Equality Requirements & Guidelines v1.1 is detailed in Appendix 12 of this report																							
2. TIMING OF LOCAL STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION 2.1.1 The Stakeholder Consultation shall be conducted prior to the start date of the Project so that the stakeholders can truly influence the project design, planning and its implementation	As per the PDD, start date of the project 07/06/2018. The first LSC meeting between landowners conducted on 12 th August 2018. Hence accepted.																							
2.1.2 If the Consultation is conducted after the start date, the stakeholders shall be provided with an opportunity to comment on the project and the Project Developer shall provide further explanation of how comments received during the consultation were taken into account.	This is not applicable.																							
3. MINIMUM GROUP OF STAKEHOLDERS TO BE CONSULTED 3.1.1 The Project Developer shall identify and invite all relevant (local, affected and interested) stakeholders as mentioned below for consultations and comments. (a) Local people, communities and or representatives who are directly or indirectly affected by the project (b) Stakeholders with land-tenure rights within or adjacent to the project must be contacted (c) Local policy makers and representatives of local authorities (d) National government officials or National focal bodies responsible for the project in the host country, for example, Designated National Authority (DNA) (e) Local non-governmental organisations (NGOs).	Initially, PP has sent the invitation and public notice to various stakeholders as follows. <table><tr><th>Organisation</th><th>Way of invitation</th><th>Date of invitation</th></tr><tr><td>Traditional wood stove users</td><td>Letter, phone & public announcement</td><td>30.07.2018 and 31.07.2018</td></tr><tr><td>TLUD users</td><td>Letter, phone & public announcement</td><td>30.07.2018 and 31.07.2018</td></tr><tr><td>Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd.</td><td>eMail</td><td>30.07.2018</td></tr><tr><td>School Board President, Sabita Bhakta Smriti School</td><td>Phone</td><td>30.07.2018</td></tr><tr><td>Business, Kastury Consultancy</td><td>Phone</td><td>30.07.2018</td></tr><tr><td>Field Assistant, Kastury</td><td>Phone</td><td>30.07.2018</td></tr></table>			Organisation	Way of invitation	Date of invitation	Traditional wood stove users	Letter, phone & public announcement	30.07.2018 and 31.07.2018	TLUD users	Letter, phone & public announcement	30.07.2018 and 31.07.2018	Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd.	eMail	30.07.2018	School Board President, Sabita Bhakta Smriti School	Phone	30.07.2018	Business, Kastury Consultancy	Phone	30.07.2018	Field Assistant, Kastury	Phone	30.07.2018
Organisation	Way of invitation	Date of invitation																						
Traditional wood stove users	Letter, phone & public announcement	30.07.2018 and 31.07.2018																						
TLUD users	Letter, phone & public announcement	30.07.2018 and 31.07.2018																						
Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd.	eMail	30.07.2018																						
School Board President, Sabita Bhakta Smriti School	Phone	30.07.2018																						
Business, Kastury Consultancy	Phone	30.07.2018																						
Field Assistant, Kastury	Phone	30.07.2018																						

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion		
Women Groups working on topics relevant to the project or working with communities who are likely to be affected by the project (f) A Gold Standard representative at help@goldstandard.org (g) Relevant international Gold Standard NGO Supporters NGO Supporters located in the host country of the project with representation in your region and all Gold Standard	Consultancy		
	Field Assistant, Kastury Consultancy	Phone	30.07.2018
	Field Assistant, Kastury Consultancy	Phone	30.07.2018
	Field Assistant, Kastury Consultancy	Phone	30.07.2018
	Stove Factory workers	Personal	30.07.2018
	West bengal forest development corporation	eMail	30.07.2018
	West bengal Forest Minister	eMail	30.07.2018
	West Bengal pollution Control Board	eMail	30.07.2018
	WBREDA, Department of Power and N.E.S.	eMail	30.07.2018
	Department of Panchayats & Rural Development	eMail	30.07.2018
	Ministry of Minority Affairs	eMail	30.07.2018
	National CDM Authority, Ministry of Environment and Forests	eMail	30.07.2018
	Ministry of Environment & Forests	eMail	30.07.2018
	Bandini Anandadhara Basuderpur	phone	30.07.2018
	Mou Anandahara Rota	phone	30.07.2018
	All Bengal Womens Union	eMail	30.07.2018
	SAMUHA, social and environment organisation	eMail	30.07.2018
	Association for Social and Environmental Development	eMail	30.07.2018
	Centre for environmental and Socio-economic Regeneration	eMail	30.07.2018
	Direct Initiative for Social and Health Action	eMail	30.07.2018

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion		
	West Bengal Minorities' Development & Finance Corporation	eMail	30.07.2018
	Direct Initiative for Social and Health Action	eMail	30.07.2018
	Bengal Women Welfare Association	eMail	30.07.2018
	Mother & child, NGO	Letter	31.07.2018
	West Bengal Commission for Women	Letter	31.07.2018
	Voice of Muslim Women in West Bengal	Letter	31.07.2018
	Local GS representative	eMail	30.07.2018
	Carbon Finance	eMail	30.07.2018
	Development Alternative	eMail	30.07.2018
	ENERghg	eMail	30.07.2018
	Fair Climate Network	eMail	30.07.2018
	Green Peace India	eMail	30.07.2018
	Rural Education for Development Society-REDS	eMail	30.07.2018
	SKG Sangha	eMail	30.07.2018
	WWF India	eMail	30.07.2018
	Carbon Watch	eMail	30.07.2018
	HELIO International	eMail	30.07.2018
	Winrock International India	eMail	30.07.2018
	Mercy Corps	eMail	30.07.2018
	REEEP	eMail	30.07.2018
	SEWA	eMail	30.07.2018
	Voluntary Institute for Rural Development	eMail	30.07.2018
	SANKALP India Trust	eMail	30.07.2018
	RURAL ORGANIZATION FOR SUSTAINABLE EMPOWERMENT	eMail	30.07.2018
	SOUTH GARIA GRAMIN WELFARE SOCIETY	eMail	30.07.2018
	TRIBAL AND RURAL EMPOWERMENT	eMail	30.07.2018

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion		
	AND ENLIGHTMENT SERVICES		
	EARTH FOUNDATION	eMail	30.07.2018
	UDAYANI SOCIAL ACTION FORUM	eMail	30.07.2018
	Welfare, Sustainance, Livelyhood and Economic Development of the	eMail	30.07.2018
	SWAMI VIVEKANANDA WELFARE SOCIETY	eMail	30.07.2018
	KUMARPUR RURAL DEVELOPMENT SOCIETY	eMail	30.07.2018
	Alternatively Very New Ideology (AVNI)	eMail	30.07.2018
	World Vision Australia	eMail	30.07.2018
	HIMCHI RURAL WELFARE CENTRE	eMail	30.07.2018
	WWF International	eMail	30.07.2018
	Non-Conventional Energy and Rural Development Society (NERD SOCIETY Coimbatore)	eMail	30.07.2018
3.1.2 The Project Developer shall provide evidence that invitations were sent to the relevant stakeholders and that their comments were invited. If any of the relevant stakeholders were not invited, the project participants shall provide appropriate justification.	The validation team has reviewed the LSC meeting report and observed that PP has identified the relevant stakeholders and then invitation is extended to all the relevant stakeholders.		
4. MEANS FOR INVITING STAKEHOLDERS 4.1.1 The Project Developer shall invite local stakeholders to participate in the meeting and provide comments on the proposed project in an open and transparent manner, in a way that facilitates comments to be received from local stakeholders.	PP has sent invitations to all the local people, stakeholders. LSC meeting was conducted to local stakeholders to get comments in a free and transparent manner.		
4.1.2 The Project Developer shall invite the stakeholders selecting an invitation method that is most appropriate to the context and for the region, taking into account local and national circumstances, including appropriate language and measures and using adequate and effective means.	People will understand Hindi better in India. The public notice is prepared in Hindi, Bengali language so that people will understand their common language better.		

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
4.1.3 Projects shall ensure that the stakeholders are invited in a 'gender-sensitive' manner and efforts must be made to solicit input from women and marginalised groups.	PP has conducted a LSC meeting on 12 th August 2018 especially for women to ensure equal participation. Hence accepted.
4.1.4 The Project Developer shall not deny anyone access to the consultation. It shall be open for anyone wishing to participate.	The validation team did not see any evidence to show that anybody was denied access to the LSC meetings. The validation team has also interviewed some of the stakeholders and support the fact.
4.1.5 The invitation for the consultation meeting shall be given at least 30 days before the meeting takes place.	The initial notice sent on 30 th July 2018 and LSC meeting conducted on 12 th August 2018. Since sufficient time has been given before the meeting, this is acceptable.
5. INFORMATION TO BE MADE AVAILABLE TO STAKEHOLDERS 5.1.1 Prior to the consultation, the Project Developer shall provide information in a manner including format, language(s) that allows local stakeholders to understand and engage with the project. The information to be made available to stakeholders shall include, inter alia: (a) A non-technical summary of the project including information on project design, technology, objectives, scale, duration and implementation plan (so far as known) (b) Summary of the economic, social and environmental impacts of the project as per Safeguarding Principles & Requirements (c) Contact details to get further technical detail and project information, should any stakeholder be interested (d) Other relevant information to help stakeholders understand the project (e) Means and method to provide feedback for those who are not able to join the consultation meeting	The validation team has reviewed the LSC meeting report. Along with the public notice, PP has sent agenda of the meeting and non-technical project description, contact details to the invitees.
6. CONSULTATION 6.1.1 The Stakeholder Consultation shall comprise of a minimum two rounds of consultation including one mandatory physical meeting and one stakeholder feedback round lasting for at least two months.	The validation team has reviewed the LSC meeting report. The initial LSC meeting conducted in person and the stakeholder feedback round lasting for 60 days.
6.1.2 Where necessary, other means and approaches that are appropriate for local and national circumstances can be used to conduct stakeholder consultation meetings. For example, due to the nature of the project, instead of one big physical consultation meeting, several meetings at different locations may be conducted to ensure that relevant stakeholders can participate.	There is no local rule on how to conduct LSC in India. However, PP has followed the GS guidelines for LSC.

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
6.1.3 The project shall encourage equal and effective participation by both men and women in the stakeholder consultation (this also includes the suitability of place and timing of the consultation(s)).	The LSC meeting conducted between various stakeholders as below. Hence accepted.
6.1.4 For retroactive projects, project implementation is started without conducting the first round of stakeholder consultation following the Requirements. In such cases, the physical meeting shall be integrated with the stakeholder feedback round, if this has not taken place as part of previous stakeholder consultations. The physical meeting conducted during the stakeholder feedback round must follow all requirements listed in this document. Special attention must be paid to the fact that the projects must take into account stakeholder feedback and shall modify project design, where reasonable.	This is regular project and LSC meeting conducted well before start date of the project (xx).
7. CONTINUOUS INPUT AND GRIEVANCE MECHANISM 7.1.1 All projects shall setup a formal input, feedback and grievance mechanism with the purpose of providing stakeholders with an opportunity to submit any feedback or raise grievances during the entire project life.	The validation team has checked how the stakeholder consultation for the project activity by interviewing the stakeholders during the remote audit. The validation team interviewed beneficiaries and confirmed that local stakeholders are satisfied about the project and do not have any negative comments. They are of the positive opinion about the project. They do not have any grievances from the project as such and are aware of the grievance mechanism and how to contact the CME through field officers in case of grievances. The validation team has observed that the project does not have any visible impact on human activities.
7.1.2 The project shall discuss the potential options with stakeholders and agree on an appropriate method.	
7.1.3 At a minimum, Continuous Input and Grievance Expression Process Book shall be made available at an agreed location.	
8. CONSIDERATION OF COMMENTS RECEIVED 8.1.1 The Project Developer shall apply a gender lens while assessing the relevance and appropriateness of the stakeholders' comments.	All comments are properly answered to the satisfaction of the people.
8.1.2 The project shall consider the comments provided by the Stakeholders and report on how the comments have been accounted for. It may also involve changes in the project design, where appropriate. The Project Developer shall provide justifications when any comments have not been incorporated or addressed.	PP has consolidated all the comments raised by the stakeholders during the LSC meeting and all comments are satisfactorily closed in the LSC meeting.
8.1.3 The Stakeholders shall be provided with the feedback on how their comments have been taken into account as part of the stakeholder feedback round.	The validation team has checked how the stakeholder consultation for the project activity by interviewing the stakeholders during the remote audit. The validation team interviewed beneficiaries and confirmed that local stakeholders are satisfied about the project and do not have any negative comments. They are of the positive opinion about the project. They do not have any grievances from the project as such and are aware of the grievance mechanism and how to contact the CME through field officers in case of grievances. The validation

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
	team has observed that the project does not have any visible impact on human activities.
9. ONGOING REPORTING 9.1.1 Ongoing Monitoring & reporting project Developer shall provide information in the annual and monitoring report, as applicable, for the following: (a) Concerns that have been identified and raised by stakeholders during the stakeholder consultations and the mitigation measures put in place to address those. (b) Any feedback given by stakeholders as part of the project's grievance mechanism	PP has accepted that it would take into account all the comments raised during the course of the project.
10. STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION DOCUMENTATION 10.1.1 The Project Developer shall make use stakeholder consultation report template to document all the steps taken to meet the Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement Requirements and provide evidence to demonstrate the compliance	PP has used LSC template to document LSC events, comments, mitigation measures etc.
10.1.2 The Stakeholder consultation report shall be submitted to Gold Standard within three months of the event (though this date may be after the Project Start Date).	PP has submitted LSC report ^{/4/} for preliminary review to GS.
STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT GUIDELINES v1.2 effective 24th October 2019 1. SCOPE AND APPLICABILITY 1.1.1 This document provides a step-by-step guide to help conduct a stakeholder consultation in an effective and meaningful manner. It also presents guiding questions to audit and validate the stakeholder consultation process. This guidance document refers to Gold Standard Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement Requirements, however, where any conflict appears the 'Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement Requirements' supersedes the guidance document	The validation team has reviewed the LSC meeting report ^{/4/} . The validation opinion how the requirements of Gold Standard Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement is detailed below.
1.1.2 Stakeholder Consultations provide a critical opportunity to engage stakeholders in a meaningful manner to improve project design and its outcomes. It also enables projects to identify, avoid and minimise adverse impacts and establish ongoing communications with relevant stakeholders	People will understand Hindi, Bengali better for VPA 1. The LSC meeting was conducted in Hindi, Bengali language so that people will understand their common language better.
1.1.3 Involving the relevant stakeholders at an early stage of the project cycle helps them to understand the project, participate in decision-making and exchange views and/or concerns regarding the project impacts and opportunities. This generates a sense of ownership and helps to improve the long-term results for the project.	As per the PDD, start date of the project will be on 1 st Aug 2020. The first LSC meeting between landowners conducted on 12 th August 2018. Hence accepted.

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
2. PLANNING FOR STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION 2.1.1 It is important to review the Principles & Requirements and Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement Requirements to prepare a formal "Stakeholder Consultation plan". Careful planning will help ensure a successful consultation and Project Developers should consider the key elements while planning for these consultations	PP has identified the relevant stakeholders and has sent the public notice well in advance. The validation team has reviewed the LSC meeting report^{4/}. The LSC Consultation plan is accepted by the validation team.
2.1.2 A list of suggested guiding questions for the preparation of stakeholder consultations are: (a) What are the objectives of the stakeholder consultation? (b) Who are your relevant stakeholders? Are you planning to involve everyone? Who else is missing? (c) How will you engage them? What is the most appropriate format? (d) Have you identified the potential impacts and risks of the project? (e) Have you prepared the mitigation plan to avoid and minimise the adverse impacts of the project? (f) Have you prepared an appropriate communication plan to share project information with stakeholders before and after the consultations?	The validation team has reviewed the LSC meeting report. It is observed that PP has used all the guiding questions in conducting the LSC process.
2.1.3 The Gold Stakeholder consultation process comprises of at least two rounds of consultation. The project should consider different gender relationships and roles in the project area while preparing for consultations. Women and men typically fulfil different roles and responsibilities, depending on the context and the country. Virtually no role is always exclusively performed by just women or men. Because women often are assigned lower social status relative to men, women tend to have lower confidence, less influence and less involvement in the design, decisions and engagement with projects. In developing a project, "taking gender issues into account" requires that local stakeholder consultation processes reach a wide range of community representatives in ways that ensure equal and effective participation of women and men, and that gender issues are fully factored into comprehensive social and environmental impact assessments. Project Developers are referred to the Gold Standard Gender Equality & Requirements Guidelines and Gold Standard Gender Policy.	PP has conducted a LSC meeting on 12th August 2018. Hence accepted.
2.1.4 In addition, to the above questions, the Project Developer should consider the following questions to ensure gender equality while planning for	The validation team has reviewed the LSC meeting report. It is observed that PP has used all the guiding questions in conducting the LSC process.

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
Stakeholder Consultations: (a) What measures and actions need to be put in place to ensure equal gender participation in Stakeholder Consultations? (b) How should inputs and insights from women and men be sought out, listened to, considered, addressed and documented? (c) Is it necessary to make any specific arrangements to ensure that all constituencies are engaged in the consultation? (for example, speak to women and men separately; have focus groups for women and focus groups for men before gathering them together to ensure their meaningful participation; adapt timings to fit with men's and women's working schedules) A few examples of gender-sensitive consultation approaches are: • FAO: SEAGA (Socio-economic and Gender Analysis): An approach based on an analysis of socio-economic patterns and participatory identification of women's and men's priorities. The objective of the SEAGA approach is to close the gaps between what people need and what development delivers. • CARE Canada: Stakeholder and institution mapping. • USAID: When to use a Gender stakeholder analysis. Integrating Gender into climate change projects ENERGIA: Elizabeth Cecelski; Soma Dutta (2011); Mainstreaming Gender in Energy Projects: A Practical Handbook	
2.1.5 While preparing for the Stakeholder Consultation, the Project Developer should also carefully consider the social and other barriers that may prevent participation in consultations. Examples of obstacles to participation by women in public meetings and/or decision-making include: • Ignorance and illiteracy, including ignorance of rights. • The mockery, criticism, and other attitudes that confront women who speak out. • Distrust from development workers and other members of the community. • Traditional roles and power divisions. • The higher control by men over information and resources relative to women. • Meetings are organised in places and at times not suitable for women. • Meetings are conducted in a non-local language. • Lack of access to or control over financial resources. • Lack of solidarity among women or conflict within the community. • Lack of self-confidence and low self-esteem.	PP has conducted a LSC meeting on 12th August 2018 especially for women to ensure equal participation. Hence accepted

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion		
3. IDENTIFY THE STAKEHOLDERS 3.1.1 Identification of relevant stakeholders is a critical step for a successful consultation. The Project Developer should identify the stakeholders in a transparent manner, ensuring that all relevant (both affected and interested stakeholders) are provided with an opportunity to participate in consultations. A list of required stakeholders who shall be invited to the consultation is provided in Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement Requirements and included here for reference. (a) Local people, communities and or representatives who are directly or indirectly affected by the project (b) Stakeholders with land-tenure rights for any area directly affected by the implementation of the project (i.e., within the project boundary) (c) Local policy makers and representatives of local authorities (d) National government officials or National Focal bodies responsible for the project in the host country, for example, Designated National Authority (DNA)⁴ (e) Local non-governmental organisations (NGOs), Women Groups working on topics relevant to the project or working with communities who are likely to be affected by the project (f) Relevant international Gold Standard NGO Supporters located in the host country of the project 5 with representation in your region and all Gold Standard (g) A Gold Standard representative at help@goldstandard.org	Initially, PP has sent the invitation and public notice to various stakeholders as follows.		
	Organisation	Way of invitation	Date of invitation
	Traditional wood stove users	Letter, phone & public announcement	30.07.2018 and 31.07.2018
	TLUD users	Letter, phone & public announcement	30.07.2018 and 31.07.2018
	Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd.	eMail	30.07.2018
	School Board President, Sabita Bhakta Smriti School	Phone	30.07.2018
	Business, Kastury Consultancy	Phone	30.07.2018
	Field Assistant, Kastury Consultancy	Phone	30.07.2018
	Field Assistant, Kastury Consultancy	Phone	30.07.2018
	Field Assistant, Kastury Consultancy	Phone	30.07.2018
	Field Assistant, Kastury Consultancy	Phone	30.07.2018
	Stove Factory workers	Personal	30.07.2018
	West bengal forest development corporation	eMail	30.07.2018
	West bengal Forest Minister	eMail	30.07.2018
	West Bengal pollution Control Board	eMail	30.07.2018
	WBREDA, Department of Power and N.E.S.	eMail	30.07.2018
	Department of Panchayats & Rural Development	eMail	30.07.2018
	Ministry of Minority Affairs	eMail	30.07.2018
	National CDM Authority, Ministry of Environment and Forests	eMail	30.07.2018
	Ministry of Environment & Forests	eMail	30.07.2018
Bandini Anandadhara	phone	30.07.2018	

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion		
	Basuderpur		
	Mou Anandahara Routs	phone	30.07.2018
	All Bengal Womens Union	eMail	30.07.2018
	SAMUHA, social and environment organisation	eMail	30.07.2018
	Association for Social and Environmental Development	eMail	30.07.2018
	Centre for environmental and Socio-economic Regeneration	eMail	30.07.2018
	Direct Initiative for Social and Health Action	eMail	30.07.2018
	West Bengal Ninorities' Development & Finance Corporation	eMail	30.07.2018
	Direct Initiative for Social and Health Action	eMail	30.07.2018
	Bengal Women Welfare Association	eMail	30.07.2018
	Mother & child, NGO	Letter	31.07.2018
	West Bengal Comission for Women	Letter	31.07.2018
	Voice of Muslim Women in West Bengal	Letter	31.07.2018
	Local GS representative	eMail	30.07.2018
	Carbon Finance	eMail	30.07.2018
	Development Alternative	eMail	30.07.2018
	ENERghg	eMail	30.07.2018
	Fair Climate Network	eMail	30.07.2018
	Green Peace India	eMail	30.07.2018
	Rural Education for Development Society-REDS	eMail	30.07.2018
	SKG Sangha	eMail	30.07.2018
	WWF India	eMail	30.07.2018
	Carbon Watch	eMail	30.07.2018
	HELIO International	eMail	30.07.2018
	Winrock International India	eMail	30.07.2018

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion		
	Mercy Corps	eMail	30.07.2018
	REEEP	eMail	30.07.2018
	SEWA	eMail	30.07.2018
	Voluntary Institute for Rural Development	eMail	30.07.2018
	SANKALP India Trust	eMail	30.07.2018
	RURAL ORGANIZATION FOR SUSTAINABLE EMPOWERMENT	eMail	30.07.2018
	SOUTH GARIA GRAMIN WELFARE SOCIETY	eMail	30.07.2018
	TRIBAL AND RURAL EMPOWERMENT AND ENLIGHTMENT SERVICES	eMail	30.07.2018
	EARTH FOUNDATION	eMail	30.07.2018
	UDAYANI SOCIAL ACTION FORUM	eMail	30.07.2018
	Welfare, Sustainance, Livelyhood and Economic Development of the	eMail	30.07.2018
	SWAMI VIVEKANANDA WELFARE SOCIETY	eMail	30.07.2018
	KUMARPUR RURAL DEVELOPMENT SOCIETY	eMail	30.07.2018
	Alternatively Very New Ideology (AVNI)	eMail	30.07.2018
	World Vision Australia	eMail	30.07.2018
	HIMCHI RURAL WELFARE CENTRE	eMail	30.07.2018
	WWF International	eMail	30.07.2018
	Non-Conventional Energy and Rural Development Society (NERD SOCIETY Coimbatore)	eMail	30.07.2018
3.1.2 The Project Developer should ensure all stakeholder groups are engaged, particularly the	PP has conducted a LSC meeting on 12 th August 2018 especially for women to ensure equal		

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
stakeholders that are often marginalised, including women, youth, the poor informal sector workers, ethnic minorities, indigenous peoples, disabled or elderly people, and members of the LGBTQ community.	participation. Hence accepted. The LSC meeting conducted for various categories as below.
3.1.3 Where it is not appropriate to engage with stakeholder groups, for example indigenous peoples, the project should make provisions to engage with their legitimate representatives (this may include community leaders, regional or national political groups and NGOs).	PP has not conducted a LSC meeting for indigenous people. But it has conducted LSC meeting among provincial authorities and national authorities who represents indigenous people.
3.1.4 Stakeholder mapping is one effective way to explore gender gaps. The Project Developer should ensure that gender-sensitive stakeholder mapping is conducted, and the selection of stakeholders is complemented with sex-disaggregated census data, where available.	PP has identified the relevant stakeholders including community people, landowners, women etc. Hence accepted.
3.1.5 Suggested guiding questions: (a) Who are the local stakeholders? Do they include women, men or both? Do they include different socio-economic groups? (b) Are there stakeholder groups from which women or men are excluded? (c) Which ones? Why? What do they lose through non-participation? (d) Are there stakeholder groups composed of women exclusively or men exclusively? If so, what is the focus of these groups? What do women/men gain from them? (e) What project activities are men and women involved in and when and where do these activities take place? (f) Who is most dependent on the resources at stake (women or men)? Is this a matter of livelihood or economic advantage? (g) Who has access to and control of resources and services and decision making? How are decisions made? (h) How do target groups interact with the project developer? (i) What are the constraints to access and participation? (j) Who has the capacity to contribute to gender equality in the project? (k) Who has the capacity to hinder efforts of gender equality in the project?	The validation team has reviewed the LSC meeting report. It is observed that PP has used all the guiding questions in conducting the LSC process.
4. DECIDE TIME AND PLACE FOR PHYSICAL MEETING	The LSC meeting conducted between various stakeholders as below. Hence accepted.

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
4.1.1 To schedule the physical meeting, the Project Developer should take into account the stakeholder's work arrangements, accessibility, cultural or religious sensitivities. Particular attention should be given to women and the needs of marginalised groups to ensure their participation 4.1.2 The Project Developer should ensure that the physical meeting(s) is organised in an atmosphere that allows all participants to express their views and concerns freely.	
4.1.3 When one meeting is not adequate due to social, cultural, logistics and other barriers, the Project Developer should consider organising focus groups or smaller meetings for specific groups. For example, • A women's only meeting may be required in order to register their concerns and insights • In some communities, power relations play a part in who may or may not voice an opinion or concern in a meeting. Therefore, excessive representation of a hierarchy in a physical meeting could be intimidating for particular stakeholder groups. For example, a senior government official and a female widowed farmer may have different perspectives and positions of power, which might affect their contributions in the meeting. In such cases, the developer may need to organise several meetings in different locations to ensure that all stakeholders can participate and contribute to the discussion and share their views.	PP has conducted a LSC meeting on 12th August 2018 especially for women to ensure equal participation. Hence accepted
5. MEANS FOR INVITING STAKEHOLDERS 5.1.1 When inviting stakeholders for physical meetings, the Project Developer should ensure that all stakeholders are invited proactively and well in advance to allow sufficient time for stakeholders to make arrangements to participate.	PP has sent invitations to all the local people. LSC meeting was conducted separately for landowners, community and women to get comments in a free and transparent manner. PP has identified the relevant stakeholders and has sent the public notice well in advance. The validation team has reviewed the LSC meeting report. The LSC consultation plan is accepted by the validation team.
5.1.2 The invitation should clearly state the objectives of the consultation, physical meeting date, venue along with details on how feedback can be submitted for those who are unable to attend the physical meeting. The Project Developer should provide an email address, postal address, contact details of a local representative, which stakeholders can use to submit their concerns and/or questions and get project information. 5.1.3 The Project Developer should select an invitation method taking into account local and national circumstances, including appropriate language and measures to ensure a gender-	PP has sent invitations to all the local people. LSC meeting was conducted separately for landowners, community and women to get comments in a free and transparent manner. PP has identified the relevant stakeholders and has sent the public notice well in advance. The validation team has reviewed the LSC meeting report and accepted the mode of invitation, mode of conducting the LSC meeting. The LSC consultation plan is accepted by the validation team.

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
sensitive communications process, using adequate and effective means. 5.1.4 The invitations should include both oral and written invitations – for example door to door announcements, announcements in newspapers, radio or television, emails, announcements in public meetings, phone messages and calls, announcements at places which stakeholders visit frequently, for example, community centres, cultural centres, health clinics, post offices, municipality offices, schools and places of worship (churches, shrines, temples, mosques, etc.). 5.1.5 The Project Developer should also use alternative means of invitations considering the local context. For example, the written notice is not a useful mode of communication with an illiterate group of stakeholders. In cases, where the majority of stakeholders are illiterate, the Project Developer should use oral means – like radio announcement or hand-delivered invitation in the local language.	
5.1.6 Project Developers should track all the invitations sent out. If stakeholders do not respond to the invitation, the Project Developer should follow up via email, letter or by phone. In many cases, where phone numbers are unknown, visits to the project area may be required. This is important for cases where a Project Developer has identified a potential risk to a particular stakeholder group or local authority, as a justification will need to be provided on how they were consulted.	PP has sent the public notice and invitation to the identified stakeholders and most of them has attended the meeting.
6. INFORMATION TO BE MADE AVAILABLE TO STAKEHOLDERS 6.1.1 The scope of the stakeholder consultation is to engage affected stakeholders and to discuss potential environmental, social and economic impacts (both positive contributions and potential risks) that projects may have during design, planning and implementation, and to establish an ongoing mechanism for feedback. 6.1.2 In order to provide adequate and timely information to the stakeholders, the Project Developer shall share the following information in the local language, prior to a consultation. (a) A non-technical summary of the project, including information on project design, technology, objectives, scale, duration and implementation plan (so far as known) tailored to the target stakeholder group to allow them to understand and engage with the project.	The LSC meeting include introduction, agenda, project description, advantages, project cycle etc. in a simple manner for the stakeholders to understand.
(b) Summary of the economic, social and	The LSC meeting include introduction, agenda,

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
environmental impacts of the project as per Safeguarding Principles & Requirements (c) Contact details to get further technical detail and project information, should any stakeholder be interested (d) Other relevant information to help stakeholders understand the project	project description, advantages, project cycle etc. in a simple manner for the stakeholders to understand. The stakeholders are provided with summary of the economic, social and environmental impacts of the project.
6.1.3 The Project Developer is not obliged to disclose confidential commercial information. 6.1.4 The Project Developer should consider some key points to decide the format in which project information should be prepared and presented to stakeholders - level of technical detail; local language and dialects; cultural sensitivity; and the roles of women and men, including the impact of the project on gender relations, ethnic composition of communities, literacy levels, community leadership structures, and local methods of disseminating information within stakeholder groups	The LSC meeting include introduction, agenda, project description, advantages, project cycle etc. in a simple manner for the stakeholders to understand. The stakeholders are provided with summary of the economic, social and environmental impacts of the project.
7. CONDUCT CONSULTATION 7.1.1 The Stakeholder Consultation should comprise of a minimum of two rounds of consultation	The LSC meeting consists of two rounds of consultation. The validation team has observed that both rounds are conducted by the PP.
7.1.2 For a successful consultation, it is crucial to ensure that participants understand the information shared during the physical meeting. Therefore, the Project Developer should consider common issues and plan accordingly. For example (a) arrange for an interpreter if more than one language is used in the project area (b) keep the agenda of the meeting clear (c) explain the project and its potential impacts and risks in a simplified and easy to understand manner (d) include a discussion on potential adverse impacts that a project may cause and how the Project Developer will address these (e) should include a question and answer session to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to seek more information or raise any questions about the project (f) should be sensitive to those stakeholders who are unable to read, write, see or hear and provide assistance to them	The LSC meeting include introduction, agenda, project description, advantages, project cycle etc. in a simple manner for the stakeholders to understand. The stakeholders are provided with summary of the economic, social and environmental impacts of the project.
7.1.3 The Project Developer should identify a respected local facilitator(s) to assist with engaging all stakeholders present and avoid allowing a single person or stakeholder group to set an atmosphere that prevents others from sharing their views and concerns. Particular attention should be given to encourage	All were allowed to give their opinion freely and there was no suppression.

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
women to voice their opinions and if this is not possible given local customs, consider conducting a separate meeting, for example, a separate consultation for women only.	
7.1.4 To conduct the physical meeting, following an agenda and discussion points are recommended. The Project Developer may deviate from the agenda; however all elements listed below should be covered to ensure a meaningful consultation. (a) Opening of the meeting with an introduction of the Project Developer and stakeholders and objective of the meeting i.e., share project information and gather feedback and suggestions from all stakeholders to further improve the project. (b) Explain the project in non-technical terms, providing project details including the location, project technology, implementation timelines, etc. Also, it is good practice to disclose relevant information about the Project Developer, implementers and other parties involved in the project.	The validation team has reviewed the LSC meeting report. The LSC meeting include introduction, agenda, project description, advantages, project cycle etc. in a simple manner for the stakeholders to understand. The stakeholders are provided with summary of the economic, social and environmental impacts of the project.
(c) Arrange a question and answer session to provide stakeholders with an opportunity to ask questions to understand the project. Provide pen and paper for stakeholders to write down any questions and/or concerns, and encourage people to do so. (d) Explain the expected sustainable development impacts of the project, both positive and negative, in a simplified manner and invite the stakeholders to provide their feedback. The Project Developer should ask stakeholders if they think there are any other relevant impacts of the project.	The validation team has reviewed the LSC meeting report. The LSC meeting include introduction, agenda, project description, advantages, project cycle etc. in a simple manner for the stakeholders to understand. The stakeholders are provided with summary of the economic, social and environmental impacts of the project. All the questions raised by the stakeholders are answered to the satisfaction of the stakeholders.
(e) Discuss any potential adverse risks of the project, asking obvious questions for the Safeguarding Principles Assessments. Invite stakeholders to discuss their concerns and how these concerns could be addressed. Discuss the mitigation plan to address the risks and ask if there are any suggestions to improve the mitigation measure(s). Try to reach a consensus among the stakeholder regarding the final proposed measure(s) to mitigate or minimise the risk in time. (f) Follow the discussion with the positive impacts and invite stakeholders to provide views on project contributions; if the project is doing too little/enough/too much for identified impact and invite their reasoning. Consider prompting people by asking them first to think in terms of their priorities and day-to-day realities and then of the priorities of future generations. Try to reach consensus on the assessment of the impacts during the discussion before continuing to	The stakeholders are provided with summary of the economic, social and environmental impacts of the project.

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
the next agenda item. The exercise is challenging, so take care not to confuse and ask too much of your stakeholders. Gather as many comments as possible to improve and balance the project's impacts. (g) Discuss the monitoring plan for sustainable development impacts by inviting stakeholders to share ideas on how this could be done in a cost-effective and participatory way. What are the most appropriate ways for stakeholders to monitor the project? Again, consider the abilities and capacity of your stakeholders and be reasonable in expectations. (h) Discuss the mechanism for input and grievance with the stakeholders to decide what are the best methods to raise concerns and/or seek recourse for impacts that occur during the project implementation. At the physical meeting, the Project Developer should discuss potential options, such as those listed in the table below, for filing a grievance and the associated procedures and protocols to ensure that stakeholders agree with the selected grievance mechanism. (i) Particular attention should be paid to feedback received from women or women's groups or other groups who are marginalised or fearful to come forward with a complaint	
(j) At the end of the meeting, invite the stakeholders to complete the evaluation form. Explain the follow-up action plan and how stakeholders can access the minutes of the meeting. It is also important to let attendees know how their comments are recorded and how they may find out about the follow-up actions to address the comments. Also, share the information on the Stakeholder Feedback Round. Close the meeting and collect Stakeholder Meeting Evaluation Forms using the following format.	The validation team has reviewed the evaluation forms used during the LSC meetings. Feedback of the stakeholders is recorded in the forms. All questions raised by the stakeholders are answered adequately by the PP.
7.1.5 The Project Developer should record the minutes at the meeting and gather evidence as pictures or if appropriate record a video; these are useful for the Stakeholder Consultation documentation. Keep the meeting minutes short and focus on comments received during the meeting. The developer may appoint a trusted individual (for example, a community nurse or school principal) in advance to record the minutes of the meeting.	PP has recorded the minutes of meeting and consolidated as a LSC report
7.1.6 The Project Developer should record the participant list (see example content below), to register their name and contact details, job or position and sign to indicate they were present	PP has recorded the participant list and consolidated as a LSC report. The list contains their name and contact details, job, position and signature.
8. CONSIDERATION OF COMMENTS RECEIVED 8.1.1 Feedback evaluation and follow up actions are	All the questions raised by the stakeholders are satisfactorily answered by the PP.

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
a crucial part of the consultations process. The following steps provide guidance on how the follow up actions and feedback should be shared after the meeting. 8.1.2 All the comments/suggestions raised by the stakeholders in the meeting or via evaluation forms or other means must be documented by categorising as positive, neutral or negative.	
8.1.3 The Project Developer should consider all the comments and identify the comments that are serious, reasonable and proportional and therefore should be taken into account. 8.1.4 The Project Developer should compare its own sustainable development and safeguarding assessment with the outcome of the stakeholder consultation meeting. All the differences should be identified, and the project documentation should be updated accordingly. 8.1.5 If one or more aspects of the project are considered negative and consensus could not be reached in the meeting, the Project Developer should revisit the impact assessment with an independent third party. 8.1.6 The Project Developer's judgment is key at this stage and will ultimately determine changes to the final Project Design, implementation and other relevant aspects. For example, if women provided feedback on the design of a cookstove, it is important to account and understand the rationale behind the feedback considering that women are the primary user of the technology.	All the questions raised by the stakeholders are satisfactorily answered by the PP.
8.1.7 If some stakeholders' concerns seem unwarranted, make a case as to why this is so. Negative stakeholder comments are not necessarily a reason to stop a project's progress, however, all stakeholder concerns should be addressed and accounted for or justified. 8.1.8 It may highlight unintended risks or harms from a gender perspective. Make sure to document individual differences⁶ as they relate to priorities, concerns and potential impacts (positive or negative). These should be categorised and evaluated separately. 8.1.9 After assessing the comments, the Project Developer should decide whether to change or amend the Project Design. Changes to the Project Design generally increase local ownership of and interest in the project and enhance sustainable development. 8.1.10 The Project Developer shall document any alterations that will be made to the Project Design resulting from the Stakeholder Consultation meeting	There was no negative comment raised in the LSC meeting. Hence accepted.

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
in the respective section of the project documentation 8.1.11 The Project Developer should document any comments, criticisms or improvements that were made to the input and grievance expression methods discussed at the physical meeting.	
9. STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK CONSULTATION 9.1.1 The Stakeholder Feedback Round (i.e., the second round of consultation) covers all the issues raised in the first round of consultation (i.e., physical meeting). The Project Developer should provide feedback to the stakeholders on how comments from the physical meeting have been considered and provide another opportunity to seek comments from stakeholders 9.1.2 All stakeholders invited to participate in the first consultation should be invited to the Stakeholder Feedback Round. 9.1.3 The Stakeholder Consultation documentation and revised project documentation should be made accessible via a website or online platform. In addition to publishing the project documents via a website, the Project Developer should consider providing hard copies of the documents available at community places; for example, the local post office or municipality office, library, community health centre, or nursery or primary school.	For the Design Consultation feedback on the programme design was collected electronically. On 03/09/2018 e-mail was sent to several stakeholders with following documents: The e-mail contained the following documents: PoA Design Consultation form • Key Project Information_improved cookstove_PoA_Assamese • Key Project Information_improved cookstove_PoA_Bengali • Key Project Information_improved cookstove_PoA_English • Key Project Information_improved cookstove_PoA_Hindi • Key Project Information_improved cookstove_PoA_Tamil • Key Project Information_improved cookstove_PoA_Telugu
9.1.4 The Stakeholder Feedback Round remains open for a minimum of 60 days. 9.1.5 If the physical meeting was not organised in the first round of consultation, the Project Developer should organise a physical meeting with stakeholders following the steps mentioned previously. 9.1.6 During the Stakeholder Feedback Round, all stakeholder comments should be captured and addressed. 9.1.7 The Stakeholder Feedback Round can be conducted in parallel to the Validation process but the validating VVB must take into account the stakeholders' feedback to conclude the Validation opinion. 9.1.8 The Project Developer should document the Stakeholder Feedback Round and how it was organised, what the outcomes were and how the feedback was followed up.	The validation team has reviewed the LSC meeting report. The initial LSC meeting conducted in person and the stakeholder feedback round lasting for 60 days.
10. ONGOING MONITORING 10.1.1 The Project Developer should monitor and record concerns and feedback that have been identified and raised by stakeholders during the	PP has accepted that it would take into account all the comments raised during the course of the project.

Stakeholder Consultation and engagement requirements v1.2 effective 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
stakeholder consultations and implementation and the mitigation measures put in place to address those. 10.1.2 The Project Developer should record and address any feedback given by stakeholders as part of the project's grievance mechanism and include in the monitoring report.	

Appendix 14: GS for Global Goals-Programme of Activity Requirements v1.2

GS for Global Goals-Programme of Activity Requirements v1.2 effective from 24 th October 2019	Validation opinion
1. SCOPE AND APPLICABILITY 1.1.1 The Programme of Activity (PoA) requirements provide the minimum requirements for designing and implementing a PoA and seeking issuance of Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products.	The project will purchase and organize the distribution of the renewable biomass and ensures that only sources are used that are in line with the requirements according to GS Renewable energy activity requirements vers. 1.2.
1.1.2 All Voluntary Project Activities (VPAs) or Component Project Activities (CPAs) submitted for Design Certification within a PoA, must be in compliance with relevant Gold Standard eligibility criteria (for example Principles & Requirements and applicable Activity Requirements).	The proposed PoA is generally open for different technologies that allow energy efficient cooking with biomass. Therefore, the applied technology will differ from one VPA to another and will be justified.
1.1.3 These Requirements are not applicable to projects applying Land Use & Forests Activity Requirements or Contextual Requirements.	The project will purchase and organize the distribution of the renewable biomass and ensures that only sources are used that are in line with the requirements according to GS Renewable energy activity requirements vers. 1.2.
1.1.4 Unless otherwise specified in this document, Gold Standard PoAs follow the requirements listed in the CDM Project Standard for Programmes of Activities.	OK
2. PoA BOUNDARY 2.1.1 The PoA boundary is defined as the geographical area (e.g. municipality, region within a country or several countries) within which all CPAs/VPAs will be implemented. All applicable regional and national policies and regulation shall be taken into consideration for each Host Country within a PoA boundary.	The PoA will be located in India, the boundary of the PoA being identical to the political boundaries of the Republic of India. Approximated geographical coordinates are 8-36° northern latitude and 68-98° eastern longitude.
2.1.2 The PoA boundary must be defined in its entirety at the time of Design Certification. An expansion of the PoA boundary can be requested following the design change approval procedure (refer to Section - Design Change Rules for details).	
3. START DATE, DURATION AND CREDITING PERIOD 3.1.1 The PoA start date for a Gold Standard voluntary PoA is the date when the PoA Design Consultation Report is submitted for Gold Standard Review. This event is the time of first submission of the PoA. The	The CME has chosen date of notification to DNA and UNFCCC for determining the start date of the PoA i.e., 7th June 2018. The validation team has accepted the date of notification as the start date of the proposed PoA project activity by reviewing the UNFCCC website and email sent to both

start date for a CDM Gold Standard PoA follows the definition of start date of a CDM PoA.	UNFCCC & DNA. The expected operational lifetime is 28 years from the date of start date of the PoA. PP has selected the crediting period to lasts 5 years and can be renewed two more times, up to 15 years.
3.1.2 The PoA crediting period start date is the crediting period start date of the earliest VPA/CPA included in the PoA.	PP has selected the crediting period to lasts 5 years and can be renewed two more times, up to 15 years.
3.1.3 The PoA duration shall not exceed 20 years or the crediting period of first VPA/CPA plus 5 years, whichever is greater. The PoA that are design certified under an earlier version of Gold Standard shall maintain their maximum crediting periods as envisaged at time of registration. Refer to Transition Requirements for further details.	The expected operational lifetime is 28 years from the date of start date of the PoA. However PP has selected the crediting period to lasts 5 years and can be renewed two more times, up to 15 years.
3.1.4 Unless otherwise stated in a specific Methodology or Product Requirements, the VPA/CPA crediting period start date is either the VPA/CPA Start Date or two years prior to the date of Design Certification whichever is later. For the VPA/CPA start date definition, refer to the project start date as defined in the principles and requirements. Under no circumstances, the VPA/CPA crediting period start date can be earlier than PoA crediting period start date.	PP has selected the crediting period to lasts 5 years and can be renewed two more times, up to 15 years.
3.1.5 The crediting period of a VPA/CPA shall not exceed the end of the duration of the PoA, regardless of the VPA/CPA inclusion date or start date.	PP has selected the crediting period to lasts 5 years and can be renewed two more times, up to 15 years.
3.1.6 The crediting period of a VPA/CPA shall be selected as per relevant Activity Requirements or in the absence of these Principles & Requirements. The coordinating/managing entity (hereafter "CME") shall select and specify the crediting period in the VPA/CPA Design document (VPA/CPA DD) at the time of inclusion to the PoA.	PP has selected the crediting period to lasts 5 years and can be renewed two more times, up to 15 years.
3.1.7 A CPA/VPA may be submitted for inclusion to the PoA at any time during the duration of the PoA by the CME.	PP is submitting VPA1 along this PoA for registrations
3.1.8 In order for the PoA to be listed under Gold Standard, the PoA document including a Stakeholder Consultation Report shall be submitted for preliminary review. The PoA can only be listed once a preliminary review of PoA and each one of its VPAs/CPAs submitted with PoA for preliminary review has been completed. When the Stakeholder Consultation is conducted at the Programme level only, the listing will be based on the submission of the Programme level Stakeholder Consultation Report.	PP has already submitted Stakeholder Consultation Report for preliminary review from GS. There are now major outstanding issues
3.1.9 Regular and Retroactive VPA/CPA are defined as (a) Regular VPA/CPA is the activity for which the Stakeholder Consultation (1st round) has been conducted before the Start Date of the VPA/CPA. (a) Retroactive VPA/CPA is the activity for which a Stakeholder Consultation (1st round) is conducted after the Start Date of the VPA/CPA.	NA

4. ADDITIONALITY 4.1.1 The additionality shall be demonstrated at both the PoA and VPA/CPA level, where required, in line with the Principles & Requirements or relevant Activity Requirements. The CME may seek exception by providing convincing justifications validated by Validation/Verification Body (VVB) and approved by Gold Standard as to why demonstration of programme level additionality is appropriate for proposed PoA.	According to the COMMUNITY SERVICES ACTIVITY REQUIREMENTS vers1.2 Annex B positive list, in order to qualify for automatic additionality, it will be demonstrated in the CPA-DD registered under this PoA that: Project activities are solely composed of isolated units where the users of the technology/measure are households or communities or institutions and where each unit results in ≤ 600 MWh of energy savings per year or ≤ 600 tonnes of emission reductions per year.
4.1.2 The CME shall demonstrate additionality of proposed PoA by establishing that in the absence of Gold Standard Certification related finance (i) the proposed CPA/VPA would not be implemented, or (ii) the mandatory policy/regulation would systematically not be enforced and that non-compliance with those requirements is widespread in the country/region, or (iii) that the PoA will lead to a greater level of enforcement of the existing mandatory policy/regulation or to a greater level of adoption of an existing voluntary scheme	According to the COMMUNITY SERVICES ACTIVITY REQUIREMENTS vers1.2 Annex B positive list, in order to qualify for automatic additionality, it will be demonstrated in the CPA-DD registered under this PoA that: Project activities are solely composed of isolated units where the users of the technology/measure are households or communities or institutions and where each unit results in ≤ 600 MWh of energy savings per year or ≤ 600 tonnes of emission reductions per year.
4.1.3 VPA/CPA level additionality can be proven using one of the following options in line with the Principles & Requirements (a) UNFCCC-approved or a Gold Standard-approved Additionality tool to demonstrate project additionality, with the exception of specific Activity or Product Requirements as stated in the relevant documentation. (b) Where appropriate under specific Activity Requirements, small-scale Gold Standard Projects can use the latest version of CDM "Methodological Tool – Demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities" to demonstrate additionality. 4.1.4 The latest version of the additionality tool available at the time of first submission of PoA shall be applied. This tool may be used by PoA until PoA completes Design Certification. The PoA shall include conditions that would systematically demonstrate additionality of VPAs/CPAs under the proposed PoA in the inclusion criteria of VPAs/CPAs in the PoA. 5. USE OF THE GOLD STANDARD IMPACT REGISTRY 5.1.1 To develop a PoA under Gold Standard, the CME shall have an account in the Gold Standard Impact Registry. The PoA and its corresponding VPAs/CPAs/ will be managed via this CME account as follows: (a) The CME of the PoA opens an account in their name in the Impact Registry; (b) PoA entry is created under this account with a unique GS ID. All relevant PoA level documents required at the Design Certification shall be uploaded (PoA-DD and associated documentation) to this GS ID; (c) An entry per VPA/CPA is created each with its own unique GS ID, in the CME account or in the Project Developers' accounts as per the signed Cover Letter. All	As above

documents relevant to a VPA/CPA (VPA/CPA DD, VPA/CPA Stakeholder Consultation Report) will be uploaded to its registry entry; and (d) Each CPA/VPA must be prefixed with the GS ID and title of the POA that it is linked to Example: A cookstove PoA in Mongolia comprised of two VPAs will have the following three entries on the Impact Registry: GS ID Project Name	
6. STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION 6.1.1 The CME shall conduct the local Stakeholder Consultation at both the PoA and the VPA/CPA level. The CME may seek exception by providing convincing justifications validated by Validation/Verification Body (VVB) and approved by Gold Standard at the PoA Design Certification stage as to why demonstration of programme level stakeholder consultation is sufficient for proposed PoA. 6.1.2 The PoA level consultation i.e., PoA Design Consultation is mandatory and is conducted to obtain feedback from governments, relevant national authorities, NGO communities, and other stakeholders on the design of the PoA. The PoA design consultation does not necessarily require a live meeting. The CME shall make use of the design consultation template to document the PoA Design Consultation. 6.1.3 In the case of multi-country PoA, the CME shall demonstrate that all relevant stakeholders across the different countries have been invited to provide feedback on the design of the PoA. 6.1.4 Stakeholder consultations at the VPA/CPA level shall comprise of a minimum two rounds of consultation including one mandatory physical meeting and one stakeholder feedback round lasting at least two months. Refer to the Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement requirement for details. 6.1.5 For regular VPA/CPA, the physical meeting with stakeholders shall be conducted during the first round of consultation. For retroactive VPA/CPA, a physical meeting shall be held at the stakeholder feedback round if no physical meeting has taken place earlier or depending on the outcome of the detailed preliminary review or a VVB's request in case of Completeness Check pathway (Pathway 1). 6.1.6 A single stakeholder physical meeting can be organised for several VPA(s)/CPA(s) as long as convincing justification is provided and approved by Gold Standard, e.g. the activities are close enough to each other in location and time (start of construction/implementation within the same 2 years), similar socio-economic situations, identical activity or technology, etc. This approach shall be approved at the time of listing the VPA/CPA i.e. submission of activity level stakeholder consultation report.	PP conducted local stakeholder consultations on both levels i.e., PoA and VPA level. The PoA Design Consultation on the PoA level has taken place from 03/09/2018 - 03/11/2018. The Design Consultation Report was provided for verification. The VPA stakeholder consultation took place on 12/08/2018. Both reports were submitted to the Gold Standard.
6.1.7 In cases where only PoA level consultations are being conducted, a physical meeting for stakeholders is required at the PoA level in parallel to the design consultation. The physical meeting shall be followed by	As above

a Stakeholder Feedback Round at PoA level. The CME shall use the PoA Design Consultation Report template for this process and shall give at least one month notice to stakeholders invited to attend the meeting. 6.1.8 The stakeholder consultation report shall be submitted to Gold Standard within three months of the event (though this date may be after the VPA/VPA Start Date).	
7. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT (a) Contributions to SDGs 7.1.1 The CME shall conduct the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) impact assessment at the VPA/CPA equivalent level as per Principles & Requirements. 7.1.2 An exception can be granted, if convincing justifications validated by a VVB and approved by Gold Standard are provided as to why the SDG impact assessment shall be conducted at PoA level only. In such a case, the CME shall include SDG inclusion criteria in the PoA DD for inclusion of VPAs/CPAs in the PoA. The future VPAs/CPAs shall only be included in the PoA if they are in line with SDG compliance criteria. (b) Safeguarding Principles & Requirements 7.1.3 The CME shall conduct the Safeguarding Principles Assessment as per the Safeguarding Principles & Requirements at the VPA/CPA equivalent level. 7.1.4 An exception can be granted, if convincing justifications, validated by a VVB and approved by Gold Standard are provided as to why the Safeguarding Assessment shall be conducted at PoA level only. In such a case, the CME shall include Safeguarding Principles & Requirements conformity criteria in the PoA DD based on identified risks with respect to the relevant safeguarding principles. The PoA DD shall contain Safeguarding Principles & Requirements criteria per type of activity, defined at Programme level. The future VPAs/CPAs shall only be included in the PoA if they are in line with the conformity criteria.	PP has selected the following SDG's Goal 1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere Target 1.1 By 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, currently measured as people living on less than \$1.25 a day. The stove generates charcoal during the normal cooking task as a waste product of the pyrolysis process. This charcoal can be sold by the stove users to the project partners. The selling of the charcoal generates an additional income for the households. The indicator to measure this goal will be the income generated by the sales of the charcoal. Goal 7. Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all 7.1 By 2030, ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services The project is designed to provide cleaner, safer, more affordable and more efficient cooking equipment than traditional stoves to poor household by means of carbon finance. The indicator to monitor the access to affordable and clean energy is the increase in number of households using clean cooking devices such as Improved Cook Stoves. Goal 8. Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all 8.5 By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value. The project will lead to economic growth and employment opportunities. Jobs will be created that benefit locals. The number of jobs created will be monitored, and also evidence on the income and equal income for both men and women for the same job, will be provided. The indicator to monitor the target is the number of jobs created by the project activity. Goal 13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts 13.2 Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning The efficient cookstoves will use less fuelwood for the cooking task and thus reduce GHG emissions compared to the traditional way of cooking. The indicator to monitor the target is the amount of the reduced GHG emissions annually through the project as contribution to a lower greenhouse gas emission development path of India.

	Other possible contributions: Since the PoA-DD is open for several stove designs, some of these stoves might be imported to the host country, or production lines for such stoves might be established in the future. The TLUD Gasifier stove is fabricated in India. As such there is no technology transfer to the host country.
8. SELECTION OF A BASELINE AND MONITORING METHODOLOGY 8.1.1 The Gold Standard allows Voluntary PoAs to use more than one GS-Approved Methodology. In the case of CDM methodologies, combinations of multiple technologies/measures and/or small-scale methodologies is allowed in line with the latest version of the CDM project standard for programmes of activities.	The CPAs registered under the PoA may apply three small scale methodologies: - AMS–II.G, version 12: “Energy Efficiency Measures in Thermal Applications of Non-Renewable Biomass”. This methodology will be applied in any case. - AMS–III.BG version 03: “Emission reduction through sustainable charcoal production and consumption”. ER will be claimed under this methodology in activities where charcoal generated in ICS will replace conventional charcoal. - AMS-I.E, version 11: “Switch from Non-renewable biomass for thermal applications by the users”. ER will be claimed under this methodology in activities where renewable biomass will be provided to ICS users.
8.1.2 All methodologies/combination of methodologies shall be introduced in the PoA DD together with a justification for their application. A real case VPA/CPA DD be submitted for each/combination of methodologies at the time of validation of the PoA. 8.1.3 In the case of methodologies applicable for several technologies/measures (e.g. Gold Standard TPDDTEC methodology), each/combination of the technologies/measures included in the PoA shall be included in the PoA DD along with the justification of their eligibility and application. A real case VPA/CPA must also be submitted for each/combination of these technologies/s at the time of validation of the PoA. 8.1.4 In the event that an activity makes use of a technology/measure that was not included in the PoA DD prior to Design Certification, design change rules at the PoA level shall be followed to include new technology/measures. Subsequently, a complete validation (including VVB site-visit) and Design Certification review of the VPA/CPA shall be required at the time of inclusion in the PoA. A site visit is not automatically necessary, if justification is provided and approved by Gold Standard. 8.1.5 A new methodology not already applied in the registered PoA DD may be introduced post-Design Certification, but in such a case, design change rules at the Programme level shall apply and the VPA/CPA applying the new methodology shall undergo a full Validation and Design Review. 8.1.6 When the design change is carried out at the	The CPAs registered under the PoA may apply three small scale methodologies: - AMS–II.G, version 12: “Energy Efficiency Measures in Thermal Applications of Non-Renewable Biomass”. This methodology will be applied in any case. - AMS–III.BG version 03: “Emission reduction through sustainable charcoal production and consumption”. ER will be claimed under this methodology in activities where charcoal generated in ICS will replace conventional charcoal. - AMS-I.E, version 11: “Switch from Non-renewable biomass for thermal applications by the users”. ER will be claimed under this methodology in activities where renewable biomass will be provided to ICS users.

Programme level as a result of the introduction of new methodology(ies)/ technology(ies)/measure(s) not already included in the design certified PoA DD, the PoA DD shall be modified accordingly. 9. APPLICABLE METHODOLOGY VERSIONS (a) PoA 9.1.1 The latest version of the methodology available at the time of first submission to Gold Standard shall be used. At the time of renewal of the PoA, the latest version of the methodology available at that time shall be adopted. (b) VPA/CPA 9.1.2 All VPAs/CPAs to be included in the PoA shall use the same version of the methodology that is defined in the most recent version of the PoA documentation. The use of an updated methodology version is also allowed following Validation and Design Review of the methodology changes.	
9.1.3 At the time of renewal of a VPA/CPA, the methodology version defined in the most recent version of the PoA documentation shall be adopted. The use of an updated methodology version is also allowed following Validation and Design Review of the methodology changes. Examples: • A VPA/CPA included during the second year of the first certification period of the PoA shall use the methodology version defined in the PoA documentation at the time of Design Certification; this methodology version is valid for the course of the CPA/VPA's first crediting period or longer if allowed in the relevant activity requirement. • A VPA/CPA included during the second crediting period of the PoA shall use the methodology version defined in the PoA documentation that was revised during its Design Certification Renewal after the first certification cycle; this methodology version is valid for the course of the VPA/CPA's first crediting period or longer if allowed in the relevant activity requirement. 10. DE-BUNDLING RULES 10.1.1 De-bundling provisions included in CDM methodology Tool Assessment of De-bundling for small-scale project activities do not apply to Voluntary PoAs. 11. PROJECT DOCUMENTS 11.1.1 For a CDM PoA, the CME shall provide following documents CDM-POA-DD, PoA-Key Programme information, CPA-DD and CPA-Key Project Information document (KPI). 11.1.2 Similarly, for a Voluntary PoA, in addition to the PoA DD, a VPA DD is required for each VPA. 12. PoA CERTIFICATION CYCLE (a) Preliminary review 12.1.1 All VPAs with a start date after the first submission date of the PoA shall follow the	OK

Completeness Check pathway (Pathway 1) at Preliminary Review. The VPA(s) shall comply with inclusion criteria defined originally in the PoA and complementary criteria established by the Preliminary Review of the first regular or retroactive VPA, as applicable. Refer to Principles & Requirements for further details. The consolidated list of inclusion criteria shall be included in the revised version of the PoA DD Documentation.	
12.1.2 Regular and retroactive VPA(s) with the start date before the first submission date of the PoA shall undergo a Detailed Preliminary Review (Pathway 2), full Validation and Design Certification review in order to be included in the PoA. (b) PoA Validation 12.1.3 A PoA and all its VPAs shall achieve Design Certification and therefore each undergoes a Design Review. 12.1.4 To include a VPA/CPA in a design certified PoA, the CME shall ensure that the proposed VPA/CPA complies with the latest version of the registered PoA-DD, including the inclusion criteria of VPAs/CPAs in the PoA, and relevant Gold Standard rules and requirements. 12.1.5 The CMEs shall submit the following documentation with the supporting documents to the selected VVB for validation: (a) A completed PoA DD. Generic information on baseline and monitoring must be provided for each one of the different methodologies (or combination of methodologies) or technologies/measures (or combination of technologies/measures) in the case of a methodology allowing for multiple technologies to be considered. (b) A completed VPA/CPA DD based on the application of the PoA to a real case VPA/CPA, for each one of the different methodologies (or combination of methodologies) or each technology/measure (or combination of technologies/measures) considered. This must be completed prior to Design Review. (c) Key Programme information and for each one of the CPAs or VPAs. 12.1.6 The VVB shall validate the appropriateness of the sampling approach (including approach proposed for site-visits) as part of the Validation Report, and Gold Standard shall assess and approve the approach at the time of PoA Design Certification review. The VVB shall take into account the following factors, amongst others, while approving proposed sampling approach for validation in the PoA DD: (a) Risks related to the type(s) of project activity/technology/geographic location (b) Risks related to non-identification of emission and leakage sources (c) Risks related to double counting, especially in the case of distributed technologies.	PP had submitted PoA and CPA1 for Detailed Preliminary Review to GS and now to EPIC for validation

(d) Uncertainty with respect to the data monitored etc. (e) Risks related to environmental, economic or social safeguards (f) Risks on account of previous VPA/CPA having been erroneously included or other VPA/CPA facing significant grievances from local stakeholders or ongoing legal cases for existing CPA/VPA etc.	
12.1.7 Once a real case VPA/CPA has been fully validated, other CPA/VPAs applying the same technology/measure(s) may be included in the PoA following a simplified inclusion process. (c) VPA/CPA Inclusion 12.1.8 Once a PoA has achieved Design Certification, VPA/CPA may be included to the PoA as per the process below. 12.1.9 The VVB shall conduct a compliance check prior to inclusion of any new CPA/VPA. The inclusion check with respect to the inclusion criteria defined in the PoA-DD and PoA-KPI, where SDG and Safeguarding Principles assessments are conducted at the PoA level only. The VVB/CME/PD shall request formal inclusion by informing Gold Standard. 12.1.10 The VVB shall take into account the following for preparing the VPA/CPA Inclusion Report: (a) Geographical boundary of the VPAs/CPAs is consistent with the geographical boundary of the PoA; (b) Additionality criteria is being met as defined in the registered PoA DD; (c) The activity is in line with the baseline scenario(s) identified in the PoA DD; (d) Emission reduction calculations are in accordance with the procedures defined in the registered PoA DD; (e) The Monitoring Plan for the activity is designed as per the applied methodology and in accordance with the PoA DD; and (f) In the case of Safeguarding Principles and SDG Assessments being done at the PoA level, the SDG monitoring plan is checked against the PoA-DD. (d) Site visit requirements during CPA/VPA inclusion 12.1.11 The CME shall provide details of the approach chosen for site-visits in view of the inclusion of future VPAs/CPAs in the PoA-DD. The CME shall take into consideration the fact that a site visit by the VVB may be required when a new technology/methodology is introduced into the PoA (if not completed at the time of registering the PoA). 12.1.12 The Gold Standard can mandate site-visits if a risk is identified. (e) Design review	PP had submitted PoA and CPA1 for Detailed Preliminary Review to GS and now to EPIC for validation
12.1.13 The Gold Standard Design Certification requires both the PoA and all its VPAs to be registered with Gold Standard. 12.1.14 The VPAs/CPAs proposed by a VVB for inclusion must undergo a two-week compliance check and shall receive Gold Standard approval before being formally included in the Programme. The two-week period starts the day the relevant documents (VPA/CPA DD, VPA/CPA-KPI, VVB Inclusion Report etc.) are	PP had submitted PoA and CPA1 for Detailed Preliminary Review to GS and now to EPIC for validation

submitted to Gold Standard. The VPAs/CPAs inclusion date is the date when the two-week compliance check period ends. 12.1.15 The Gold Standard may conduct spot-checks for any of the proposed VPA/CPAs for inclusion by the VVB, based on a target-random approach. The spot-check will entail Gold Standard carrying out a full review as opposed to a compliance check done normally. This activity would undergo an additional one-week review period. 12.1.16 The VPA/CPA undergoing a complete validation shall go through a four-week Design Review period. Any clarification or corrective action requests for the CPA/VPA need to be closed to be approved for inclusion. In such a case, VPA/CPA inclusion date is the date when four-week review period ends, even if actual inclusion takes longer due to requests for clarification or corrective action. 12.1.17 During any of the periods mentioned above, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and NGO Supporters can raise any requests that shall be addressed in a satisfactory manner for Design Certification to be approved. (f) CDM PoAs 12.1.18 All documentation submitted for CDM validation shall undergo Gold Standard Validation and Design Certification review, as applicable, following the options below: (a) In case of a full PoA certification i.e. all CPAs of a CDM registered PoA wanting to certify under Gold Standard, the CDM registered PoA and CPA level documents along with the PoA and CPA DD shall be provided to Gold Standard. (b) In the case of a single CPA submitting for Design Certification under Gold Standard, the process followed is the same as that for either a regular or a retroactive standalone project, as applicable. (c) Under special circumstances for CDM PoA (such as when the CDM PoA CME is not willing to act as CME for Gold Standard), Design Certification at the CPA level can be allowed. This is evaluated on a case-by-case basis.	
(d) In the case of multiple CPAs submitting for Design Certification, a Gold Standard PoA-DD is created for those CPAs seeking Design Certification and the following steps are followed: - PoA/CPA level stakeholder consultation is conducted - PoA validation and Design Certification. Documentation to be submitted to Gold Standard include the registered CDM-PoA-DD and the additional information required for the Gold Standard PoA-DD not included in the CDM-PoA-DD, (e.g. sampling verification for Gold Standard is different from CDM), along with the specific CPA-DD and CPA KPI. - CPA inclusion based on the CDM-CPA-DD, the CPA KPI and the VVB Validation/inclusion report	PP had submitted PoA and CPA1 for Detailed Preliminary Review to GS and now to EPIC for validation

iv. CPA verification based monitoring reports and verification reports for activities chosen for actual verification by the VVB (in the case of sampling verification) and all verification reports (in the case of systematic verification) 12.1.19 The following conditions shall also be satisfied for the labelling of CERS: (a) The serial numbers associated with the CERS issued to the relevant CDM PoA by the UNFCCC must allow for a clear differentiation among the various CPAs; (b) A CDM PoA-DD and a GS PoA KPI must be submitted to Gold Standard for approval. These documents will contain all the information necessary to allow the VVB to perform a compliance check for the subsequent CPAs. It will be submitted together with a first CPA-DD; and (c) Gold Standard CPA documentation, i.e., the CPA-DD and the CPA-KPI must be delivered for each one of the Gold Standard applicant CPAs. (g) PoA PERFORMANCE CERTIFICATION 12.1.20 The CME shall submit monitoring reports for all the VPA/CPA for which request of Performance Certification is intended. The CME can submit a single monitoring report for VPAs/CPAs part of the same PoA as long as all VPA/CPA have the same monitoring period. 12.1.21 The Performance Review starts the day the monitoring and verification report and supporting documents are provided to the Gold Standard. 12.1.22 In the case of sampling verification, the VVB shall select activities for verification as per the statistically sound sampling plan defined in the PoA DD, conduct site visits for all selected activities and deliver a verification report to Gold Standard.	
12.1.23 The approach chosen for the sampling verification shall be discussed in detail in the PoA DD. The CME shall take into account the following factors, amongst others, while defining the approach for verification in the PoA DD: (a) Risks related to the type(s) of project activity (b) Risks related to non-identification of emission and leakage sources (c) Risks related to double counting (d) Uncertainty with respect to the data monitored etc. (e) Different monitoring periods for activities requesting issuance that may lead to sampling verification not being compatible (any period for which SDG Impacts are claimed must be covered by verification). For instance, for a set of activities requesting issuance but having different monitoring periods, it may not be possible to choose a sample and all activities may need to be systematically verified. 12.1.24 For further guidance, refer to Section A.2.4 Validation or Verification approach of the ISO 14064-3 standard. 12.1.25 The Gold Standard initiates a three-week review	NA, as it is validation now

period for all VPA/CPAs submitted for performance certification. The Gold Standard systematically reviews activities that have been selected for verification. 12.1.26 The Gold Standard Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and NGO Supporters may also raise requests for clarification and corrective action. All requests must be addressed in a satisfactory way for the verification to be approved and for issuance to proceed. 12.1.27 For activities that are not verified by a VVB, spot-checks based on a target-random approach are conducted by Gold Standard. For randomly selected VPAs/CPAs, the spot check review is conducted in three 3-week review period. 12.1.28 Multiple VVBs may be contracted within a same PoA to verify different CPAs/VPAs. In case of the choice of a sampling verification, each one of the VVB involved in the verification shall comply with the sampling approach defined in the PoA DD. (h) Retroactive Performance Certification 12.1.29 A CDM PoA and its CPAs registered with the UNFCCC may be operational before submission for Design Certification under Gold Standard. In such a case, CERs generated for a maximum period of two years prior to Gold Standard Design Certification of the CPAs can receive Gold Standard labels retroactively.	
12.1.30 A Retroactive VPA with a project start date before or after the time of first submission of the PoA must submit the required documents for preliminary review within one year of its start date. Retroactive VPA submitted at a date later than one year from the VPA start date will not be eligible for Gold Standard Certification. 12.1.31 A regular or retroactive VPA can claim Certified Impact Statements or Products, for example Gold Standard VERs, for the emission reductions generated for a period of up to two years prior to Gold Standard Design Certification of the VPA. 13. RENEWAL OF PoA & VPAs/CPAs 13.1.1 All Gold Standard PoAs shall be renewed every 5 years. Exception is granted to PoAs that were registered under earlier versions of Gold Standard which shall be renewed after the first 7 years and thereafter follow the Gold Standard for the Global Goals certification cycle (i.e., 5 year renewals). 13.1.2 All VPAs/ CPAs shall be renewed every 5 years. Exception is granted to Gold Standard VPAs that are or will be part of PoA that was registered under earlier versions of Gold Standard. Any VPA submitted within the first crediting cycle of PoA (i.e., 7 years) shall be allowed to use the same 7 year, twice renewal model. All VPAs/CPAs submitted for inclusion after the first crediting cycle of such PoA and completion of transition to GS4GG shall follow the GS4GG Certification Cycle (i.e. 5 year renewals). 13.1.3 The documents to be submitted during Design Certification Renewal shall be in line with the list of documentation mentioned in the Principles &	NA

Requirements but with relevant documents to be submitted at both PoA and CPA/VPA levels. 14. PoAS AND LIABILITY 14.1.1 For Gold Standard voluntary PoAs, the liability for erroneous inclusions lies with the CME. 14.1.2 An Erroneous Inclusion occurs where a non-conformity is identified against an activity that is part of a wider group certification a Programme of Activities (PoA). The implication of the non-conformity is that the activity should not have been successfully included within the certification due to the non-conformity and that there may be systemic issues with other activities included. An Erroneous Inclusion may be identified by Gold Standard or the VVB, typically during Verification or Performance Review where a sample-based approach is employed. 14.1.3 When an Erroneous Inclusion is identified: (a) Activities that have been verified, including a site visit, can proceed to Performance Certification and issuance as appropriate.	
(b) Activities of the same type that have not been verified, including a site visit (for example, due to the application of a sample-based approach) shall remain on hold subject to the closure of the non-conformity by Gold Standard, as per the Non-conformity Requirements of the Principles & Requirements. 14.1.4 Where the Erroneous Inclusion does not represent a systemic non-conformity¹ across the whole group of activities, then all other activities that have not actually been verified due to the choice of a sample-based approach verification shall also proceed to Performance Certification and issuance as appropriate. 14.1.5 Where the Erroneous Inclusion represents a systemic non-conformity, indicating risks with other activities that have not actually been verified due to the choice of a sampling verification, then all such activities shall also be put on hold until the issue is resolved to the satisfaction of Gold Standard. The assessment by Gold Standard shall be as per the Non-conformity Requirements of Principles & Requirements. 14.1.6 For Voluntary PoAs, whenever a VPA is found to be erroneously included and has already been issued Gold Standard Certified SDG Impact Statements or Products, the CME shall within sixty (60) calendar days after receiving notification of non-conformity: (a) Compensate issued Certified Impact Statements or Products by retiring equivalent number of Certified Impact statements or products from other projects of its portfolio; or (b) Compensate issued Certified Impact Statements or Products by retiring equivalent number of Certified Impact Statements or Products bought from other Gold Standard projects. 14.1.7 For Voluntary PoAs, whenever a verified VPA is found not to be delivering in accordance with the registered Voluntary PoA (e.g. the VPA is no longer operating), but Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products have already been issued to	NA

that PoA, the CME shall within sixty (60) calendar days after receiving notification of non-conformity: (a) Compensate issued Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products by retiring equivalent number of Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products from other projects of its portfolio; or 1 Systemic non-conformity: A non-conformity that has been identified as part of the Verification of activities under a PoA that may be reasonably assumed to arise in other included activities that have not been verified (for example due to a Sample-based approach). Non-systemic Non-conformity: A non-systemic non-conformity is one that can be demonstrated to have occurred due to the particular circumstances of the activity that does not apply to other activities in the Sample.	
(b) Compensate issued Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products by retiring equivalent number of Gold Standard Certified Impact Statements or Products bought from other Gold Standard projects. 14.1.8 For CDM PoAs, whenever the CDM EB finds a project to be erroneously included and the carbon credits have been incorrectly issued. The CME shall proactively inform Gold Standard and the equivalent number of labels already issued under Gold Standard for the project must be compensated by the CME within sixty (60) calendar days after receiving notification of a non-conformity as per the above. 15. CERTIFICATION FEES 15.1.1 For PoAs applying for Design Certification, the Design Review fee is calculated based on the first VPA/CPA. 15.1.2 Design review fees apply to each additional CPA/VPA and are calculated on an individual basis. 16. DESIGN CHANGES RULES 16.1.1 In the case of a design change, the CME shall assess the changes based on the Design change rules for standalone project activities, but do so for both the Programme and the affected VPAs/CPAs. E.g. If a new country (not already mentioned in the geographical boundary of the Programme in the PoA-DD) is added to the Programme, it should be ensured that the stakeholders from this new country accept the design of the Programme and also that this does not impact the additionality demonstrated at the Programme level etc. 16.1.2 The documents to be submitted during PoA or CPA/VPA design change shall be in line with the list of documentation mentioned in Annex A of the Principles & Requirements but with relevant documents to be submitted at both PoA and CPA/VPA levels. 17. REGISTRATION OF MULTI-COUNTRY PoAs 17.1.1 Multi-country Voluntary PoA shall provide a VPA-DD for each country considered at the time of PoA registration. Exceptions may be granted on a case-by-case basis and after review by the GS-TAC. The CME shall submit a formal request to Gold Standard with convincing justification to support their case. 17.1.2 Any request for exception shall be supported by documentation addressing the following elements in the PoA DD and VPA DD, (where submitted):	NA

(a) Additionality – Where applicable PoA level additionality shall be demonstrated taking into account all countries in the PoA boundary. Additionality at PoA level can be demonstrated using approved CDM2 or Gold Standard additionality tools. (b) Baseline scenario – the baseline situation (as defined by the applied baseline methodology/methodologies) for all countries in the PoA boundary shall be similar and this shall be justified. (c) Emission reductions or other SDG Impact calculation (where applicable) – a typical emission reduction calculation approach as per the applied methodology should be demonstrated in the PoA/VPA DD and the same approach shall be applied for VPAs from all countries in the PoA boundary. (d) Legislation – the legislation applicable to the applied technology shall be provided for all countries in the PoA boundary. 17.1.3 The information given in the PoA DD and VPA DD should demonstrate with confidence that all targeted communities within the PoA boundary are homogeneous with respect to the above four points. 17.1.4 Gold Standard Voluntary PoAs that are granted with this exception can submit one VPA DD (from one of the countries included in the PoA boundary) at the time of PoA Design Certification and subsequent VPA(s) for the other countries can be included in the PoA at a later stage. In this case, the CME shall conduct a Sustainable Development Goals Assessment and Safeguarding Principles Assessment at the VPA equivalent level. 17.1.5 Gold Standard Voluntary PoAs that not are granted with this exception can add new countries to the PoA boundary after PoA registration via a formal design change request and in line with Principles & Requirements (Annex A) and payment of the design change fee. This process requires submission of a VPA DD for activities developed in each of the countries.	NA
ANNEX A – MICROSCALE PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES REQUIREMENTS 1. SCOPE AND APPLICABILITY 1.1.1 Unless stated otherwise in this Annex, rules mentioned above for PoAs shall apply to Microscale Programme of Activities (mPoA) scheme. In case of any discrepancy, the rules in this Annex shall prevail. 2. GENERAL ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA 2.1.1 VPAs within mPoA are eligible under this scheme; (a) If the annual emission reductions achieved are limited to a maximum of 10,000 tonnes of CO₂eq in each and every year of the crediting period. Whenever actual emission reductions, as per the verification report, exceed the upper threshold for a given registered VPA, the VPA can still request for issuance, but the claimable emission reductions are capped at 10,000 tonnes of CO₂eq per annum. OR (b) VPA seeking Certified Impact other than emission reductions meets the criteria defined within respective Activity Requirements for the project scale 3. ADDITIONALITY 3.1.1 The additionality criteria as defined in Activity Requirements for project level assessment shall apply. In the absence of specific Activity Requirements, the	NA

requirements outlined in Principles & Requirements shall apply. 4. BASELINE, PROJECT SCENARIO & MONITORING 4.1.1 Baseline, project scenario and monitoring shall be defined as per the Gold Standard Approved Impact Quantification Methodology (including eligible CDM Methodologies). Refer to PoA requirements for further details. 4.1.2 The CME can describe and submit a new methodology as part of the mPOA DD documentation for approval by Gold Standard. Refer to Microscale Project Requirements for further details. 5. DE-BUNDLING RULES 5.1.1 No de-bundling rules apply to this scheme. The Gold Standard Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) can decide to discontinue the scheme at any time in the case it's shown as being abused. In such cases, activities under mPoA already submitted or registered remain eligible for their entire crediting period.	
6. VALIDATION OF THE PROGRAMME 6.1.1 Validation shall be conducted in one of the following ways: (a) Contracting an accredited Gold Standard Validation/Verification Body (GS-VVB). The PoA and its VPAs shall make use of an existing methodology or submit a new methodology to Gold Standard for approval, with opinion of VVB, at the time of requesting design certification. (b) Applying for the Gold Standard Internal Validation by paying required fee to the Gold Standard Validation Fund. If the PoA proposes a new methodology as part of the PoA documents, the proposed methodology shall be reviewed following the process outlined in the Microscale Project Requirements. 6.1.2 The following procedure apply to the Gold Standard Validation Fund option: (a) The Gold Standard shall be notified of the selection of the Internal Validation process option. (b) The completed PoA DD, VPA DD along with supporting evidence and documents shall be provided to Gold Standard to initiate the validation process. (c) Gold Standard will decide and notify the CME on whether the mPoA is selected for an external validation by a VVB, or will be validated internally by Gold Standard. In both cases, the Validation Fund covers the validation costs. (d) In the case when a mPoA is selected for external validation by a VVB, the CME shall provide competitive quotes from three VVBs. Based on the quotes, Gold Standard will contract and pay the VVB from the validation fund and the mVPA will follow the steps of a regular validation. (e) For an internal validation, the CME will be notified on whether the project is selected for an appraisal of sustainable development spectrs, including SDG 13, by an Objective Observer. The Validation Fund will cover these costs. (f) At all times, any assistance from the Gold Standard Validation Fund is subject to the availability of funds. The decision is made through a 'target-random'	PP has approched EPIC for validation of PoA and CPA1 inclusion

selection among microscale projects opting to make use of the Validation Fund.	
7. VPA VALIDATION AND INCLUSION 7.1.1 CMEs can request for the inclusion of VPAs at any time during the duration of the PoA. 7.1.2 For any VPA to be included, the completed VPA-DD (along with the Stakeholder Feedback Round Reporting) and the Validation Appraisal Report must be submitted to initiate the validation process: (a) If an Objective Observer is appointed for appraisal of the project upon listing then the selected VPA undergoes a compliance check by the Objective Observer for sustainability aspects including SDG 13. The compliance check ends with positive conclusion of Objective observer assessment. (b) If no Objective Observer is appointed, the Gold Standard conducts a compliance check based on a desk review of sustainable development aspects, including SDG 13. The compliance check ends with positive conclusion of Gold Standard assessment. 7.1.3 After successful completion of compliance check by Objective Observer and Gold Standard, activities must undergo a two-week review period during which the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and NGO Supporters can request for clarification or corrective actions. 7.1.4 Upon successful completion the review period, the proposed VPA is formally included in the Programme. 7.1.5 The two-week period starts the day relevant documents (VPA-DD, Validation Appraisal Report and VPA Inclusion Report) are submitted to Gold Standard. The formal date retained for the inclusion is when the two-week review period ends, even if actual inclusion takes longer due to potential requests for clarification or corrective action. 7.1.6 The process is different for a VPA undergoing a complete validation in view of an inclusion. In such a case, the VPA must go through a four-week review period and potential requests for clarification or corrective action must be closed for the inclusion to be approved. The formal date retained for the inclusion is when the four -week review period ends, even if actual inclusion takes longer due to potential requests for clarification or corrective action. 8. VERIFICATION 8.1.1 Verification shall be conducted in either of the following ways: (a) Contracting of an accredited GS-VVB (b) Applying for the Gold Standard Internal Verification by paying an required fee to the Gold Standard Verification Fund. 8.1.2 The following procedure applies to the Gold Standard Internal Verification Fund option:	
(a) The Gold Standard shall be notified of the selection of the Internal Verification option. (b) The Monitoring Report together with supporting evidence and documents shall be provided to Gold Standard to initiate the verification process. (c) Gold Standard will decide and notify the CME on whether the VPA(s) is selected for an external verification by VVB or will be verified internally by Gold	PP has approached EPIC for validation of PoA and CPA1 inclusion

Standard. In both cases, the Verification Fund covers the costs. (d) In the case when VPA(s) is selected for external verification by a VVB, the CME shall provide competitive quotes from three VVBs. Based on the quotes, Gold Standard will contract and pay the VVB from verification fund and the VPA(s) will follow the steps of a regular verification. (e) For an internal verification, the CME is notified on whether the VPA(s) is selected for an appraisal of sustainable development aspects, including SDG 13, by an Objective Observer, or if these will be verified internally by Gold Standard alone. The Verification Fund will cover these costs. (f) At all times, any assistance from the Gold Standard Verification Fund is subject to the availability of funds. This decision is made through a 'target-random' selection among microscale projects opting to make use of the Verification Fund. 8.1.3 If CME deliberately provide information that is incorrect to obtain Gold Standard status, or to inflate the SDG outcomes and impacts, the PoA will be subject to an investigation by Gold Standard. If such wrongdoing is suspected and the resulting investigation shows that the PoA or its VPAs documentation is fraudulent and credible evidence shows the negative intent of the CME and or Project Developer, the party submitting the project is permanently disqualified and this is publicly announced (see Gold Standard Terms & Conditions for more details). 9. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT PROCESS 9.1.1 In view of the inclusion and verification of VPAs to a mPoA, a target-random approach is applied to the VPAs appraisal, making use of an Objective Observer at inclusion and/or verification stage. 9.1.2 A microscale VPA must be subjected to an Objective Observer appraisal and site visit at least once within three years of date of VPA inclusion or start of crediting period, whichever is later. 9.1.3 The inclusion of a VPA with different technology, measure or methodology than any of those submitted with, or already part of the mPoA Certified Design requires an appraisal by an Objective Observer(s) in all cases.	
9.1.4 Upon request from Gold Standard and in time for validation, inclusion or verification, CME shall identify and provide the names and contact details of at least three independent experts (e.g. academics from local universities, staff from local NGOs or local consultancies, etc.) who shall appraise VPAs with respect to sustainable development aspects, including SDG 13. The Gold Standard appoints one or more Objective Observers amongst the people suggested and/or other experts chosen from the Gold Standard NGO Supporters, Roster of Experts, or representatives of development organisations with host country experience such that environmental and socio-economic impacts can be credibly assessed. Experts are selected	PP has approached EPIC for validation of PoA and CPA1 inclusion

based on an assessment of the relevance of their expertise and knowledge of the local conditions. (a) VPA Validation/ Inclusion stage 9.1.5 Objective Observers visit the site at validation/inclusion or verification stage to provide an independent assessment of the following: (a) to Safeguarding Principles & Requirements (human rights abuse, environmental degradation, non-adherence to labour laws, corruption, etc.). (b) contributions to three SDGs with mandatory contribution to SDG-13 (c) completeness of stakeholder consultations 9.1.6 During mPOA validation, when risks with regards to the safeguarding principles are identified, the CME is required to prepare and submit an appropriate mitigation plan. This will be evaluated by Gold Standard or the Objective Observer who will evaluate the appropriateness of the mitigation measures and they will be reported in the Validation Appraisal Report. Inputs from stakeholders during the design consultation, Stakeholder Consultation (1st round) and Stakeholder Feedback Round (SFR) shall be taken into account for this assessment. SDGs Impact indicators shall also be included in the monitoring plan and discussed with Stakeholders. 9.1.7 The Validation Appraisal Report completed by Objective Observers will be made available to the Gold Standard Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and NGO Supporters at the time of review and will form part of the mPoA design certification process. The appraisal will be made publicly available following project design certification. 9.1.8 For any VPA not selected for an appraisal by an Objective Observer at stage of inclusion, the CME/PP shall conduct a self-assessment of the risks associated with respect to the safeguarding principles (human rights abuse, environmental degradation, non-adherence to labour laws, corruption, etc.), check completeness of stakeholder consultations as well as assess contribution to three SDGs. The CME shall use of the Validation Appraisal Report provided to deliver the assessment.	
(b) VPA Verification stage During verification, if an Objective Observer is selected for an appraisal then he/she shall visit the site to: (a) Confirm the status of VPA(s) operation, (b) Assess the SDG contribution by the VPA(s) (c) Assess if the mitigation plan is effectively implemented and negative impacts and risks are being effectively mitigated, (d) Check that other negative impacts have not resulted due to implementation and operation of the VPAs. 9.2 The Objective Observer may also report a new issue observed during the verification. 9.3 The Verification Appraisal Report will be made available to the Gold Standard Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and NGO Supporters at the time of review and will form part of the issuance review. The Verification Appraisal Report will be made publicly	NA

available after the issuance approval. 9.4 For VPA(s) not selected for an appraisal by an Objective Observer(s) at verification stage, and in view of any request for issuance, the CME shall relevant information in the monitoring report including, status of the VPA operation, assess if the mitigation plan is effectively implemented and negative impacts and risks have been mitigated, and check that other negative impacts have not resulted due to implementation and operation of the VPA.	
--	--

- - - -

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
03.0	31 May 2019	Revision to: •Ensure consistency with version 02.0 of the “CDM validation and verification standard for programmes of activities” (CDM-EB93-A08-STAN); •Make editorial improvements.
02.0	29 December 2017	Revision to align with the requirements of the “CDM validation and verification standard for programme of activities” (version 01.0).
01.0	4 May 2015	Initial publication.
Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Form Business Function: Registration Keywords: programme of activities, validation report		