VERIFICATION REPORT OF

DISTRIBUTION OF ONIL STOVES – MEXICO, SAN FELIPE USILA 1

Document Prepared By

Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.

Address: 2071/38, 2nd Floor
Naiwala, Karol Bagh
Postal code: 110005
City: New Delhi
Country: India
http://www.carboncheck.co.in/

Project Title	Distribution of ONIL Stoves – Mexico, San Felipe Usila 1
Version	01
Report ID	CCIPL625/VCS/VER/DONILS/20180702

Report Title	Verification Report of Distribution of ONIL Stoves – Mexico, San Felipe Usila 1
Client	C-Quest Capital LLC
Pages	38
Date of Issue	05 November 2018
Prepared By	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
Contact	2071/38, 2nd Floor Naiwala, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005 ,India Tel: +91 120 4373114

	E-mail: info@carboncheck.co.in http://www.carboncheck.co.in/
Approved By	Amit Anand
Work Carried Out By	Team Leader/ technical expert - Vikash Kumar Singh Technical Reviewer- Amit Anand

Summary:

C-Quest Capital LLC has commissioned the validation/verification body Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. to perform a verification of VCS Project Activity "Distribution Of Onil Stoves - Mexico" in Mexico (hereafter "project activity") for the period from 01-August-2017 to 31-July-2018.

HELPS International A.C. and C-Quest Capital registered the "PoA 8521: Distribution of ONIL Stoves– Mexico" under the CDM on 07 December 2012 and included the first CPA, called: Distribution of ONIL Stoves – Mexico, San Felipe Usila 1, on the same date.

The project proponent applied the methodology CDM Methodology: AMS-II.G. Version 03 - Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass. In addition, the Standard for Sampling and Surveys in CDM Project Activities and Programme of Activities version 3.0 (EB 69 Annex 4); Guidelines for Sampling and Surveys in CDM Project Activities and Programme of Activities version 2.0 are used; these documents includes the requirements for sampling and surveys applied to clean development mechanism projects and programme of activities (PoA) and specifies the reliability requirements and describes appropriate sampling methods and what is expected to be provided in a sampling plan.

The verification consisted of the following three phases: i) a desk review of the Monitoring Report ii) On-site Visit; iii) the resolution of outstanding issues and internal technical review followed by the issuance of the final verification report and opinion. In the course of the verification 04 CLs were raised, all are closed. The list of Clarification and Corrective Actions Requests (CL and CAR) is presented in this report.

CCIPL confirms that the project is implemented in accordance with the validated VCS-PD, CDM-SSCPoA-DD, CDM-SSC-CPA-DD and the monitoring plan; and then, claimed emissions reductions are calculated without material misstatements.

CCIPL has performed the verification Distribution Of Onil Stoves - Mexico on the basis of all issues and criteria of VCS Standard version 3.7 and VCS Program Guide version 3.7 for VCS projects and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. Hence, in CCIPL's opinion the project correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology AMS-II.G. Version 3 "Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass" and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM Methodology, Voluntary Carbon Standard

requirements and the relevant host country criteria.

Therefore, CCIPL is able to certify that the emissions reductions from the "Distribution Of Onil Stoves Mexico" project during the period from 01-August-2017 to 31-July-2018 amount to 45,809 tonnes of CO_2e. The year-wise break up of verified emission reduction is as below :

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO_2e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO_2e)	Leakage emissions (tCO_2e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO_2e)
2017 (01-August-2017 to 31/12/2017)	19,202	0	0	19,202
2018 (01/01/2018 to 31-July-2018)	26,607	0	0	26,607
Total	**45,809**	**0**	**0**	**45,809**

Table of Contents

Table of Contents 4

1 Introduction 6

1.1 Objective 6

1.2 Scope and Criteria 6

1.3 Level of Assurance 7

1.4 Summary Description of the Project 7

2 Verification Process 8

2.1 Method and Criteria 8

2.2 Document Review 8

2.3 Interviews 9

2.4 Site Inspections 10

2.5 Resolution of Findings 11

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests 11

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities 11

3 Validation Findings 11

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs 11

3.2 Methodology Deviations 12

3.3 Project Description Deviations 12

3.4 Grouped Project 12

4 Verification Findings 13

4.1 Project Implementation Status 13

4.2 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations 17

4.3 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals 27

4.4 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis 28

5 Verification conclusion 29

APPENDIX 1: References 30

APPENDIX 2: ABBREVIATION 32

APPENDIX 3: Competency certifcates 33

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

C-Quest Capital LLC (Project Proponent) has commissioned CCIPL for verification service for the registered VCS project - “Distribution of ONIL Stoves – Mexico, San Felipe Usila 1” (VCS Project ID 1216) located in Mexico against the requirement of VCS Program.

Verification is the periodic independent review and ex post determination of both quantitative and qualitative information by a Validation and Verification Body (VVB) of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions that have occurred as a result of the VCS project activity during a defined monitoring period.

The purpose of verification is to review the monitoring results and verify that the monitoring methodology was implemented according to the monitoring plan and monitoring data, and used to confirm the reductions in emissions is sufficient, definitive and presented in a concise and transparent manner. Carbon Check’s objective is to perform a thorough, independent assessment of the registered projects activities. In particular the, monitoring plan, monitoring report and the project’s compliance are verified against the relevant criteria and guidance documents provided by VCS. This allows for the confirmation that the project has been implemented in accordance with the registered VCS PD and conservative assumptions, as documented. And also to confirm if the monitoring plan is in compliance with the VCS PD and approved monitoring methodology. The objective of this verification was to verify and certify emission reductions reported for the “Distribution of ONIL Stoves – Mexico, San Felipe Usila 1” for the period 01-August-2017 to 31-July-2018.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The verification of this project is based on the registered Project Description , the Monitoring Report of this monitoring period /01/, emission reduction calculation spread sheet /03/, supporting documents made available to the verifier and information collected through performing interviews and during the on-site assessment. Furthermore publicly available information was considered as far as available and required.

Carbon Check has employed a risk-based approach in the verification, focusing on the identification of significant risks and reliability of project monitoring and generation of emission reductions.

The verification is carried out on the basis of the following requirements (latest available on VCS website at the time of verification), applicable for this project activity:

- VCS Standard
- VCS Program Guide
- VCS Validation and Verification Manual
- Approved CDM methodology
- Other relevant rules, including the host country legislation

The scope of this verification, by independent checking of objective evidence, is as follows:

- To verify that the project is implemented as described in the project description
- To assess the project's compliance with other relevant rules including the host country legislation.
- To assess the implementation of the monitoring plan content as mentioned in the registered VCS-PD
- To confirm that the monitoring system is implemented and fully functional to generate voluntary emission reductions (VERs/VCUs) without any double counting and
- To establish that the data reported are accurate, complete, consistent, transparent and free of material error or omission by checking the monitoring records and the emissions reduction calculation /03/, /04/.
- To evaluate the GHG emission reduction data and express a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emission reduction data is free from material misstatement.
- To verify that reported GHG emission data is sufficiently supported by evidence.

The verification shall ensure that the reported emission reductions are complete and accurate in order to be certified.

The method and criteria used for verification consisted of the following phases:

1. Completeness check and desk review:
2. On site visit;
3. Resolution of outstanding issues and issuance of final verification report and applicable VCS Validation and Verification Deeds of Representation.

Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. conducts all its work under strict rules to safeguard impartiality and ensure the independence of the verification team. The verification does not provide any consulting or recommendations for the client. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the monitoring activities.

1.3 Level of Assurance

☒ Reasonable level of assurance

☐ Limited level of assurance

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

Distribution of ONIL Stoves – Mexico involves the distribution and installation of ONIL Stoves for use by households in Mexico; which includes 31,178 improved cook stoves benefiting families throughout the country. Before the adoption of the ONIL Stove, households in Mexico used inefficient, conventional open fires.

HELPS International A.C is the implementer of this project. HELPS International A.C. manufactures the ONIL stoves and distributes them to communities throughout Mexico.

This project was registered under the CDM as the “ONIL Stoves —Mexico, San Felipe Usila 1”/3/ which is first CPA of “PoA: Distribution of ONIL Stoves—Mexico” (CDM PoA 8521) /2/.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Method and Criteria

The method and criteria used for verification:

The verification consists of the following three phases:

1. Completeness check and desk review of the validation report, monitoring plan, monitoring report, monitoring methodology, VCS PD, applicable tools in particular attention to the frequency of measurements, quality of metering equipment’s including calibration requirements, QA/QC procedures and other relevant documents;

2. On-site visit (including follow-up interviews with project stakeholders, when deemed necessary). The on-site assignment includes the following;

    - An assignment of implementation and operation of project activity with respect to validated VCS PD;
    - Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters;
    - Interview with relevant personals to determine whether the operational and data collection procedures are implemented and in accordance with monitoring plan of the validated VCS PD;
    - Cross check of information and data provided in the monitoring report with plant logbooks, inventories, purchase records or similar data sources;
    - Check of monitoring equipment’s, calibration frequency and monitoring practice in-line with methodology and validated VCS PD;
    - Review of assumptions made in calculating the emission reduction;
    - Implementation of QA/QC procedure in-line with the validated VCS PD and methodology requirement.

Resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final Verification report and if applicable, the VCS Validation and Verification Deeds of Representation.

2.2 Document Review

The registered VCS PD , VCS MR /01/, /02/, emission reduction calculation spread sheet/03/, /04/ and supporting documents related to the project implementation, project design, monitoring and baseline were reviewed as per VCS version 03 standard requirements. The desk review included:

- A review of the data and information presented to verify completeness and consistency in accordance with VCS version 03 requirements;

- A review of the approved monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, quality of monitoring equipment (including calibration requirements) and the quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) procedures;

- An evaluation of data management and the QA/QC system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions.

Data input values were also checked from the records maintained by the project proponents. Results of calculations reported in the monitoring report were checked against data values as available from the project proponent in VER calculation sheet /03/, /04/.

These data values and other information related to project performance are available in the form of data records duly archived and maintained as per the quality assurance/quality control procedure specified as a part of monitoring plan in the registered VCS-PD .

Furthermore, the verification team used additional documentation by third parties like host-party legislation, technical reports referring to the project design or to the basic conditions and technical data.

2.3 Interviews

A site visit to the project activity was undertaken from 18/09/2018 to 19/09/2018 to assess the implementation and operation of the project activity and to review evidence, and interview key personnel to confirm evidence associated with the data generation, aggregation, and calculation and reporting of the monitoring parameters. The site visit addressed:

- An assessment of the project implementation and operation as per the PD (including physical inspection to confirm physical existence and operation of project components);

- Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters;

- Interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan in the monitoring report /01/,/02/.

The key personnel interviewed and the main topics of the interviews are summarized in the table below:

S. No.	Name	Organization	Topic
/i/	Mr. Tridip Kumar Goswami	C-Quest Capital LLC	CER calculation and completeness of monitoring report, Electronic Monitoring system Project implementation and operation, Project design, monitoring procedure, data and information flow, compliance of monitoring plan with monitoring methodology and approved VCS-PD.

/ii/	Ms. Magda	Fuego Limpio	Roles and responsibility, Project Implementation and Operation status , Qualification and Training, Roles and responsibility.
/iii/	Ms. Andrea Santos	Fuego Limpio	Data and information flow, Data input device, Roles and responsibility, Project implementation and operation, monitoring procedure.
/iv/	Mr. Oscar Troncoso Torrez	Fuego Limpio	Data and information flow, Data input device, monitoring procedure.
/v/	Mr. Carlos	Fuego Limpio	Sampling Surveys and Water boiling Test

2.4 Site Inspections

Site inspection was carried out to verify that the project is implemented in accordance with the applicable criteria. On-site assessment is necessary to check the monitoring data with respect to accuracy to ensure the calculation of emission reductions. The main tasks carried out during site inspection are:

- The on-site assessment included an investigation of whether all relevant equipment is installed and works as anticipated.
- The operating staff was interviewed and observed in order to check the risks of inappropriate operation and data collection procedures.
- Information processes for generating, aggregating and reporting the selected monitored parameters were reviewed.
- The duly calibration/testing of all metering equipment was checked.
- The monitoring processes, routines and documentations were audited to check their proper application.
- The monitoring data were checked completely.

During the site visit all monitoring data with respect to accuracy to ensure the calculation of emission reductions was checked. All the procedures and records were found authenticated and properly maintained as per the requirements of the project.

The verification team has carried out interviews in order to assess the information included in the project documentation and to gain additional information regarding the compliance of the project with the relevant criteria applicable for the VCS.

2.5 Resolution of Findings

Material discrepancies identified in the course of the verification are addressed either as CARs, CLs or FARs. **Corrective action requests (CAR)** are issued, where:

i. Mistakes have been made with a direct influence on project results requiring adjustments of the VERs/VCUs monitoring report;

ii. Applicable methodological specific requirements have not been met.

A **Clarification request (CL)** may be used where additional information is needed to fully clarify an issue or where the information is not transparent enough to establish whether a requirement is met.

A **forward action request (FAR)** should be issued, where:

i. The actual project monitoring and reporting practices requires attention and /or adjustment for the next consecutive verification period, or

ii. An adjustment of the MP is recommended.

In the context of FARs, risks have been identified, which may endanger the delivery of high quality emissions reductions in the future, i.e. by deviations from standard procedures as defined by the MP. As a consequence, such aspects should receive a special focus during the next consecutive verification. A FAR may originate from lack of data sustaining claimed emission reductions.

A total of 04 CLs had been raised for the verification of the project activity and all are open.

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

No FAR has been raised for the project activity during the monitoring period.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

Validation/Verification body (VVB), Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. holds accreditation for validation for the relevant sectoral scope 3 and is eligible for validation/verification for the project activity.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

Not applicable as the project is already validated.

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

The project activity is also registered under CDM, with reference: PoA 8521.The component project activity is within programme of activity. Details of the CDM registration are the following:

- PoA: Distribution of ONIL Stoves—Mexico, registration date 7 December 2012.
- CPA: Distribution of ONIL Stoves – Mexico, San Felipe Usila 1, date of inclusion 7 December 2012 .

3.2 Methodology Deviations

No methodology deviations apply to the project activity and project meets the methodology criteria

3.3 Project Description Deviations

Deviation 1: Adoption of Simple Random Sampling instead of Multi Stage Sampling

The proposed change in sampling frame from previous multi-stage sampling to Simple Random Sampling, is one of the options prescribed under Standard: Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programme of Activities . As per the Guidelines for Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, the Simple random sampling is suited to populations that are homogeneous (if there is little heterogeneity amongst the units being sampled). As per the CPA DD, the project is to be implemented in Mexico and thus demographically it can be categorized as similar region.

Considering the above assessment, validation team confirms that the population being studied is relatively homogeneous with respect to the parameter being studied i.e. parameters $n_{y,l}$, SS_Y and efficiency ($\eta_{new,i}$) and thus simple random sampling is appropriate for the project.

Furthermore the change from multi-stage sampling to simple random sampling entails the removal of Secondary Sampling Unit, validation team confirms that since the simple random sampling is accurately/appropriately applied, this change (i.e. removal of Secondary Sampling Unit) is unlikely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions.

The same version of the methodology has been considered by the CME. The most recent version for Standard: Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programme of Activities /22/ has been consistently used. The proposed changes do not lead to any deviation from the applied methodology/tools.

The proposed permanent changes are unlikely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions.

The sample size calculation has been conducted in the corresponding Sample calculation spread sheet .
The validation team has reviewed the revised information and found them consistent with Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities.

Deviation 2: Number of stoves included in the project activity

As described in the previous issuance Monitoring Report, the initial number of stoves to be included in the project was capped at 13,859. This limit was established based on an adoption rate of 100% and an average stove efficiency of 24%. Because of the lower-than-expected stove efficiency and adoption rate, the project would not be economically sustainable and its continuity jeopardized if capped at 13,859 stoves. Therefore, a deviation is requested to increase the number of stoves to 31,178. The applied methodology AMS.II.G version 03 /17/ falls under type II category project in CDM. According to the response given by small working group on “SSC_233” , the threshold limit of the type II project is 180 $GWh_{thermal}$.

This deviation results in annual energy savings of savings of 69.24 GWh in year 2017 and 109.59 GWh in year 2018., which still lower than the 180 $GWh_{thermal}$/year that would qualify the project as small scale as per the CDM thresholds for type II projects

CCIPL confirms that above deviation does not affect the applicability of the methodology as the small scale threshold is not surpassed. After this deviation, the project is still in compliance with the applied methodology, thus, accepted by the verification team of CCIPL.

Regarding the additionality, above deviation mentioned does not affect it .Additionality of the project activity at PoA level and it has been demonstrated as per "Methodological tool: Demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities version 10.0" /13/.

CCIPL confirms that the deviation is properly described and justified in the final Monitoring Report therefore the project deviation is deemed to be valid and that the project remains in compliance with VCS rules.

Deviation 3: Extension of the crediting period

As described in the previous issuance Monitoring Report, the original crediting period for this project was from 01January-2010 to 31-December-2012. Project participants requested a deviation to extend this crediting period to 31-December-2020 (ten years, renewable twice, but not extending beyond the CDM total crediting period for this CPA). Project participants have confirmed (please refer to the closure of CL-04) that carbon credits claimed under VCS will not be double counted under the CDM and vice-versa. This was verified during the last periodic verification of the project as well.

CCIPL based on review of documents of last periodic verification as available on VCS database, confirms that the deviation is properly described and justified in the Monitoring Report and thus the project deviation is deemed to be valid and that the project remains in compliance with VCS rules.

3.4 Grouped Project

N/A

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Implementation Status

The implemented project involves distribution of fuel-efficient stoves in Mexico. The project installed 3 stoves in 2009 (these stoves were excluded from the estimation of emissions reductions, as there were installed in a region that was deemed unsafe for the project implementer to monitor), 4,361 stoves in 2010, 8,524 in 2011, 3,833 in 2013 , 5,900 in 2014 , 4067 in 2015 and 4440 in 2016 for a total of 31,178 stoves installed for this project. The monitoring period (01-August-2017 to 31-July-2018) covered all these stoves.

During the visit CCIPL was able to verify that the project has been implemented as planned and as mentioned in the registered VCS-PD, CDM-SSC-PoA-DD and CDM-SSC-CPA-DD by visiting a sample of 08 households selected at random from the records available at the offices of the PP and the survey samples.

CCIPL verification team preformed samples among households included in the monitoring system. Few of the samples were chosen from the list of households were the $n_{y,j}$ and SS_y parameters were monitored, the other sample were chosen from households where the $\eta_{new,i}$ were monitored (stoves where the WBTs were performed).

To verify the result of the calculation of confidence/precision, CCIPL has followed the Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities.

The project is already registered under CDM (another GHG program) as a CPA. Whereas, the project was included under the registered CDM PoA 8521 on 7 December 2014. Project participants have provided confirmation that the carbon credits claimed under VCS will not be double counted under the CDM and vice-versa .

In addition, during desk review and on-site visit was confirmed that the project has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit for the project. Also, it was verified that the project has not been rejected from other GHG program after validation and; therefore, it was not necessary to a complete revalidation of the project against the VCS rules.

Overall the project activity was implemented as described in the registered/included VCS-PD and CDM-SSC-CPA-DD. Verification team confirmed that the component project implementation is in accordance with the project description contained in the registered/included VCS-PD and CDMSSC-CPA-DD. No material discrepancies were identified between project implementation and the project description.

Based on above assessment, verification team concluded that all physical features of the project activity in the registered CPA DD are in place and that the project participant has operated the project activity as per the registered CPA DD.

CL ID	01	**Section no.**	Section 4.1	**Date :** 01/10/2018
Description of CL				
Review of registered PoA DD and CPA DD along with VCS PD, reveals that HELPS International A.C is the implementer of this project. The same has also been discussed in the Monitoring Report. Verification team during the OSV interviews however noted that a different entity (Fuego Limpio) is now responsible for the project implementation and operation. This change needs to be elaborated, while doing so please also explain over the right of carbon credits generated from the project. This explanation should be a part of Monitoring report for better transparency to the readers.				
Project Proponent response				**Date :** 01/11/2018
HELPS international is still the implementer of the project. Fuego Limpio is the third party which was used by CME to help during monitoring and verification process. Since this organisation is don't have any carbon rights and merely a third party, CME doesn't consider it necessary to mention their role and responsibility in the monitoring report.				
Documentation provided by Project Proponent				
CQC-Fuego Services Agreement - (executed 12 Jun 2017)				

DOE assessment	**DOE assessment : 04/11/2018**
Based on the above response and review of CQC-Fuego Services Agreement (schedule 6, p42 of 42), verification team confirms that Fuego Limpio is the third party which was used by CME to help during monitoring and verification process and don't have any carbon rights. Roles & responsibility of Fuego Limpio is clarified. CL is closed	

CL ID	02	**Section no.**	Section 4.1	**Date :** 01/10/2018
Description of CL				
The number of stoves (for year 2013 & 2014) as listed in Monitoring report and ER spread sheet does not matches with the original records (database). Project Proponent is requested to clarify this inconsistency.				
Project Proponent response				**Date :** 01/11/2018
The number of stoves reported in previous verification (monitoring period of 01-Jan-14 to 28-Oct-15) for year 2013 is 3,883 and for year 2014 is 5,900. The same number of stoves are reported in the current monitoring report and ER spread sheet.				
Documentation provided by Project Proponent				
--				
DOE assessment				**Date:** 04/11/2018
As clarified in the response above, the records are as per the previous issuance, this approach maintains consistency. Verification team accepts this approach since the overall number for 2013 & 2014 stoves are the same and this doesn't material impact on the emission reductions. CL is closed.				

CL ID	03	**Section no.**	Section 4.1	**Date :** 01/10/2018
Description of CL				
As per the registered CPA DD and VCS PD, the number of stoves included in the CPA was capped at 13,859. The number of stoves during this monitoring period is 31,175 (stoves eligible as per the database). The increase in number of stoves needs to be justified while doing so please demonstrate that the project is within the small scale threshold during this monitoring period. While doing so it is requested to clarify the reason of increase (actual during the monitoring period as compare to estimated in the VCS PD) in emission reduction from the project.				
Project Proponent response				**Date :** 01/11/2018

The deviation results in annual energy savings of 38.22 GWh in year 2015 (Oct to Dec), 175.36 GWh in year 2016 and 109.59 GWh in year 2017(Jan to Jul). The energy saving achieved in previous verification is 96.08 GWh/year (for period of Jan to Oct 2015), thus total energy savings achieved for year 2015 is estimated to be 134.3 GWh (96.08 + 38.22). In overall, the energy savings achieved still lower than the 180 GWh/year that would qualify the project as small scale as per the CDM thresholds for type II projects.
Documentation provided by Project Proponent
--

DOE assessment	**Date:** 04/11/2018
Based on response above and the fact that the threshold of energy saving is below the small scale threshold (i.e. 180 GWh) during the monitoring period (178.82 GWh during the monitoring period), the CL is closed.	

CL ID	04	**Section no.**	Section 4.1	**Date :** 01/10/2018
Description of CL				
Project Proponent is requested to provide evidence to demonstrate (as reflected in the previous issuance documents) that carbon credits claimed under VCS will not be double counted under the CDM and vice-versa.				
Project Proponent response				**Date :** 01/11/2018
Till to date, no new request of CER issuance is made under CDM. *The only CER issuance made under CDM was for monitoring period 1 Jan 2013 to 31 Dec 2013. VCS project database shows that the VCS issued was for the period 29-October-2015 to 31-July-2017. This issuance is sought for the monitoring period from 01-August-2017 to 31-July-2018. Thus there is no double counting for the credits claimed.*				
Documentation provided by Project Proponent				
The link to CDM website for PoA 8521 Distribution of ONIL Stoves—Mexico. https://cdm.unfccc.int/ProgrammeOfActivities/poa_db/2BH1T0SFERD67JCZXAIWMKLO8PN5UQ/view				
DOE assessment				**Date:** 04/11/2018
Based on above confirmation from Project Proponent (in above response) and review of CDM website, it is confirmed that the carbon credits claimed under VCS will not be double counted under the CDM and vice-versa. CL is closed.				

4.2 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

The monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the provision of monitoring plan; the verification team reviewed if:

- The monitoring of reductions in GHG emissions resulting from the proposed VCS project activity were implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS-PD, CDM-SSC-PoA-DD and CDM-SSC-CPA-DD.
- The monitoring plan and the applied methodologies had been properly implemented and followed by the project participants.
- All parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied methodologies and relevant CDM EB decisions had been sufficiently monitored and updated.
- The responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting were in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the monitoring plan.

The monitoring system and all applied procedures are in compliance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS-PD, CDM-SSC-PoA-DD and CDM-SSC-CPA-DD and the applied methodology AMS-II.G. version 03, based on the information included in the final monitoring report, there are several procedures for data collecting depending on the methodology applicable for each step of the project. The PP performed the following monitoring steps:

1. **HELPS International: User registered stove**. HELPS International field personnel collected the information in the Registration Card from the users. Information was collected via a Registration Card filled by HELPS International staff and partner organizations. HELPS International staff double-checked the accuracy of the information and requested clarifications if needed.

2. **HELPS International: Data logged into database**. HELPS International trained staff inputted the information from the Registration Card into the database. HELPS International and CQC checked the database records and removed duplicates (this included completing the serial number, checking for name duplicates, etc...).

3. **HELPS International: Spot-checks (ongoing).** HELPS International visited locations in the field and reported updates to office either via telephone or forms. HELPS International personnel corrected the database and clearly marked stoves that were not installed, were given away, the end user died or left town, or had any other issues that made the stove no longer eligible to participate in the CPA. These stoves were excluded from the emission reduction calculations.

4. **Third Parties: Monitoring.** Third Parties followed the sampling plan outlined in the PoA-DD (Section E.7.2). Data was collected in the field from 01-August-2017 to 31-July-2018.

5. **CME Preparation of monitoring report**. CQC has prepared the final monitoring report and retained copies of the document.

Steps 1, 2 and 3 captured end user information and populated the database, as well as provided database quality control. Step 4 involved sampling surveys to capture data on continuous use of stove ($n_{y,j}$) and use of baseline or secondary fires (SS_y) as well as stove efficiency ($\eta_{new,i}$) as described in the table below.

Parameter	Description of Parameter	Sampling approach (outcome in brackets)
$n_{y,j}$	Proportion of ONIL Stoves still in operation	Visual inspection of the premises to see if ONIL stove is operational and in use. Interview with end user if required to verify that ONIL stove is still in use (Yes/No)
SS_y	Percentage of continued baseline stove use among ONIL stove households in the database	Interview with end user and visual inspection to determine if a baseline (replaced) stove is still being used in addition to ONIL stove (Yes/No)
$\eta_{new,i}$	Thermal Efficiency of operational ONIL Stoves	ONIL Stoves will be tested using WBTs (ONIL stove thermal efficiency)

Two different type of sampling surveys were performed: one gathered information needed for the monitoring of $n_{y,j}$ and SS_y **,** another one to the monitoring of $\eta_{new,I}$ parameter.

Sampling captured information on monitoring variables with required confidence/precision (in that case as a single CPA is sampled, it is required a 90/10 confidence/precision for annual monitoring). A simple random sampling was used. The proposed change in sampling frame from previous multi-stage sampling to Simple Random Sampling, is one of the options prescribed under Standard: Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programme of Activities Version 07.0 . As per the Guidelines for Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, the Simple random sampling is suited to populations that are homogeneous (if there is little heterogeneity amongst the units being sampled). As per the CPA DD, the project is to be implemented in Mexico and thus demographically it can be categorized as similar region.

Considering the above assessment, validation team confirms that the population being studied is relatively homogeneous with respect to the parameter being studied i.e. parameters $n_{y,I}$, SS_Y and efficiency ($\eta_{new,i}$) and thus simple random sampling is appropriate for the project.

Furthermore the change from multi-stage sampling to simple random sampling entails the removal of Secondary Sampling Unit, verification team confirms that since the simple random sampling is accurately/appropriately applied, this change (i.e. removal of Secondary Sampling Unit) is unlikely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions.

The same version of the methodology has been considered by the CME. The most recent version for Standard: Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programme of Activities has been consistently used. The proposed changes do not lead to any deviation from the applied methodology/tools.

The proposed permanent changes are unlikely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions.

The sample size calculation has been conducted in the corresponding Sample calculation spread sheet . The validation team has reviewed the revised information and found them consistent with Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities /22/.

CCIPL considers the technical references used were adequate taking into account the methodology and the EB provisions and guidelines for sampling. CCIPL was able to reproduce the calculation obtaining the same results.

The collected data are summarized in a survey report provided to the verification team. The verification team checked the figures during the on-site visit by means of the review of the central database, household visits, and the handwritten records.

CCIPL considers the procedure for sampling to be accurate, conservative and following the approved methodology AMS-II.G ver. 03 and the EB guidance for sampling.

The actual achieved confidence/precision obtained by CCIPL (when reproducing the calculations) was the same than the indicated by the project proponent for each survey. Therefore, the requirement has been met.

During the visit CCIPL was able to verify that the project has been implemented as planned and as mentioned in the registered VCS-PD by visiting a sample of 08 households selected at random from the records available at the offices of the PP in respective zones and city offices and the survey samples. CCIPL verification team preformed samples among households included in the monitoring system.

CCIPL's verification on-site sampling:

CCIPL has followed paragraph 20 to 31 of the Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities, version 07.0.

CCIPL confirms that the selected samples (as elaborated in the MR) by the project proponent for their monitoring surveys are representative of the population and that the required confidence and precision have been met. This is in line with the requirement of paragraph 21-22 of the sampling Standard and has been explained before.

In line with the requirements of the standard for sampling, CCIPL has designed an acceptance sampling, and has verified a total of 08 records (during the on-site visit to customer households and has found PPs survey records to be acceptable within the limits required of the applied standard as described below.

CCIPL's sample size of 08 records for onsite visit was deemed to be adequate due to the following reasons:

CCIPL selected an acceptable quality level at 1% (following the guidance of the Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities version 07.0. In line with paragraph 29 of the sampling standard, the maximum discrepancy (unacceptable quality level) was fixed at 20% of the determined sample size.

The maximum errors associated with the determination indicated in paragraph above shall remain at levels indicated below:

- A 10% chance that the DOE will wrongly reject the PPs records (producer's risk).
- A 20% chance that the DOE will wrongly accept the PPs records (consumer's risk).

This total sample size of 08 records (is taken from table 1 of the Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities, version 07.0.

Hence, CCIPL confirms that the sampling size and the method of onsite verification were in line with the requirements of the sampling standard and confirms that the monitoring for the verified period has been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan.

Therefore, in CCIPL's opinion emission reductions have been calculated in accordance with the applied methodology AMS-II.G version 03; registered CPA-DD; and the registered VCS-PD. The PP has used monitored data and ex-ante fixed data including default values as mandated/permitted by the applied methodology. The values used for calculation of GHG emission reductions have been thoroughly checked by the verification team and was found appropriate and correct. The spread sheet submitted by the PP clearly and transparently mentions values of the data parameters used for calculation of emission reductions. The calculations are traceable and follow logical steps. The input values have been verified from the reliable and authentic sources including monitoring records and applied methodology. The emission reductions calculated were compared with the emission reduction spread sheet and found to be correct. No significant reporting risks have been identified for the data reported. The details of monitoring parameters used for calculation of emission reductions are provided below:

Monitored Parameters

Data / Parameter:	Number of ONIL Stoves in operation during the monitoring period. ($\mathbf{n_{y,i}}$)
Measuring frequency:	-
Recording frequency:	Data from Registration Cards was uploaded to database continuously to come up with the overall number of stoves installed under the CPA. Monitoring surveys captured the fraction of operational ONIL stoves.
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes.
Type of monitoring equipment:	Not applicable. Monitoring surveys and registration card records loaded into CPA database.
Value(s) of monitored parameter:	18,353 = 0.5887 multiplied by 31,175 stoves eligible in the database. Note: The percentage of ONIL stove was found in operation from the survey is 58.87%.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the PDD?	Not applicable

Calibration frequency /interval:	Not applicable
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD?	Not applicable
Company performing the calibration:	Not applicable
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	Not applicable
Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Not applicable
If applicable, has the reported data been crosschecked with other available data?	Yes, with hand-written records and personal information from households interviewed during on-site visit
How were the values in the monitoring report verified	Cross checked with the actual data available at the time of the site visit and were also checked with records of PP for the monitoring period (01-August-2017 to 31-July-2018) in form of PDF and Excel files and the database register.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes. The PP system assures the traceability of all records and the spreadsheets could assure correct emission reduction calculations in a transparent way

Data / Parameter:	The fraction of ongoing baseline stove use within the population of in-use ONIL Stoves during a monitoring period. (**SS_y**)
Measuring frequency:	Once per monitoring period
Recording frequency:	Once per monitoring period
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes.
Type of monitoring equipment:	Not applicable. Calculated from surveys. Data for this parameter was collected using the same survey for the fraction of $n_{y,j}$. The number of households with operational ONIL stoves and continuing to use baseline stoves divided by the total number of households with operational ONIL Stoves.

Value(s) of monitored parameter:	94.94%
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the PDD?	Not applicable
Calibration frequency /interval:	Not applicable
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD?	Not applicable
Company performing the calibration:	Not applicable
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	Not applicable
Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Not applicable
If applicable, has the reported data been crosschecked with other available data?	Yes, with handwritten registers and personal information from households interviewed during on-site visit
How were the values in the monitoring report verified	Cross checked actual data available at the time of the site visit and were checked records of PP for the monitoring period (01-August-2017 to 31-July-2018) in form of PDF and Excel files and the database register.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes. The PP system assures the traceability of all records and the spreadsheets could assure correct emission reduction calculations in a transparent way

Data / Parameter:	Efficiency of the ICS ($\eta_{new,i}$)
Measuring frequency:	Water Boiling Tests were implemented over stove samples of 2010, 2011, 2013, 2014,2015 and 2016 vintages (i.e. installed during 2010 and 2011) during monitoring period.
Recording frequency:	-

<table>
<tr><td>Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)</td><td>Yes.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Type of monitoring equipment:</td><td>Digital scales
Firewood moisture meters
Digital thermometers
Thermocouples
The Water Boiling Test (WBT) protocol used was the WBT version 4.2.2 published by the Global Alliance for Clean Cook stoves.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Value(s) of monitored parameter:</td><td><table><tr><td>Vintage</td><td>Efficiency</td></tr><tr><td>$\eta_{new,2010}$</td><td>21.48%</td></tr><tr><td>$\eta_{new,2011}$</td><td>21.19%</td></tr><tr><td>$\eta_{new,2013}$</td><td>21.62%</td></tr><tr><td>$\eta_{new,2014}$</td><td>21.67%</td></tr><tr><td>$\eta_{new,2015}$</td><td>21.67%</td></tr><tr><td>$\eta_{new,2016}$</td><td>22.48%</td></tr></table></td></tr>
<tr><td>Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the PDD?</td><td>Not applicable</td></tr>
<tr><td>Calibration frequency /interval:</td><td>Not applicable</td></tr>
<tr><td>Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD?</td><td>Not applicable</td></tr>
<tr><td>Company performing the calibration:</td><td>The WBTs were conducted by trained staff from the Grupo Interdisciplinario de Tecnologia Rural Apropiada, A.C. (GIRA), a third party to the project.

This laboratory has the needed accreditation and qualification for the performance of the tests.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):</td><td>Not applicable</td></tr>
<tr><td>Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?</td><td>Not applicable</td></tr>
</table>

If applicable, has the reported data been crosschecked with other available data?	Yes, with handwritten registers and personal information from households interviewed during on-site visit
How were the values in the monitoring report verified	Cross checked with the records in form PDF and Excel files and the database register of WBT reports from GIRA.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes. The PP system assures the traceability of all records and the spread-sheets could assure correct emission reduction calculations in a transparent way

Data / Parameter:	Fraction of CPA monitoring period the stove is in operation (weeks in operation/total weeks in monitoring period) (t_{yj})
Measuring frequency:	-
Recording frequency:	Continuous monitoring. Registration Cards or surveys have date of installation of ONIL stoves. These dates are input in CPA database.
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes.
Type of monitoring equipment:	Not applicable.
Value(s) of monitored parameter:	0.94
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the PDD?	Not applicable
Calibration frequency /interval:	Not applicable
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD?	Not applicable
Company performing the calibration:	Not applicable
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	Not applicable

Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Not applicable
If applicable, has the reported data been crosschecked with other available data?	Yes, with handwritten registers and personal information from households interviewed during on-site visit
How were the values in the monitoring report verified	Cross checked of actual data available at the time of the site visit and were checked with records of PP for the monitoring period (01-August-2017 to 31-July-2018) in form of PDF and Excel files and the database register.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes. The PP system assures the traceability of all records and the spreadsheets could assure correct emission reduction calculations in a transparent way

Furthermore, after review fixed parameters/ex-ante parameters used for calculation of emission reductions, verification team conclude that it has been properly used on determining emission reduction calculation.

The different data sources mentioned above permit the comparison of the data and the detection of any deviation between them.

Emission reduction (ER)

The methodology does not calculate baseline and project emissions separately.

Instead, the methodology calculates emission reduction using the following equations:

$$ER = B_{y,saving} \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{biomass} \times EF_{projected\ fossil\ fuel} \times L$$

Where:

ER_y : Emissions reductions during the year in tCO2e

$B_{y,saving}$: Quantity of woody biomass that is saved in tonnes

$f_{NRB,y}$: Fraction of woody biomass saved by the project activity in year y that can be established as non-renewable biomass (0.87)

$NCV_{biomass}$: Net calorific value of non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted (IPCC default value for fuel wood 0.015 TJ/tonne)

$EF_{projected\ fossil\ fuel}$: Emission factor for the substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers. Use a value of 81.6 tCO_2/TJ

L : A net to gross adjustment factor (0.95 default) is applied above (equation (1) of AMS II.G, version 3) in order to adjust B_{old} to account for leakages as per paragraph 13 (a) of the methodology.

To calculate $B_{y,saving}$we use Option 2 (paragraph 6 of AMS II.G)

$$B_{y,saving} = B_{old} \times \left(1 - \frac{n_{old}}{n_{new}}\right)$$

Where:

B_{old} : Quantity of wood fuel used in the absence of the project activity in tonnes

n_{old} : A default value of 0.10 may be optionally used if the replaced system is a three stone fire, or a conventional system with no improved combustion air supply or flue gas ventilation system, i.e. without a grate or a chimney.

n_{new} : Efficiency of the system being deployed as part of the project activity (fraction), as determined using the Water Boiling Test (WBT) protocol. And

$$B_{y,saving} = B_{old,adjusted} \times \sum_{i=1}^{n} N_{y,i} \left(1 - \frac{n_{old}}{n_{new,i}}\right)$$

Where:

$N_{y,i}$: Total number of stoves in operation for a full monitoring period equivalent within each SSC-CPA

n_{old} : Efficiency of the baseline system/s being replaced. The 0.10 default value is used as the replaced systems are three-stone fires or conventional systems lacking improved combustion air supply mechanism and flue gas ventilation system i.e., traditional stoves.

$n_{new,i}$: Efficiency of the system being deployed as part of the project activity (fraction), as determined using the Water Boiling Test (WBT) protocol

It is noted that the formula and calculation used for baseline calculation in the monitoring report and ER sheet is in compliance with the registered CDM-SSC-PoA-DD, CDM-SSC-CPA-DD and VCS-PD. The default values and data used in the final monitoring report are in-line with the registered CDM-SSC-PoA-DD, CDM-SSC-CPA-DD and VCS-PD. Hence, accepted by the verification team of CCIPL.

The reported emission reductions are equivalent to **45,809** tCO_{2e} during the reported monitoring period (01-August-2017 to 31-July-2018). According to the registered CDM-SSC-PoA-DD, CDM-SSC-CPA-DD and VCS-PD, the estimated average emission reductions are equivalent to 40,090 tCO2 per year. The reported average emission reductions per year are lower than the estimated average emission reductions.

PP provided the spreadsheet /03/ used for calculating the GHG emission reductions. CCIPL has reproduced all these calculations to obtain the same results, hence, they are deemed appropriate and

consistent with the evidence provided and cross-checked by CCIPL. Furthermore, appropriate methods and formulae for calculating emission reductions have been followed, and assumptions and emission factors correctly applied and justified.

Project Emission (PE)

Not Applicable.

Leakage (L)

Not Applicable.

According to the applied methodology, a net-to-gross adjustment factor of leakage of 0.95 is applied to calculate the emission reductions for the monitoring period.

PP provided the spreadsheets used for calculating the GHG emission reductions. CCIPL has reproduced all these calculations to obtain the same results, hence, they are deemed quantified correctly in accordance with the project description and applied methodology; consistent with the evidence provided and cross-checked by CCIPL. Furthermore, appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage have been followed, and assumptions and emission factor correctly applied and justified.

4.3 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

CCIPL was able to confirm that the calculations are based on authentic data. The spreadsheets used to calculate the VCUs calculations and all figures were tracked, checked and found to be consistent.

The quality of supporting evidences submitted to the VVB for verification is adequate and found to be verifiable. The transfer of carbon rights and other supporting documents related to quality and maintenance were checked by the verification team during the site visit to confirm the authenticity of the documents and to check the correctness of the calculation.

The verification team can confirm that sufficient evidence is available for the whole monitoring period and the same is verifiable and that the data collection system meets the requirements of the monitoring plan and the applied methodology according to the assessment carried out on site and in the document review

Verification team confirms that the quality of evidence to determine the GHG reductions and removals produced was found satisfactory. The detailed information flow with the roles and responsibilities of the individuals and the monitoring system have been provided in the VCS-MR.

4.4 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

As the project activity is a non-AFOLU project activity no risk related to non-permanence has been identified for the project activity.

5 SAFEGUARDS

5.1 No Net Harm

This project was registered under the CDM as the “Distribution of ONIL Stoves – Mexico, San Felipe Usila 1”/3/ which is first CPA of “PoA 8521 : Distribution of ONIL Stoves – Mexico” (CDM PoA 8521) /2/.

Based on review of the PoA DD /14/ and CPA DD /15/, it is confirmed that the ONIL Stove installed under this project presents positive environmental impacts wherever they are applied and no negative environmental impacts have been identified.

5.2 Local Stakeholder Consultation

This project was registered under the CDM as the “Distribution of ONIL Stoves – Mexico, San Felipe Usila 1”/3/ which is first CPA of “PoA 8521 : Distribution of ONIL Stoves – Mexico” (CDM PoA 8521) /2/.

Based on review of the PoA DD /14/ and CPA DD /15/, The local stakeholder consultation was done at PoA level, prior to the registration of the PoA.

The outcomes from the local stakeholder consultation is available in Section D of the PoA-DD /14/,/15/

6 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

Carbon Check has performed the verification of the project activity "Distribution of ONIL Stoves – Mexico, San Felipe Usila 1" in Mexico, with regards to the relevant requirements for VCS project activities.

The conclusions can be summarised as follows:

- The project is implemented and installed as planned and described in the registered VCS PD and project activity confirms with the verification criteria for project and their GHG emission reductions or removals set out in the VCS rules.
- The monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied approved methodology, i.e. AMS II G, version 03.0 and monitoring plan as sought out in the registered VCS-PD .
- The monitoring system is in place and functional. The project has generated verifiable GHG emission reductions.

As the result of the verification of project activities, the verifier confirms that the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements in a conservative and appropriate manner. Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. herewith confirms that the project has achieved emission reductions in the below mentioned reporting period as follows. The project complies with the verification criteria for projects and their GHG emissions reductions or removals set out in VCS rules. Verification period: From [01-August-2017] to [31-July-2018].

Verified GHG emission reductions and removals in the above verification period:

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO_2e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO_2e)	Leakage emissions (tCO_2e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO_2e)
2017 (01-August-2017 to 31/12/2017)	19,202	0	0	19,202
2018 (01/01/2018 to 31-July-2018)	26,607	0	0	26,607
Total	**45,809**	**0**	**0**	**45,809**

APPENDIX 1: REFERENCES

S. No.	Document
/01/	Monitoring report (draft)
/02/	Monitoring Report (final)
/03/	ER spread sheet corresponding to /01/
/04/	ER spread sheet corresponding to /02/
/05/	CPA Monitoring Records pertaining to: 1. Efficiency of the system being deployed as part of the project activity 2. Total number of stoves installed 3. Stove Operation Fraction – used to determine the share of distributed stoves that are still operating, measured ex-post through sampling 4. The fraction of end users that are still using baseline (replaced) stoves.The amount of woody biomass consumption that is consumed through the continued use of old stoves
/06/	CPA distribution records including evidence for the dates of distribution and first distribution of stove in each of the CPAs
/07/	Evidence for the stove specifications for stove type distributed under the CPAs including the efficiency in the monitoring period
/08/	Proof of Carbon Credits waiver by end users
/09/	Sample copies sales receipt / user agreement
/10/	1. Water boiling test records 2. Copy of the protocol for conducting WBT for the cook stoves
/11/	Records of the measuring equipment used for WBT
/12/	*CQC-Fuego Services Agreement - (executed 12 Jun 2017)*
/13/	VCS-PD version 3.0, dated on 20 July 2014.
/14/	Registered Clean Development Mechanism Small-Scale Programme Of Activities Design Document (CDM-SSC-PoA-DD), version 15, dated on 23 November 2012.
/15/	Clean development mechanism small-scale program activity design document (CDM-SSCCPA-DD), version 15, dated on 23 November 2012.
/16/	CDM methodology AMS II.G., version 03 “Energy Efficiency Measures in Thermal Applications of Non-Renewable Biomass”

/17/	Websites referred: a) http://www.v-c-s.org/project/vcs-program/ b) https://cdm.unfccc.int c) http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/
/18/	Documentation (Monitoring report, ER spread sheet and Verification report) of previous verification
/19/	• VCS Standard , version 03.7 • VCS Program Guide version 03.7 • VCS Validation and Verification Manual, version 03.2 • *Registration_and_Issuance_Process_v3.8*
/20/	VCS Program Definitions version 03.7
/21/	VCS MR Template
/22/	1. Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, version 07.0 2. Guidelines for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities, version 04.0

APPENDIX 2: ABBREVIATION

BAU	Business As Usual
CA	Corrective Action / Clarification Action
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CCIPL	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CL	Clarification Request
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
CO_{2e}	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
DOE	Designated Operational Entities
DVR	Draft Validation Report
EB	CDM Executive Board
EF	Emission Factor
FA	Final Approval
FAR	Forward Action Request
FVR	Final validation Report
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
GWh	Giga Watt Hour
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MWh	Mega Watt Hour
OSV	On Site Visit
QC/QA	Quality control/Quality assurance
TA	Technical Area
TR	Technical Review
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard
VVB	Validation / Verification Body

APPENDIX 3: COMPETENCY CERTIFCATES

Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.

Vikash Kumar Singh

has been qualified as per CCIPL's internal qualification procedures, in accordance with requirements of Accreditation Standard (version 06.0):

For following functions:

Validator	☒	**Team Leader**	☒	**Technical reviewer**	☒
Verifier	☒	**Technical Expert**	☒	**Local Expert**[1]	☒

In the following Technical Areas:

TA 1.1	☐	**TA 3.1**	☒	**TA 5.2**	☐	**TA 9.2**	☐	**TA 13.2**	☒
TA 1.2	☒	**TA 4.1**	☒	**TA 8.1**	☐	**TA 10.1**	☐	**TA 14.1**	☐
TA 2.1	☐	**TA 5.1**	☐	**TA 9.1**	☐	**TA 13.1**	☒		

Mr. Amit Anand
CEO

Date of Approval	**Valid Till**
24/12/2017	23/12/2018

Revision History of the Document

26/12/2014	Initial Adoption
24/12/2015	Annual Revision
20/01/2016	Interim Revision for office address change
23/12/2017	Annual Revision
24/12/2017	Annual Revision

[1]India, South Africa

CARBON CHECK (INDIA) PRIVATE LIMITED
Registered in India: U74930DL2012PTC232495
Regd. Off: 2071/38, 2nd Floor, Naiwala, Karol Bagh, New Delhi - 110005
Corporate off: G 49 & 50, 3rd Floor, Sector – 3, NOIDA (Uttar Pradesh) – 201301
Tel: +91 120 4373114| URL: www.carboncheck.co.in
e-mail: info@carboncheck.co.in

Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.

Amit Anand

has been qualified as per CCIPL's internal qualification procedures, in accordance with requirements of Accreditation Standard (version 06.0):

For following functions:

Validator	☒	**Team Leader**	☒	**Technical reviewer**	☒
Verifier	☒	**Technical Expert**	☒	**Local Expert**[1]	☒

In the following Technical Areas:

TA 1.1	☐	**TA 3.1**	☒	**TA 5.2**	☐	**TA 9.2**	☐	**TA 13.2**	☐
TA 1.2	☒	**TA 4.1**	☐	**TA 8.1**	☒	**TA 10.1**	☐	**TA 14.1**	☒
TA 2.1	☐	**TA 5.1**	☐	**TA 9.1**	☐	**TA 13.1**	☒		

Vikash

Mr. Vikash Kumar Singh
Compliance Officer

Date of Approval
24/12/2017

Valid Till
23/12/2018

Revision History of the Document

26/12/2014	Initial Adoption
24/12/2015	Annual Revision
20/01/2016	Interim Revision for office address change
23/12/2016	Annual Revision
24/12/2017	Annual Revision

[1]India, South Africa

CARBON CHECK (INDIA) PRIVATE LIMITED
Registered in India: U74930DL2012PTC232495
Regd. Off: 2071/38, 2nd Floor, Naiwala, Karol Bagh, New Delhi - 110005
Corporate off: G 49 & 50, 3rd Floor, Sector – 3, NOIDA (Uttar Pradesh) – 201301
Tel: +91 120 4373114| URL: www.carboncheck.co.in
e-mail: info@carboncheck.co.in