Validation Report for Project Activity (stand-alone project)

Gold Standard Project Title	iRise Africa Limited Cookstove Project
Gold Standard ID Number	GS12957
Project Developer	iRise Africa Limited
Project Representative/s	iRise Africa Limited
Project Participants and any communities involved	iRise Affordable Housing and Agriculture Limited iRise O81 Limited iRise WW1 Limited iRise QC1 Limited iRise IC1 Limited
Host Country	Malawi
Date of listing	28/10/2024
GS PDD date and version **Initial** **Final**	 Version 1 dated 20/07/2025 Version 5 dated 27/02/2026
Applicable Requirements	☐ Renewable Energy Activity Requirements ☒ Community Services Activity Requirements ☐ Land-Use & Forests Activity Requirements ☐ New project types ☒ Others Principles and Requirements, version 2.1 Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement Guidelines, version 2.0 Safeguarding Principles & Requirements, version 2.0 Gender Equality Requirements & Guidelines, version 2.0
Scale of the project activity	☐ Microscale ☐ Small scale ☒ Large scale ☐ Others
Product Requirements applied	☒ *GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration* ☐ *Renewable Energy Label* ☐ Others ☐ N/A
Methodology applied and version number	☒ Gold Standard approved methodology, including any specific Gold Standard applicability criteria.

	☐ A project-specific methodology (Applicable to Microscale Project only) Title(s) of methodology: Technologies and Practices to Displa Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption (TPDDTEC) The version number of the methodology: Version 4.0
Deviation applicable to the project (accepted and rejected both)	Deviation ID: Not applicable Applicable section of validation report: Not applicable
Project Type	☒ Regular ☐ Retroactive
Validated amount of annual average GHG emission reductions or GHG removals by sinks	250,298 tCO_2e
Vintage wise GS VERs	**The validated emission reductions**

Year	Estimated GS-VERs
1	250,298 tCO_2e
2	250,298 tCO_2e
3	250,298 tCO_2e
4	250,298 tCO_2e
5	250,298 tCO_2e
Total	1,251,490 tCO_2e

Sustainable Development Goal contributions

SDG	Estimated annual average	Unit of measurement
SDG 13 (mandatory)	250,298	tCO_2e (GS VERs)
SDG 15	125,461	Tonnes
SDG 8	156	Number
SDG 7	80,000	Number
SDG 5	50,735	Minutes
SDG 3	8.46	Percentage
SDG 1	235,744	MWk

Report version	02
Report date	12/03/2026
On-site audit date	03/11/2025 to 05/11/2025

Validation and Verification Body (VVB)	SustainCERT S.A.
Working Team and Internal Reviewer	Team Leader: Dr. Atul Takarkhede GS approved auditor: Dr. Atul Takarkhede Technical Expert and Local Auditor: Mr. Jean Bosco Auditor: Ms. Zhiyue Wang Independent Reviewer: Ms. Muskan Chawla
Name, position and signature of the approver of the validation report	Signed by: 2A746454C798401... Mr. Agustín Calle de Miguel *Director of GHG Auditing* Date: 18/03/2026

SECTION A. Executive summary 5

SECTION B. Validation approach 6

B.1. Scope 6
B.2. Objectives 6
B.3. Materiality 6
B.4. Impartiality 7
B.5. Validation Process 7
B.6. Appointment of the validation team 7
B.7. Desk review 8
B.8. On-site audit 8
B.9. Remote audit (if applicable) 11
B.10. Sampling approach by VVB for the current assessment 11
B.11. Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Request 12
B.12. Conclusion 12

SECTION C. Validation assessment 13

C.1. Preliminary review 13
C.2. General requirements as per GS4GG requirements 13
C.3. General Description of the Project Activity 14
C.4. Legal owner(s), project developer (s) and other entities involved. 16
C.5. Project boundary 16
C.6. Project eligibility as per GS4GG principles and requirements and other statutory documents 17
C.7. Project eligibility as per applied methodology/ies 29
C.8. Baseline identification 32
C.9. Additionality 33
C.10. Sampling plan 34
C.11. Monitoring parameters and other elements of monitoring plan 34
C.12. Estimation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals 42
C.13. Prior Consideration 43
C.14. Ongoing Financial Need 44
C.15. Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) outcomes 44
C.16. Safeguarding principles 46
C.17. Compliance with Gender Equality Requirements and Guidelines 47
C.18. Crediting period and duration 48
C.19. Local Stakeholder Consultation (LSC) 48
C.20. FOR LUF only 49

SECTION D. Internal quality control 49

SECTION E. Validation opinion and statement 49

Appendix 1. Abbreviations 52

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers 53

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced. 55

Appendix 4. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests 57

Appendix 5. Safeguarding Principles Assessment 66

SECTION A. Executive summary

SustainCERT has been contracted by iRise Africa Limited to perform validation for the GS4GG Design Certification of “iRise Africa Limited Cookstove Project” applying the methodology, Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption (TPDDTEC), version 4.0/3/.

The management of iRise Africa Limited is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions reduction data and the reported GHG emission reductions. A desk review and onsite audit have been conducted to validate the data submitted in the PDD/11/.

The main purpose of the validation activity is to have an independent third party for the assessment of the project design, baseline, additionality and monitoring plan to ensure a thorough assessment of the proposed project activity against the applicable GS4GG requirements.

A risk-based approach has been followed to perform this validation activity. During the same, 05 Corrective Action requests (CARs) and 03 Clarification Requests (CLs) were raised and successfully closed. 03 FARs were raised during preliminary review which were closed during this validation. The review of the GS PDD and additional documents related to baseline and monitoring methodology; the subsequent background investigation, follow-up interviews with PP, stakeholders have provided SustainCERT with sufficient evidence to verify the fulfilment of the stated criteria of GS4GG.

The validation has been planned and organized to achieve a reasonable Level of assurance. VVB has applied sampling procedure only for on-site audit. The documents were checked to arrive at positive validation conclusion.

The project developer - iRise Africa Limited (iRise) is implementing a project that distributes, for free, fuel efficient cookstoves built using locally available resources to the households in Kasungu district, Malawi. The improved cookstove (ICS) to be distributed are high energy efficient firewood cookstoves aim at reducing the amount of greenhouse gas emissions and indoor air pollution caused by the above traditional cooking methods. iRise intends to distribute these cookstoves in 80,000 households. By the end of January 2026 total 54,285 stove distribution was done by project developer. The project activity is planned in rural communities of Kasungu District in Malawi. iRise has established that at present, households in the target population principally use three stone wood fires which roughly consume 10 to 15 kgs firewood daily.

SECTION B. Validation approach

B.1. Scope

The scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the project to perform validation of the project activity. The scope of validation is.

a. To confirm that the GS4GG project meets all applicable rules and requirements, including those specified in the Principles and Requirements/1/, relevant Activity Requirements/7/, Product Requirements selected and applied methodology TPDETEC, version 4.0/3/, methodological tools, templates and guidelines as applicable to the project being validated, taking into account applicable rule updates, rule clarifications and guidance provided by Gold Standard, as well as any deviations granted to the project;

b. To assess the accuracy, conservativeness, relevance, completeness, consistency and transparency of the information provided by the Project Developer (PD).

c. To determine whether information provided by the Project Developer is reliable and credible.

B.2. Objectives

iRise Africa Limited has engaged SustainCERT S.A to validate the Gold Standard Project "iRise Africa Limited Cookstove project (GS 12957)". The objective is to provide reasonable assurance that:

- The GHG emission reductions/removals estimated in the GS PDD (version 5, dated 27/02/2026) are fairly stated and conform with applicable GS rules.
- The project's claimed Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) contributions are substantiated.
- The estimated emission reductions are free from material errors, omissions or misstatements in accordance with Gold Standard Principles & Requirements version 2.1 and other relevant guidance and requirements.

B.3. Materiality

SustainCERT S.A identify the materiality threshold referred to in paragraph 9.6.3 of GS4GG Validation and verification standard, version 2.0/2/ as below.

2 per cent of the emission reductions/removals for large-scale project activities achieving a total emission reduction of 300,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per year or less,

The VVB has planned and performed validation with an attitude of professional scepticism and has relied on its professional judgement when applying the concept of materiality. The application of the concept of materiality and reasonable level of assurance imply that some data or information may not be checked. However, the VVB has designed its validation and sampling plans to detect all material errors, omissions or misstatements, and any unchecked data or information should not contain any material errors, omissions or misstatements. A VVB's validation decision applies to 100 per cent of the data and information, even if the VVB may not have checked the entire data set and information. VVB has conducted a risk assessment to identify and assess the risks of individual or aggregated material errors, omissions or misstatements that may occur within the threshold levels.

Based on the assessed risks of material errors, omissions or misstatements, validation plan, audit procedures and sampling plans were developed.

B.4. Impartiality

SustainCERT recognizes Impartiality as fundamental to its work as a Validation and Verification body (VVB), and any other work we develop in our Mission to bring credibility to climate action. Please refer to SustainCERT | Impartiality Statement for our impartiality statement.

B.5. Validation Process

The project assessment is based on the requirement of Gold Standard and is conducted using standard auditing techniques to assess the correctness of the information provided by the project developer.

Before the assessment begins, members of the team covering the technical scope(s), sectoral scope(s), and relevant host country experience for evaluating the project activity are appointed.

Once the project is made available to SustainCERT, the members of the assessment team carried out:

a) A desk review of the project design documentation.

b) On-site audit and follow-up interviews with project stakeholders.

c) The resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final validation report and opinion.

As per the VVB procedure, validation report has undergone through the internal quality control before issuance of final opinion.

B.6. Appointment of the validation team

According to the applicable sectoral scope / technical area and experience in the sectoral or national business environment, SustainCERT S.A. has appointed the validation team in compliance with the SustainCERT S.A. internal Quality Management System as well as applicable requirements in the GS Validation and Verification Body Requirements ensuring that the required skills and capabilities are covered.

B.6.1. Validation team member(s)

S. NO.	FULL NAME	ROLE(S)	TYPE OF ACTIVITY(IES) CARRIED OUT
1	Dr. Atul Takarkhede	Team Leader & GS approved auditor	Desk review, findings and their closures, report preparation
2	Ms. Zhiyue Wang	Auditor	Desk review, findings and their closures, report preparation
3	Mr. Jean Bosco	Technical expert (3.1) & Local auditor	On-site visit, stakeholder interviews, findings preparation

B.6.2. Technical Reviewer(s) and approver(s) of the validation report

S. NO.	FULL NAME	ROLE(S)	TYPE OF ACTIVITY(IES) CARRIED OUT
1	Ms. Muskan Chawla	Independent Reviewer / Technical expert (3.1)	Independent review of the validation report along with supporting documents i.e. PDD, ER sheet etc.
2	Mr. Agustín Calle de Miguel	Approver	Approval of the project for submission to the registry for design certification

B.7. Desk review

While conducting document review, the assessment team determined that, whether the proposed project complies with the requirements of the applicable regulatory documents.

a. Whether the evidence submitted, claims, and assumptions made as part of the project documentation are sufficient to confirm the following but not limited to.

   i. Stakeholder Consultation Report

   ii. SDG Impact Tool

   iii. Safeguarding Principles Assessment

   iv. Official Development Assistance (ODA) declaration

   v. Other project documents e.g., Risks and Capacities Guidelines

b. whether Project Developer addressed Forward Action Requests (FARs) from the preliminary review stage.

The team also cross checked between the information provided in the PDD and information from sources other than those used based on the VVB's sectoral or local expertise; and, if necessary, independent background investigations as and when required.

The documents reviewed or referenced during the validation are listed in Appendix 3 below.

B.8. On-site audit

As per GS4GG validation and verification standard, version 2.0 section 6.3.3.c.i, it is not mandatory for the VVB to conduct an on-site audit during validation. However, the validation team has conducted a strategic assessment and risk analysis to determine whether the on-site audit is required for the current project. The VVB decided to conduct the on-site audit for the current project. The on-site visit was conducted by the local expert and Technical expert in the team during 03/11/2025 to 05/11/2025.

During site visit, project description, its boundary, baseline, implementation plan and monitoring system were checked for accuracy and completeness. The views obtained through stakeholders, PD representatives, baseline users, implementing partners were considered while concluding the validation opinion.

For validation, the assessment team selected random sampling method to check the acceptability (or otherwise) of the data for each records with PD's sample records and determined whether the PD sampling meets the requirements of sampling guidelines and standard.

The Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities (Version 9.0)/5/ states under paragraph 28 that "When the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have applied a sampling approach, the VVB may apply acceptance sampling as described in the steps indicated in paragraphs 29–38 below as part of validation/verification activities". The sampling is discussed below in section B.10.

Table 1: Project implementation field team, PP representative and Local Stakeholders interviewed during site visit

S.NO	INTERVIEWEE		DATE	SUBJECT	TEAM MEMBER INVOLVED
	Name	Affiliation			
1	Alex Pettefer	Country Manager CEO iRise Africa	03/11/2025 to 05/11/2025	Project description, Project boundary, technical description, Monitoring plan, baseline scenario, technical description, Additionality, Project boundary, Ex-ante and Ex- post parameters, fNRB value, EIA requirement, Local stakeholder consultation.	Mr. Jean Bosco
2	Alex Pettefer	CEO iRise Africa			
3	Teuka Tembo	Director, Carbon and Sustainability – Clean Cooking (iRise Africa)			
4	Timothy Sandram	CEO, Community Development Initiative			

The baseline users interviewed and key points discussed with them are presented in the below table. VVB assessment team had taken a verbal consent from the interviewed people to mention their names in the report and share photographs, if necessary.

Table 2: Project technology users interviewed during on-site visit

Sr. No.	Name of end user	Location (Village, District/Province/state, Country	Stove Id Number	Key Points discussed
1.	Margaret Mvula	Jala, Kasungu District, Central Region, Malawi	04D4D5421D1290	1. Are you the main user of the project cookstove? How many people are there in your household? 2. What type and number of stoves did you use? 3. What kind of fuel do you use for the stove? Charcoal, firewood or others. 4. Is the baseline device in continual use for food preparation? 5. How many meals are cooked in a day and for how many people? 6. Do you buy the fuel required for the cookstove?
2	Tamara banda	Mituta, Kasungu District, Central Region, Malawi	0490A8421D1290	
3	Rufina Mukandawire	Chiwukepo, Kasungu District Central Region, Malawi	04398E421D1290	
4	Cecilia Phiri	Jala, Kasungu District Central Region in Malawi	0476C6421D1291	
5	Melina banda	Nanana, Kasungu District Central Region, Malawi	04119442D91190	
6	Liness Standwell Jere	Chiwukepo, Kasungu District Central Region, Malawi	0452D5421D1291	

Sr. No.	Name of end user	Location (Village, District/Province/state, Country	Stove Id Number	Key Points discussed
7	Mabvuto Banda	Chiwukepo, Kasungu District Central Region, Malawi	0464C142D91191	7. How much time is spent on fuel collection? 8. If fuel is collected from a nearby area, how much time is spent for its collection? 9. What is quantity of average fuel required for preparation of meals in a day? 10. Did an investigator come to your home to measure the fuel consumption for the cookstove? If yes, how long is the measurement period?
8	Emery Zimba	Chiwukepo, Kasungu District Central Region, Malawi	04765A42D91190	

Table 3: Baseline stove users interviewed during on-site visit[1]

Sr. No.	Name of end user	Location (Village, District/Province/state, Country	Key Points discussed
1.	Alinafe Chilambo	Kalare, Kasungu District Central Region, Malawi	1. Are you the main user of the old cookstove? How many people are there in your household? 2. What kind of fuel do you use for the stove? Charcoal, firewood or others? If others, what sort of fuel is it. 3. How many meals are cooked in a day and for how many people? 4. What is quantity of average fuel required for preparation of meals in a day? 5. Do you buy the fuel required for the cookstove? 6. How much time is spent on fuel collection? 7. If fuel is collected from a nearby area, how much time is spent on its collection? 8. Was KPT conducted at your household? 9. When was the KPT conducted at your household? 10. Who conducted such test at your household? 11. How much was the duration of this KPT test? 12. Did an investigator come to your home to provide measured fuel stock for the cookstove? 13. Did they measure fuel on daily basis at least twice?
2	Peter Gilbert	Moses, Kasungu District Central Region, Malawi	
3	Florence Mwandosha	Danani, Kasungu District Central Region, Malawi	
4	Litty Banda Lulu	Danani, Kasungu District Central Region, Malawi	
5	Marita Kapereke	Danani, Kasungu District Central Region, Malawi	
6	Fydas Kanyenzi	Moses, Kasungu District Central Region, Malawi	
7	Pemphero Robert	Moses, Kasungu District Central Region, Malawi	
8	Rachel Mpanda	Kaning'a, Kasungu District Central Region, Malawi	

[1] As per PD sampling, the baseline stove users and baseline KPT user sample pool is the same.

B.9. Remote audit (if applicable)

Not applicable

B.10. Sampling approach by VVB for the current assessment

During the physical on-site visit, a random acceptance sampling approach has been used by the validation team to validate the information as listed in the GS PDD which are determined through baseline survey by PD.

As per para 4.3.2 of the applied methodology, to conduct a baseline survey, the sample size required for project with group size more than 1000 is minimum 100 nos. The current project has targeted to distribute 80,000 improved, PD must have sample group size of minimum 100 nos. The submitted baseline survey was checked to confirm that PD in accordance with applied methodology has selected appropriate number of samples for baseline survey and baseline KPT survey.

As the PD has applied sampling approach, the VVB has chosen acceptance sampling in accordance with paragraph 28 of Standard for "Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities" version 09.0/5/.

In line with Section 4.4 of applied methodology, TPDDTEC version 4.0/3/ and Guideline for Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, version 04.0/14/; PP has designed the sampling plan and thus VVB has used acceptance sampling, as described in the "Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities, Version 09.0"/5/, in the validation process to validate that the PD has implemented a sampling plan to a satisfactory level and appropriately.

In line with the Standard for "Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities" version 09.0/5/, Paragraph 26, the VVB has applied a sampling as part of the validation process.

To select size of sample and acceptance number in line with the CDM sampling standard, VVB referred to paragraph 30 and 31 of Standard for "Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities" version 09.0 as follow;

Acceptable quality level (AQL) – 1.0%
Unacceptable Quality Level (UQL) – 20%
Producer risk - 10%
Consumer risk - 20%

Based on "Table 1. Sample size and acceptance number based on AQL, UQL, and producer and consumer risks" of standard "Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities" version 09.0/5/ with above values the sample size (n) will be 8 and acceptance number (c) as 0.

The on-site interviews were conducted by the country expert/technical expert in the audit team. The information checked during the interviews is mentioned in section B.8 table above.

The selected samples for baseline survey and baseline KPT were the same. This was confirmed based on submitted survey records and KPT records. Thus, 08 samples were selected through VVB sampling for interviewing baseline users for baseline survey and KPT related information.

The project has already distributed project ICS and has conducted usage survey too. Hence, VVB sampling was conducted based on usage survey conducted by the PD for their proposed monitoring.

The assessment team would like to conclude that based on acceptance sampling approach, the project developers sample records meets the requirement.

B.11. Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Request

The objective of this phase of the validation was to resolve the requests for corrective actions and clarification and any other outstanding issues which need to be clarified for SustainCERT S.A. positive conclusion on the submitted GS PDD. The Corrective Action Requests and Clarification Requests raised by SustainCERT S.A. were resolved during communications between the PD and SustainCERT S.A. to guarantee the transparency of the validation process, the concerns raised and responses given.

The final revised version of PDD submitted by PD serves as the basis for the final assessment presented. Additional changes to the project during the validation process are not considered to be significant with respect to the GS4GG eligibility principles and requirements as mentioned in the latest version of GS4GG Principles and Requirements.

The VVB raises a **CAR** if one of the following situations occur:

a. Non-compliance with the applied methodologies, the applied standardised baselines (if any) or the other applicable regulatory documents (including applicable templates and procedures) is found in the reporting and has not been sufficiently documented by the Project Developer(s), or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient.

b. Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission and SDG Impacts that will impact the quantity of emission reductions and SDG Impacts.

c. Issues identified in a FAR during the preliminary review to be validated during the validation have not been resolved by the Project Developer(s).

The VVB raises a **CL** if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable GS4GG requirements and procedures have been met.

The VVB raises a **FAR** if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.

SustainCERT S.A. confirms that all the CARs and CLs are resolved or 'closed out' as the Project Developer has rectified the PDD and provided additional explanations or evidence that satisfy the VVB's concerns. A FAR 01 (containing 3 FARs from preliminary review) was raised by the VVB which is accessed and closed during the current validation.

Total findings raised because of current validation are: 05 CARs, 03 CLs and 03 FAR from preliminary review. No FAR raised during this validation.

All CARs, CLs and FARs are mentioned below in appendix 4 of the report below.

B.12. Conclusion

SustainCERT S.A. has performed a validation (design certification) for the "GS 12957 - iRise Africa Limited Cookstove Project". The validation was performed in accordance with the GS4GG standards/guidance and host country criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operation, monitoring and reporting.

The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided SustainCERT S.A. with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant Gold Standard and host country criteria.

Validation timeframe

Activity	Timeline
Receipt of PDD and supporting documents	18/09/2025
Desk Review	From 20/10/2025 to 13/11/2025
On-site audit	From 03/11/2025 to 05/11/2025
Issuance of validation findings	13/11/2025
Findings closure and Issuance of Draft validation report	14/02/2026
Issuance of Final Validation Report	12/03/2026

SECTION C. Validation assessment

C.1. Preliminary review

Means of validation	As a preliminary review, GS4GG had raised 03 FARs to check and confirm a. details about the start date b. whether LSC was conducted in in line with the latest Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement Requirements c. whether carbon rights transfer was discussed and end users are aware of carbon rights waiver d. details about the ongoing stakeholder feedback procedures The project start date is 01/08/2024 which is confirmed based on the copy of 'iverify' results submitted. PD has submitted copy of stakeholder consultation report which confirmed that a physical meeting was held on 28/02/2024 and 29/02/2024. The invitations were sent 30 days earlier for the same to the identified stakeholders. The stakeholder meeting records further confirmed that, stakeholder grievance/feedback procedures were also discussed during this meeting. Post the physical meeting, a SFR was held from 01/03/2024 to 31/03/2024 as evident from the submitted records/18/. The project has started implementation in year 2024/19/ and hence during the on-site interviews, few stakeholders/end users were interviewed to confirm whether they have signed carbon transfer agreement. A positive response was received and same was cross checked against copy of these documents submitted.
Findings	FAR 01-03 raised and successfully closed. More details available below in appendix 4.
Conclusion	The assessment team confirms that the findings raised as a part of FAR from preliminary review are closed. The PD has submitted evidence concluding the project start date. The submitted LSC report confirms about adherence to GS requirements and mentions about ongoing feedback procedures established. The review of carbon transfer agreements and interviews confirmed that end users are aware of carbon transfer rights.

C.2. General requirements as per GS4GG requirements

Means of validation	VVB noted that the most recent version of GS PDD template at GS4GG is version 1.5. The submitted PDD by the PD is using the same version. PD

	has followed template filling guide and all the sections within the PDD are appropriately described. As a part of on-site interview, the country expert has confirmed with the interviewee. to disclose their details publicly in the current validation report with no bias introduced due to this.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	VVB confirms that PD has used the most recent GS PDD template. Also, during the on-site visit, all the interviewees have confirmed to disclose their details publicly in the current validation report.

C.3. General Description of the Project Activity

Means of validation	iRise Africa Limited is implementing a project that distributes, for free, fuel efficient cookstoves built using locally available resources. The distributed improved cookstove (ICS) will replace existing three stone open fire stove. The ICS have better efficiency i. e. 30.5%/20/ and use firewood as a fuel. PD has envisaged that total distribution with the selected project boundary i. e. rural communities in Kasungu District in Malawi would be 80,000 nos. However, by the end of October 2024 project has achieved 1080 stove distributions and by end of January 2026 total 54,285 stove distribution. VVB confirmed the above information based on the project ownership document i.e. carbon agreement between government of Malawi and PD/15/, carbon transfer agreements/15/, ICS manufacturer details/20/, baseline survey report/21/, baseline and project KPT results/21/, ICS technical datasheet/21/ and on-site interviews/17/. The project does not involve the alteration of an existing installation or process. It is a greenfield project replacing existing three stone open fire stoves with efficient ICS. The fuel remains the same i.e. firewood. This has been confirmed based on on-site interviews, baseline survey report, ICS technical datasheet/20/. The ICS to be distributed is locally manufactured. The unit incorporates a combination of clay and rice husks to increase the thermal efficiency and physical strength of the stove and further reinforced through extremely high temperature firing in a kiln. The front firebox of ICS has been designed to allow larger pieces of firewood into the stove without sacrificing thermal efficiency and increasing usability. The ICS does not have any doors, hinges, or additional parts that necessitate replacement or repair. The exterior handles are moulded into the sides of the stove for easy handling and portability. The ICS is expected to last for 5 years with fuel as the firewood/20/. The rated efficiency of the ICS is 30.5%. With this higher efficiency than the baseline stove, the project is expected to lead to GHG emission reductions. VVB confirmed the above information based on the ICS technical datasheet and on-site interviews. PP has submitted copy of carbon agreement between government of Malawi and PD which explicitly mentions that the carbon rights from usage of ICS distributed in the concerned project boundary lies with iRise/15/. Further, on-site visit has confirmed that PD has signed carbon waiver

	contracts through their 'iverify' app with each of the end user which gives carbon rights to the PD. The proposed project is located in Kasungu district of Malawi. PD has provided map and geographical co-ordinates in the GS PDD. During on-site visit, the interviewed baseline users and project user locations were checked to confirmed that they are within the defined project location boundary. The project scale is large scale in line with GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration Product Requirements, version 3.2. As per this document, for project activities that improve thermal energy efficiency, the maximum energy saving of 60 GWh(e) per year is equivalent to 180 GWh(th) per year saving. The project ICS is expected to save 0.011 GWh(th) per year per ICS distributed and with 80,000 planned distribution, total energy savings are 885.70 GWh(th) which are higher than 180 GWh(th) per year. The detailed calculation provided in section A.4 footnote of PDD is checked and found acceptable. As per paragraph 3.1.1 of the applied methodology, the project boundary is the physical, geographical sites of the project technologies/practices including the fuel collection and production area. PD has considered Kasungu District in Malawi as the project boundary which is acceptable. More assessment on the project boundary is provided below in section C.5. As per section 3.4 of the applied methodology, "*PD shall define the baseline scenario as the existing baseline technology/practice use and fuel consumption patterns for the type of service provided by the project technology in the population targeted for adopting the new project technology, i.e., "target population". The selection and description of the baseline scenario must be informed by the Baseline Scenario Survey and All expected baseline and project scenarios shall be defined in the project documentation prior to validation and registration review"*. The review of submitted copy of baseline survey, interviews with locals and PP representatives confirmed that the selected baseline scenario is acceptable. More assessment on the baseline scenario is provided below in section C.8. The project activity has not applied for any other certification or GHG schemes. Therefore, the validation team concluded that the project activity meets the applicability criteria of Gold Standard. Assessment team checked the double counting clarification vide GS guideline on double counting. The project is applied for GS VER regular validation. Also, assessment team checked the other registries such as VCS Registry/Project pipeline and found that project activity is not applied for this scheme further, project is also not applied for any carbon credit registry, as confirmed by VVB. PP has provided undertaking stating that they will avoid double counting and not intended to seeking registration under other GHG schemes/23/. Same has been crosschecked by VVB and was found to be correct. PD has provided copy of signed declaration confirming that the project has not received any public funding. The same declaration also mentioned that the project has not claimed any ODA funding/23/.

	PD has signed an agreement with Malawi government through which all the rights of carbon credits are with PD for this project activity/15/. Further, the activity is not located in a host country, region, locality or state that has an emission reduction cap enforced or has the possibility to trade emissions that include the scope of the proposed project as confirmed by country expert and during on-site visit. PD has ensured that each of the distributed ICS will have unique identification number thus confirming that there is no potential for double counting of impacts if the Project Area overlaps with that of another Gold Standard or other voluntary or compliance standard programme of a similar nature. Review of regulations of the host country i.e. Malawi confirmed that the project is in compliance with applicable Host Country's legal, environmental, ecological and social regulations
Findings	CL 01 was raised and closed successfully. Refer appendix 4 for more information.
Conclusion	Review of submitted documents including and not limited to latest PDD, emission reduction sheet, baseline survey report, baseline KPT report, agreement with Malawi government, carbon waiver agreements with the end users, ICS technical datasheet, declaration by PD for no double counting and no ODA confirms the accuracy and completeness of the project description. The information presented in the PDD is an accurate reflection of actual project information; and is in accordance with applicable standard documents i.e., methodology and applicable GS4GG requirements. VVB confirms that the provided information is sufficient to understand the purpose of the project and how it reduces GHG emissions and contributes to SDGs.

C.4. Legal owner(s), project developer (s) and other entities involved.

Means of validation	iRise Africa Limited has full and uncontested legal ownership of carbon rights that are generated under this project. PD has submitted copy of agreement with Government of Malawi which confirms that all the carbon rights for this project ICS are with the PD. Further, PD has signed carbon waiver forms with the project beneficiaries which clearly mention that carbon credit ownership for generated emission reductions is with PD. The review of LSC report further confirmed that, the same was demonstrated transparently and discussed during local stakeholder consultations too.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	Review of the copy of agreement with the Government of Malawi and copies of carbon waiver forms confirmed that iRise has a legal ownership of the project and is involved in the project development and implementation.

C.5. Project boundary

Means of validation	As per paragraph 3.1.1(a) of applies GS methodology Technologies and practices to displace decentralized thermal energy consumption (TPDDTEC), version 4.0/3/ "The project boundary is the physical, geographical sites of the project technologies". The project boundary includes the physical locations of improved cookstoves distributed in the Kasungu district of Malawi. Therefore, several villages within the Kasungu district of Malawi have been considered in the project boundary for the proposed GS project activity.

	The project boundary is correctly identified by PD which was confirmed during the on-site inspection and local stakeholder interview and was found to be in accordance with the clause 3.1 of the applied GS4GG methodology TPDDTEC version 04.0. It was confirmed by VVB through interviews that the beneficiaries will collect woody biomass mainly from the nearby area which is as mentioned in the baseline survey report submitted by the PD.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	VVB confirms that, a. the project boundary is appropriately described and is based on technologies/measures confirmed in the earlier section i.e. improved cookstoves and fuel used therein. b. Review of PDD confirms that the project boundary has included emission sources and GHGs to calculate baseline/project and/or leakage emissions.

C.6. Project eligibility as per GS4GG principles and requirements and other statutory documents

Means of validation	The VVB checked and has confirmed applicability of GS4GG principles and requirements as below. The project is eligible to apply the "Community Services Activity Requirements" version 1.2/7/ since it meets the criteria as outlined in sections "Eligible Project Types" and "General Eligibility Criteria" of those "Community Services Activity Requirements". The details are discussed below, Applicability of GS4GG Principles and Requirement, version 2.1/1/

Eligibility Criteria	**VVB assessment**
3.1.1 (a) Types of Projects: 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 current project is distribution of Improved Cookstoves (ICS) to the individual families thus qualifies eligibility as this will involve physical action/implementation on the ground. The on-site visit has confirmed that PD has already initiated ICS distribution within the project boundary. Hence, this criterion is satisfied.
3.1.1 (b) Location of Project: Projects may be located in any part of the world	The project activity is located within Kasungu district if Malawi as confirmed by the VVB with the on-site visit. Hence, this criterion is satisfied.
3.1.1 (c) Project Area, Project Boundary and Scale: The 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	The project boundary and the project area of the project activity have been checked by VVB against the submitted KML file and as confirmed by the PD, it will be within Kasungu district if Malawi. The project activity is a community-based energy saving project and thus, a large-scale ass defined based on energy savings. The project activity has expected wood savings of 0.039858 TJ per year per ICS i.e. 0.011 GWh(th) per year with total savings as 885.70 GWh

	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 misestimation of impacts amongst projects).	thermal which is more than 180 GWh thermal per year. Thus, the project qualifies for large scale as per GS4GG guidelines. PD has given a declaration/23/ that current project is not included in any other PoA or registered as a stand-alone project or is/are not registered by other carbon compliance standards / programs and/or country specific registries. VVB has checked the other carbon registries such as VERRA, CDM, GCC and others to confirm that the current project is not part of any carbon compliance standard/programs. Further, as evident during the on-site visit/interviews with PD representative, PD has ensured that each ICS distributed has a unique serial number and project database/21/ will record user location details to avoid double counting. Hence, this criterion is satisfied.
	3.1.1 (d) Host Country Requirements: Projects shall be in compliance with applicable Host Country's legal, environmental, ecological and social regulations.	VVB has checked and confirmed that there is a specific host country (Malawi) framework as evident from website https://www.metmalawi.gov.mw/documents/194/NFWCS_for_Malawi_FINAL.pdf but nothing specific for improved cookstove distribution programme. VVB noted that government of Malawi has not notified any laws/regulations/orders for such project/programme's implementation in recent years. Hence, this criterion is satisfied.
	3.1.1 (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 organization (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	Name and contact details of the PD have been provided in appendix 2 of the submitted final version of GSPDD, which is found to be in accordance with the organization's registration certificate/15/ and acceptable. The details of Local partner organizations and staff involved in the implementation of project was checked during on-site visit to confirm that PD is acting as a project implementer with other participants as below: • iRise Affordable Housing and Agriculture Limited • iRise O81 Limited

	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.	• iRise WW1 Limited • iRise QC1 Limited • iRise IC1 Limited The PD has provided the company registration certificates/15/ for these project participants and found to be satisfactory. Also, there is no evidence of insolvency or legal/criminal notices placed against it or any of its directors, same has been confirmed by VVB through interviews and was found to be consistent as stated by the PD representatives during the on-site inspection. Hence, this criterion is satisfied.
	3.1.1 (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 (FLIC). 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.	The legal ownership of project activity is with PD as confirmed based on carbon waiver forms/agreements/15/ and hence accepted. The carbon waiver forms/agreements clearly demonstrated FPIC and same was cross checked during on-site visit/17/.
	3.1.1 (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 (for example, access rights, water rights etc.). 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.	The project activity distributes ICS, and this does not involve any legal rights and/or permissions concerning change of other resources. The current project will distribute ICS to the households in the project area and there is no impact on legal rights or change of the resources involved. This is confirmed because, distribution of ICS changes household stove type and does not have legal right change. The only change of resource would be less use of wood as a fuel due to higher efficiency. Hence this criterion is satisfied.
	3.1.1 (h) Official Development Assistance (ODA) Declaration:	The assessment team has verified the ODA declaration provided by PD to confirm that the current project activity does not involve ODA funding/23/.

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.	Hence, this criterion is satisfied.

Applicability of Community Services Activity Requirements, Version 1.2:

Paragraph 2.1.2: Assessment team checked that project claims credits for the Emission Reductions associated with the use of fuel-efficient cookstoves distributed to local households and therefore this criterion is applicable.

Paragraph 2.1.3: The project conforms with the GS4GG Principles and Requirements; hence this criterion is applicable.

General Eligibility Criteria as per section 3 of Community Services Activity Requirements version 1.2:

Paragraph 3.1.1: Types of projects – Pre-identified CSA project types are noted below.

(a)Renewable energy Project Developers may submit new project types to Gold Standard for approval following the Principles & Requirements.

(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.

Assessment team checked that the project activity is an "End- use energy efficiency". "End-use energy efficiency" projects are defined as 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. Hence, this criterion is applicable. The applicable criteria selected by the PD is found to be correct and the same has been confirmed from the review of the documents/20//15/ and an on-site interview.

	Paragraph 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_2eq per annum (b) CSA Project seeking any Gold Standard Certified Impact or Product other than emission reductions and meeting one of the following criteria: • Installed capacity less than equal to 2 MWel /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 tCO_2eq 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'. The project utilizes the TPDDTEC methodology, version 4.0. The project boundary encompasses communities within Kasungu District in Malawi. The same has been confirmed during the site-visit and the geo-coordinates as mentioned the GS PDD/11/. Assessment team has also checked from the efficiency test report/20/ provided by the PP. Based on the ICS efficiency and no. of ICS to be distributed, the validation team confirmed that with the number of distributed ICS, energy savings would be more than the small-scale threshold i. e. the aggregate annual 180 GWh_{th}. Hence, this criterion is applicable as the project activity is a large scale project activity. **Paragraph 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. Assessment team noted that the concept of suppressed demand has not been used while establishing the baseline and baseline survey/21/ has been conducted. Further this is a large-scale project and hence supressed demand scenario is not applicable. The assessment team has confirmed through the on-site interview with Project participants. Hence, this criterion is not relevant to the project activity. **Paragraph 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.

Assessment team has checked that the PD and end users have signed "carbon waiver agreements" wherein a clear description of the ownership of the Products (i.e. carbon credits) that are generated under Gold Standard Certification all along the investment chain is provided and end-users are aware of and willing to give up their rights. The transfer of credit ownership was discussed also during local stakeholder consultation as confirmed based on meeting report submitted. Hence, it is applicable.

Based on the above assessment, validation team confirms that the applicable community service activity requirements are followed by the project activity.

Principle 2: Safeguarding Principles

The Safeguarding principles assessment is as below:

PRINCIPLES	VVB JUSTIFICATION
Principle 1: Human Rights	During on-site inspection, VVB confirmed that the project activity promotes and distributes efficient project stoves to the local communities in Kasungu district, Malawi. The project promotes clean energy for healthy environment and has not discriminated on faith or belief which is confirmed by VVB during interviews of end user and distribution team on onsite visit. Hence no such monitoring is required for this principle.
Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	PD has taken steps to ensure that the project will observe gender equality. As confirmed during on-site inspection, PD had conducted awareness meetings and records of the same were made available for cross-checking to VVB. As confirmed during the on-site inspection, the Project directly benefits women. Cooking activity is primarily managed by women in these areas as evident during on-site visit. With ICS distribution, women's exposure to smoke is reduced which was confirmed as a part of on-site interviews. ICS with better efficiency than the baseline stove leads to improved air quality compared to baseline scenario thereby, project leads to safer and cleaner environment, while also aiding in the healthier respiration and overall health improvement due to lesser generation of smoke. This was confirmed by ICS users during the on-site interview. The project ICS distribution and maintenance team is composed of male and female staff. The salary slips

		checked on-site confirmed that equal remuneration is given to the male and female workers without making discrimination when they are engaged in works of similar nature. As the ICS distribution and maintenance is gender neutral work, no risk specific to any gender is identified. The current project is ICS distribution project and VVB accepts that no expert recommendation is required for the same. Hence, the principle is safeguarded by the project activity
	Principle 3: Community Health and Safety Principle	The project ICS does not involve any hazardous material during construction/installation and its operation. VVB noted with higher efficiency rather leads to cleaner combustion compared to conventional cooking stoves. Hence, the project only leads to safe working conditions and improved in health of end users. Hence, the principle is safeguarded by the project activity
	Principle 4: Cultural Heritage, Indigenous Peoples, Displacement and Resettlement Principle	The project will be implemented in existing households where the inefficient conventional cooking stoves i.e. open fire stoves are replaced with improved cooking stoves. This does not involve any damage to cultural heritage or displacement and resettlement and rights of indigenous people. Hence, this parameter is safeguarded.
	Principle 5: Corruption	The project involves installation of ICS in households without any financial implication to the end users and does not require any specific permit or approval from any authority. Therefore, the project does not have any scope for corruption or corrupt practice. It also is confirmed by PD team during the on-site interviews. Hence, the principle is safeguarded by the project activity.
	Principle 6: Economic Impacts	The project involves distribution of ICS and its operation by end users is not labour intensive as it doesn't involve major construction works. VVB noted for project operation (training, maintenance) PD has trained the local people to contribute towards the main objective to avail better cooking solution at the households such that the trained persons can develop entrepreneurial skills to handle the supply chain of stoves. Therefore, the safeguarding principle under discussion will not have negative impact. PD will monitor employment records to check compliance with national laws and regulations which is found acceptable.
	Principle 7: Climate and Energy	The project being implementation of improved cooking stoves with higher efficiency (30.5%) than the baseline stove thus, saves energy which leads to overall emission reductions. The energy supply is not hampered compared to baseline but improved as more efficient stoves are provided to the end users. Hence, the principle is safeguarded by the project activity.

Principle 8: Water	The project involves use of improved cook stoves which does not need any water for its operation. Therefore, the project does not have any impact on water. Hence, the principle is safeguarded by the project activity
Principle 9: Environment, Ecology and Land Use	The project involves use of improved cook stoves which does not involve any landscape modification or leads to vulnerable natural disasters. It also does not involve any manufacture, trade, release, and/ or use of hazardous reports or hazardous chemicals and/or materials. It leads to less pollution (air pollution due to firing of fuelwood) compared to baseline scenario as the project technology itself is saving fuelwood consumption compared to baseline scenario. Hence, the principle is safeguarded by the project activity.

The safeguarding principles relevant to the project activity are justified by PP based on supporting web links, references wherever applicable. These safeguarding principles assessment is validated through references given by PP as mentioned above and based on site visit and interviews.

Complete Safeguarding principles assessment table in accordance with the GS4GG Safeguarding Principles Requirements Version 2.1 has been described in this validation report appendix 5.

The assessment of selected Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is provided below.

13 Climate Action (mandatory)	13.b Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change related planning and management in least developed countries and small island developing States. Indicator – emission reductions (GS VERs)	The project through savings of firewood through use of ICS will lead to emission reductions. PD has demonstrated emission reduction calculation in line with the applied methodology which is found acceptable. The assessment of monitoring parameter is provided in the below section.
15 Life on land	15.2 By 2020, ensure conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular, forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with	Use of ICS will lead to reduction in use of firewood within the project boundary. The baseline survey has confirmed that the baseline fuel is being collected/purchased within the vicinity of the baseline stove. Thus,

			obligations under international agreements. Indicator - Reduced deforestation attributed to wood fuel savings	VVB accepts that use of ICS will lead to reduced firewood usage ultimately reduced deforestation. PD will calculate this value based on the parameters $P_{P,y}$ and $P_{b,y}$. which is found acceptable. The assessment of monitoring parameter is provided in the below section.
		8 Decent work and economic growth	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. Indicator - Increased employment opportunities	The project implementation from baseline survey onwards has crated employment opportunities for the local people. This was confirmed during on-site visit. The project implementation will further lead to more job creation for operation and maintenance of ICS along with other supportive activities as confirmed during on-site interviews. Hence the selected indicator is acceptable. The assessment of monitoring parameter is provided in the below section.
		7 Affordable and Clean Energy	7.1: By 2030, ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services. Indicator - Increased access to energy	With improved efficient cookstoves, the baseline user will have access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services. This was confirmed during on-site visit and interviews conducted. Hence the selected indicator is acceptable. The assessment of monitoring parameter is

			provided in the below section.
	5 Gender equality	5.4 Recognize and value unpaid care and domestic work through the provision of public services, infrastructure and social protection policies and the promotion of shared responsibility within the household and the family as nationally appropriate Indicator - Women empowerment and gender equality	With improved efficient cookstoves, the time required for kitchen activities will reduce and the baseline user will have more time available to conduct other household work or any other work. The on-site visit has confirmed that the end users are primarily women and thus, will have more time to carry out other works leading to women empowerment and gender equality. Hence the selected indicator is acceptable. The assessment of monitoring parameter is provided in the below section.
	3 Good Health and Well-being	3.9: By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination. Indicator - Reduced incidence of disease caused by air pollutants	With improved efficient cookstoves, the smoke from kitchen activities will reduce and the baseline user will experience less health-related issue. This was confirmed during on-site visit interviews. Hence the selected indicator is acceptable. The assessment of monitoring parameter is provided in the below section.
	1 No Poverty	1.1: By 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere. Indicator - Financial savings	With improved efficient cookstoves, the end user will require less firewood. PD has conducted survey for expected expenditure within the sampled households. With improved stove

		distribution, this expenditure will go down was the opinion when the representative sampling was conducted by the VVB. Hence the selected indicator is acceptable. The assessment of monitoring parameter is provided in the below section.

Principle 3: Stakeholder Inclusivity

VVB noted and confirmed based on submitted evidence such as Local stakeholder consultation report including SFR report and physical meeting report that PD has conducted both a stakeholder round of physical meetings and a Stakeholder Feedback Round (SFR).

As per the GS requirements, it is necessary to invite the relevant stakeholders, before the validation process starts. For developing project under GS, stakeholder meeting was held on 28/02/2024 and 29/02/2024. For the meeting conducted, PD had invited the stakeholders through phone calls, the public notice in English and local language were published on 31/01/2024 as confirmed based on invitation letter and meeting report.

The meeting was organized to encourage participants to post their views on the project more openly and without hesitation of protocol. All kind of stakeholders (Women, Senior Citizens, students, local people etc.) has participated in the meeting. Validation team verified the list of participants/18/ who attended the stakeholder meeting and feedback questionnaire and confirms the stakeholders identified were relevant. The validation team also verified the minutes of meeting to note that no negative comments were received and the same was cross checked with the information obtained during follow up interviews with the stakeholders.

Thus, validation team is of the opinion that the stakeholder meeting was adequate and appropriate.

The project activity is a GS VER project and therefore PP was required to conduct a Stakeholder Feedback Round (SFR) covering the issues (if any) related to the project activity. The same is conducted by PD and different representative of stakeholders like representatives of government authorities at national and local levels, private, technical and administrative entities and from local and international non-governmental organizations were invited for their comments via email during stakeholder's feedback round held between 01/03/2024 to 31/03/2024.

No negative comments were received, and local stakeholders were very satisfied with the project activity implementation and operation in their area.

The assessment team is in opinion after witnessing the consultation process and document review and interaction with the local stakeholders during on-site inspection that SFR has been conducted in line with GS4GG guidelines and a

	grievance/input mechanism is established. It is concluded that the stakeholder consultation carried out adequately. VVB confirms that physical LSC and SFR (conducted online) were conducted in accordance with the Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement Requirements Version 2.0. Relevant documents are already submitted to the validation team. The same has also been confirmed from the local stakeholders during the on-site inspection. All the steps were found to be performed as per the guideline. The assessment team has checked the list of invitees and attendance list/ and confirmed that relevant stakeholders was part of the local stakeholder meeting. The PD has submitted the LSC report that includes the photographs of the conducted meeting. The VVB has checked the minutes of meeting, stakeholders feedback forms and it was observed that no negative comment or grievance found recorded during the stakeholder meeting. Furthermore, the assessment team had also interviewed the local stakeholders during on-site inspection that no negative comments from stakeholders received. This was also confirmed by the stakeholder feedback documents as provided by the PD. **Principle 4: Demonstration of real outcomes** The distribution of Improved cookstoves will have positive contribution and PD has monitored the parameters in line with the applied methodology, tools and other guidelines. The assessment of ex-ante and ex-post parameters is provided in section C.11 below. The values of ex-ante parameters and monitored parameters can be found in the table given below. The VVB confirms that; a) The monitoring complies with the requirement of the applied methodology c) The information flow (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting) is included for each parameter and confirms to the requirement of the methodology. d) The findings relevant to each parameter, wherever appropriate are discussed in detail in Appendix 4 of this report. In summary, the VVB confirms that all the ex-post parameters are correctly mentioned as per applied methodology. Moreover, VVB confirmed all the data and collected evidence as per the required monitoring frequency and found to be correct and appropriate meeting the requirements of the applied methodology/6/. **Principle 5: Financial Additionality & Ongoing Financial Need** Since this is not a design certification renewal, Ongoing Financial Need demonstration is not required as per the clause 4.1.51 of the GS4GG Principles & Requirements. Additionality for this project activity has been described below in section C.9.

Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	The assessment conducted confirms that the project is eligible to apply the "Community Services Activity Requirements" version 1.2 as it meets the criteria outlined in sections "Eligible Project Types" and "General Eligibility Criteria" of these guidelines.

C.7. Project eligibility as per applied methodology/ies

Means of validation

The VVB checked and has confirmed applicability of methodology and tools applied and the assessment is as below.

Applied methodology - Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption (TPDDTEC), version 4.0

Applicability Criteria as per methodology	VVB Assessment
Section 2.2.1 (a) Project shall choose a technology design that has predictable performance in that it is proven to be efficient and durable under field conditions; for cookstoves, the rated thermal efficiency shall be at least 20%.	Since the project activity includes distribution of ICS leading to end user energy efficiency, the applicable criteria selected by the PD is found to be correct and the same has been confirmed from the review of the submitted document i.e. manufacturer's datasheet/20/.
Section 2.2.1 (b) The technology shall have continuous useful energy output of less than 150kW per unit.	VVB has checked and confirmed that useful energy output of the ICS being used is 110 kW which is less than 150 kW and hence acceptable.
Section 2.2.1(c) The project activity is implemented by a project developer and can include additional project participants listed in Appendix 2 of the PDD template. The individual households and institutions may be represented collectively by community organizations, etc., but do not individually act as project participants.	As checked against the submitted duly signed carbon waiver agreements between the end-users and the PD, it was confirmed that the project implementer is iRise Africa Limited. Moreover, it is also confirmed by the PD representatives as well as local stakeholders during the on-site inspection that no individual households are the project representatives, hence acceptable to VVB.
Section 2.2.1(d) The project developer must design incentive mechanism(s), which should be effective as fast as possible, for the elimination of inefficient baseline stoves that are replaced by the project cooking devices and describe the incentive mechanism(s) in the PDD/PROJECT-DD at the time of validation.	The on-site interviews were held to confirmed that incentive mechanisms mentioned in the in the GS PDD and confirmed as below. 1. The on-site interviews confirmed that PD has implemented project activity in collaboration within relevant health, environmental and community officers of Kasungu District Council. 2. The on-site interviews confirmed that, PD has communicated with local chiefs for project implementation.

		3. The copies of carbon waiver agreement and interviews have confirmed that ICS will be distributed free to the selected end users. 4. On-site visit confirmed that PD had published project related information within the identified communities.
	Section 2.2.1 (e) To avoid double counting or double claiming, the project developer must: i. clearly communicates its ownership rights and intention of claiming the emission reductions resulting from the project activity to the following parties by contract or clear written assertions in the transaction paperwork: all other project participants; project technology manufacturers; and retailers of the project technology other renewable fuel in use; and ii. inform and notify the end users that they cannot claim emission reductions from the project, and exclude from the project activity, cooking devices included in any other voluntary market or CDM project activity/PoA and strive not to displace the cooking devices of another CDM or voluntary project/PoA. See data and parameters not monitored, Avoidance of double counting or double claiming with other mitigation actions, for details on this demonstration.	PD has submitted copy of direct carbon agreement signed with the Government of Malawi and carbon waiver forms signed by the project participants and individual household end users. This confirmed that ownership right and intention of claiming the emission reductions resulting from the project activity To avoid double counting of ICS with other project, as a standalone project or in other carbon mechanisms such as VERRA, CDM, GCC and also other voluntary carbon mechanisms, all the distributed ICS under the project activity bears the unique serial number. Unique serial number and user location details identifies the project devices individually and separates it from other programs. PD has developed iVerify which is their monitoring and management system. PP has NC tags on each ICS which communicates with the central system. This ensures that the carbon credit generated from the specific cookstove, and specific household is not counted or claimed twice. The review of 'iVerify' system has confirmed the same.
	Section 2.2.1 (f) Project activities making use of solid fossil fuel in the project scenario or other improved fossil fuel cookstoves meeting certain conditions described in the footnote to Table 1 (e.g. switch from three-stone fire biomass stoves to LPG stoves) may only claim emission reductions for energy efficiency improvement aspect and shall assume the same baseline and project fuel for emission reduction calculations.	The on-site visit has confirmed that PD has distributed ICS in the project area, hence VVB based on on-site visit and project database/5/ records has confirmed that all the ICS devices will be using the same fuel which was being used in the baseline i.e. fuel wood and no fuel switch technology is involved.

	Section 2.2.1 (g) Project activities making use of a new solid biomass feedstock in the project situation (e.g. switch to green charcoal or renewable biomass briquettes) must comply with relevant specific requirements for biomass related project activities, as defined in the latest version of the Community Services Activity Requirements. The specific requirements apply to both plantations established for the project activity and/or existing plantations that will supply biomass feedstock.	The on-site visit has confirmed that PD has distributed ICS in the project area. Hence VVB based on on-site visit has confirmed that all the ICS devices will use the same fuel which was being used in the baseline i.e. fuel wood and no new biomass feedstock will be used by the project ICS.
	Section 2.2.1 (h) Adequate evidence is supplied to demonstrate that indoor air pollution (IAP) levels are not worsened compared to the baseline, and greenhouse gases emitted by the project fuel/stove combination are estimated with adequate precision. Furthermore, for projects where cooking will move from outdoor to indoor or where the project technology reduces ventilation (for example, changing from a stove with chimney to improved stove with no chimney), indoor air pollution (IAP) levels shall not worsen in the project compared to the baseline, including PM 2.5 and carbon monoxide (CO) emissions. This may be demonstrated before project Design Certification or during project operation using the certification resulting from of a manufacturer's test, report of field testing of the technology's PM 2.5 and carbon monoxide (CO) emissions, report of lab testing of the technology, or results of modelling of the technology's operation under field conditions. If none of these are available, reference from published literature or report by independent agencies may be used as evidence, provided it is not more than 5 years old.	VVB has noted based on the technical specifications that the project ICS is with efficiency of 30.5%. This efficiency is higher than the baseline stoves in use which were traditional inefficient stoves. Thus, VVB noted that with use of project ICS, indoor air pollution will reduce as compared to the baseline scenario. This is cross checked during on-site interviews. The project does not involve cooking being moved from outdoor to indoor or where the project technology reduced ventilation. This was confirmed during the site assessment which confirmed that the project is replacing traditional inefficient stoves with project cookstoves within the end users house. With better efficiency of project ICS than the baseline ICS, the IAP levels will be better in the project as compared to the baseline. As per the methodology requirement, PD has demonstrated this through the certification resulting from of a manufacturer's test, the same is found acceptable.
Findings	No findings were raised.	
Conclusion	VVB confirms that the latest version of the methodology was applied at time of first submission of the Project to Gold Standard. The assessment further confirmed that the project meets each applicability condition of the applied methodology. The review of PDD and supporting evidences along with on-site visit has confirmed that the selected methodology was correctly applied with respect to the following:	

	a. Project boundary; b. Identification of baseline scenario; c. Demonstration of additionality; d. Explanation of methodological choices/approaches for estimating the SDG Impact e. Algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions/removals and SDG impacts Thus, validation team confirms that the project is eligible as per applied GS4GG methodology requirements.

C.8. Baseline identification

Means of validation	According to the applied methodology TPDDTEC, version 4.0, paragraph 3.4.1, "the project developer shall define the baseline scenario as the existing baseline technology/practice use and fuel consumption patterns for the type of service provided by the project technology in the population targeted for adopting the new project technology, i.e., "target population" and as per paragraph 3.4.2, "The selection and description of the baseline scenario must be informed by the Baseline Scenario Survey". As per para 4.3.3 of the applied methodology, to conduct a baseline survey, the sample size required for project with group size more than 1000 is minimum 100 nos. The current project has targeted to distribute 80,000 improved hence, PD needed to select sample group size of minimum 100 nos. The submitted baseline survey was checked to confirm that PD in accordance with the methodology has selected 156 samples. VVB has confirmed that PD has conducted baseline survey/21/ results of the same has been submitted to the VVB. This survey was conducted in line with section 4.3 of applied methodology which details the requirement of the baseline scenario survey. VVB has confirmed that the conducted survey has covered all the data points as mentioned in the paragraph 4.3.4 of the applied methodology, version 4.0 as below: 1. User follow up: i. Address or location; ii. Mobile telephone number and/or landline telephone number (when possible) 2. End user characteristics: iii. Number of people served by baseline technology; iv. Typical baseline technology usage patterns and tasks (commercial, institutional, domestic, etc.) 3. Baseline technology and fuels: v. Types of baseline technologies used and estimated frequency; vi. Types of fuels used and estimated quantities; vii. Seasonal variations in baseline technology and fuel use; viii. Sources of fuels; purchased, hand-collected, or etc., and prices paid or effort made, e.g. walking distances, persons collecting, opportunity cost The review has further confirmed that the survey has followed requirements as per section 4.4 of meth for sampling and section 4.5 for requirements for quality assurance and quality control.

	The baseline survey has established that in the baseline scenario, the users are using open stove for food preparation using firewood collected from the nearby areas within the identified project boundary. VVB confirms that PD has established baseline scenario and described the same adequately. The baseline survey has clearly established that within the project area, firewood is the choice for fuel, and three stone or open stove is the cookstove being used for cooking activity. The same was also cross-checked and confirmed during on-site interviews by VVB. Thus, VVB confirms that there is no multiple baseline technologies are being used by the target population. Hence, no stove stacking is present. As a part of baseline survey, PP had asked end users about the availability of other clean fuels/other improved cookstoves but as evident from the submitted survey and discussion with the baseline users during site visit, availability of free firewood in the vicinity and traditional cooking practices are dominant. The project activity is a non-industrial activity and only a single technology is installed in a household. In line with the applicable methodology, the baseline is fixed until the end of the crediting period and will not require continuous monitoring or updating. VVB noted that if a project cookstove is replaced with a cookstove of similar efficiency prior to the end of the crediting period, the original baseline shall be applicable till the end of the replaced cookstoves' useful lifetime or the registered crediting period, whichever occurs earlier. VVB further noted that in the host country – Malawi, there is no requirement that households must purchase efficient cookstove or any project which targets to implement a domestic household project must install efficient cookstoves. Thus, the project activity is a voluntary action by the project developer to initiate this project. PD has confirmed that the project is not being implemented as a result of any existing requirements.
Findings	CL 01 was raised and closed successfully. Refer appendix 4 for more information.
Conclusion	To conclude, VVB noted that baseline survey, on-site visit has confirmed that the baseline stove users are using firewood and no other fuel is being used. Thus, the baseline is clearly identified as per the applied methodology and is appropriate.

C.9. Additionality

Means of validation	Additionality for this project activity has been described as below: As per the clause 3.3.2 of the GS4GG Community Services Activity Requirements V2.0, "The project developer shall demonstrate additionality prior to project registration by conforming to additionality requirements as per the GS4GG Activity Requirements" and the para 4.1.9 states that, "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, LLDC (c) Microscale projects". The project activity satisfies requirements of positive list as demonstrated below. The annex B of the GS4GG Community Services Activity Requirements V1.2 states that, "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."

	As cross checked by VVB based on the information provided in the PDD, it could be confirmed that the annual energy savings is <=600 MWh, which is 11.07 MWh as confirmed based on the ER sheet. Therefore, this Project activity is deemed additional and accepted.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	VVB confirmed that the project activity fulfils criteria for positive list and is additional.

C.10. Sampling plan

Means of validation	In section B.7.2 of the submitted PDD, PD has explained the sampling plan followed for the current project activity. As per the applied methodology, PD has to be applied sampling to establish baseline scenario. Section 4.4 of the methodology provided general requirements for sampling and are assessed below. Section 4.4.2 - A statistically valid sample can be used to determine parameter values, as per the relevant requirements for sampling in the latest version of the CDM Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities. 90% confidence interval and a 10% margin of error requirement shall be achieved for the sampled parameters unless mentioned otherwise in the methodology. In any case, for proportion parameter values, a minimum sample size of 30, or the whole group size if this is lower than 30, must always be applied. PD has selected simple random sampling method which is statistically valid and is in line with the latest version of the CDM Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities. PD has followed 90% confidence interval, and a 10% margin of error requirement shall be achieved for the sampled parameters. Section 4.3.3 mandates minimum sample size as 100 if the group size is more than 1000 nos. VVB noted that the project is expected to distribute 80,000 ICS and hence, PD has selected 156 (>100) samples which is appropriate. PD has submitted both, baseline survey report and Kitchen performance test reports which were conducted based on samples selected using simple random method. The submitted baseline survey report based on randomly selected samples and KPT result document was checked to confirm the sampling is appropriately applied. The review of submitted emission reduction worksheet further confirms the same.
Findings	CAR 01 and CAR 04 were raised and closed successfully. Refer appendix 4 for more information.
Conclusion	The sampling plan is in line with the sampling standard and guidance.

C.11. Monitoring parameters and other elements of monitoring plan

Means of validation

EX-ante Parameters	Description	Value	VVB Assessment
Baseline scenario survey results	Report of the results of the	Not applicable	PD carried out baseline survey to identify baseline practices i.e.

		baseline scenario survey		Stove and fuel being used along with the other parameters. The review of the submitted copy and on-site interviews have confirmed the results.	
	Project technology description	Detailed description of cookstove model	Manufacturer: HCS Limited Efficiency: 30.5% Continuous useful energy output: 2.18 KWh Technology type: Portable Rural Wood Stove Fuel: Firewood	PD has submitted manufacturer's specifications which confirm the ICS details mentioned and same were cross-checked during the on-site visit.	
	Expected technical life of project technology	The expected technical life of an individual project technology	5 years	The value is based on submitted manufacturer's specifications and found appropriate.	
	Indoor air pollution (IAP) levels of the project technology	For projects where cooking will move from outdoor to indoor or where the project technology reduces ventilation (for example, changing from a stove with chimney to improved stove with no chimney), demonstration that Indoor air pollution (IAP) levels are not worsened in the project scenario compared to the baseline, including PM 2.5 and carbon	2.47 g/min (CO emissions) and 8.98 mg/min ($PM_{2.5}$ emissions)	PD has submitted copy of RTKC/CREEC laboratory test which confirms that the values mentioned in the PDD are appropriate.	

		monoxide (CO) emissions.		
	Avoidance of double counting or double claiming among project participants	Evidence of avoidance of double counting or double claiming with other parties directly involved with the project or programme	Not applicable	The project activity does not have any other party being directly involved in the project. This is confirmed based on the declaration submitted by PD. Further, the project implementing partners have already declared that they will not claim carbon credits.
	Avoidance of double counting or double claiming with other mitigation actions	Review and analysis of mitigation actions in other voluntary market or UNFCCC/compliance mechanisms	Not applicable	The review of other certification body webpages has confirmed that the current project is not registered with any other statutory or voluntary carbon mechanism. PD has submitted a declaration saying no double counting of carbon credits will be ensured which is found acceptable.
	Regulatory framework for provision of thermal energy services	Evidence that the project does not undermine or conflict with any national, sub-national or local regulations or guidance for thermal energy supply/devices or fuel supply or use		Government of Malawi has formulated a policy in 2018 as National Energy Policy[2]. The policy review confirms that, there is not regulatory framework for thermal energy service in Malawi.
	$EF_{b,f,CO2}$	CO2 emission factor arising from the use of fuels in baseline scenario	112 tCO_2/TJ	The value applied for the parameter was found to be default IPCC value for CO_2 Emission factor of fuelwood. Hence, found to be appropriate
	$EF_{b,f,non\ CO2}$	Non - CO2 emission factor arising from use of	9.46 tCO_2e/TJ	The value applied for the parameter was found to be default IPCC value for

[2] https://npc.mw/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/National-Energy-Policy-2018.pdf

	fuels in baseline scenario.		CO_2 Emission factor of fuelwood. Hence, found to be appropriate.
$EF_{p,f,CO2}$	CO2 emission factor arising from the use of fuels in project scenario	112 tCO_2/TJ	The value applied for the parameter was found to be default IPCC value for CO_2 Emission factor of fuelwood. Hence, found to be appropriate
$EF_{p,f,non\ CO2}$	Non - CO2 emission factor arising from use of fuels in project scenario.	9.46 tCO_2e/TJ	The value applied for the parameter was found to be default IPCC value for CO Emission factor of fuelwood. Hence, found to be appropriate.
$NCV_{b,fuel}$	Net calorific value of the fuels used in the baseline	0.0156 TJ/ton	The value applied for the parameter was found to be default IPCC value for NCV of fuelwood. Hence, found to be appropriate
$NCV_{p,fuel}$	Net calorific value of the fuels used in the baseline	0.0156 TJ/ton	The value applied for the parameter was found to be default IPCC value for NCV of fuelwood. Hence, found to be appropriate
$f_{NRB,i,y}$	Non-renewability status of woody Biomass fuel in project scenario	62	The value of fNRB is calculated using the fNRB Application or GS4GG Certification, version 1.0./25/. As per rule update section 2.3, 3 eligible methods of fNRB estimation are provided. And, PD has chosen option as per para 2.3.1 a i. e. Modelling Fuelwood Saving Scenario (MoFuSS) derived values. The review of https://www.mofuss.unam.mx confirms that the value used for the country of Malawi is appropriate and acceptable. MofuSS provides fNRB for all 136 different municipalities/ areas within the Kasungu District itself. Thus, PP

			has taken an average against this and calculated average fNRB for the whole district. Assessment team checked the excel file and found that correct values are taken from MoFuSS and thus accepted by assessment team/24/.
$P_{b,y}$	Quantity of fuel that is consumed in baseline scenario p during year y	0.0108 tonnes	The quantity of fuel consumed in baseline scenario is determined using baseline survey and KPT. The quantity of fuel consumed in project scenario will be determined using baseline field test results. The parameter determination approach is found acceptable and justified.
$LE_{p,y}$	Leakage in project scenario p during year y	5%	The applied methodology allows to consider a leakage factor of 0.95 for project related emissions. PP has used this value as 5% and hence seems appropriate.
$Thh_{b,y}$	Time spent on cooking and wood collection or purchase tasks per day by a household in baseline scenario b in year y	279 minutes per household	PD has defined this value based on baseline survey results. The results were discussed during the on-site interviews and were found appropriate.
$HHvisited_{b,y}$	Percentage of households reporting incidence of respiratory illness in baseline scenario p in year y	13.64%	PD has defined this value based on baseline survey results. The results were discussed during the on-site interviews and were found appropriate.

EX post parameters	Description	Value	VVB Assessment
$N_{b,p,y}$	Number of project technology-days included in the project database for baseline b/project p pair in	365 nos.	The parameter will be monitored based on the project technology units distributed times the total calendar days that unit is

	year y			operational in a year. PD has a proprietary cloud system – iVerify which monitors ICS in real time and transparent manner. VVB noted that this will ensure correct data is captured as a part of monitoring plan and hence acceptable.
Up,y	Weighted average usage rate in project scenario p during year y	99%	This parameter describes the Weighted average usage rate in project scenario p during year y. This has been assessed by VVB in accordance with para 2.1 of the GS4GG Requirements and Guidelines: Usage Rate Monitoring. The PP will submit corresponding survey and its results during verification. And the value to be confirmed by the verifying VVB as per "Requirements and Guidelines: Usage Rate Monitoring". Therefore, it is acceptable to VVB.
$SFS_{b,p,y}$	Specific fuel savings for an individual project technology of baseline b/project p pair in year y	7 kg	The specific fuel savings for an Individual project Technology of baseline b/project p is calculated from $P_{p,y}$. The parameter determination approach is found acceptable and justified. The monitoring frequency of the parameter would be biennial.
$P_{b,y}$	Quantity of fuel that is consumed in baseline scenario b during year y	0.0038 tonnes	The value of parameter was calculated from the baseline KPT/21/. PP has conducted baseline KPT test to determine the value of the parameter. The KPT test conducted

				was found to be in line with the requirements stated in applied methodology/3/. The calculations in the baseline KPT have been reviewed and found to be appropriate. The parameter will be fixed for the entire crediting period and will be monitored on biennial basis.
	Presence of stove stacking	Descriptive statistics of the presence and usage practices of baseline- and other non-project-technology by project technology end users	Annual	PD will conduct usage surveys to confirm usage baseline- and other non-project-technology by project technology end users. The survey will confirm cookstove use through Pictures of the mud-stoves, survey form, interviews, feedback of the beneficiaries, and pictures of ICS with beneficiaries on an annual basis. The parameter determination approach is found acceptable and justified.
	Avoidance of double counting or double claiming among project technology end users	Evidence of avoidance of double counting or double claiming with project technology end users	None	Each of the end user signs a carbon waiver form at time of ICS collection. This form transfers all the carbon credits generated through the project to the project developer which was confirmed during on-site visits .
	$ICS_{t,y}$	Project ICS distributed in year y	80,000	The parameter will be monitored based on the project technology units distributed. PD has a proprietary cloud system

				– iVerify which monitors ICS in real time and transparent manner. VVB noted that this will ensure correct data is captured as a part of monitoring plan and hence acceptable.
	$Employment_{,p,y}$	Number of employment opportunities created during project scenario p during year y	156	The project activity will lead to full time employment at the end of the defined annual reporting period which will be measured on annual basis through employment records. This is found appropriate.
	$Thh_{p,y}$	Time spent on cooking and wood collection or purchase tasks per day by a household in project scenario p in year y	140	PD has defined this value based on project survey results. The results were discussed during the on-site interviews and were found appropriate.
	$HHvisited_{p,y}$	Percentage of households reporting incidence of respiratory illness in project scenario p in year y	5.18%	PD has defined this value based on project survey results. The results were discussed during the on-site interviews and were found appropriate.
	$MWK_{b,p,y}$	Per Kg cost of fuel consumed in baseline b/project p pair in year y	93.2	This value is defined based on monitoring survey being conducted. The results were discussed during the on-site interviews and were found appropriate.
	In section B.7.2 of GS PDD, PD has detailed the monitoring plan which is to be followed as a part of registered project activity. The details were checked during interviews with the PD representatives. The monitoring plan is found acceptable.			
Findings	CL 02, CAR 02, CAR 03 were raised and closed successfully. Refer appendix 4 for more information.			
Conclusion	The assessment team checked the monitoring plan and noted that the parameters (ex-ante and ex-post) are enough to ensure that emission reduction calculations can be calculated in line with the applied methodology/tool and other guidance.			

C.12. Estimation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals

Means of validation	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption Version 4.0 is used for the proposed project activity. As the GS4GG recommends the application of the latest version of the applied methodology along with the conservative argument of the approach followed. The latest version is 4.0 and VVB confirm that the project activity is in line with the latest methodology as well. The formula used in the PDD was used for the calculation of emission reduction and same is found to be correct. Hence emission reduction calculation at this time of validation is conservative and appropriate. Assessment team checked that Formula used to calculate the net emission reduction for the project activity is as per Method 1 of the applied methodology which says – "Baseline and project fuel(s) are identical and emission reductions are exclusively from improved efficiency" Hence, For SDG 13 $ER_y = \sum_{b,p} (N_{b,p,y} \times U_{p,y} \times SFS_{p,b,y} \times NCV_{b,fuel} \times (f_{NRB,b,y} \times EF_{b,f,CO2} + EF_{b,f,nonCO2})) - \sum LE_{p,y}$ Where: ERy = Emission reduction for total project activity in year y ∑bp = (tCO_2e/yr) Sum over all relevant baseline b/project p pairs Nb,p,y = Number of project technology-days included in the project database for baseline b/project p pair in year y (days) Up,y = Cumulative Usage rate for technologies in project scenario p in year y (fraction) SFSp,b,y = Specific fuel savings for an individual project technology of baseline b/project p pair in year y (mass or volume units/technology*day) NCVb,fuel = Net calorific value of the fuel(s) that is substituted or reduced in baseline b (TJ/mass or volume units) f_{NRB},b,y = Fractional non-renewability status of woody biomass fuel during year y (fraction). For biomass, it is the fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable. This parameter is omitted when f is a fossil fuel. $EF_{b,f,CO2}$ = CO_2 emission factor from use of fuel f (tCO2/TJ) $EF_{b,f,nonCO2}$ = Non-CO_2 emission factor arising from use of fuel f when the baseline fuel f is biomass or charcoal (tCO2e/TJ). This parameter is omitted when f is a fossil fuel.

	$LE_{p,y}$ = Leakage for project scenario p in emissions in year y (tCO2e/yr) $NCV_{p,fuel}$ = Net calorific value of the project fuel (IPCC default for Wood/Wood Waste 0.015 TJ/ton). This is equal to the baseline fuel NCV in projects which use the same fuel. **Leakage:** As per the para 3.11.2 of the applied methodology[5], PD has applied an adjustment factor of 0.95 to the emission reductions to approximate the leakage emissions. In this case, the term "$-\sum LEp$," in equations 1, 2 or 3 changes to "* 95%". PD has presented ER calculation in the submitted GS PDD which is checked for the values and found correct. The equations, parameter values and unit of measurements used in the GS PDD and submitted ER sheet are found correct and in line with the applied methodological choices.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	Based on the submitted GS PDD and ER sheet, the assessment team confirmed the emission reduction calculations presented and same are mentioned in the below table.

Year	**Baseline estimate (tCO_2e)**	**Project estimate (tCO_2e)**	**Net benefit (tCO_2e)**
Year 1	386,174	135,876	250,298
Year 2	386,174	135,876	250,298
Year 3	386,174	135,876	250,298
Year 4	386,174	135,876	250,298
Year 5	386,174	135,876	250,298
Total	1,930,870	679,380	1,251,490
Total number of crediting years	5		
Annual average over the crediting period	**386,174**	**135,876**	**250,298**

C.13. Prior Consideration

Means of validation	This section is 'not applicable' as the current project is a 'regular' project. The project developer has conducted stakeholder consultation in February, 2024 and the project start date is 01/08/2024 which satisfies requirements of 'regular' project as confirmed based on the submitted stakeholder consultation records and ICS distribution database.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	Not applicable as the project is 'regular' type.

C.14. Ongoing Financial Need

Means of validation	Not applicable' as the project is under Design Certification.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	Not applicable' as the project is under Design Certification.

C.15. Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) outcomes

Means of validation

VVB confirmed that the project activity describes selected SDG targets and indicators with their estimated values in the submitted GS PDD and SDG impact tool. For the values for SDG, VVB assessed and confirmed the proposed approach for calculating baseline and project outcomes and confirmed that the same are in line with the methodological requirements.

The assessed values for each of the SDGs are presented below.

SDG 13: Climate Action – Reduction in GHG emissions (tCO_2e.)

Year	Baseline estimate	Project estimate	Net benefit
Year 1	386,174	135,876	250,298
Year 2	386,174	135,876	250,298
Year 3	386,174	135,876	250,298
Year 4	386,174	135,876	250,298
Year 5	386,174	135,876	250,298
Total	1,930,870	679,380	1,251,490
Total number of crediting years	5		
Annual average over the crediting period	**386,174**	**135,876**	**250,298**

SDG 15: **Total non-renewable wood fuel saved (tonnes/y)**

Year	Baseline estimate	Project estimate	Net benefit
Year 1	193,568	68,107	125,461
Year 2	193,568	68,107	125,461
Year 3	193,568	68,107	125,461
Year 4	193,568	68,107	125,461
Year 5	193,568	68,107	125,461
Total	967,840	340,535	627,305
Total number of crediting years	5		
Annual average over the crediting period	**193,568**	**68,107**	**125,461**

SDG 8: Number of jobs created through the project (number)

Year	Baseline estimate	Project estimate	Net benefit
Year 1	0	156	156
Year 2	0	156	156
Year 3	0	156	156
Year 4	0	156	156
Year 5	0	156	156
Total	0	156	156
Total number of crediting years	5		
Annual average over the crediting period	**0**	**156**	**156**

SDG 5: Time saving on cooking and collecting fuel (minutes)

Year	Baseline estimate	Project estimate	Net benefit
Year 1	101,835	51,100	50,735
Year 2	101,835	51,100	50,735
Year 3	101,835	51,100	50,735
Year 4	101,835	51,100	50,735
Year 5	101,835	51,100	50,735
Total	509,175	255,500	253,675
Total number of crediting years	5		
Annual average over the crediting period	**101,835**	**51,100**	**50,735**

SDG 7: Households provided with new energy access (number)

Year	Baseline estimate	Project estimate	Net benefit
Year 1	0	79,200	79,200
Year 2	0	79,200	79,200
Year 3	0	79,200	79,200
Year 4	0	79,200	79,200
Year 5	0	79,200	79,200
Total	0	79,200	79,200
Total number of crediting years	5		
Annual average over the crediting period	**0**	**79,200**	**79,200**

SDG 3: Households reporting to hospital with eye infections and respiratory illness

Year	Baseline estimate	Project estimate	Net benefit
Year 1	13.64%	5.18%	8.46%
Year 2	13.64%	5.18%	8.46%
Year 3	13.64%	5.18%	8.46%
Year 4	13.64%	5.18%	8.46%
Year 5	13.64%	5.18%	8.46%
Total	13.64%	5.18%	8.46%
Total number of crediting years	5		
Annual average over the crediting period	**13.64%**	**5.18%**	**8.46%**

SDG 1: Average household savings (MWK Savings on Firewood Expenditure)

Year	Baseline estimate	Project estimate	Net benefit
Year 1	363,720	127,976	235,744
Year 2	363,720	127,976	235,744
Year 3	363,720	127,976	235,744
Year 4	363,720	127,976	235,744
Year 5	363,720	127,976	235,744
Total	1,818,600	639,880	1,178,720
Total number of crediting years	5		
Annual average over the crediting period	363,720	127,976	235,744

Findings	CL 03 was raised and closed successfully. Refer appendix 4 for more information.
Conclusion	VVB confirms that the SDGs are clearly identified and net benefits are well described in the submitted PDD. PD has selected 7 SDGs thus, requirement for minimum 3 SDGs must be identified is fulfilled.

C.16. Safeguarding principles

Means of validation	The assessment of safeguarding principles is provided below in the appendix 5. PD has decided not to be monitor any of the principle, which is found appropriate based on the document review, on-site interviews.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	PD has decided not to monitor any of the safeguarding principles. VVB noted safeguarding principle monitoring is not mandatory and hence same is acceptable. PP has provided justification for the safeguarding principle monitoring under Section D.1 and Gender Sensitive requirements under Section D.2 of the PDD. Same are found correct.

C.17. Compliance with Gender Equality Requirements and Guidelines

<table>
<tr><td>Means of validation</td><td>PD has demonstrated compliance with the mandatory requirements as outlined in Gender Equality Requirements and Guidelines in section D.2 of the submitted GS PDD. The on-site interviews confirmed that with improved cookstoves, women and girls who are primary cook within the households will have access to cleaner cooking practices. Thus, helping them for betterment of life.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Findings</td><td>No findings were raised.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Conclusion</td><td>VVB has concluded that the project activity meets the requirements as outlined in Gender Equality Requirements and Guidelines under section D.2 of the submitted GS PDD as below:
<table>
<tr><th>Assessment Questions</th><th>PP Response</th><th>VVB Assessment</th></tr>
<tr><td>Question 1 - Explain how the project reflects the key issues and requirements of Gender Sensitive design and implementation as outlined in the Gender Policy?</td><td>Women and girls are disproportionately affected by unclean cooking practices. Statistically, they spend significant time collecting firewood and are exposed to hazardous gases using unclean technologies. The project therefore directly targets women and girls who have participated in the design of the project from its onset through local stakeholder consultations i.e. the cookstove was designed to be light and portable, which was a specific design requirement and input from the women and girls consulted.</td><td>Assessment team checked the Stakeholder Consultation Report and found that women & girls were considered for designing of light and portable cookstoves. Further, women & girls spend significant time collecting firewood and are exposed to hazardous gases using unclean technologies during cooking/18/. Same was also confirmed through the onsite interviews/17/.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Question 2 - Explain how the project aligns with existing country policies, strategies and best practices</td><td>Malawi implemented a National Gender Policy in 2016. It recognises the need for gender mainstreaming in natural resources management to respond to prevalent gender inequalities. It is stated that women and girls are principal players in usage of energy for cooking. Unclean cooking technologies therefore disproportionately affect women. Women are affected in terms of exposure to harmful pollutant gases from burning of biomass; and they are also disproportionately affected in terms of time wastage to source firewood for cooking which translates into time being taken away from their involvement in productive social and economic activities. The project reduces fuelwood biomass utilised in cooking</td><td>The project activity reduces fuelwood consumption for cooking and exposure to the smoke. Also, due to higher efficiency of the installed stoves, less time required for cooking which give free time for involvement in productive activities/17/.</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
</table>

		and exposure to pollutant gases thereby freeing up time for women and girl's involvement in productive activities and reducing their exposure to hazardous gases respectively.	
	Question 3 - Is an Expert required for the Gender Safeguarding Principles & Requirements?	No	As verified from per the GS preliminary review report, Gold Standard did not mention any requirement for an expert stakeholder opinion (with a specific emphasis on gender and environment expertise) to support the gender safeguards assessment process.
	Question 4 - Is an Expert required to assist with Gender issues at the Stakeholder Consultation?	No	As verified from per the GS preliminary review report, Gold Standard did not mention any requirement for an expert stakeholder opinion (with a specific emphasis on gender and environment expertise) to support the gender safeguards assessment process.

C.18. Crediting period and duration

Means of validation	PD has submitted ICS distribution database and their E-database 'iverify' was checked. The review confirmed that, the 1st set of ICS were distributed and were in operation on 01/08/2024. So, this is considered as project start date. However, PD has decided to consider 01/09/2024 as the crediting period start date. The PD decided to delay the crediting period start date to accurately capture realistic technology usage post 4 week acclimatization period. The same is found acceptable. Thus, the crediting period of the project activity is considered as 01/09/2024 to 31/08/2029, renewable twice, in line with GS requirements which is acceptable. Since, the local stakeholder consultation was conducted in February, 2024 i.e. prior to project start date, the project is 'regular' which is acceptable.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	VVB confirms that PD has identified and stated the crediting period start date correctly in line with the GS guidance. The 05 year renewable twice crediting period satisfies GS requirements and hence acceptable.

C.19. Local Stakeholder Consultation (LSC)

Means of validation	PD has submitted stakeholder consultation report providing details of both the rounds of stakeholder consultations. The report confirms that the meetings were conducted on 28 and 29 February ,2024 at different location in Kasungu district i. e. project boundary. The on-site interviews were confirmed that stakeholders were invited by means of written letters and/or voice calls at least 30 days in advance to the meeting. The invited stakeholders include

	local authority representatives, local NGOs/CSOs, National Government Officials, Community members, representatives of government institutions, traditional leaders, working groups, media, and religious leaders as confirmed based on submitted records and on-site interviews. Post these meeting, a SFR was held for the month of March, 2024 as evident based on the submitted documents. Review of the report and on-site interviews confirmed that, PD discussed about the proposed project, its impacts, usage, environmental benefits and benefits to the local population. Review of the report and on-site interviews confirmed that, no negative comment was received as a part of the stakeholder consultation. PD has established Grievance Expression Process Book which is available at the CDI office and the DCs office. Also, other channel includes CDI repeatedly interfaces with local chiefs who are also utilised as a tier for receiving complaints from communities. Further, grievance can also be lodged through Email id: compliance@irisecarbon.com and Telephone: +265 996305335. This was confirmed during the on-site visit.
Findings	CAR 05 was raised and closed successfully. Refer appendix 4 for more information.
Conclusion	VVB noted that stakeholder consultation process is followed by PD in line with the GS requirements. The stakeholder consultation process and grievance mechanism was discussed during stakeholder interviews conducted by the assessment team during on-site audit.

C.20. FOR LUF only

Means of validation	The project is NON LUF and hence this section is not applicable.
Findings	Not applicable
Conclusion	Not applicable

SECTION D. Internal quality control

Following completion of the validation process and upon the validation team's recommendation, relevant documentation shall be submitted for independent technical review. The independent reviewer, who is not involved in the validation activities, will confirm that the validation has been conducted in accordance with applicable SustainCERT S.A. procedures and the requirements of GS4GG, ensuring consistency, transparency, and impartiality.

Upon confirmation of the project developer, the validation opinion together with all supporting documentation will be submitted to Gold Standard via the Assurance Web Platform, in accordance with the established submission protocol.

SECTION E. Validation opinion and statement

SustainCERT has performed the validation for Design Certification of the Gold Standard for Global Goals (GS4GG) Project Activity: iRise Africa Limited Cookstove Project (GS 12957). The validation was conducted based on the rules and requirements defined by the Gold Standard as applicable to Design Certification.

The review of GS PDD, supporting documents, and subsequent follow-up site visit has provided SustainCERT with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of the stated validation criteria. The project through distribution of improved stoves is anticipated to reduce the consumption of non-renewable biomass, mitigate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and deliver significant social, economic, and health benefits to the local community, particularly for women and girls who are disproportionately affected by the burdens of traditional cooking methods. The project is expected to result in real, measurable, and long-term greenhouse gas emission reductions, contributing to climate change mitigation, and is additional to any reductions that would occur in the absence of the proposed Gold Standard project activity.

The estimated average annual emission reductions from the project activity are expected as 250,298 tCO_2e per year over the 5-year initial crediting period. SustainCERT based on a reasonable level of assurance and the means of validation employed, deems it likely that, these emission reductions and the SDG impacts outlined are achievable, provided that the underlying project assumptions remain valid.

The monitoring plan, as detailed in the GS PDD, is compliant with the applied methodology TPDDTEC v4.0 and adequately provides for the ex-post monitoring of the project's emission reductions and relevant sustainable development indicators, as defined within the GS PDD.

GHG emissions reductions and removals validated according to the design document (PDD):

YEAR	**Estimated Baseline Annual GHG Emissions (tCO_2e)**	**Estimated Project Annual GHG Emissions (tCO_2e)**	**Estimated amount of annual GHG Emission reductions or GHG removals (tCO_2e)**
Year 1	386,174	135,876	250,298
Year 2	386,174	135,876	250,298
Year 3	386,174	135,876	250,298
Year 4	386,174	135,876	250,298
Year 5	386,174	135,876	250,298
Total	**1,930,870**	**679,380**	**1,251,490**
Total number of crediting years	05 Years		
Annual Average over Crediting Period	**386,174**	**135,876**	**250,298**

Validation STATEMENT

SustainCERT S.A. has performed a validation of the "iRise Africa Limited Cookstove Project" GS 12957 for the crediting period 01/09/2024 to 31/08/2029. The validation was performed on the basis of Gold Standard GS4GG guideline and host country criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The review of the GS4GG PDD and the subsequent follow-up interviews has provided SustainCERT S.A. with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant requirements for the Gold Standard and all relevant host country criteria. The project will hence be recommended by SustainCERT S.A. for registration with the Gold Standard Registry.

The iRise high energy efficient firewood cookstoves aim at reducing the amount of greenhouse gas emissions and indoor air pollution caused by the traditional cooking methods as iRise cookstove has high thermal efficiency, thereby emitting fewer carbon emissions than the combustion of firewood in a three-stone open fire. Thus, the project results in reductions of CO_2 emissions that are real, measurable and give long-term benefits to the mitigation of climate change. Emission reductions attributable to the project are hence additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity. Given that the project is implemented as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated amount of annual emission reductions of 250,298 tCO_2e per year.

The validation has been performed following the requirements of the latest version of the GS VVS version 2.0, other Gold Standard GS4GG guideline and on the basis of the contractual agreement.

In detail the conclusions can be summarized as follows:

- The project does not result in negative social, environmental and/or economic impacts.
- The project contribution to Environment, Social Development and Economic and technological development.
- The project additionality is sufficiently justified in the Gold Standard PDD.
- The project does not result in diversion of ODA.
- Conservative assumptions were applied in the project description.
- The monitoring plan of SDG parameters is transparent and adequate.
- The project meets the stakeholder consultation requirements.

The conclusions of this report show that the project, as it was described in the project documentation, is in line with all criteria applicable for the validation.

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

ACR	American Carbon Registry
AFOLU	Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use
AQL	Acceptable Quality Level
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CL	Clarification Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
ER	Emission reductions
ETS	Emission Trading Scheme/s
FAR	Forward Action Request
FVR	Final validation/verification report
GCC	Global Carbon Council
GHG	Green House Gas(es)
GS4GG	Gold Standard for Global Goals
IAP	Indoor Air Pollution
ICR	International Carbon Registry
ISO	International Standards organization
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
KPT	Kitchen Performance Test
MW	Mega Watt
MWh	Mega Watt hours
MP	Monitoring Period
PA	Project Activity
PDD	Project design document
PD	Project developer
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Check
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
tCO_2e	Tonnes of Carbon Di-oxide equivalent
TPDDTEC	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption
UQL	Unacceptable Quality Level
VER	Verified Emissions Reductions

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

COMPETENCY STATEMENT	
Name	Dr. Atul Takarkhede
Years of Experience	19+
QUALIFYING ROLES	
Team Leader	Yes
Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) / CE Region 6 (Hindis)
Technical Expert	Yes (1.1, 1.2, 3.1, 13.1)
Financial Expert	Yes
Independent Reviewer	Yes
APPROVAL	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT
Date	22/05/2025

COMPETENCY STATEMENT	
Name	Ms. Zhiyue Wang
Years of Experience	1+
QUALIFYING ROLES	
Team Leader	No
Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) / CE Region 6 (Chinese)
Technical Expert	No
Financial Expert	No
Independent Reviewer	No
APPROVAL	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT
Date	23/09/2025

COMPETENCY STATEMENT	
Name	Mr. Jean Bosco
Years of Experience	-
QUALIFYING ROLES	
Team Leader	No
Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) / CE region 3 (French) / CE Region 6 (Other language)
Technical Expert	Yes (1.2 , 3.1)
Financial Expert	No

Independent Reviewer	No
APPROVAL	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT
Date	05/02/2024

COMPETENCY STATEMENT	
Name	Ms. Muskan Chawla
Years of Experience	3
QUALIFYING ROLES	
Team Leader	Yes
Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) / CE Region 6 (Hindi)
Technical Expert	Yes (1.2, 3.1)
Financial Expert	No
Independent Reviewer	Yes
APPROVAL	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT
Date	05/09/2023

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced.

No.	Title	Version and date	Provider
1.	Gold Standard Principles & Requirements	2.1	Gold Standard
2.	Gold Standard Validation & Verification Standard	2.0	Gold Standard
3.	Gold Standard Methodology Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption	4.0	Gold Standard
4.	Requirements and Guidelines: Usage Rate Monitoring	2.0	Gold Standard
5.	Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities	09.0	UNFCCC
6.	Safeguarding Principles & Requirements	2.1	Gold Standard
7.	Community Services Activity Requirements	1.2	Gold Standard
8.	Gender Equality Requirements & Guidelines	2.0	Gold Standard
9.	Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement Guidelines	2.0	Gold Standard
10.	Gold Standard Project Design Document template guide	1.5	Gold Standard
11.	GS PDD	1 dated 20/07/2025 5 dated 27/02/2026	PD
12.	Ex-ante ER sheet	3.0	PD
13.	SDG impact tool	3.0	PD
14.	Guideline for Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities	4.0	CDM
15.	Carbon waiver form samples carbon agreement between government of Malawi and PD carbon transfer agreements IRise group companies registration certificate	N/A	PD
16.	Audited survey photos Sample kitchen photographs Survey forms	N/A	PD
17.	On-site visit observations	-	SustainCERT
18.	Local stakeholder consultation meeting report	-	PD
19.	Initial cookstove deployment records	-	PD
20.	Improved cookstove technical datasheet Performance certificate	-	PD
21.	Baseline survey report Baseline and Project KPT results	-	PD

No.	Title	Version and date	Provider
	ICS distribution database		
22.	Host country regulations regarding cookstove distribution, usage etc.	-	Web resources
23.	No double counting/ODA declaration	-	PD
24.	fNRB calculation sheet for average value https://www.mofuss.unam.mx.	-	-
25.	fNRB Application or GS4GG Certification, version 1.0	-	Gold Standard

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

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments-FARs from GS Preliminary Review	Developer Response
GS review	FAR 01-03	Following FARs have been raised during GS Preliminary Review: FAR 1. VVB to validate the evidence of start date. FAR 2. VVB shall evaluate through appropriate means at their disposal that the LSC report is in line with the latest Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement Requirements and provide their opinion in the validation report. FAR 3. VVB to confirm from stakeholders during validation if carbon rights transfer was discussed and end users are aware of carbon rights waiver. VVB shall also interview stakeholders about the ongoing stakeholder feedback procedures.	VVB response FAR 1: XXX FAR 2: PP has submitted Stakeholder Consultation report. This report dated 11/07/2024 confirms that an initial meeting was conducted on 28 and 29 Feb. 2024 and SFR was conducted between 01 March to 31 March 2024. The assessment is provided in the validation report. FAR 3: During on-site visit, the VVB team confirmed that carbon right transfer was discussed and end users are aware about the same. The site interviews confirmed that stakeholders are aware about ongoing stakeholder feedback procedures.
	Rd 2	FAR1. The start date of project is 01/08/2024. PP has submitted evidence through 'iverify' app for beneficiary data which confirmed that 1st beneficiary was onboarded on this date. Hence this FAR is closed. FAR 2. The submitted LSC report was checked and found in line with the GS requirements. The project type is regular as the stakeholder consultation and feedback round was conducted prior to the project start date which	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments-FARs from GS Preliminary Review	Developer Response
		is cross checked during the on-site visit. An opinion on the LSC report is now provided in the validation report. FAR 3. VVB has confirmed the same with the end users during on-site visit. They agreed that carbon right transfer was discussed during the registration process with 'iverify' app. All FARS are closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
GS VVS and PDD template requirements	CL 01	Section B.4 mentions footnote no. 28,32,33 but no footnotes are added on the corresponding pages in the PDD.	Amended
	Rd 2	PP has revised section B.4 for baseline demonstration. As a part of the same, the concerned footnotes are deleted. CL 01 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
GS VVS and PDD template requirements	CL 02	During field visit, it was found that out of the 11 households visited, 10 no longer had their NFC tags on cookstove, rather end-users kept it with them separately which are used to uniquely identify each cookstove by its serial number and to record its geographic location within the iVerify system. Kindly clarify.	All cookstoves are currently fitted with NFC tags at the time of dispatch to households. These tags serve to uniquely identify each cookstove by its serial number and to record its geo-location within our iVerify system. However, field observations have shown that the current tags are not sufficiently durable under village conditions. Several

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
			cases have been reported where children have removed or damaged the tags, compromising their functionality. To address this issue, we are transitioning to a more robust type of serialised tags that will be securely affixed to the cookstove using screws rather than adhesive. These new tags have already been ordered. Once received, our monitoring team will conduct a comprehensive exercise to replace all existing tags on distributed cookstoves. Additionally, all cookstoves leaving the production centre will henceforth be fitted with the new screw-mounted tags. Notably, the tag number for each serialised tag functions as the unique identification number and serial number for each cookstove.
	Rd 2	PP response is found satisfactory. A FAR is raised for the verifying body to confirm about the planned 'serialised tags for the ICS CL 02 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
GS VVS and PDD template requirements	CL 03	The section 4 refers to data from the period of 1990-2010 and the most recent data is not mentioned. In PPD section 6, for SDG 7 it is mentioned that "according to the World Bank, at least 72 % of the population lives below 2.15/day per day, a majority of which are concentrated in rural	Amended. Reference to most recent data. Source provided in footnotes. Amended. Sources provided in footnotes.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		areas". A source of the information to be mentioned in the footnote and to be ensured that it is the most recent one. Also, the same section for SDG 5 mentions "Studies indicate that women and girls are primarily responsible for cooking and collecting firewood". But which study is not clear to the audit team. For SDG 3, PDD mentions "…several studies indicate…", these studies shall be mentioned and reference shall be provided with to validate the value considered i. e. 0 – 10,850 µg/m3.	
	Rd 2	The revised PDD was checked to confirm that footnotes are now provided at the appropriate places. The same were checked and confirmed to be operation CL 03 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
GS VVS and PDD template requirements	CAR 01	In section B.4 of PDD, PD has not mentioned how the baseline survey and baseline KPT survey were conducted, when it was conducted, sampling being carried out, the questions asked, target population, results , impact of daily and seasonal variations on the expected average fuel consumption savings, in line with the requirements as mentioned in section 4 of the applied methodology. Further, various inconsistencies observed in the GS PDD has been provided as comment in respective section. Corrective action requested for the same.	Amended. Summary of studies provided. Comments in PDD addressed in track changes.
	Rd 2	PD has revised section B.4 to discuss about sampling being conducted as a part of baseline survey and KPT surveys. The survey results are submitted to the VVB	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		which were checked to confirm the values and duration. The same was cross checked during on-site visit too. Revised GS PDD was checked to note that inconsistencies are now removed. CAR 01 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
GS VVS and PDD template requirements	CAR 02	In section B.6.2, For the parameter table, maintain consistency with the table formats from the PDD template and same shall not be modified. For ICS 3, the value applied in the PDD, and its unit of measurement is different and to be corrected. In section B.6.4, mention unit of measurement for the values provided in the table for SDG 13, SDG 5 and SDG 1.	Table formats amended by adding shade blue to Parameter ID row. For ICS 3, value applied is ‘5’, unit of measurement is ‘years’
	Rd 2	Revised PDD section B.6 was checked to confirm that PD has made the table consistent with the template requirements. Further, the values of the data/parameters are corrected along with their unit of measurements. CAR 02 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
GS VVS and PDD template requirements	CAR 03	In section B.7.1, a. for parameter ICS 28, i. Mention exact source of measurements. The applied methodology mentions; “sources established by following section 2.4.A Leakage	All amended. See track changes. ii. Value fixed ex ante, amended.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		emissions" while PDD mentions "Deemed valid by methodology" ii. If the value to be used is fixed ex-ante then, PD cannot select monitoring frequency as 'biennial' as mentioned in the PDD. Correction requested. b. For ICS 27, the source of data shall be more specific to validate and confirm the same. c. For ICS 26, source of data refers to section 4.1 of PDD which is non-existent. d. For ICS 30, it is now clear how this parameter is used in the emission reduction calculation and needs to be monitored. e. For ICS 19, project specific QZ/QC procedures to be mentioned and not a generalised one as per the applied methodology. f. For ICS 18, the value is mentioned as 10.7 kg which is not in line with the applied meth requirements. project specific QZ/QC procedures to be mentioned and not a generalised one as per the applied methodology. g. For ICS 17, the source of data shall be more specific to validate and confirm the same. h. For ICS 16, project specific QZ/QC procedures to be mentioned and not a generalised one as per the applied methodology. Also, the parameter does not discuss about continual use of baseline stove and its impact identification on the parameter	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		i. For ICS 15, project specific QZ/QC procedures to be mentioned and not a generalised one as per the applied methodology. j. For ICS 27, project specific QZ/QC procedures to be mentioned and not a generalised one as per the applied methodology. k. For ICS 26, the source of data shall be more specific to validate and confirm the same. l. For SDG 8, measurement methods shall be more specific to validate and confirm the same. m. For SDG 3, project specific QZ/QC procedures to be mentioned	
	Rd 2	Revised PDD section B.7.1 was checked to confirm, a. for parameter ICS 28, i. exact source of measurements i. e. Sources established by following section 2.4.a Leakage of emissions. Default discount value applied is now mentioned with the value as 5% i. e. 0.95 and hence acceptable. ii. Table format is revised for ex-ante data/parameter now which is appropriate. b. For ICS 27, the source of data is now mentioned as project monitoring survey which is found acceptable. c. For ICS 26, the source of data is now revised as usage survey which is found acceptable. d. For ICS 20, the parameter nomenclature is corrected in line with applied methodology and is	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		required for ER calculation. Hence found acceptable. e. For ICS 19, PD has now mentioned project specific QA/QC procedures. Hence found acceptable. f. For ICS 18, the value is now mentioned as 10.7 kg based on KPT results for daily fuel consumption of baseline stoves. PD has now mentioned project specific QA/QC procedures for the parameter as per the applied methodology. Hence found acceptable. g. For ICS 17, the source of data is now revised to specific source MoFUSS which is appropriate. h. For ICS 16, project specific QA/QC procedures are now mentioned as per the applied methodology. PD has now also discussed about continual use of baseline stove and its impact identification on the parameter which is appropriate. i. For ICS 15, project specific QA/QC procedures are now mentioned as per the applied methodology. j. For ICS 27, project specific QA/QC procedures are now mentioned as per the applied methodology. k. For ICS 26, the source of data is now specified to validate and confirm the same. l. For SDG 8, measurement methods are now made specific to validate and confirm the same. a. For SDG 3, project specific QA/QC procedures are now mentioned	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR 03 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
GS VVS and PDD template requirements	CAR 04	In section B.7.2, provide details in line with section 4.4 of the applied methodology also mention how the selected sample size is appropriate.	Amended.
	Rd 2	Revised section B.7.2 of PDD was checked to confirm that details provided are now and are appropriate. CAR 04 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
GS VVS and PDD template requirements	CAR 05	In section E, Provide details such as location, date, person attended, mode of communication etc.	Amended.
	Rd 2	PD has revised section E to provide location, date, person attended, mode of communication etc. which is cross checked against submitted consultation report and found appropriate. CAR 05 is closed.	

Appendix 5. Safeguarding Principles Assessment

SOCIAL SAFEGUARDING PRINCIPLES		
Reference requirement	Question	Response
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project developer, its representatives and the Project disrespect internationally proclaimed human rights?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Is the project involved or complicit in violence or human rights abuses of any kind as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Have local communities or individuals raised human rights concerns regarding the project (e.g., during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g., Project-affected stakeholders) do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does this project undermine national or regional measures for the realisation of the right to development?	☐ YES ☒ NO
If the answer to any of the questions above is "yes," please explain the reason and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here…		
Would the project potentially involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference source not found.	adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalised groups?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	inequitable or discriminatory impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalised or excluded individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	restrictions on availability, quality of and/or access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalised individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	exacerbation of conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Briefly describe below how the project incorporates a human rights-based approach. For example, by describing how the project design:		

is informed by human rights analysis, including from UN human rights mechanisms (human rights treaty bodies, universal periodic review, special procedures)
includes measures to assist the government to realise (respect, protect and fulfil) human rights under international law and to implement human rights-related standards in national law (whichever is higher)
enhances the availability, accessibility and quality of benefits and services for potentially marginalised individuals and groups, and to increase their inclusion in decision-making processes that may impact them (consistent with the non-discrimination and equality human rights principle)
provides reasonable accommodations to strengthen inclusivity and accessibility of project benefits and services to persons with disabilities.

Please add text here….

Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.

Error! Reference source not found.	Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the project, (e.g., during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project undermine the principles of non-discrimination, equal treatment, and equal pay for equal work?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project prevent men and women from having equal opportunities to participate in identified tasks and activities, whether through paid work, volunteer work, or community contributions, as appropriate?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project limit the participation of women or men based on pregnancy, maternity/paternity leave, or marital status?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Is information about project objectives being communicated in a way that is inappropriate for the local context and not tailored to the methods of understanding of both women and men, which could hinder their participation?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Has the project assessed gender risks without referencing the country's gender strategy or equivalent national commitment?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Has expert stakeholder(s) been involved, and has their input been requested for the project design on gender equality and women's empowerment?	☐ YES ☒ NO

If the answer to any of the questions above is "yes," please explain the reason and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.

Please add text here….

Would the project potentially involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference source not found.	adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	exacerbation of risks of gender-based violence? For example, through the influx of workers to a community, changes in community and household power dynamics, increased exposure to unsafe public places and/or transport, etc.	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference	reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO

source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.	limitations on women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well-being.	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO

Briefly describe below how the project is addressing any identified risk to gender equality and women's empowerment.

Please add text here….

Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.

Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve potential risks to the health and safety of affected communities during its life cycle?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve any potential risks to the workers' safety and health?	☐ YES ☒ NO

If the answer to any of the questions above is "yes," please explain the reason and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.

Please add text here….

Would the project potentially involve or lead to:

Error! Reference source not found.	construction and/or infrastructure development (e.g., roads, buildings, dams)?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	air pollution, noise, vibration, traffic, injuries, physical hazards, poor surface water quality due to runoff, erosion, sanitation?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	harm or losses due to failure of structural elements of the project (e.g., collapse of buildings or infrastructure)?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	risks of water-borne or other vector-borne diseases (e.g., temporary breeding habitats), communicable and noncommunicable diseases, nutritional disorders, mental health?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g., explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	adverse impacts on ecosystems and ecosystem services relevant to communities' health (e.g., food, surface water purification, natural buffers from flooding)?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO

Briefly describe below how the project is addressing any identified risk related to community health and safety.

Please add text here….

Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.

Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve altering, damaging, or removing sites, objects, or structures of significant cultural heritage?	☐ YES ☒ NO
If the answer to question above is "yes," please explain the reason and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Would the project potentially involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference source not found.	activities adjacent to or within a cultural heritage site?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	significant excavations, demolitions, movement of earth, flooding or other environmental changes?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	alterations to landscapes and natural features with cultural significance?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	adverse impacts to sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g., knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	utilisation of tangible and/or intangible forms (e.g., practices, traditional knowledge) of Cultural Heritage for commercial or other purposes?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to question above is “YES” or “POTENTIALLY” - are the communities made aware of their right under the law, scope and nature of proposed development and its potential consequences?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to question above is “YES” - does the project provide equitable sharing of benefits from commercialization of such knowledge, innovation, or practice, consistent with their customs and traditions?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to question above is “YES” - are opinions and recommendations of an Expert Stakeholder(s) not sought and demonstrated as being included in the project design?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to question above is “YES”, has project design been changed, modified, updated considering opinions and recommendations of an Expert Stakeholder?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above questions, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve any risks related to involuntary relocation of people?	☐ YES ☒ NO

If the answer to question above is "yes," please explain the reason and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Would the project potentially involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference source not found.	risk of forced evictions or involuntary relocation of people?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement (including people without legally recognizable claims to land)?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	economic displacement (e.g., loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to question above is “YES” or “POTENTIALLY”, has the project developed Resettlement Action Plan or Livelihood Action Plan in consultation and agreement with affected individual, group or community? has the project integrated Resettlement Action Plan or Livelihood Action Plan into the Project design?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to question above is “YES” - are opinions and recommendations of an Expert Stakeholder(s) not sought and demonstrated as being included in the project design?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to question above is “YES”, have project design been changed, modified, updated considering opinions and recommendations of an Expert Stakeholder?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above questions, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve any risks related to identifying and managing legitimate tenure rights that may be affected by the project?	☐ YES ☒ NO
If the answer to question above is "yes," please explain the reason and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Would the project potentially involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference source not found.	impacts on or changes to land tenure arrangements and/or community-based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	uncertainties with regards to land tenure, access rights, usage rights or land ownership? Examples include, but are not limited to water access rights, community-based property rights and customary rights.	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference	Changes in legal arrangements, if yes, are the changes done in line with relevant laws and regulations?	☐ YES ☐ NO

source not found.		☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	Changes in legal arrangements, if yes, are these changes agree with free, prior and informed consent of the involved stakeholders?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	Does some other entity (other than the project developer) hold uncontested land title for the entire Project Boundary?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	Are opinions and recommendations of an Expert Stakeholder(s) not sought and demonstrated as being included in the project design?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to question above is “YES”, have project design been changed, modified, updated considering opinions and recommendations of an Expert Stakeholder?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	Have project developer in consultation with stakeholders established a functioning mechanism to receive, process, resolve, communicate and record grievances?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above questions, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		

Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.

Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve Indigenous People within the Project area of influence who may be affected directly or indirectly by the Project?	☐ YES ☒ NO
If the answer to question above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Would the project potentially involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference source not found.	affect areas where indigenous peoples are present (including project area of influence)	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	affect areas, land and territory claimed by indigenous peoples?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	impacts (positive or negative) to the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to above questions is “YES’’ or “POTENTIALLY”, Is it determined that the proposed project may affect the rights, lands, resources, or territories of indigenous people? Has an "Indigenous People Plan" (IPP) or "Indigenous People Plan Framework" been elaborated and included in the project documentation? Was the plan developed in accordance with the effective and meaningful participation of indigenous peoples and in accordance with UNDP Guidelines?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA

Error! Reference source not found.	risk of forcibly removing indigenous people from their lands and territories?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	utilisation and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Principle 4.1 above	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found. **Error! Reference source not found.**	If answer to question above is "YES" or "POTENTIALLY" Did the project obtain free, prior and informed consent from indigenous people before taking their cultural, intellectual, religious, and/or spiritual property? Does the project ensure that the indigenous people receive an equitable sharing of benefits resulting from the use of their traditional knowledge and practices?? Does the project ensure that the sharing of benefits resulting from the use of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge and practices is culturally appropriate and inclusive? Does the project ensure that the provision of equitable sharing of benefits does not impede land rights or equal access to basic services including health services, clean water, energy, education, safe and decent working conditions, and housing?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project lack appropriate feedback and grievance channels for Indigenous Peoples and their representatives?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	Has a grievance mechanism not been established at the beginning of programme or project implementation with due consideration given to customary dispute settlement mechanisms among the Indigenous Peoples concerned and will it remain operational throughout the project cycle?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	Are opinions and recommendations of an Expert Stakeholder(s) not sought and demonstrated as being included in the project design?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to question above is "YES", have project design been changed, modified, updated considering opinions and recommendations of an Expert Stakeholder?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above questions, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve, or is it complicit in, contributing to or reinforcing corruption or corrupt projects?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project have a risk of encouraging bribery, kickbacks, or other unethical behaviour?	☐ YES ☒ NO
If the answer to any of the questions above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		

Please add text here….
ECONOMIC SAFEGUARDING PRINCIPLES
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.

Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve, facilitate, or condone forced labour, or pose a potential risk of forced labour?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project violate any labour or health and safety laws, international obligations, or ILO conventions?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project violate the principles of equal opportunity and fair treatment in its employment decisions?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project violate national laws, if available regarding non-discrimination in employment?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found. **Error! Reference source not found.**	Does the project allow child labour?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found. **Error! Reference source not found.**	Does the project have insufficient processes and measures in place to ensure the safety and health of project workers?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project have insufficient measures to safeguard and support vulnerable project workers, such as women, people with disabilities, migrant workers, and young workers, and to prevent any kind of harassment, abuse, bullying, or exploitation, including gender-based violence (GBV)?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project have no grievance mechanism available for workers to voice workplace concerns? Is information about this mechanism not provided to workers at the time of recruitment, or is it not easily accessible?	☐ YES ☒ NO

If the answer to any of the questions above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.
Please add text here….
Would the project potentially involve or lead to: (note: applies to both project and contractor workers)

Error! Reference source not found.	use of forced labour?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	working conditions that do not meet national labour laws and international commitments?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	working conditions that may deny freedom of association and collective bargaining?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	absence of documented working agreements with all individual workers if such agreements do not exist, or do not address working conditions and terms of employment, the project developer shall provide reasonable working conditions and terms of employment.	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	use of migrant workers? if engaged, the developer shall ensure that they are engaged substantially equivalent terms and conditions to non-migrant workers carrying out similar work.	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	having no arrangements for basic services3 for workers? the project developer shall put in place and implement policies on the quality and management of the accommodation and provision of basic services in a manner consistent with the principles of non-discrimination and equal opportunity. Workers' accommodation arrangements should not restrict workers' freedom of movement or of association	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	any form of discrimination or harassment based on factors unrelated to job requirements, such as gender, race, nationality, ethnicity, social or indigenous origin, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	any form of discrimination in any aspect of employment, such as recruitment, compensation, working conditions, training, job assignment, promotion, termination, or discipline?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	harassment, intimidation, and/or exploitation, especially in regard to women?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	discriminatory working conditions and/or lack of equal opportunity where national law provides provision to address non-discrimination in employment?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	use of child labour? (including third-party engaged workers)	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference	inadequate and verifiable mechanisms for age verification?	☐ YES ☒ NO

[3] Basic services requirements refer to minimum space, supply of water, adequate sewage and garbage disposal system, appropriate protection against heat, cold, damp, noise, fire, and disease-carrying animals, adequate sanitary and washing facilities, ventilation, cooking and storage facilities and natural and artificial lighting, and in some cases basic medical services.

source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.	no processes and measures in place for the safety and health of project workers?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	No provision of safety and health training provisions, including on the proper use and maintenance of personal protective equipment conducted by competent persons and the maintenance of training records?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	No provision to record and document accidents, diseases, incidents, and any resulting injuries, illnesses, or deaths?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	occupational health and safety risks due to physical, chemical, biological and psychosocial hazards (including violence and harassment) throughout the project life cycle?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	No measures to protect vulnerable project workers from harassment, exploitation, and gender-based violence (GBV)? This includes women, people with disabilities, migrant workers, and young workers.	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	No grievance mechanism available for workers to voice workplace concerns.	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	No measures for due diligence and the establishment of policies and procedures to manage and monitor the performance of third-party employees in the project?	☐ YES ☒ NO
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above questions, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.	Is there a risk of project failure during implementation or after project certification due to a lack of financial resources?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project have potential negative impacts or pose a risk to the local economy?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Are there any potential risks or negative impacts this project may have on vulnerable or marginalised social groups, despite the benefits it may bring?	☐ YES ☒ NO
If the answer to any of the questions above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here…		
Would the project involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference	economic impacts (negative/detrimental) to the local economy?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO

source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.	negative economic consequences during and after project implementation, e.g., for vulnerable and marginalised social groups in targeted communities?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above questions, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project have a risk of increasing greenhouse gas emissions over the Baseline Scenario?	☐ YES ☒ NO
If the answer to question above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Would the project involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference source not found.	increase greenhouse gas emissions over the Baseline Scenario?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to the above question, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project pose a risk to the availability and reliability of energy supply to other users?	☐ YES ☒ NO
If the answer to question above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Would the project involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference source not found.	negative impact on the availability and reliability of energy supply to other users?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to the above question, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		

Please add text here….
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.

Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project increase water usage to a level that will not allow for the maintenance of environmental flows?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project result in the discharge of wastewater that does not meet the required standard for beneficial reuse and could therefore negatively impact the environmental flow?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project have the potential risk to exceed the rate of recharge for the groundwater source?	☐ YES ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve any processes or activities that could contaminate the groundwater and render it unsuitable for use?	☐ YES ☒ NO

If the answer to any of the questions above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.
Please add text here….
Would the project involve or lead to:

Error! Reference source not found.	affect the natural or pre-existing pattern of watercourses, groundwater and/or the watershed(s) such as high seasonal flow variability, flooding potential, lack of aquatic connectivity or water scarcity?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Wastewater discharge of quality that does not meet the required standard for beneficial reuse?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	significant extraction, diversion of ground water? For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Are opinions and recommendations of an Expert Stakeholder(s) not sought and demonstrated as being included in the project design?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA

If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above questions, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.
Please add text here….
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.

Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project have a risk of negatively impacting the catchment and has it been assessed and addressed?	☐ YES ☒ NO

If the answer to question above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Would the project involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference source not found. **Error! Reference source not found.**	negatively impact on the catchment area. If yes, Erosion prevention measures, including soil and slope protection measures, must be implemented before project commencement. These measures should involve natural terracing, infiltration strips, permanent ground cover, hedge and tree rows, and effective slope length assessment. Regular reassessment of these measures is necessary.	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Are opinions and recommendations of an Expert Stakeholder(s) not sought and demonstrated as being included in the project design?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above questions, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found. - **Error! Reference source not found.**	Is there any risk of soil resource degradation or loss of ecosystem services provided by soils in the project? If yes, the project shall maintain healthy soils by minimising negative impacts on soil health, productivity, structure, and water retention. Steps to minimise soil degradation include crop rotation, composting, using N-fixing plants, and reducing tillage and ecologically harmful substances.	☐ YES ☒ NO
If the answer to question above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Would the project involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference source not found.	production, harvesting, and/or management of living natural resources by small-scale landholders and/or local communities?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	if answer to above question “yes” or “potentially”, does project adopt appropriate and culturally sensitive sustainable resource management practices?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above questions, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		

Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project have any risks associated with natural or man-made hazards that could result from land use changes due to the project?	☐ YES ☐ NO
If the answer to question above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Would the project involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference source not found.	any potential risks that require emergency preparedness and response planning?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☐ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	if answer to above question "yes" or "potentially", did the project developer disclose appropriate information about emergency preparedness and response to affected communities?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above questions, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve the transfer, handling, and use of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms that may result in adverse effects on biological diversity?	☐ YES ☐ NO
If the answer to question above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Would the project involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference source not found.	the transfer, handling and use of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms (GMOs/LMOs) that result from modern biotechnology	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to above question is "yes" has a risk assessment by a competent Expert stakeholder been carried out in accordance with Annex iii of the Cartagena protocol on biosafety to the convention on biological diversity?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to above question is "yes" has any risks identified in the risk assessment?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	Forestry (for example Afforestation/Reforestation) involving GMO planting? Note - Forestry projects (for example Afforestation/ Reforestation) involving GMO planting are not eligible for Certification under Gold Standard for the Global Goals.	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA

If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above questions, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.
Please add text here….

Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.

Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project have a risk of releasing pollutants to air, water, and land in routine, non-routine, or accidental circumstances?	☐ YES ☐ NO
If the answer to question above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		

Would the project involve or lead to:

Error! Reference source not found.	any potential risk of pollutant release that cannot be avoided?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to above question is “Yes” or “potentially”, has the project identified all potential pollution sources that may degrade the quality of soil, air, surface, and groundwater in the project area?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to above question is “Yes” or “potentially”, do the pollution prevention and control technologies and practices applied during the project life cycle align with national regulations or international best practices?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to above question is “Yes”, is there a monitoring plan to ensure that mitigation measures are implemented, and resources are protected?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above questions, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		

Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.

Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve the generation of waste materials (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	☐ YES ☐ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve risk of release of hazardous materials resulting from their production, transportation, handling, storage, or use?	☐ YES ☐ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve the use of any chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs?	☐ YES ☐ NO
If the answer to any of the questions above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		

Would the project involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference source not found.	the generation and management of waste materials?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	treatment, destruction, or disposal of waste material?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to above question is “Yes”, does the project involve an environmentally friendly method that includes appropriate control of emissions and residues resulting from the handling and processing of waste material?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	risk of release of hazardous materials resulting from their production, transportation, handling, storage, or use?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to above question is "yes”, does project has measures in place to address health risks?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	Involve manufacture, trade, and use of chemicals and hazardous materials subject to international bans or phase-outs due to their high toxicity to living organisms, environmental persistence, potential for bioaccumulation, or potential for depletion of the ozone layer	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above questions, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve the use of chemical pesticides?	☐ YES ☐ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve purchase, store, manufacture, trade or use products that fall in Classes IA (extremely hazardous) and IB (highly hazardous)	☐ YES ☐ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project use fertilisers, and if so, are measures being taken to minimize their use and nutrient losses to the environment?	☐ YES ☐ NO
If the answer to any of the questions above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Would the project involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference source not found.	chemical pesticides use for pest management?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO

Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to question above is “yes” or “potentially”, does project has documented Chemical Pesticides Policy in place?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	purchase, store, use, manufacture, or trade in Class II (moderately hazardous) pesticides?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to question above is “yes” or “potentially”, does project has appropriate controls on manufacture, procurement, or distribution and/or use of these chemicals?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above questions, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		

Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.

Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project have a risk of unsustainable forest management, including timber harvesting?	☐ YES ☐ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project pose a risk of depleting biodiversity and ecosystem functionality in areas where improved forest management is undertaken?	☐ YES ☐ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project risk not meeting requirements for environment-friendly, socially beneficial, and economically viable plantations using native species whenever possible?	☐ YES ☐ NO
If the answer to any of the questions above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		

Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.

Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve the risk of negatively influencing access to and availability of food for people affected?	☐ YES ☐ NO
If the answer to the question above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		

Would the project involve or lead to:

Error! Reference source not found.	modification of the quantity or nutritional quality of food available such as through crop regime alteration or export or economic incentives?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to the above question, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		

Error! Reference source not found. Error! Reference source not found.		
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve any risks to animal welfare? Animal welfare shall be ensured by providing access to water and food, appropriate environment, humane treatment, and staff training. Evidence of mistreatment will be treated as an immediate non-conformity.	☐ YES ☐ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve any potential risk of excessive or inadequate use of veterinary medicines?	☐ YES ☐ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project involve the risk of administering synthetic growth promoters, including hormones?	☐ YES ☐ NO
If the answer to any of the questions above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		
Would the project involve or lead to:		
Error! Reference source not found.	animal husbandry or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?[4]	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	limiting access for animals to basic needs like drinking water, adequate food, daylight, appropriate shelter etc.?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	inadequate measures to isolate sick animals and control the spread of disease, especially zoonotic diseases?	☐ YES ☐ no ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	inadequate low-stress methods, equipment, and facilities that facilitate calm animal movement.	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	inadequate measures to ensure that animals are exposed to the least stress possible during transportation and slaughtering?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	inappropriate spacing per animal and stocking rates per land unit?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	inadequate measures to address the specific needs of aquatic animals?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found. Error!	primary production of living natural resources such as animal husbandry, aquaculture, and fisheries?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA

[4] 'Involve' means if the project mechanism and/or impact(s) are achieved via changing animal husbandry practices in some way.

Reference source not found.	If the answer is yes, implement industry-standard sustainable management practices in line with to one or more relevant and credible standards and utilize available technologies.	

If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above question, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.

Please add text here….

Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.

Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project have the risk of negatively impacting HCV areas and/or critical habitats?	☐ YES ☐ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project in the project area or area of downstream impacts have risks to the following: native tree patches, individual native trees, freshwater resources (including rivers, lakes, swamps, temporary water bodies, and wells), habitats of rare, threatened, and endangered species, and biodiversity-enhancing areas?	☐ YES ☐ NO

If the answer to any of the questions above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.

Please add text here….

Would the project involve or lead to:

Error! Reference source not found.	identified habitats as HCV areas and or Critical habitats?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to above question is “yes”, does the project have any risks that could negatively impact the catchment, project success, and surrounding HCV and ecological assets, as well as any measurable adverse impacts on the criteria or biodiversity values for which the critical habitat was designated, and on the ecological processes supporting that biodiversity?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to above question is “yes”, is a robust, appropriately designed, and long-term Habitats and Biodiversity Action Plan absent which will make the project unable to achieve net gains of those biodiversity values for which the critical habitat was designated?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A
Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project area or area of downstream impacts have native tree patches, individual native trees, freshwater resources (including rivers, lakes, swamps, temporary water bodies, and wells), habitats of rare, threatened, and endangered species, and biodiversity-enhancing areas?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	If the answer to the above question is “yes”, will the project have any adverse effects on these areas?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	If the answer to above question is “yes”, does the project has opportunities to minimize unwarranted conversion or degradation of the habitat and to enhance the habitat as part of its development?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	Is the project applying Land Use & Forest Activity Requirements and managing a minimum 10% of the project area to protect or enhance the biological diversity of native ecosystems following HCV approach as per the given requirements?	☐ YES ☐ No ☒ NA
Error! Reference	Are opinions and recommendations of an Expert Stakeholder(s) not sought and demonstrated as being included in the project design?	☐ YES ☐ NO

source not found.		☒ NA

If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above question, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.

Please add text here….

Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.

Error! Reference source not found.	Does the project lead to the reduction or negative impact on any recognized Endangered, Vulnerable or Critically Endangered species?	☐ YES ☒ NO

If the answer to question above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.

Please add text here….

Would the project involve or lead to:

Error! Reference source not found.	distortion of habitats of endangered species?	☐ YES ☐ Potentially ☒ NA
Error! Reference source not found.	If answer to the above question is “yes”, does the project plan to protect and enhance them?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☐ NO ☒ N/A
Error! Reference source not found.	Are opinions and recommendations of an Expert Stakeholder(s) not sought and demonstrated as being included in the project design?	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA

If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above question, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.

Please add text here….

Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.

Error! Reference source not found.	Does project introduce any alien species (not currently established in the country or region of the project) into new environments?	☐ YES ☒ NO

If the answer to question above is "yes," please explain project situation and how the project will ensure compliance with applicable requirements.

Please add text here….

Would the project involve or lead to:

Error! Reference source not found.	risk of introducing any alien species with a high risk of invasive behaviour regardless of whether such introductions are permitted under the existing regulatory framework?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO

Error! Reference source not found.	risk of potential accidental or unintended introductions including the transportation of substrates and vectors (such as soil, ballast, and plant materials) that may harbour alien species.	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
Error! Reference source not found.	risk of spreading alien species into areas in which they have not already been established?	☐ YES ☐ POTENTIALLY ☒ NO
If the answer is "yes" or "potentially" to any of the above questions, please provide a brief description of the project situation below. Also, provide justification and/or evidence as necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements.		
Please add text here….		

- - - - -

Document History

Version	Date	Description
1.0	06/11/2025	Initial adoption