



VPA VALIDATION REPORT

TITLE OF VPA

“PROYECTO MIRADOR ENHANCED
DISTRIBUTION OF DOS POR TRES
COOKSTOVES”

IN

HONDURAS

TITLE OF PoA TO WHICH VPA IS INCLUDED:

“PROYECTO MIRADOR ENHANCED
DISTRIBUTION OF IMPROVED
COOKSTOVES IN LATIN AMERICA”

REPORT No. 2013-9524

REVISION No. 02

DET NORSKE VERITAS



VPA VALIDATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 07 September 2013	ConCert Project No.: PRJC- 482849-2013 -CCS-USA	DNV CLIMATE CHANGE SERVICES AS Veritasveien 1, 1322 HØVIK, Norway Tel: +47 67 57 99 00 Fax: +47 67 57 99 11 http://www.dnv.com Org. No: NO 994 774 352 MVA
Approved by: Michael Lehmann	Organisational unit: Accredited Climate Change Services	
Client: Proyecto Mirador	Client ref.: Esther Adams	
Summary: Title of VPA: Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Dos por Tres Cookstoves Title of PoA: Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Improved Cookstoves in Latin America Country: Honduras Methodology: Methodology for Improved Cook-stoves and Kitchen Regimes Version: 01 GHG reducing Measure/Technology: Distribution of improved cookstoves to replace traditional cookstoves in households Sectoral scope(s): 3 ER estimate of CPA: 181 231 tCO ₂ e per year (average) Size ☒ Large Scale ☐ Small Scale Validation Phases: ☒ Desk Review ☒ Follow up interviews ☒ Resolution of outstanding issues Validation Status ☐ Corrective Actions Requested ☐ Clarifications Requested ☒ Submission for registration ☐ Rejected In summary, it is DNV's opinion that the VPA "Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Dos por Tres Cookstoves" in Honduras, as described in the VPA-DD, version 01 of 05 November 2013, meets the eligibility criteria established in the PoA "Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Improved Cookstoves in Latin America", as described in the PoA-DD, version 01 of 05 November 2013, and meets relevant GS requirements for including VPAs in a PoA. While the PoA applies the baseline and monitoring methodology entitled "Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption", version 1.0, the Gold Standard approved the application of the baseline and monitoring methodology entitled "Methodology for Improved Cook-stoves and Kitchen Regimes", version 01 to this VPA. This version of the methodology is correctly applied. Hence, DNV requests the inclusion of the VPA "Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Dos por Tres Cookstoves" in Honduras to the PoA "Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Improved Cookstoves in Latin America".		

Report No.: 2013-9524	Subject Group: Environment	Indexing terms Key words Climate Change Gold Standard Kyoto Protocol Validation Clean Development Mechanism ☒ No distribution without permission from the client or responsible organisational unit ☐ free distribution within DNV after 3 years ☐ Strictly confidential ☐ Unrestricted distribution
Report title: "Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Dos por Tres Cookstoves" in Honduras		
Work carried out by: Kyle Silon & Shruthi Poonacha		
Work verified by: Weidong Yang		
Date of this revision: 10 April 2014	Rev. No.: 02	Number of pages: 9
© 2009 Det Norske Veritas AS All rights reserved. This publication or parts thereof may not be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying or recording, without the prior written consent of Det Norske Veritas AS.		



<i>Table of Content</i>	<i>Page</i>
1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – VALIDATION OPINION	1
2 INTRODUCTION	2
2.1 Objective	2
2.2 Scope	2
3 METHODOLOGY	3
3.1 Document review	3
3.2 Follow-up actions	5
3.3 Closing out of validation findings	5
3.4 Internal quality control	8
3.5 Validation team	8
4 VALIDATION FINDINGS	9
Appendix A Protocol for assessing compliance of specific VPA with PoA requirements	
Appendix B Curricula vitae of the validation team members	
Appendix C Curricula vitae of the validation team members	

**Abbreviations**

CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CH ₄	Methane
CL	Clarification request
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
DNA	Designated National Authority
DNV	Det Norske Veritas
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
GS	Gold Standard
GWP	Global Warming Potential
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
N ₂ O	Nitrous oxide
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PoA	Programme of activities
PoA-DD	CDM programme of activities design document
PS	Clean Development Mechanism Project Standard
tCO ₂ e	Tonnes of CO ₂ equivalents
VVS	Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard
VPA	Voluntary project activity
VPA-DD	GS voluntary project activity design document



1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – VALIDATION OPINION

DNV Climate Change Services AS (DNV) has performed a validation of the voluntary project activity (VPA) “Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Dos por Tres Cookstoves” in Honduras requesting to be included in the PoA “Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Improved Cookstoves in Latin America”. The validation was performed on the basis of the eligibility criteria for including VPAs established in the PoA “Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Improved Cookstoves in Latin America”, as described in the PoA-DD, version 01 of 05 November 2013, and relevant Gold Standard criteria for including VPAs to PoAs.

The review of the VPA design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided DNV with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of stated criteria.

The VPA correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology entitled Methodology for Improved Cook-stoves and Kitchen Regimes, version 01.

The VPA disseminates fuel-efficient stoves to reduce household biomass consumption related to cooking in Honduras. As a result, the PoA results in reductions of CO₂ emissions that are real, measurable and give long-term benefits to the mitigation of climate change. It is demonstrated that the VPA is not a likely baseline scenario. Emission reductions attributable to the VPA are hence additional to any that would occur in the absence of the VPA.

The total emission reductions of the VPA are estimated to be on the average 181 231tCO₂e per year over the selected 7 year renewable crediting period. The emission reduction forecast has been checked and it is deemed likely that the stated amount is achieved given that the underlying assumptions do not change.

The monitoring plan provides for the monitoring of the CPA’s emission reductions. The monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the VPA design, and it is DNV’s opinion that the project participants are able to implement the monitoring plan.

In summary, it is DNV’s opinion that the programme of activity “Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Dos por Tres Cookstoves” in Honduras, as described in the VPA-DD, version 01 of 05 November 2013, meets the eligibility criteria established in the PoA “Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Improved Cookstoves in Latin America”, as described in the PoA-DD, version 01 of 05 November 2013, meets relevant GS requirements for including VPAs in a PoA and correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology entitled Methodology for Improved Cook-stoves and Kitchen Regimes, version 01. Hence, DNV requests the inclusion of the VPA “Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Dos por Tres Cookstoves” in Honduras to the PoA “Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Improved Cookstoves in Latin America”.

Oakland and Oslo, 10 April 2014

Kyle Silon
Validator
DNV Oakland, USA

Michael Lehmann
Director of Services and Technologies
DNV Climate Change Services AS



2 INTRODUCTION

Proyecto Mirador has commissioned DNV Climate Change Services AS (DNV) to perform a validation of the proposed voluntary project activity (VPA) “Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Dos por Tres Cookstoves” in Honduras (hereafter called “VPA”) requesting to be included in the PoA “Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Improved Cookstoves in Latin America”. This report summarizes the findings of the validation of the VPA on the basis of the eligibility criteria for including VPAs established in the PoA “Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Improved Cookstoves in Latin America”, as described in the PoA-DD, version 01 of 05 November 2013, and relevant GS criteria for including VPAs to PoAs.

2.1 Objective

The assessment of a VPA requesting to be included in a PoA shall ensure that all the requirements determined in the PoA are met.

The assessment was performed on the basis of the eligibility criteria established in the PoA and the GS criteria for including VPAs to programme of activities under the Gold Standard (GS), as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting according to Methodology for Improved Cook-stoves and Kitchen Regimes, version 01.

2.2 Scope

The validation scope is defined as an independent and objective review by a Designated Operational Entity (DOE) of the specific VPA to be included in the PoA. The DOE shall scrutinize the information in the VPA-DD to assess compliance with the eligibility criteria established by the PoA, to check correct application of the baseline and monitoring methodology, to check compliance with documentation requirements for VPAs and to check compliance with relevant GS criteria for including VPAs to PoAs.

The PP currently operates a small-scale, Gold Standard registered cookstove project entitled “Enhanced distribution of efficient wood stoves in Honduras,” (hereafter, stand-alone project) that was registered on 29 June 2010 /10//29/ utilizing the “Methodology for Improved Cook-stoves and Kitchen Regime”, version 01. The small-scale stand-alone project is transferred to a large-scale VPA, and is submitted as the first VPA with the title Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Dos por Tres Cookstoves, as approved by the Gold Standard /38/. While the PoA applies the approved methodology entitled Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption, version 1.0, the Gold Standard approved the use of the Methodology for Improved Cook-stoves and Kitchen Regimes (Version 01) for this VPA /38/.

The validation is not meant to provide any consulting towards the programme participants. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may have provided input for improvement of the VPA design.



3 METHODOLOGY

The validation consisted of the following three phases:

- I document review
- II follow-up actions (e.g. on-site visit and telephone or email interviews)
- III the closing out of validation findings and the issuance of the final validation report and opinion

The following sections outline each step in more detail.

3.1 Document review

The following tables list the documentation that was reviewed during the validation.

3.1.1 Documentation provided by the project participants

- /1/ Proyecto Mirador: *GS-VPA-DD for project activity "Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Dos por Tres Cookstoves" in Honduras*, version 01 dated 05 November 2013 and version 01 dated 05 November 2013
- /2/ Proyecto Mirador: *GS-PoA-DD for PoA titled "Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Improved Cookstoves in Latin America"*, version 01 of 05 November 2013,
- /3/ Proyecto Mirador: PoA Passport, version 1, 21 June 2013
- /4/ Proyecto Mirador: Stakeholder consultation report, 24 February 2013
- /5/ Proyecto Mirador: Stakeholder consultation report, 18 December 2008
- /6/ Proyecto Mirador: Use and Maintenance Brochure
- /7/ Proyecto Mirador: Cost per stove 1Q 2013 (Confidential Document): 30 March 2013
- /8/ Proyecto Mirador: Cost per stove 2Q 2013 (Confidential Document): 30 June 2013
- /9/ Proyecto Mirador: Emission reduction calculations, 24 September 2013
- /10/ Proyecto Mirador: Enhanced distribution of efficient wood stoves in Honduras, version 04, dated 15 June 2010
- /11/ Proyecto Mirador: Official Development Assistance Declaration, 4 November 2013
- /12/ Proyecto Mirador: Gold Standard Passport – Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Improved Cookstoves in Latin America", 20 June 2010

3.1.2 Methodologies, tools and other guidance by the Gold Standard

- /13/ Gold Standard: *The Gold Standard Requirements, version 2.2*
- /14/ Gold Standard: The Gold Standard PoA Rules and Guidelines, Annex F, GSV2.2
- /15/ Gold Standard: The Gold Standard Continuous Input & Grievance Mechanism, Annex W, GSV2.2
- /16/ Gold Standard: Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption, version 01
- /17/ Gold Standard: Methodology for Improved Cook-stoves and Kitchen Regimes, version 01
- /18/ Gold Standard: Guidance on LSC Best Practice, Annex J, GSV2.2
- /19/ Gold Standard: Annex D – Official Development Assistance Declaration, GSV2.2



3.1.3 Methodologies, tools and other guidance by the CDM Executive Board

- /20/ CDM Executive Board: *Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard*, version 04.0
- /21/ CDM Executive Board: *Standard for the demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria, and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities*, version 03.0
- /22/ CDM Executive Board: *Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities*, version 04.0
- /23/ CDM Executive Board: *Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality*, version 07.0.0
- /24/ CDM Executive Board: *AMS II.G., Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass*, version 5.0
- /25/ CDM Executive Board: *Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers*, version 01
- /26/ CDM Executive Board: *Guidelines on common practice*, version 02.0

3.1.4 Documents used by DNV to validate / cross-check the information provided by the project participants

- /27/ DNV: *Gold Standard Verification Report: Enhanced Distribution of Efficient Cookstove in Honduras* for the second monitoring period from 1 01 December 2010 to 30 November 2011, 17 March 2012
- /28/ DNV: *Gold Standard Verification Report: Enhanced Distribution of Efficient Cookstove in Honduras* for the third monitoring period from 01 December 2011 to 30 November 2012, 17 March 2013
- /29/ SGS: *Gold Standard VER Validation Report: Enhanced distribution of efficient wood stoves in Honduras*, 22 January 2010
- /30/ Wang, Xiaoping; Franco, Janina; Masera, Omar R.; Troncoso, Karin; Rivera, Marta X. 2013. What have we learned about household biomass cooking in Central America? Washington DC; World Bank.
- /31/ Honduras: *Compendio de Legislación Ambiental de Honduras*, SERNA 2011. General Laws for the Environment, Electricity Sector laws.
<http://cambioclimaticohn.org/?cat=1015&title=Legislaci%F3n&lang=es>
- /32/ Aprovecho Research Center, Results of “2by3” stove testing, 28 April 2009
- /33/ Rural Poverty Portal, “Rural Poverty in Latin America.”
<http://www.ruralpovertyportal.org/region/home/tags/americas>
- /34/ Large, William R., *An Enduring Partnership for Development: Central America and the IDB Since 1990*. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank, 2005, p. 328. http://issuu.com/idb_publications/docs/book_en_22638
- /35/ Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, “Data & Statistics”
<http://www.cleancookstoves.org/resources/data-and-statistics/>
- /36/ Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, “Spark Fund I (RFP 12-7), p. 8.
<http://www.cleancookstoves.org/funding-opportunities/spark-fund-i.html>
- /37/ Organización Latinoamericana de Energía (OLADE), 2010, “Proyecto Apoyo a la



Matriz de Acciones para la Integración y Desarrollo Energético de Centroamérica

3.2 Follow-up actions

The validation of this VPA included a desk review only, and did not include a site visit. This was approved by the Gold Standard/38/ during a conference call because the boundary of the first VPA is unchanged relative to the stand-alone project. DNV has verified the stand-alone project twice, conducting site visits each time, and is already familiar with the project implementation and local conditions, and was able to apply this experience to the validation of this VPA.

	Date / Type of interview	Name / Organization	Topic
/38/	08 August 2013	Gold Standard	• Approval to submit GS as first VPA
	☐ On-site	- Ivan Hernandez	
	☐ Face-to-face at office	- Abisheck Goyal	• PoA validation requirements, including site visit
	☒ Telephone	Proyecto Mirador	
	☐ E-mail	- Esther Adams	

3.3 Closing out of validation findings

The objective of this phase of the validation was to resolve any issues which needed be clarified prior to DNV's conclusion on the VPA's compliance with applicable PoA requirements and relevant GS criteria for including VPAs to PoAs. In order to ensure transparency a validation protocol was customised for the VPA. The protocol shows in a transparent manner the criteria (requirements), means of verification and the results from validating the identified criteria. The validation protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organises, details and clarifies the requirements a VPA is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent validation process where the validator will document how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the validation.

The validation protocol consists of three tables. The different columns in these tables are described in the figure below. The completed validation protocol for the VPA "Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Dos por Tres Cookstoves" in Honduras is enclosed in Appendix A to this report.

Table 1 of the validation protocol documents the findings of the desk review of the VPA design documentation and follow-up interviews with VPA stakeholders. Any findings raised in Table 1 are listed in Table 2 of the protocol, and changes to the description of the VPA design as a result of these findings are addressed in Table 2. Table 1 thus may not reflect all aspects of the VPA as described in the final VPA-DD submitted for inclusion.

A corrective action request (CAR) is raised if one of the following occurs:

- (a) The project participants have made mistakes that will influence the ability of the VPA to achieve real, measurable additional emission reductions;



- (b) Applicable PoA and GS requirements have not been met;
- (c) There is a risk that emission reductions cannot be monitored or calculated.

A clarification request (CL) is raised if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable requirements have been met.

A forward action request (FAR) is raised during validation to highlight issues related to VPA implementation that require review during the first verification of the VPA. FARs shall not relate to the requirements for inclusion of VPAs.

The validation identified one CAR, eight CLs and one FAR. The CARs and CLs were satisfactorily addressed by the project participants by among other revising the PoA-DD (please refer to Table 2 in Appendix A for further details). In addition to the changes made to the VPA-DD as a result of the validation findings, no changes to the VPA-DD (version 01 dated 05 November 2013) were made compared to the version of the VPA-DD submitted for validation (version 01 dated 01 June 2013).



Validation Protocol Table 1: Requirement Checklist				
Checklist question	Reference	Means of verification (MoV)	Assessment by DNV	Draft and/or Final Conclusion
The various requirements in Table 1 are linked to checklist questions the PoA should meet. The checklist is organised in different sections, following the logic of the GS- PoA-DD	Gives reference to documents where the answer to the checklist question or item is found.	Means of verification (MoV) are document review (DR) , interview (I) or any other follow-up actions (e.g., on site visit and telephone or email interviews) and cross-checking (CC) with available information relating to projects or technologies similar to the proposed GS PoA under validation.	The discussion on how the conclusion is arrived at and the conclusion on the compliance with the checklist question so far.	OK is used if the information and evidence provided is adequate to demonstrate compliance with GS requirements. A corrective action request (CAR) is raised when project participants have made mistakes, the GS requirements have not been met or there is a risk that emission reductions cannot be monitored or calculated. A clarification request (CL) is raised if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable GS requirements have been met. A forward action request (FAR) during validation is raised to highlight issues related to VPA implementation that require review during the first verification of the VPA.

Validation Protocol Table 2: Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests		
Corrective action and/or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Validation conclusion
The CARs and/ or CLs raised in Table 2 are repeated here.	The responses given by the project participants to address the CARs and/or CLs .	The validation team's assessment and final conclusions of the CARs and/or CLs .

Validation Protocol Table 3: Forward Action Requests	
Forward action request	Response by project participants
The FARs raised in Table 2 are repeated here.	Response by project participants on how forward action request will be addressed prior to first verification.

Figure 1: Validation protocol tables



3.4 Internal quality control

The validation report underwent a technical review performed by a technical reviewer qualified in accordance with DNV's qualification scheme for CDM validation and verification.

3.5 Validation team

Role	Last Name	First Name	Country	Type of involvement					
				Desk review	Site visit / Interviews	Reporting	Supervision of work	Technical review	TA 3.2 competence
Team leader (Validator)	Silon	Kyle	USA	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Technical reviewer	Weidong	Yang	USA					✓	

The qualification of each individual validation team member is detailed in Appendix B to this report.



4 VALIDATION FINDINGS

The VPA “Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Dos por Tres Cookstoves” in Honduras, as described in the VPA-DD, version 01 of 05 November 2013:

- meets the eligibility criteria established in the PoA “Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Improved Cookstoves in Latin America”, as described in the PoA-DD, version 01 of 05 November 2013;
- meets relevant GS requirements for including VPAs in a PoA; and
- correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology entitled Methodology for Improved Cook-stoves and Kitchen Regimes, version 01.

Hence, the VPA meets the requirements for inclusion of the VPA “Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Dos por Tres Cookstoves” in Honduras to the PoA “Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Improved Cookstoves in Latin America”.

The validation criteria (requirements), the means of verification and the results from validating the identified criteria are documented in detail in the validation protocol in Appendix A.

- o0o -

APPENDIX A

PROTOCOL FOR ASSESSING COMPLIANCE OF SPECIFIC VPA WITH POA REQUIREMENTS

Table 1 Requirements checklist

Checklist Question		Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
A Description of VPA (PS § 31, VVS § 62-63, § 189)						
A.1. Title, Technical description of VPA and Parties involved						
A.1.1	Does section A.1 of the VPA-DD include a clearly identifiable VPA title, version number of the VPA-DD and date of the VPA-DD?	/1/	DR	☐ Clearly identifiable title of the CPA ☒ Version number of the VPA-DD is included ☒ Date of the VPA-DD is included.	CL1	OK
A.1.2	Is the VPA-DD is in accordance with the applicable requirements for completing VPA-DDs?	/1/	DR	The VPA-DD is in accordance with the requirements for completing the VPA-DD		OK
A.1.3	Does the description of the VPA sufficiently cover all relevant elements, is accurate and does it provides the reader with a clear understanding of the nature of the proposed CPA?	/1/	DR	All required elements are contained in the VPA description		OK
A.1.4	Does the VPA-DD provide information on the VPA implementer(s)? VPA implementers can be project participants of the PoA, under which the VPA is submitted, provided the name is included in the registered PoA.	/1/	DR	The CPA implementer is Proyecto Mirador Foundation (CME)		OK
A.1.5	Does the VPA-DD describe all the technologies and/or measures to be employed and/or implemented by the VPA including a list of the facilities, systems and equipment that will be installed and/or modified by the CPA	/1/	DR	The VPA will install Dos por Tres” stove models.		OK
A.1.6	Does the VPA-DD adequately list all Party(ies) and VPA implementer(s) involved in the VPA and provide contact information in Appendix 1? Are all listed Party(ies) and VPA implementer(s) included in the PoA?	/1/	DR	All parties are listed in the CPA, and are included in the PoA_DD. The CPA Implementer is Proyecto Mirador Foundation, the CME listed in the PoA-DD		OK
A.1.7	Does the VPA-DD provide geographic reference or other means of identification that allows for the unique	/1/	DR	The VPA-DD is implemented within the country of Honduras.		OK

MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview, CC= Cross-Checking

Protocol for assessing compliance of specific VPA with PoA requirements – Report No. 2013-9524, rev. 02

A-1

Checklist Question		Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
identification of the CPA?						
A.2. Duration of the VPA and crediting period						
A.2.1	Is the VPA starting date clearly defined and evidenced? Is the start date of the VPA the earliest date at which either the implementation or construction or real action of the VPA begins?	/1/	DR	According to Annex F, the start date is the “earliest date at which either the implementation or construction or real action of a project begins.” The start date of the VPA is December 1, 2013. PP shall provide verifiable evidence of the start date.	CL4	OK
A.2.2	Is the VPA operational lifetime clearly defined and evidenced?	/1/	DR	The operational lifetime of the CPA is defined as 21 years, based on the assumption of a 7 year crediting period, renewed twice.		OK
A.2.3	Has the crediting period been clearly defined and is the start of the crediting period deemed to be reasonable?	/1/	DR	The first VPA is currently a standalone GS project that has been in operation since 2009. The VPA-DD states that the length of the crediting period is 28 years. PP shall clarify how the crediting period of the VPA is adjusted to account for crediting period of the current project.	CL5	OK
A.2.4	Has it been confirmed that the length of the VPA crediting period does not exceed the end of PoA?	/1/	DR	The VPA crediting period will end prior to termination of the PoA		OK
A.3. Estimated amount of emission reductions from the CPA						
A.3.1	Has the emission reduction forecast been checked and is it deemed likely that the stated amount is achieved given that the underlying assumptions do not change?	/1/	DR	The emission reduction forecast has been reviewed and deemed accurate		OK
A.4. Public funding						
A.4.1	In case public funding from Parties included in Annex I is used for the CPA, have these Parties provided an affirmation that such funding does not result in a diversion of official development assistance and is separate from and is not	/1/	DR	There is no public funding being used to implement the VPA.		OK

MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview, CC= Cross-Checking

Checklist Question	Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
counted towards the financial obligations of these Parties?					
A.5. Confirmation for CPA					
A.5.1 Has a confirmation been provided that the VPA is neither registered as an individual GS project activity nor is part of another registered PoA?	/1/	DR	The VPA is currently registered as a stand-alone GS project. Upon inclusion in the PoA, emission reductions will not be counted for the stand-alone project.		OK
B Environmental impacts (PS § 63-64, VVS § 134-135) It is assessed whether environmental impacts of the VPA have been properly addressed.			☒ Analysis at PoA level ☐ Analysis at VPA level This section must only be completed if the analysis of environmental impacts must be at VPA level.		
B.1. Has an analysis of the environmental impacts of the VPA been sufficiently described?	/1/	DR	NA		OK
B.2. Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)?	/1/	DR	NA		OK
B.3. Will the programme create any adverse environmental effects?	/1/	DR	NA		OK
B.4. Are transboundary environmental impacts considered in the analysis?	/1/	DR	NA		OK
B.5. Have identified environmental impacts been addressed in the programme design?	/1/	DR	NA		OK
B.6. Does the programme comply with environmental legislation in the host country?	/1/	DR	NA		OK
C Stakeholders' comments (PS § 65-69, VVS § 138-140) It is assessed whether stakeholders have been properly consulted in the development of the VPA.			☒ Consultation at PoA level ☒ Consultation at VPA level The GS requires the LSC at the PoA and VPA level		
C.1. Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	/1/	DR	The LSC was originally conducted on 18 December 2008 for the stand-alone project		OK

MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview, CC= Cross-Checking

Checklist Question		Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
				/10/38. The GS did not require a new stakeholder consultation be conducted for the VPA prior to inclusion /38/, though the CME did conduct the necessary PoA design consultation.		
C.2.	Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?	/1/	DR	The LSC was originally conducted on 18 December 2008 for the stand-alone project /10/38. The GS did not require a new stakeholder consultation be conducted for the VPA prior to inclusion /38/,		OK
C.3.	If a stakeholder consultation process is required by regulations/laws in the host country, has the stakeholder consultation process been carried out in accordance with such regulations/laws?	/1/	DR	The LSC was originally conducted on 18 December 2008 for the stand-alone project /10/38. The GS did not require a new stakeholder consultation be conducted for the VPA prior to inclusion /38/,		OK
C.4.	Is a summary of the stakeholder comments received provided?	/1/	DR	The LSC was originally conducted on 18 December 2008 for the stand-alone project /10/38. The GS did not require a new stakeholder consultation be conducted for the VPA prior to inclusion /38/,		OK
C.5.	Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	/1/	DR	The LSC was originally conducted on 18 December 2008 for the stand-alone project /10/38. The GS did not require a new stakeholder consultation be conducted for the VPA prior to inclusion /38/,		OK
D Application of a baseline and monitoring methodology(ies)						
D.1. Title and reference of the approved baseline and monitoring methodology(ies) selected						
D.1.1.	Are the exact title and version of approved methodology(ies)	/1/	DR	Section D.5 of the VPA-DD references “Gold	CL6	OK

MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview, CC= Cross-Checking

Checklist Question	Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
and tools listed?			Standard Methodology v2.2". PP shall clarify the reference.		
D.2. Applicability of methodology (and tools) (VVS § 73-77) The applicability of the methodology is checked through the eligibility criteria specifying the conditions that ensure compliance with applicability and other requirements of single or multiple methodologies applied by VPAs					
D.2.1. Do the eligibility criteria in D.5 below, in particular the eligibility criteria specifying the conditions that ensure compliance with applicability and other requirements of single or multiple methodologies applied by the CPA, sufficiently demonstrate that the VPA complies with the applicability criteria of the applied methodology (and tools)? If not, provide below and assessment of the VPAs compliance with the applicability criteria.	/1/	DR	The VPA was previously registered as a stand-alone GS project, and the GS approved its transfer to a VPA. DNV thus accepts that the VPA meets the applicability of the applied methodology		OK
D.3. Project boundary of VPA (VVS § 82-87)					
D.3.1. Is the VPA located within the geographical boundary of the proposed or registered PoA?	/1/	DR	The VPA boundary is identical to the PoA boundary, spanning several countries. However, the evidence provided for the VPA is specific to Honduras.	CL3	OK
D.3.2. Which GHG sources are identified for the CPA? Does the identified boundary cover all possible sources linked to the CPA? Give reference to documents considered to arrive at this conclusion.	/1/	DR	CO2 and CH4 are the sources identified in the VPA. This covers all possible sources linked to the VPA.		OK
D.3.3. Does the VPA involve other emissions sources not foreseen by the methodologies that may question the applicability of the methodology? Do these sources contribute with more than 1% of the estimated emission reductions of the CPA?	/1/	DR	The VPA does not involve other emission sources not foreseen by the methodology.		

MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview, CC= Cross-Checking

Checklist Question	Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
D.4. Baseline scenario determination and description (VVS § 88-95 / Identification of alternatives to the project activity (VVS § 113-116)) Ensure that the evaluation of all alternatives provided and required by the methodology and also possible alternatives/offshoots of alternatives are discussed. If baseline alternatives required to be considered by the methodology are considered not applicable, please assess the justification for this					
D.4.1. Which baseline scenarios have been identified? Is the list of baseline scenarios complete? Does the list include as one of the options that the VPA is undertaken without being registered as a proposed CPA? Does the list contain all plausible alternatives which are viable means of supplying the comparable outputs or services that are to be supplied by the proposed CPA?	/1/	DR	The baseline scenario is the continued use of the traditional fogon stove. This was confirmed during validation of the stand-alone project /10//29/. DNV has subsequently verified this project twice, and can confirm that this baseline is accurate for the project population /28//27/.		OK
D.4.2. Could the project activity in absence of the GS or other baseline alternatives also be implemented by other entities than the GS project participants? If so, has this also been included in the list of baseline scenarios?	/1/	DR	See above		OK
D.4.3. How have the other baseline scenarios been eliminated in order to determine the baseline?	/1/	DR	See above		OK
D.4.4. What is the baseline scenario?	/1/	DR	See above		OK
D.4.5. Is the determination of the baseline scenario in accordance with the guidance in the methodology?	/1/	DR	See above		OK
D.4.6. Has the baseline scenario been determined using conservative assumptions where possible?	/1/	DR	See above		OK
D.4.7. Does the baseline scenario sufficiently take into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies? Does the baseline scenario comply with all applicable and enforced legislation?	/1/	DR	See above		OK
D.4.8. Is the baseline scenario determination compatible with the available data and are all literature and sources clearly	/1/	DR	See above		OK

MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview, CC= Cross-Checking

Checklist Question	Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
referenced?					
D.4.9. Is the baseline determination adequately documented in the VPA-DD? • All assumptions and data used by the project participants are listed in the VPA-DD and related document to be submitted for registration. The data are properly referenced. • All documentation is relevant as well as correctly quoted and interpreted. • Assumptions and data can be deemed reasonable • Relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances are considered and listed in the VPA-DD. • The methodology has been correctly applied to identify what would occurred in the absence of the proposed CPA	/1/	DR	See above		OK
D.5. Demonstration of eligibility for the CPA					
D.5.1. Has it been sufficiently justified that the VPA complies with the following eligibility criteria? VPA shall involve the distribution of ICS within the geographical boundary of Host Countries defined in the PoA	/1/ /2/	DR	The first VPA is located within Honduras, which is within the PoA boundary		OK
D.5.2. Has it been sufficiently justified that the VPA complies with the following eligibility criteria? VPA shall apply a unique identifier to each cookstove installed and apply routine data checks and other management protocols that ensure double counting is avoided.	/1/ /2/	DR	A unique identifier is generated from the Salesforce database, allowing each stove to be uniquely identified and avoiding double counting.		OK
D.5.3. Has it been sufficiently justified that the VPA complies with the following eligibility criteria? VPAs shall utilize ICS technologies with useful energy output of less than 150kW	/1/ /2/	DR	DNV reviewed the lab report from Aprovecho, a qualified 3 rd party /32/, which confirms that the stoves meet this criterion.		OK
D.5.4. Has it been sufficiently justified that the VPA complies with	/1/	DR	The start date of the VPA is 1 May 2009, which		OK

MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview, CC= Cross-Checking

Checklist Question	Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
the following eligibility criteria? The start date of each VPA shall be the first date of stove construction.	/2/		is the first date of stove construction, as confirmed by the sales database		
D.5.5. Has it been sufficiently justified that the VPA complies with the following eligibility criteria? VPA uses approved Gold Standard Methodology and satisfies all its requirements. (First VPA shall conform to Methodology for Improved Cook-stoves and Kitchen Regimes v.01 and subsequent VPAs shall conform to Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption – 11/4/2011.)	/1/ /2/	DR	This is the first VPA, and the GS approved use of the Methodology for Improved Cook-stoves and Kitchen Regimes v.01 for this VPA only. This methodology is appropriately applied		OK
D.5.6. Has it been sufficiently justified that the VPA complies with the following eligibility criteria? VPA shall conduct an LSC that follows the GS LSC guidance	/1/ /2/	DR	The LSC was originally conducted on 18 December 2008 for the stand-alone project /5//10/38. The GS did not require a new stakeholder consultation be conducted for the VPA prior to inclusion /38/, though the CME did conduct the necessary PoA design consultation.		
D.5.7. Has it been sufficiently justified that the VPA complies with the following eligibility criteria? EIA shall be conducted if required by the host country	/1/ /2/	DR	An EIA is not required by the host country.		OK
D.5.8. Has it been sufficiently justified that the VPA complies with the following eligibility criteria? VPAs shall target household or institutional users of inefficient biomass stoves.	/1/ /2/	DR	The target group for this VPA is household users of traditional biomass stoves. DNV has confirmed this during two previous verifications of the stand-alone project /28//27/		
D.5.9. Has it been sufficiently justified that the VPA complies with the following eligibility criteria? VPA must demonstrate that the project meets additionality requirements of the Gold Standard.	/1/ /2/	DR	The VPA demonstrates additionality using the CDM additionality tool /23/, as required by the PoA inclusion criterion. Two alternative scenarios are presented; continuation of current practice (use of traditional fogon), and the implementation of the project activity without carbon revenues /1/. These alternatives are in accordance with local regulations, and are		OK

MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview, CC= Cross-Checking

Checklist Question	Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
			justified based on the local conditions observed by DNV during two verification site visits for the stand alone project /27//28/. The investment barriers analysis is presented from the point of view of all possible project developers, including individual HHs, governmental institutions and private organizations, and considers several funding sources for each, including donations, loans, and equity investments. The barriers discussion draws on credible, third-party information /33//34//35//36//37/ to clearly demonstrate the financial constraints faced by the project in the absence of carbon market funding. Finally, the common practice assessment correctly identifies one other energy efficiency project in Honduras. Following the Guidelines to Common Practice, $N_{all} = 1$ while $N_{diff} = 0$, resulting in $F = 1 (1 - N_{diff}/N_{all})$. As $F > .02$ and $N_{all} - N_{diff} < 3$, the proposed activity is not common practice. It should be noted that this additionality demonstration is similar to the additionality demonstration of the registered stand-alone project /10//29/. DNV thus confirms that the VPA meets the additionality criterion.		
D.5.10. Has it been sufficiently justified that the VPA complies with the following eligibility criteria? VPA shall be developed and implemented by the CME. In case contracted entities are retained to manage future VPAs,	/1/ /2/	DR	The CME is the VPA implementer, ensuring that ownership of VERs is not in doubt.		OK

MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview, CC= Cross-Checking

Checklist Question	Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
the contractual agreements between each partner and the CME will clearly establish ownership of emission reduction credits generated through the PoA as belonging to the CME.					
D.5.11. Has it been sufficiently justified that the VPA complies with the following eligibility criteria: If official development assistance (ODA) is provided, it is not contingent on transfer of carbon credits to the donor country providing ODA support.	/1/ /2/	DR	Section A.11 of the VPA-DD confirms that public funding is not used in this VPA. Further, the CME has submitted an ODA declaration form /11/, confirming the same.		OK
D.5.12. Has it been sufficiently justified that the VPA complies with the following eligibility criteria: VPA is required to align with the 'Do-no harm' assessment and SD matrix.	/1/ /2/	DR	The GS allowed the PDD-Passport for the standalone project to be transferred to the first VPA. DNV thus accepts that the VPA meets GS requirements for the Sustainability Assessment.		OK
D.5.13. Is verifiable evidence provided to demonstrate compliance with the above criteria/	/1/ /2/	DR	The VPA-DD does not demonstrate how the VPA meets the eligibility criteria described in the PoA-DD.	~~CAR1~~	OK
D.6. Algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions of the VPA (VVS § 96-100)					
Data and parameters that are available at validation and that are not monitored					
D.6.1. How was $X_{nrb,bl,y}$ verified?	/1/	DR	The VPA-DD specifies an ex-ante fNRB value of 77%. As described in the verification report, this value was calculated using data specific to the Western Highlands, and a FAR was raised requiring the PP to demonstrate a national fNRB value if the project boundary expanded. The PP is requested to justify the applicability of the fNRB value for the VPA region.	~~CL8~~ FAR1	OK
D.6.2. How was $B_{bl,y}$ verified?	/1/	DR	The value in the VPA-DD is identical to the value presented in the stand-alone PDD. As the GS approved the transfer of the stand-alone PDD to the first VPA, DNV accepts the accuracy of		OK

MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview, CC= Cross-Checking

Checklist Question	Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
D.6.3. How was EF_{bl,bio,CO_2} verified?	/1/	DR	the parameter value The value in the VPA-DD is identical to the value presented in the stand-alone PDD. As the GS approved the transfer of the stand-alone PDD to the first VPA, DNV accepts the accuracy of the parameter value		OK
D.6.4. How was $EF_{bl,bio,nonCO_2,CH_4}$ verified?	/1/	DR	The value in the VPA-DD is identical to the value presented in the stand-alone PDD. As the GS approved the transfer of the stand-alone PDD to the first VPA, DNV accepts the accuracy of the parameter value		OK
D.6.5. How was $EF_{bl,bio,nonCO_2,N_2O}$ verified?	/1/	DR	The value in the VPA-DD is identical to the value presented in the stand-alone PDD. As the GS approved the transfer of the stand-alone PDD to the first VPA, DNV accepts the accuracy of the parameter value		OK
D.6.6. How was EF_{pe,bio,CO_2} verified?	/1/	DR	The value in the VPA-DD is identical to the value presented in the stand-alone PDD. As the GS approved the transfer of the stand-alone PDD to the first VPA, DNV accepts the accuracy of the parameter value		OK
D.6.7. How was $EF_{pe,bio,nonCO_2,CH_4}$ verified?	/1/	DR	The value in the VPA-DD is identical to the value presented in the stand-alone PDD. As the GS approved the transfer of the stand-alone PDD to the first VPA, DNV accepts the accuracy of the parameter value		OK
D.6.8. In case any of the parameters above were determined based on sampling, was the sample adequate and did it comply with the specific guidance in the applicable methodology or, if no such guidance is available in methodology, did it achieve a 90/10 confidence/precision as the criteria for reliability of sampling efforts for small-scale project	/1/	DR	The parameter values in the VPA-DD are identical to the values presented in the stand-alone PDD. As the GS approved the transfer of the stand-alone PDD to the first VPA, DNV accepts the accuracy of the parameter values		OK

MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview, CC= Cross-Checking

Checklist Question	Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
activities and 95/10 for large scale project activities?					
Baseline emissions					
D.6.9. Are the calculations documented according to the approved methodology and tool and in a complete and transparent manner?	/1/	DR	The calculations used in the VPA-DD follow the calculations from the approved methodology /17/, and are also identical to the calculations in the registered stand-alone project /10//29/.		OK
D.6.10. Are uncertainties in the baseline emission estimates properly addressed?	/1/	DR	Uncertainties exist in the parameter values. This uncertainty is addressed by using credible 3 rd party sources, and/or by using sampling plans that comply with the Standard for sampling and surveys /22/.		OK
D.6.11. If the calculations of baseline emissions are based on sampling, does this comply with the Standard for sampling and surveys?	/1/	DR	Several parameters are determined by sampling. The sampling plan described in the PoA-DD meets the requirements of the GS methodology /17/; in cases where the GS methodology is not specific, the sampling plan follows the requirements of the CDM sampling standard /22/.		OK
Project emissions					
D.6.12. Are the calculations documented according to the approved methodology and tool and in a complete and transparent manner?	/1/	DR	The calculations used in the VPA-DD follow the calculations from the approved methodology /17/, and are also identical to the calculations in the registered stand-alone project /10//29/.		OK
D.6.13. Are uncertainties in the project emission estimates properly addressed?	/1/	DR	Uncertainties exist in the parameter values. This uncertainty is addressed by using credible 3 rd party sources, and/or by using sampling plans that comply with the GS methodology/17/, or the CDM Standard for sampling and surveys /22/.		OK
D.6.14. If the calculations of project emissions are based on sampling, does this comply with the Standard for sampling and surveys?	/1/	DR	Several parameters are determined by sampling. The sampling plan described in the PoA-DD meets the requirements of the GS		OK

MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview, CC= Cross-Checking

Checklist Question	Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
			methodology/17/; in cases where the GS methodology is not specific, the sampling plan follows the requirements of the CDM sampling standard /22/.		
Leakage					
D.6.15. Are the leakage calculations documented according to the approved methodology and in a complete and transparent manner?	/1/	DR	Leakage was assessed prior to registration of the stand-alone project /10//29/. According to this assessment, leakage is not a factor. DNV has subsequently verified the project twice /28//27/, and found no reason to conclude that leakage must be accounted for. As the VPA-DD handles leakage in the same way as the stand-alone PDD, and the GS approved the transfer of the stand-alone project to the VPA, DNV confirms that leakage is documented as per the applied methodology /17/.		OK
D.6.16. Have conservative assumptions been used when calculating the leakage emissions?	/1/	DR	See above		OK
D.6.17. Are uncertainties in the leakage emission estimates properly addressed?	/1/	DR	See above		OK
D.6.18. If the calculations of leakage emissions are based on sampling, does this comply with the Standard for sampling and surveys	/1/	DR	See above		OK
Emission Reductions					
D.6.19. Algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions: - All assumptions and data used by the project participants are listed in the VPA-DD and related document submitted for registration. The data are properly referenced - All documentation is correctly quoted and interpreted. - All values used can be deemed reasonable in the context of	/1/	DR	DNV reviewed the equations to calculation emission reductions/1//2/, and can confirm that they are reasonable and accurate		OK

MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview, CC= Cross-Checking

Checklist Question	Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
the CPA The methodology has been correctly applied to calculate the emission reductions and this can be replicated by the data provided in the PoA-DD and supporting files to be submitted for registration.					
D.7. Monitoring plan (VVS § 131-133)					
Data and parameters monitored					
D.7.1. Do the means of monitoring described in the plan comply with the requirements of the methodology?	/1/	DR	Parameters will be monitored by surveys conducted by local experts and CME staff.		OK
D.7.2. Does the monitoring plan contains all necessary parameters, and are they clearly described?	/1/	DR	All necessary parameters are included in the monitoring plan		OK
D.7.3. In case parameters are measured, is the measurement equipment described? Describe each relevant parameter.	/1/	DR	Parameters will be monitored via self-reported surveys and 3 rd party literature. Measurement equipment is not required		OK
D.7.4. In case parameters are measured, is the measurement accuracy addressed and deemed appropriate? Describe each relevant parameter.	/1/	DR	Surveys conducted to determine parameter values will be conducted in accordance with sampling plan described in the PoA-DD, which meets the requirements of the applied methodology /17/ and the CDM sampling standard guidance for accuracy /22/.		OK
D.7.5. In case parameters are measured, are the requirements for maintenance and calibration of measurement equipment described and deemed appropriate? Describe each relevant parameter.	/1/	DR	Parameters are determined via self-reported survey and literature reviews. Measurement equipment is not required		OK
D.7.6. Is the monitoring frequency adequate for all monitoring parameters? Describe each parameter.	/1/	DR	- Stove Sales, or the total number of households that receive an improved cookstove, is recorded continuously in the Installation Record Database. - $B_{pj,y}$, or the fuel wood consumed per household per year, is measured		OK

MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview, CC= Cross-Checking

Checklist Question	Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
			biennially - $EF_{pj,bio,co2}$, The CO ₂ emission factor for use of the biomass fuel in the project scenario in tonnes CO ₂ per tonne of woody biomass fuel, is determined prior to VPA inclusion via lab testing. As required by the methodology, it is reassessed if the verifier has reason to believe that the parameter value has changed. - Continued use of stoves over time (drop-off rate) shall be measured annually via survey. - Leakage shall be measured annually via surveys		
D.7.7. Is the recording frequency adequate for all monitoring parameters? Describe each parameter.	/1/	DR	The recording frequency is the same as the monitoring frequency described above		OK
D.7.8. In case any of the parameters will be determined based on sampling, is the sample plan adequate and does it comply with the specific guidance in the applicable methodology or, if no such guidance is available in methodology, does it achieve a 90/10 confidence/precision as the criteria for reliability of sampling efforts for small-scale project activities and 95/10 for large scale project activities?	/1/	DR	Sampling will be conducted in accordance with the applied methodology /17/. In cases where the applied methodology is not specific, sampling will comply with the CDM sampling standard /22/.		OK
Ability of project participants to implement monitoring plan					
D.7.9. How has it been assessed that the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the VPA design?	/1/	DR	DNV has twice verified the stand-alone project, and can confirm that the monitoring plan is feasible		OK
D.7.10. Are procedures identified for day-to-day records handling (including what records to keep, storage area of records and	/1/	DR	The VPA references a Use & Maintenance Brochure that is distributed to each beneficiary	GL2	OK

MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview, CC= Cross-Checking

Checklist Question	Ref	MoV	Assessment by DNV	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
how to process performance documentation)?			at the time of stove construction. PP shall provide a copy of this to DNV for review.		
D.7.11. Are the data management and quality assurance and quality control procedures sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by/resulting from the VPA can be reported ex post and verified?	/1/	DR	QA/QC procedures are sufficient to ensure that reductions can be verified, as DNV confirmed during two verifications of the stand-alone project		OK
Monitoring of sustainable development indicators/ environmental impacts					
D.7.12. Is the monitoring of sustainable development indicators/ environmental impacts warranted by legislation in the host country?	/1/	DR	SD monitoring is in compliance with host country legislation		OK
D.7.13. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of relevant data concerning environmental, social and economic impacts?	/1/	DR	All elements of the SD monitoring plan are included, as per the PoA-Passport.		OK

Table 2 Resolution of corrective action requests and clarification requests

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Validation conclusion
CAR1 The VPA-DD does not demonstrate how the VPA meets the eligibility criteria described in the PoA-DD.	Eligibility discussion in Section D.5 of the VPA has been re-written. Further specifics have been added, and new eligibility criteria addressed in accordance with PP's responses to PoA finding #7 above. With respect to double counting, PP has provided DNV with a sheet explaining the applicable management protocols.	DNV has reviewed the document "VPA_09_Double Counting procedure". PP shall clarify at what point the unique identifier is added to the stove, and how the unique identifier is obtained. CAR1 (cont)
CAR1 (cont) DNV has reviewed the document "VPA_09_Double Counting procedure". PP shall clarify at what point the unique identifier is added to the stove, and how the unique identifier is obtained.	The unique identifier (serial number) is generated automatically by the electronic Salesforce.com database system at the moment when household data is uploaded via handheld device for each new stove installed. GPS readings are also added via handheld device for every stove installed, in order to confirm and memorialize the location. Routine data checks (as provided to the DOE) ensure double counting is avoided. Eligibility criteria have been clarified accordingly in PoA (sec. B.2), Generic VPA (Sec. B.5) and	The information provided is sufficient to close the CL. DNV has reviewed the PoA-DD and confirms that sufficient safeguards are in place to eliminate double-counting. This CAR is closed.

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Validation conclusion
	VPA (Sec. B.5).	
CL 1 The title of the VPA must have a prefix that links it to the relevant PoA. However, the title of the VPA is identical to the title of the PoA	Title of VPA has been amended to read: “Proyecto Mirador Enhanced Distribution of Dos por Tres Cookstoves.”	The VPA title has been revised. This CL is closed.
CL 2 The VPA references a Use & Maintenance Brochure that is distributed to each beneficiary at the time of stove construction. PP shall provide a copy of this to DNV for review.	The Use & Maintenance Brochure has been provided to DNV as a PDF attachment.	DNV has reviewed the Use & Maintenance Brochure, and confirms that it communicates that the CME maintains ownership of and VERs generated from the project. This CL is closed.
CL 3 Section A.7 of the VPA-DD shall list the geographic boundary of the VPA; it currently describes the boundary of the PoA	The VPA boundary has been revised	The VPA boundary has been revised to be the country of Honduras. This CL is closed.
CL4 According to Annex F, the start date is the “earliest date at which either the implementation or construction or real action of a project begins.” The start date of the VPA is December 1, 2013. PP shall provide verifiable evidence of the start date.	According to guidance from the GS, PP has adjusted the start date of the First VPA to May 1, 2009.	The start date of the first VPA is identical to the start date of the stand-alone project. This CL is closed.
CL 5 The first VPA is currently a standalone GS project that has been in operation since 2009. The VPA-DD states that the length of the crediting period is 28 years. PP shall clarify	Section A.9.2 has been amended to reflect a crediting period of 21 years (7 crediting years, renewable 3 times). It is noted that while the PoA may span 28 years, each VPA	The crediting period of the VPA is reduced based on the operating lifetime of the stand-alone project. This CL is closed.

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Validation conclusion
how the crediting period of the VPA is adjusted to account for crediting period of the current project.	shall span a maximum of 21 years. PP acknowledges that the first 7-year crediting period will run from May 1, 2009 to April 30, 2016.	
CL 6 Section D.5 of the VPA-DD references “Gold Standard Methodology v2.2”. PP shall clarify the reference.	The word “Methodology” has been deleted to clarify that Gold Standard v.2.2 Requirements shall be followed.	The reference has been clarified. This CL is closed.
CL 7 PP shall provide all references to support parameter values	The following references are provided as PDF attachments: • 2011 NRB Analysis by Berkeley Air Monitoring Group • Yale 2007 Study • Aprovecho 2009 Study • Aprovecho 2008 Study • 2010 Fuel wood Consumption Study	DNV has reviewed the provided references, and confirms that the parameter values accurately reflect the sources. This CL is closed.
CL 8 The VPA-DD specifies an ex-ante fNRB value of 77%. As described in the verification report, this value was calculated using data specific to the Western Highlands, and a FAR was raised requiring the PP to demonstrate a national fNRB value if the project boundary expanded. The PP is requested to justify the applicability of the fNRB value for the VPA region.	PP requests to transfer the FAR from the PDD to the VPA.	The GS approved the transfer of the FAR from the stand-alone project to the VPA. The VPA will be required to demonstrate the applicability of the fNRB value when the actual implementation expands beyond the Western Highlands. This CL is Closed.

Table 3 Forward action requests

Forward action request	Response by project participants
FAR 1 The fNRB value of 77% relies on data that is specific to the Western Highlands. This is appropriate for the current project boundary. If the project boundary is expanded, the PP must determine an fNRB value that is appropriate for the expanded boundary. Note: This FAR was transferred from the stand-alone project /28/ , as approved by the Gold Standard /38/.	Proyecto Mirador accepts the FAR and will revise the f_{NRB} value as appropriate.

- o0o -

APPENDIX B

CURRICULA VITAE OF THE VALIDATION TEAM MEMBERS

Kyle Silon holds a Masters Degree in Energy and Environmental Economics, and has 9 years' experience climate change mitigation strategies and carbon reduction projects. Prior to joining DNV, Kyle worked for 7 years in the climate change industry, devising corporate level marginal abatement cost curves and developing mitigation strategies for the financial, oil & gas, mining, and electric power sectors. His experience has focused particularly on California, where he has worked with several major California utilities to develop GHG strategies surrounding the developing carbon markets under AB32 and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard.

Mr. Silon has 2 years of experience related to the validation and verification of CDM projects/JI and other 3rd party validation/verification services. He has worked on the validation and verification of 8 household energy demand projects, including 5 CDM projects, located throughout the world.

His qualifications, experience and experience in CDM demonstrate his sufficient sectoral competence in household energy demand.

Weidong Yang holds a Master's Degree in Chemical Engineering and has studied MBA in general management, with an overall experience of around 20 years. Prior to joining DNV he had around 4 years' experience in chemical process industry covering technology, production, and quality control. He worked in research institute of pharmaceutical industry for about 8 years. His experience also covers the fields of quality management, environmental management and health & safety management. He has also been an IRCA registered lead auditor of management systems such as ISO 9001, ISO 14001 and OHSAS 18001 standards for various industrial sectors, including chemical process industry for 6 years.

He has experience of around 4 years in validation and verification of numerous GHG emission projects and inventory in DNV, both in China and other countries. The GHG emission projects and inventory include various types, such as, CDM, VCS, CAR and CCAR. His qualification, industrial experience and experience in CDM demonstrate his sufficient sectoral competence in chemical process.

Shruthi Poonacha is a consultant for DNV Climate Change Services. Ms. Poonacha has over 6 years of experience in the climate change validating and verifying CDM carbon offset projects. Shruthi is qualified to act as lead verifier for Livestock, Landfill and Forestry Projects under the Climate Action Reserve and the Livestock under State of California Air Resource Board (ARB) Climate Change Program. Shruthi is also certified lead verifier and an Oil and Gas Expert for Greenhouse Gas Emissions Verification under the State of California Air Resource Board GHG Mandatory Reporting Program. , and has worked on the verification of global GHG inventories for Corning, Shell Oil Company , Valero, Tesoro, Chevron and ConocoPhillips.