



VERIFICATION REPORT FOR FUEL EFFICIENT COOKING IN SOUTH AFRICA



Report ID	VCS VerR 2505 01082023-31012024
Project title	Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa
Project ID	2505
Verification period	01-Aug-2023 to 31-Jan-2024
Original date of issue	17-May-2024
Most recent date of issue	17-May-2024
Version	1
VCS Standard Version	VCS Standard Version 4.7 ¹

¹ <https://verra.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/VCS-Standard-v4.7-FINAL-4.15.24.pdf>

Client	TASC SA (PTY) LTD.
Prepared by	SustainCERT S.A.
Approved by	Shivraj Sharma Director, Validation and Verification Services
Work carried out by	Team Leader: Indrapal Parmar Technical Area Expert: Indrapal Parmar Local Expert: Alistair Galloway Auditor: Joan Adera Independent Reviewer: Shivraj Sharma

Summary:

A description of the verification of the project

The Verification of the project titled Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa VCS ID – 2505, have been undertaken by SustainCERT, with accordance to the relevant VCS standard, V4.7^{1/}, VCS Program Guide, V4.4^{2/}. Relevant requirements of the ISO 14064-2 and ISO 14064-3, as well as applicable criteria for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting has been applied for verification.

The project 2505 involves dissemination of cookstoves in South Africa under three project instances (PI-KC, PIOVH and PI-WB). The cookstove distributed is Rocket Works Zama Zama rocket stove which by rocket stove design principles reduces the use of biomass fuel through improved combustion efficiency of wood fuel.

The Purpose and scope of verification

Purpose:

Verification service provided by SustainCERT for the project activity 2505 is to perform independent periodic verification for the monitoring period 01/08/2023 to 31/01/2024. The verification of the project is an independent review and ex-post determination by SustainCERT of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions that have occurred, against the VCS standard, V4.7, VCS Program Guide, V4.4, the Project baseline and host party criteria.

Scope of verification

The scope of verification is to establish/verify that:

- The project activity has been implemented and operated as per the approved registered PD.
- All the physical features (technology, project equipment and monitoring and metering equipment) of the project are in place in accordance with registered PD.
- The monitoring report and other supporting documents provided are complete in accordance with the latest applicable version of VCS standard.
- The actual monitoring systems and procedures comply with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan, any registered monitoring plan, the approved methodology including applicable tool(s) and/or, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline.
- The data recorded and stored as per the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the standardized baseline

The Monitoring Period:

The project activity 2505 is undergoing 4th verification from 01/08/2023 to 31/01/2024 (both days included), under its fixed crediting period (10 years) from 20/08/2021 to 19/08/2031.

The Method and Criteria used for Verification.

Desk Review:

- Review of project information, monitoring plan specifically monitoring frequency, the metering equipment calibration requirement, quality assurance and quality control system against the registered PD^{/5/} and applicable VCS standard and applied methodology VCS Methodology from Sectoral Scope 3 –VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1.
Onsite audit Interview with the relevant personnel to confirm the implementation of the project with paying particular attention to the operational and data collection procedures, in accordance with the registered PD, Version 9.0 and methodology.
- A detailed cross check of the information provided in the monitoring report against the relevant evidence such as data sources, technical specification of measuring equipment.
- A detailed cross check of the calculations made for the estimation of greenhouse gas emissions.
- An evaluation of data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emissions reduction.

The number of findings raised during verification:

A risk-based approach has been followed for the verification of the project. During verification, 07 CARs, 13 CL and 02 FAR were raised during verification.

All the issues raised were resolved successfully, details for which can be found in appendix 4 of the report.

Any uncertainties associated with the verification:

The assessment team thoroughly review on monitoring report and the emission reduction calculation sheet against the relevant evidence and applicable VCS requirements, VCS standard V4.7^{/4/} and VCS guideline V4.4. It has been concluded that there are no more uncertainties associated with the project.

Summary of the verification conclusion:

The review of monitoring report^{/8/}, emission reduction calculation sheet along with relevant supporting evidence and the interview with relevant personnel during on site audit have provided the assessment team with sufficient evidence to confirm to the applicable criteria. The SustainCERT confirms the project activity 2505 have been successfully implemented in accordance with the registered PD, V9.0^{/5/} and applied methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves V1.1 meeting all the relevant VCS requirements. SustainCERT confirms that the monitoring period 01/08/2023 to 31/01/2024 (including both the days) in its implementation is calculated to generate 1,524,641 tCO_{2e} of emission reductions from reducing the amount of wood fuel combustion.

The management of TASC SA (PTY) LTD (=Project Proponent) is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emission reductions on the basis set out within the project's Monitoring Plan indicated in the registered Project Design and the applied methodology.

CONTENTS

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	9
2.3	Interviews	9
2.4	Site Visits	15
2.5	Resolution of Findings	16
2.6	Eligibility for Validation Activities	17
3	VALIDATION FINDINGS	17
3.1	Methodology Deviations.....	17
3.2	Project Description Deviations.....	17
3.3	New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects.....	18
3.4	Baseline Reassessment	24
4	VERIFICATION FINDINGS.....	24
4.1	Project Details	24
4.2	Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement	27
4.3	Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations.....	36
4.4	Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals.....	64
4.5	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis.....	65
4.6	Verification Summary	65
4.7	Verification Conclusion	66
4.8	Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison	67
	APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION	68
	APPENDIX 2: TABLE OF REFERENCE.....	69
	APPENDIX 3: ABBREVIATIONS.....	72

APPENDIX 4: PROJECT FINDINGS.....	73
--	-----------

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The Verification of the project titled “Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa” VCS ID – 2505, have been undertaken by SustainCERT, as requested by TASC project proponent for the monitoring period 01/08/2023 to 31/01/2024 (including both the days). The verification of project activity is the 4th periodic verification for the crediting period 20/08/-2021 to 19/08/-2031. The purpose of the verification is to conduct the independent review of the project information and confirm:

- The project activity is implemented in accordance with registered project description document, V9.0^{/5/}.
- All physical features (technology, project equipment and metering equipment) are in place.
- The actual monitoring systems and procedures comply with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan, the approved methodology including applicable tool(s) and/or, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline.
- The data collection procedures and records are as per the monitoring methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves V1.1^{/8/}

The verification followed the requirements mentioned in the VCS standard, version 4.7^{/1/} and VCS guidelines, V4.4^{/2/} ensuring the quality and consistency of the report.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of verification for this project activity involves assessing the claims made by the project proponent in the monitoring report^{/8/}, emission reduction calculation sheet^{/9/} and other supporting evidence (as mentioned in appendix 2) made available to the verifier for this monitoring period from 01/08/2023 to 31/01/2024, in accordance to:

- VCS standard, V4.7^{/1/}
- VCS program guideline, V4.4^{/2/}
- VCS Methodology from Sectoral Scope 3 –VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1^{/7/}
- Other relevant rules and requirements, including host part requirements.

A risk-based approach has been followed for the verification of the project activity. Identifying and assessing the high-risk area and ensuring the reliability of the project's emission reductions generated.

The principles of accuracy, completeness, relevance, reliability and credibility were combined with a conservative approach to establish a traceable and transparent verification opinion. The verification considers both quantitative and qualitative information on emission reductions. The verification is not meant to provide any consultancy towards the client. However, stated requests for clarifications, corrective and/or forward actions may provide input for improvement of the monitoring activities.

1.3 Level of Assurance

The verification of the project activity is conducted by doing a thorough assessment of Monitoring report^{/8/}, Registered PD^{/5/}, emission reduction calculation sheet^{/9/} and all the relevant documents mentioned Kitchen Performance Test, and Distribution Database' (as mentioned in appendix 2) of the report.

The level of assurance achieved for the project verification falls under a reasonable level of assurance. A reasonable level of assurance is high level of assurance regarding material misstatement, but not an absolute one.

Sufficient amount of evidence was gathered by the assessment team to reduce the risk associated with audit process. This means that there is some uncertainty arising from the use of sampling since it is possible that a material misstatement is missed.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

This is the fourth monitoring report for the "Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa" (VCS ID 2505), Grouped Project ("GP") by TASC, which is aimed at distributing fuel-efficient improved cookstoves (ICS) to local communities in South Africa.

The ICS disseminated under this GP is based on rocket stove design principles, which reduce GHG emissions from biomass burning through improved combustion efficiency of wood fuel and decreased wood fuel consumption.

Three Project Instances ("PIs") were implemented within the GP boundary during the monitoring period, namely Project Instance 1 – Kruger 2 Canyons (K2C), Project Instance 2 – Waterberg (WB), and Project Instance 3 – Vhembe (VH).

Across the three instances, 118,792 RocketWorks Zama Zama rocket stoves were distributed in this monitoring period. Since the project start date, a total of 737,490 units have been distributed.

An onsite audit for the project activity was conducted from 18//03/2024 to 22/03/2024. Interviews of the PP representatives were conducted through Video call to ensure the implementation of the project activity. Furthermore, it was confirmed that the project involves supply of dissemination of improved cookstoves for period 01/08/2023 to 31/01/2024, leading to 1,524,641 tCO₂e emission reductions.

The start date of the project activity is 20/08/2021 for PAI K2C, 23/09/2021 for PAI-WB and 27/03/2023 for PAI-VH, verified from the remote call and by cross verifying against previous monitoring period reports and verification reports. The crediting period for the project activity is 20/08/2021 to 19/08/2031, as verified using PD^{/5/}, validation report^{/6/} and remote audit^{/10/}.

Based on this, the assessment team confirms that the project activity 2505 Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa is implemented and operational in accordance with applied methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1^{/7/}, Project Description Document^{/5/}, VCS standard^{/1/} and VCS guidelines^{/2/}. It has also been assessed and verified that emission reduction calculation for this monitoring period from 01/08/2023 to 31/01/2024 has been done conservatively and found to be appropriate.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

The Registered Project activity has been undergoing 4th Verification under its fixed crediting period (10 years), the approach adapted to ensure the quality and credibility of emission reduction is described in the following sections.

2.1 Method and Criteria

The method and criteria used for verification consist of following phases.
A risk-based approach has been applied for the process.

Desk review:

- A document review of the monitoring report^{/8/}, emission reduction calculation sheet and other evidence like monitoring survey data^{/14/}, signed user agreements^{/16/}, project distribution database^{/13/} (as mentioned in Appendix 2 of the report) were strategically reviewed and risk assessment was undertaken.
- Project activity sources contributing to the leakage as well as project emissions are assessed.

- the frequency of measurements, quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, QA/QC procedures and other relevant documents are verified.

An onsite audit for the project was conducted from 18/03/2024 to 22/03/2024. Further details regarding the process have been mentioned in section 2.3 and 2.4 of the report.

- Interview of the project representatives were conducted to discuss the implementation and operational status of the project with respect to the registered monitoring plan^{5/}.
- Discussion of QA/QC procedure, data collection, storage and transfer, Equipment maintenance, calibration and meter testing was done.
- Interview and visual observation on the condition of the project technology stove, baseline stoves, perceived opinion on SDG claim's of the projects, grievances if any

Resolution of all the issues and findings raised, and the final verification statement was issued.

2.2 Document Review

As part of verification of the project, the primary activity performed was the strategic review and risk assessment of the documents submitted using a dedicated protocol. A detailed review of MR^{8/} and ER sheet was done to check:

- The completeness of the information with reference to the register PD^{5/}.
- Review of project information, monitoring plan specifically monitoring frequency, the metering equipment calibration requirement, quality assurance and quality control system against the registered PD V9.0 and applicable VCS standard and applied methodology version 1.1.
- A review of the QA/QC procedures were conducted to make sure the implementation is as per the register PD^{5/}.

All the other evidence reviewed is mentioned in Appendix 2 of this report. The cross checks between information provided in the Monitoring report^{08/}, VCS PD^{05/} and information from sources other than those used, if available, the team's sectoral or local expertise and, if necessary, independent background investigations.

2.3 Interviews

An on-site inspection^{10/} & remote call ^{29/} was performed by the assessment team.

Table 1: Project technology users interviewed

Stove barcode	End-User name	Type of correspondent	Cluster/village	Date of Audit
K2C				
038120	Mathlasane Malatji	Household	K2C_North_East/ Selwane	19/03/2024

160626	Tsakani Makwakwa	Household	K2C North East/ Bambeni	19/03/2024
164513	Dondisa Mwaba	Household	K2C_South_East/ Lillydale	18/03/2024
165258	Ziyandile Mnisi	Household	K2C_South_East/ Lillydale	18/03/2024
194886	Polite Ngobeni	Household	K2C_South_East/ Cork	18/03/2024
316682	Pfunani Maluleke	Household	K2C_North_East/ Ndhengeza	19/03/2024
348986	Crine Shabalala (sister- Ntsako Shabalala)	Household	K2C_South_East/ New_Forest	18/03/2024
360155	Mayadima Marobela	Household	K2C_North_East/ Sikhunyani	19/03/2024
WB				
069820	Jemina Senoamadi	Household	Zone 1.4.1/Ga Mabuela	21/03/2024
156600	Lovedelia Maphologela	Household	Zone 1.4.1/ Mosesetjane	21/03/2024
254440	Tsakane Macheke	Household	Zone_1.6/Ga- Mokaba	21/03/2024
280561	Amos Pila	Household	Zone_1.4.1/Ga-Pila	21/03/2024
350738	Mmatji Mola	Household	Zone_2.4/ Vlackfontein	21/03/2024
365296	Mary Mabokela	Household	Zone_2.4/ Vlackfontein	21/03/2024
571265	Corstance Sehume	Household	Zone_3.1/Mailula	22/03/2024
586851	David Mogashoa	Household	Zone_3.1/ Segoreng	22/03/2024
670848	Rachel Maenetja	Household	Zone_3.1/ Turfloop	22/03/2024
VH				
597456	Eunice Masilani	Household	Vhembe/Misevhe	20/03/2024
611483	Ntshavheni Nemathithi (Daughter-Awelani Nemathithi)	Household	Vhembe/ Tshiphuseni	20/03/2024
619071	Amukelani Bila (Sister-Tintswab Mdlovu)	Household	Vhembe/Altein	19/03/2024
619074	Fatima Maluleke	Household	Vhembe/ Jimmy_Jones	19/03/2024
649577	Pfunani Vhangani (Grandmother-Sarah Mulamavhu)	Household	Vhembe/ Tshitungulwani	20/03/2024
653955	Thomas Makamu (Baioyi Bongani-wife)	Household	Vhembe/ Phaphazela	19/03/2024
655090	Tintswalo Mabunda	Household	Vhembe/ Makumela	19/03/2024
670934	Patrick Mudavu	Household	Vhembe/ Xitlhelani	19/03/2024

Tables 1, 2 & 3 provide a comprehensive overview of the onsite interview process conducted during the verification. These tables outline the personnel involved in the interviews, along with their respective roles. The interviews specifically targeted individuals responsible for monitoring the project activity, data collection and management, as well as those involved in the quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) procedures. The tables serve to identify the individuals interviewed and provide relevant information regarding their roles within the project.

The key personnel interviewed during the opening meeting and closing meeting session of the onsite audit, and the main topics of the interviews are summarized in the table below:

Site visit was emphasized on project technology user with visit to each household for visual observation as well as verbal confirmation on parameter of:

- Project technology usage
- Project technology model and overall condition (repairs/maintenance)
- Project unique identification barcode
- Baseline stove and baseline fuel
- Confirmation on signing end user agreements
- Perception on smoke level of project technology vs baseline stove

During the site visit, verifier team has interviewed with PP's representative and implementation partners employed monitoring teams. Interviews were conducted as part of the verification process for data collection and storage for data sets of distribution database/¹³/and monitoring survey/¹⁴. The list of interviewed personals are as followed:

Table 2: Project implementation field team interviewed from 18/03/2024 to 22/03/2024

S.No	Name of the person Interviewed	Affiliation	Details Discussed	Audit Team
1	Hemel Molilala	Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region Non-Profit Company (K2C BR NPC)	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
2	Sauuy Sithole	Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region Non-Profit Company (K2C BR NPC)	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)

3	Hope Morema	Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region Non-Profit Company (K2C BR NPC)	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
4	Okya Sibasui	Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region Non-Profit Company (K2C BR NPC)	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
5	Vulani Mabundu	Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region Non-Profit Company (K2C BR NPC)	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
6	Khanyisa Mdlui	Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region Non-Profit Company (K2C BR NPC)	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
7	Mashele Charity	Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region Non-Profit Company (K2C BR NPC)	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
8	Ranensfa Rythis Enerst	Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region Non-Profit Company (K2C BR NPC)	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)

9	Mashele Charity	Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region Non-Profit Company (K2C BR NPC)	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
10	Ranensfa Rythis Enerst	Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region Non-Profit Company (K2C BR NPC)	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
11	Leon Reyworss	Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region Non-Profit Company (K2C BR NPC)	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
12	Mpho Lavhengwa	Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region Non-Profit Company (K2C BR NPC)	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
13	Issac Kekana	Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
14	Mpho Madiba	Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)

15	Khutjo Madida	Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
16	Emily Molchondo	Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
17	Charvmaine Motswene	Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
18	Kleinbooi Kale	Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
19	Owen Kgobola	Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
20	Beevaon Longhwesi	Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
21	Edwin Cogho	Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)

The list of PP representatives interviewed by the VVB team during the remote call is as followed/^{29/}:

Table 3: List of PP representative

S.No	Name of the person interviewed	Affiliation	Details Discussed	Audit Team
1	Edwin Cogho	TASC SA (PTY) LTD.	Project implementation and operation, Project design, monitoring procedure, data and information flow, compliance of monitoring plan with monitoring methodology and approved VCS-PD, Roles and responsibility, Qualification and Training, VCU calculation and completeness of monitoring report, Electronic Monitoring system, Data collection and data flow, Monitoring surveys, Sample size	Indrapal Parmar (Team Leader; technical expert); Joan Adera (Auditor); Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)
2	Nick Marshall	TASC SA (PTY) LTD.	Project implementation and operation, Project design	Indrapal Parmar (Team Leader; technical expert); Joan Adera (Auditor); Alistair Galloway (Country Expert)

2.4 Site Visits

The VVB carried out an on-site visit from 18/03/-2024 to 22/03/2024 and physically inspected the project technical design and implementation as specified in the VCS PD^{/5/} & MR^{/8/}.

The site visit was conducted to verify the accuracy and completeness of the project implementation. The views obtained during site observation were considered while concluding the verification opinion.

The sampling plan adopted by the VVB for carrying out the verification assessment is as follows.

The Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities (Version 9.0)^{/31/} states under paragraph 28 that “When the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have applied a sampling approach, the VVB may apply acceptance sampling as described in the steps indicated in paragraphs 29–38 below as part of validation/verification activities”.

The verification team selected random sample of PP’s baseline survey records (parameter-B_{old}) to check the acceptability (or otherwise) of the data for each such record with PP’s sample records and determined if the PP’s sample records meet the requirements.

Sample Size:

AQL	UQL	Producer Risk	Consumer Risk	Sample Size; Min	Acceptance No.
1%	15%	10%	10%	25	1

The verification team covered a total of 25 samples (8 from K2C, 9 from WB and 8 from VH) to confirm monitoring survey results. All the households interviewed were found to have inefficient three stone stove using firewood and confirmed that the project stove was operational. The verification team would like to conclude that based on acceptance sampling approach the project participant's sample record meets the requirement. However, minor discrepancies between the data presented in monitoring survey presented by PP and data collected from samples visited by verification team is raised as CL#10. After satisfactory closure of the clarification request verification team confirms that the PP's submitted sampling records and analysis results has been accepted to be in-line with the paragraph 33 of the CDM sampling and survey standard ver.9.0.

The list of interviewed users, project implementer and PP's representative that were part of site visit process is detailed in section 2.3 of the report.

2.5 Resolution of Findings

As discussed above, a risk-based approach has been applied for the verification of the project activity. During the verification, assessment team identified the issues which could impact the accuracy and the credibility of the emission reduction claimed by the project. The details analysis of the issues raised the approach used to resolve these issues can be found in Appendix 4 of this report.

The Corrective Action Request (CAR) was raised if:

- Modifications to the implementation, operation, and monitoring of the registered project activity have not been sufficiently documented by the project participants.
- Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data, or calculations of emission reductions that will impact the number of emission reductions.

The Clarification Request (CL) was raised if:

- information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable requirements have been met.

The Forward Action Request (FAR) was raised if:

- if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.

During verification a total of 7 CARs, 13 CLs and 2 FARs were raised. The details of all the issues communicated to the PD can be found in the Appendix 4. The issues raised were closed successfully.

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

The project activity is undergoing 4th Verification, monitoring period from 01/08/2023 to 31/01/2024. There are 2 FARs that have been raised during the current verification period and also there are no FARs from previous verification period.

FAR#1

FAR is raised for internal quality control to be carried out with parameter in concern i.e., moisture content of wood fuel as part of KPT to ensure that only the accurate data obtained for weight of wet wood consumption is used for calculation of the parameter uy. Internal data management shall be applied to those data sets that is sighted to be out of the equipment's capability as well as to perform cross check during data transfer process from Survey CTO to excel summary that is used for ER calculation and reporting.

FAR#2

FAR is raised taking into account effective date of the requirement as per 1 January 2025 in which employment rights in specific for salary for those personals employed under implementation Partner is ensured against applicable regulatory requirement as this comes under the scope of responsibility of Project Proponent.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

There is no validation activity undertaken as a part of current verification.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

NA, no such activity performed.

3.1 Methodology Deviations

There is no methodology deviation identified during the current monitoring period.

3.2 Project Description Deviations

No project description deviations have been applied to the grouped project activity during the reported monitoring period.

Previous Project Description Deviation:

Other entities involved in the grouped project activity were not listed in the section 1.6 of the PD/09/. The other entities involved in the grouped project activity were listed during the monitoring period 1. The deviation has also been listed in the section 3.2.2 of the MR/08/.

3.3 New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects

There are no new project activity instances added to the project activity.

With new distributed units disseminated in each PAI, the assessment of eligibility of the new units are as followed as per set criteria in the Project Description^{/5/}:

Eligibility criteria description in the PD	Means of proof (Information/document) required as listed in the Project Description	Assessment by the validation team
1.Project Instances (PIs) must meet the applicability conditions set out in the applied methodology.	Each new PI must demonstrate compliance with the applicability conditions set out in the employed methodology: VMR0006 ^{/7/} .	PP has provided assessment for newly distributed units in the monitoring period for its eligibility against methodology requirements in section 3.3.1 of the Monitoring Report. Details of assessment of eligibility against methodology ^{/7/} requirements is summarized in the table below.
2. Use the technologies or measures specified in the project description.	Only ICS that conform with the GP description are to be distributed in the project. The ICS will be chosen to deliver a level of service at least equivalent to the baseline appliance.	The technology stove as details in Project Description ^{/9/} is Rocket Works Zama Zama rocket stove, which is verified to the same technology model from first monitoring period. In the monitoring report, same stove technology model is verified as sighted in section 1.1 of the Monitoring Report. Site visit (18-22-Mar-2024) includes visual observation on the model stove that is distributed. Verification includes cross check against monitoring report for MP1, MP2 and MP3 as well as Rocket Works website for project specification ^{/28/} .

3. Apply the technologies or measures in the same manner as specified in the project description.	The ICS distributed in the PIs will adhere to the GP description and replace biomass burned in the baseline scenario.	The technology stove as details in Project Description ^{/9/} is Rocket Works Zama Zama rocket stove, which is verified to the same technology model throughout project implementation period. The same model is verified through visual observation during site visit ^{/10/} . Information on baseline stove appliance and baseline fuel of project technology user is collected at the point of distribution and during the project monitoring. This is verified during desk review with revision carried out throughout the process of verification with final database ^{/13/} verified.
4. Are subject to the baseline scenario determined in the project description for the specified project activity and geographic area.	All new PIs will be implemented only in regions within the geographic borders of South Africa subject to the same baseline scenario determined in Section 3.4 in this Project Description.	Geo-coordinates of each project user is collected and presented in project database ^{/13/} which is verified within project boundary claimed in Project Description section 1.12 which is within the geographic boundary of South Africa. KML files for each PAI are provided and verified through GoogleEarth with sampled project technology user's geo-coordinates. The information is verified through site visit of sampled households. All of the verification process above concludes that the stove units within the PAI is verified within the specified area set in project description.

5. Have characteristics with respect to additionality that are consistent with the initial instances for the specified project activity and geographic area.	All new PIs will use the activity method for demonstration of additionality and of: Step 1: Regulatory Surplus There is no government mandated programme or policy in host country of this project ensuring the distribution of new project activity instances. Step 2: Positive List The inclusion of new project activity instances will comply with the positive list as it satisfies criterion 1 where it meets all the applicability conditions of the methodology. 1. Where the project activity installs or distributes stoves at zero cost to the end-user and has no other source of revenue other than the sale of GHG credits, the project activity shall be deemed additional. 2. Project activities that are implemented as part of government schemes or are supported by multilateral funds cannot be considered additional even if the stoves are distributed free of cost or at a highly subsidized rate and hence are not eligible to use this methodology. PIs under the GP will not result in the diversion of official development assistance.	1. There is no government mandated programme or policy in South Africa ensuring the distribution of new project activity instances or fuel efficient cookstoves. Three PAIs comply with the positive list in the methodology and satisfies criterion 1 as it meets all the applicability conditions of the methodology. The End User Agreement includes statement that the PI “installs or distributes stoves at zero cost to the end-user/^{16/} and has no other source of revenue other than the sale of GHG credits”. The same is verified through interviews with users during the site visit/^{10/}. 2. The PIs are not implemented as part of a government scheme nor are they supported by multilateral funds which was verified through monitoring report MP3/^{11/}. The CME confirms that all three PAIs will not result in the diversion of official development assistance.
6. Where a capacity limit applies to a project activity included in the project, no project instance shall exceed such limit. Further, no single cluster of project activity instances shall exceed the capacity limit, determined as follows: Each project activity instance that exceeds one percent of the capacity limit shall be identified.	The VMR0006 methodology does not contain a capacity limit.	VMR0006 methodology is verified to have no restriction on capacity limit.

• Such instances shall be divided into clusters, whereby each cluster is comprised of any system of instances such that each instance is within one kilometer of at least one other instance in the cluster. Instances that are not within one kilometer of any other instance shall not be assigned to clusters. • None of the clusters shall exceed the capacity limit and no further project activity instances shall be added to the project that would cause any of the clusters to exceed the capacity limit.		
7. Occur within one of the designated geographic areas specified in the project description.	a) New project activity instances will be located within the geographic boundaries of South Africa and defined in the instance description document. b) GPS/location data captured from each end user will demonstrate the location of the project and of each PI.	Geo-coordinates of each project user are collected and presented in project database/^{13/} which is verified within project boundary claimed in Project Description section 1.12 which is within the geographic boundary of South Africa. KML files for each PAI are provided and verified through Google Earth with sampled project technology user's geo-coordinates. The information is verified through site visit of sampled households. All of the verification process above concludes that the stove units within the PAI is verified within the specified area set in project description.
8. Comply with at least one complete set of eligibility criteria for the inclusion of new project activity instances. Partial compliance with multiple sets of eligibility criteria is insufficient.	Compliance of new PIs will be evaluated exclusively against the eligibility criteria listed in this table.	Full set of eligibility criteria for the inclusion of new project activity instances is accessed and verified that new stoves are meeting all of the criteria as evident in this table.

9. Be included in the monitoring report with sufficient technical, financial, geographic, and other relevant information to demonstrate compliance with the applicable set of eligibility criteria and enable sampling by the validation/verification body.	New PIs will be described in the monitoring report with sufficient technical, financial, geographic, and other relevant information to demonstrate compliance with the applicable set of eligibility criteria and enable sampling by the validation/verification body. Monitoring data of PIs will be stored in the monitoring database, which will also allow for sampling by the validation/verification body. Evidence of relevant information such as local stakeholder engagements, baseline surveys⁵ and applicable provisions will be included when submitting for PI validation at verification.	Assessment from the provided evidence in form of: -Project database distribution/¹³/: verified for geographic location, baseline stove and baseline fuel type -Users agreements/¹⁶/: verified for the aspect of additionality, ownership of carbon credit transfer to TASC, eligibility against methodology requirements for aspect of type of establishment (household) -KML file for each PAI: verified for project location All of the process above includes verification done through interview and site visit/¹⁰/, concludes that the new stoves are meeting the criteria.
10. Be validated at the time of verification against the applicable set of eligibility criteria.	New PIs will be submitted for validation against the applicable set of eligibility criteria at the time of verification.	No new instances included in this monitoring period; only new stove units distributed in each PAI. Full assessment is performed against each eligibility criteria through information presented in monitoring report/⁸/, monitored parameters (KPT and habit survey/¹⁴/, distribution database/¹³/ in which data verification is carried out through document review, tracing data from raw/initial data source and cross checks through acceptance sampling process in site visit/¹⁰/.

11. Have evidence of project ownership, in respect of each project activity instance, held by the project proponent from the respective start date of each project activity instance (i.e., the date upon which the project activity instance began reducing or removing GHG emissions).	New PIs will demonstrate ownership by the project proponent, from the start date of the PI. Project ownership, as described in Section 1.7 of this document, is applicable to all PIs included in this GP.	Signed users' agreements/^{16/} were verified as part of the verification process with sighted statement includes acknowledgement that the project stove is distributed free of cost and TASC SA (Pty) Ltd will claim the CO2 emissions reductions from the stove. The same is verified verbally with project stover users during site visit/^{10/}. Information of date of stove distribution date for each user is recorded and verified in project database/^{13/} and traced back to project internal database system. From the verification processes above, TASC is concluded to have ownership for stoves that are listed in project database/^{13/} and used in the calculation of ER claimed in the monitoring report/^{8/}.
12. Have a start date that is the same as or later than the grouped project start date.	New PIs will have a start date that is the same as or later than the GP start date. Distribution of the efficient cookstoves in the respective PIs will begin at the start date of the GP, or later. Distribution data including distribution dates will be collected and stored on the distribution database. The sale of the first device marks the start date.	Start date for each PAI is provided in section 1.6 of the monitoring report/^{8/}. The dates are cross checked against PAI inclusion report ie K2C in MP1, WB in MP2 and VH in MP3. Review on project database distribution information is concluded that each PAI start date is reflected accurately. Start date for PAI-WB and PAI-VH is 03-Sept-2021 and 27-Mar-2023 which is later than grouped project start date i.e., K2C on 20-Aug-2021.

13. Be eligible for crediting from the start date of the instance through to the end of the project crediting period (only).	New PIs will be eligible for crediting from the start date of the instance through to the end of the project crediting period (only). New PIs will be eligible for crediting from the start date of the instance through to the end date of the project crediting period on 19 August 2031.	The current monitoring period is claimed for 01-Aug-2022 to 31-Jan-2024 for all three PAIs. This period is within the crediting period as verified against project description/ ^{5/} section 1.9 i.e., fixed 10 year from 20-Aug-2021 to 19-Aug-2031.
--	--	--

Overall, verification team confirms that the no new project activity instances included during the monitoring period and inclusion of new stoves distributed in the existing project instances PI1-K2C, PI2-WB and PI3-VH comply with the eligibility criteria of the methodology.

3.4 Baseline Reassessment

Did the project undergo baseline reassessment during the monitoring period?

☐ Yes ☒ No

The project activity has not undergone any baseline reassessment during the current monitoring period.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Details

The project “Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa” (VCS ID 2505) Grouped Project (“GP”) by TASC falls into sectoral scope 03 and is appropriately selected in the VCS PD & MR and is implemented in South Africa. The project category and type are correctly indicated in the VCS PD/^{5/} & MR/^{08/}. It has been indicated as well as accepted that it is a grouped project activity.

The project entity i.e., TASC SA (PTY) LTD is correctly listed in the VCS PD. Implementation partners Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region Non-Profit Company (K2C BR NPC) and Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd as reflected in section 1.5 of the monitoring report/^{8/} are added in previous monitoring period thus reflected as project implementation deviation in section 3.2.2 of the monitoring report/^{8/}.

The start date of the Grouped project activity is 20-Aug-2021, which is also the date of installation of first ICS under the grouped project. The start date of the Grouped project activity is identified in accordance VCS standard/^{1/}.

The crediting period of the Grouped project activity is from 20-Aug-2021 to 19-Aug-2031 and the estimated emission reductions from the Grouped project activity is 14,368,977 tCO₂eq from the entire crediting period and the annual emission reduction for the group project activity is expected to be 1,436,898 tCO₂eq.

The project crediting period is correctly filled in VCS PD/5/, which is fixed 10 years. The selected crediting period is consistent with the project start date and the first crediting period spans from 20-Aug-2021 to 19-Aug-2031 (both days included).

The project is correctly classified as large project as per VCS Standard ^{/1/} as the average annual emission reductions are more than 300,000 tCO₂e. The estimated annual average emission reductions are estimated as 1,436,898 tCO₂eq and the total emission reductions over the crediting period of 10 years are 14,368,977 tCO₂eq. The estimated emission reductions are consistent with the corresponding ER spreadsheet ^{/9/}.

Project design, including eligibility criteria for grouped projects:

The project activity involves distribution of improved cookstoves in households of South Africa. The project is a voluntary initiative as host country laws do not mandate the distribution of ICS to the local communities. The project proponent is TASC SA (PTY) LTD who is using carbon finance to support local partners engaged in different activities like production, distribution, and maintenance of various product technologies. This project includes technologies, designed to reduce GHG emission by supplying high efficiency ICS to end-users and promoting public health to tackle several health challenges caused due to using less efficient stoves. The description of the ICS models is given in PD^{/5/} & MR^{/8/} and was confirmed from manufacturer's specification (verified from previous monitoring period verification report^{/11/12/}).

The grouped project activity envisages distribution of one models of ICS i.e. Rocket Works Zama Zama which is verified during the site visit^{/10/}.

Eligibility assessment on the newly distributed unit of stoves in the monitoring period can be found in section 3.3 of the verification report.

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion:
Audit history	The project activity is undergoing 4th Verification under its fixed crediting period. The assessment team has verified that audit history using the Project webpage ^{/4/} , all the previous verification has been published under Verra. It has been concluded that the information present in section in 1.2 of MR is appropriate.
Double counting and participation under other GHG programs	The project activity is not registered under any other GHG and non-GHG program or registry. This has been confirmed by means of research on relevant applicable registries and available information in public domain and through declaration from the Project Owner.

	The assessment team has searched for similar projects having same nature, capacity and project proponent as well as legal owner. The name of the owners mentions in the regulatory licenses are also matched and checked. It was concluded that no such projects having same location and geo-coordinates, technology or project/legal owners are registered in various carbon schemes like CDM, GCC, and Gold Standard.
No double claiming with emissions trading programs or binding emission limits	The project activity has been thoroughly search on the various websites of various emission trading programs and or ETS programs running in various counties, using nature, capacity and project proponent as well as legal owner as the search option.
No double claiming with other forms of environmental credit	As discussed above the, the project has been thoroughly search in the currently active environment schemes and found that the project is not registered with any other environmental credits. PP has also submitted a declaration stating that the project is not registered with any other registry (see CL#3). Therefore, it can be concluded that the project is not claiming any credits from other programs/schemes.
Supply chain (scope 3) emissions double claiming	The grouped project activity which aims at distribution of ICS to households does not result in any Scope 3 emissions in its supply chain.
Sustainable development contributions	As claimed in section 1.12 of the monitoring report, the project is claiming positive impact for the following: -SDG 3 for the reduction of smoke resulting from the distribution and use of project technology stoves. This claim is verified from the proportion of users with positive perception of the project technology stove is performing better in respect of smoke generated which is collected from monitoring survey through representative sample pool. -SDG 3 impact calculated at Project instances level and calculated using weighted average to calculate number of households that are affected with project implementation which is verified to be 548,800 total households from total 737,490 improved stoves units distributed. The households are calculated based on the % of users with positive perception in each project instances. -SDG 7 impact is claimed by the number of households with access to clean to clean fuels and technology. In the monitoring period, additional 118,792 of improved cookstove units has been distributed which is in total of 737,490 units has been disseminated from the start date of the project. This is verified through verification from the record of distribution database as well as cross checked with site visit conducted to sampled household users. -SDG 12 impact is claimed through the reduction of wood fuel consumption in project households by an average of

	2.50 t/HH/year (Average of $B_{y,savings}$ across the three project instances). This is verified through data analysis of the project technology usage rate, measured wood fuel consumption in 5 days KPT which is verified with sampled households through site visit^{10/}. -SDG 13 impact is claimed through the emission reduction calculated by the project implementation which the detailed assessment can be found in section 5.3 of this report.
Additional information relevant to the project	No commercially sensitive information has been excluded by the PP.

4.2 Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement

4.2.1 Stakeholder Identification

As confirmed with Project Proponent, the make up of the stakeholders of the group project activities has not changed. The assessment is performed using project database distribution location as well assessment whether new project units distributed in the monitoring report are detected with material discrepancies compared to previous monitoring reports. No new project instances were added in this monitoring report.

Within the grouped project activities implementation in the monitoring report, no change is detected in terms of project location, type of technology, monitoring activities as well as changes detected in socio-economic condition within the project area.

The finding is consistent with the claim made by project proponent with the information reflected in section 2.1.1 of the monitoring report^{8/}.

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Stakeholder identification	N/A as stakeholder is identified to be the same as initial identification process as verified in project description document ^{5/} .
Legal or customary tenure/access rights	N/A
Stakeholder diversity and changes over time	N/A

Expected changes in well-being	N/A
Location of stakeholders	N/A
Location of resources	N/A

4.2.2 Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Ongoing consultation	PP's has recorded evidence of implementation for on-going consultation in section 2.1.2. During remote call ^{29/} , confirmation on the topic of the sessions collected are in form of community sensitization which are carried out for internal purposes such as to provide demonstration of on how the project stove is operated side by side with tradition stove to encourage higher usage rate providing live demonstration to community the benefit of using the stove in terms of cooking time, smoke generated. Records of these community sensitization sessions are captured and stored in SurveyCTO and presented in form of data summary in spreadsheet. During the remote call, PP has demonstrated traceability from the initial raw data source. From the topic covered in the sessions, there is no inputs/grievances that is recorded that is relevant to project implementation process. The same is concluded from the data collected from users and stakeholder interviewed during site visit ^{10/} .
Date(s) of stakeholder consultation	16-August-2023 (K2C) 17-August-2023 (K2C) 22-August-2023 (K2C) 22-August-2023 (K2C) 12-October-2023 (K2C) 19-October-2023 (K2C) 24-October-2023 (K2C) 25-October-2023 (K2C)

	01-August-2023 (WB) 24-August-2023 (WB) 25-August-2023 (WB) 22-August-2023 (VH) Dates of the sessions are traced and verified against the data summary presented derived from SurveyCTO.
Communication of monitored results	From the topic covered in the sessions, there is no inputs/grievances that is recorded that is relevant to project implementation process. The same is concluded from the data collected from users and stakeholder interviewed during site visit^{10/}.
Consultation records	From the topic covered in the sessions, there are no inputs/grievances that is recorded that is relevant to project implementation process. The same is concluded from the data collected from users and stakeholder interviewed during site visit^{10/}.
Stakeholder input	From the topic covered in the sessions, there are no inputs/grievances that is recorded that is relevant to project implementation process. The same is concluded from the data collected from users and stakeholder interviewed during site visit^{10/}.

4.2.3 Free, Prior, and Informed Consent

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Consent	From the communication channel established and communicated to project technology user through the provided contact details on the cookstove “How to guide” (sighted both in both English and local language) in which the means is sighted through phone number and email contact. The topic is also communicated during community sensitization sessions held in various events throughout the monitoring period. With this communication approach in place, inputs from stakeholders are able to be received, collected and follow up upon. Project proponent also communication can take place following normal tribal route where beneficiaries log the grievance with their tribal leader which then shall notify field team to log the grievances and follow up on it.

	From the information collected from site visit interviews with project technology users and project implementer partners' field team, no inputs/grievances that are identified that is evaluated to be material to project design and implementation. VCS standard/1/ para 3.18.8 is applicable in case the project is affecting property rights. The grouped project is an improved cookstove dissemination which is evaluated to have no risk on affecting any property right, Indigenous Peoples (IPs), local communities, nor customary rights
Outcome of FPIC discussion	N/A.

4.2.4 Grievance Redress Procedure

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Grievance received and steps taken to resolve the grievance including the outcomes of the resolution	The verification team conducted on-site assessments and interacted with local stakeholders, as detailed in section 2.3 of the report. Notably, no negative comments or feedback were received from the local stakeholders during these interactions, according to the verification team's records. It is crucial to emphasize that the responsibility for addressing grievances related to the grouped project activity is shared between the local implementation partners and the project proponent. Any grievances that arise during the operation of the grouped project activity will be conveyed to the project proponent for resolution. To facilitate ongoing communication with stakeholders, an established grievance mechanism is in place. The Project Proponent has documented its feedback and grievance redressal procedure in Section 2.1.2 of monitoring report^{8/} document. Based on interviews and observations, the assessment team evaluated that the grievance redressal procedure adequately addresses issues that may arise during project planning and implementation. Beneficiaries and stakeholders are provided with the project proponent's contact information and are encouraged to reach out with any problems, questions, or grievances.

Grievance redress procedure

From the communication channel established and communicated to project technology user through the provided contact details on the cookstove “How to guide” (sighted both in both English and local language) in which the means is sighted through phone number and email contact. The topic is also communicated during community sensitization sessions held in various events throughout the monitoring period. With this communication approach in place, inputs from stakeholders are able to be received, collected and follow up upon. Project proponent clarified that communication can take place following normal tribal route where beneficiaries log the grievance with their tribal leader which then shall notify field team to log the grievances and follow up on it.

From the information collected from site visit interviews with project technology users and project implementer partners’ field team, no inputs/grievances that are identified that is evaluated to be material to project design and implementation.

VCS standard/^{1/} para 3.18.8 is applicable in case the project is affecting property rights. The grouped project is an improved cookstove dissemination which is evaluated to have no risk on affecting any property right, Indigenous Peoples (IPs), local communities, nor customary rights

4.2.5 Public Comments

Through remote call/^{29/}, confirmation is obtained from Project Proponent that no public comment received for this grouped project. Through virtual demonstration, it is confirmed that no email communication are received from Verra in relation to this aspect till date. The same claim is confirmed in section 2.1.5 of the monitoring report/^{8/}.

Comments received	Actions taken by the project proponent	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
From the evidence gathered, no public comment has been received	N/A	N/A

4.2.6 Risks to Local Stakeholders and the Environment

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Risks to stakeholder participation	From the communication channel established and communicated to project technology user through the provided contact details on the cookstove “How to guide” (sighted both in both English and local language) in which the means is sighted through phone number and email contact. The topic is also communicated during community sensitization sessions held in various events throughout the monitoring period. With this communication approach in place, inputs from stakeholders are able to be received, collected and follow up upon. Project proponent also clarified that communication can take place following normal tribal route where beneficiaries log the grievance with their tribal leader which then shall notify field team to log the grievances and follow up on it. From the information collected from site visit interviews with project technology users and project implementer partners’ field team, no inputs/grievances that are identified that is evaluated to be material to project design and implementation
Working conditions	No risk identified. Individual employment agreements for project implementation team is verified (see CAR#3). TASC’s agreement with both implementation partners are verified for details. South Africa has Basic Conditions of Employment Act/ ^{26/} in place that cover employee’s right. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/ ^{10/} .
Safety of women and girls	No risk identified. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/ ^{10/} . The nature of the project is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which based on technology performance claimed from manufacturer and perceived stove performance from user from habit survey/ ^{14/} and cross checked through verifier’s site visit/ ^{10/} , the project implementation benefits women and girls through reduction of smoke during meal preparation and shorter cooking time.
Safety of minority and marginalized groups, including children	No risk identified, TASC and implementation partners have code of conduct and policy in place in relevant to hiring workers under legal age. No evidence is detected from the site visit and interaction between verifier team and monitoring field team.

Pollutants (air, noise, discharges to water, generation of waste, release of hazardous materials)	No risk identified. Project technology Rocketworks Zama Zama which is provided with manufacturer's technology specification which is verified through Rocket Rocket Works Website/ ^{28/} performer parameters as per manufacturer's specification is with PM2.5 emission rate of 0.52 g/hour and CO2 emission rate of 35 g/hour as their performance targets. The project technology utilize wood fuel and operate as cookstove which does not generate more waste than baseline stove. Based on perception of users as verified from habit survey, majority of the users claimed less smoke is generated from the project stove ie 73,27% for K2C, 81,70% for WB and 57,65% for VH.
---	---

4.2.7 Respect for Human Rights and Equity

4.2.7.1 Labor and Work

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Discrimination and sexual harassment	No risk identified. TASC's agreement with both implementation partners are verified for details. South Africa has Basic Conditions of Employment Act/ ^{26/} in place that cover employee's right. Both TASC and implementation partners have their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers both discrimination and sexual harassment issues. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/ ^{10/} .
Management experience	No risk identified. TASC's agreement with both implementation partners are verified for details. South Africa has Basic Conditions of Employment Act/ ^{26/} in place that cover employee's right. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/ ^{10/} .
Gender equity in labor and work	No risk identified. TASC's agreement with both implementation partners are verified for details. South Africa has Basic Conditions of Employment Act/ ^{26/} in place that cover employee's right. Both TASC and implementation partners have their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers both issues. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/ ^{10/} .
Human trafficking, forced labor, and child labor	No risk identified. TASC's agreement with both implementation partners are verified for details. South Africa has Basic Conditions of Employment Act/ ^{26/} in place that cover employee's right. Both TASC and implementation partners have their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers all of the issues in question. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/ ^{10/} .

4.2.7.2 Human Rights

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Human rights	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which present no risk to Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage. The employed worker's rights are assessed in section 4.2.7.1.

4.2.7.3 Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Preservation and protection of cultural heritage	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which present no risk to Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage

4.2.7.4 Property Rights

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Disputes over rights to territories and resources	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which present no risk to property rights. Through signed user agreements it is clearly communicated that the stove is distributed free of charge and in return the credit for claiming carbon emission reduction is with TASC.
Respect for property rights	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which present no risk to property rights.

4.2.7.5 Benefit Sharing

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
------	--

Summary of the benefit sharing plan	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which present no risk to property rights. Through signed user agreements it is clearly communicated that the stove is distributed free of charge and in return the credit for claiming carbon emission reduction is with TASC.
Benefit sharing during the monitoring period	N/A. The nature of the project implementation does not have benefit sharing arrangement through all parties involved.

4.2.8 Ecosystem Health

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove to replace the traditional baseline stove. The project implementation has no effect on biodiversity and ecosystem. Through use of improved cookstove, reduction in wood fuel consumption can serve a positive impact on surrounding ecosystem.
Soil degradation and soil erosion	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove to replace the traditional baseline stove. The project implementation has no effect on biodiversity and ecosystem. Through use of improved cookstove, wood fuel consumption reduction can serve a positive impact on surrounding ecosystem.
Water consumption and stress	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove to replace the traditional baseline stove. The use of project technology has no impact on water consumption since it is simply aimed to replace the use of baseline stove.
Usage of fertilizers	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which has no use of fertilizer in its daily implementation.

4.2.8.1 Rare, Threatened, and Endangered species

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
------	--

Species or habitat	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove to replace the traditional baseline stove which does not present risk for local species or habitat.
--------------------	--

4.2.8.2 Introduction of Species

N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove to replace the traditional baseline stove which does not involved introduction of species in its implementation.

Species introduced	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
N/A	

Existing invasive species	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
N/A	

4.2.8.3 Ecosystem conversion

Item	Evidence gathering activities and evidence checked
Ecosystem conversion	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove to replace the traditional baseline stove which does not present as risk to local ecosystem.

4.3 Accuracy of 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 VCS project activity is verified against the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS-PD^{5/} and the applied methodology^{7/}. CAR#4 and CL#6 were raised to address the issues as well as to obtain additional evidence and clarification.
- All parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied methodologies and relevant standards and requirements have 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/^{5/} and the applied methodology VMR0006 version 1.1/^{7/}, 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. Organizational Structure has been provided in the MR along with the roles and responsibilities throughout project implementation is raised as CL#11 as part of verification.

PP conducted sampling surveys to gather information needed for the monitoring of $N_{y,i,j}$ and μ_y parameters. Monitoring surveys were conducted across both PIs between October and December 2023. The minimum sample size of 100 households as per VMR0006 Section 8.4 Option (b) were selected to survey for the proportion parameter $n_{y,i,j}$ and μ_y .

Sampling captured information on monitoring variables with required confidence/precision (90/10 for individual PIs on an annual basis, or 95/10 confidence/precision basis for groups of PIs or sampling on a biennial basis). PP has applied 90/10 confidence/precision for sampling for each individual project instance. A simple random sampling was used.

Based on a population of distributed cookstove units for each project instance as 45 for K2C, 3 for WB and 37 for VH. The applied confidence interval and precision level is 90/10.

The sample size for the parameter μ_y is determined based on the section 8.4 Option (b) of the VMR0006 methodology/^{BO2/}, i.e. Project target population > 1000: Minimum sample size 100. PP has applied a sample size of 116 for K2C, 120 for WB and 111 for VH, as a means of oversampling for both parameters $N_{y,i,j}$ and μ_y . Request for additional evidence to evaluate PP's sampling approach is raised as CL#8.

Relative precision of data is calculated at 6.3% for K2C, 1.5% for WB and 9.7% for VH determined for the parameter $n_{y,i,j}$ (which is used to calculate parameter $N_{y,i,j}$ and is less than the precision level limit of 10 %).

For parameter μ_y , calculation of precision level is calculated as 5.2% for K2C, 4.0% for WB and 4.9% for VH which is used to remove outlier data for average wood fuel consumption for the sampled households. Both parameters are derived from survey with sample size accordance with the option (b) provided in the section 8.4 of the VMR0006 methodology/^{7/} which compliance with 90/10 confidence precision is not obligatory.

Data analysis on survey monitoring data presented in form of habit survey and KPT/^{14/} is performed in which inconsistency is sighted in 1 data set reported and counted as survey data from K2C but traced back to Waterberg. CAR#4 is raised as the result with points related to the survey execution are raised as well relating to the survey correspondence, timing of the execution, surveyor team competence as well as data interpretation post survey.

The Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities (Version 9.0)/^{31/} states under paragraph 28 that “When the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have applied a sampling approach, the VVB may apply acceptance sampling as described in the steps indicated in paragraphs 29–38 below as part of validation/verification activities based on an AQL of 1 % and UQL of 15 %, producer risk 10 % and consumer risk 10 % which sample size of 25 and acceptance number of 1 is determined. The sampled users are taken from each project instance, 8 users from K2C, 9 from WB and 8 from VH.

Details of the sampled users are detailed in section 2.3 of the verification report. Data collected from the site visit on the sampled survey/^{10/} verified against habit survey/^{14/} and project distribution database/^{13/}.

Parameter $n_{y,i,j}$ is verified to be 100% with 100% claimed with 3 stone fire baseline stove (with 2 users using electrical stove as additional baseline stove)

Parameter	Description of Parameter	Assessment approach
$n_{y,i,j}$ (used to calculate $N_{y,i,j}$)	Number of project devices of type i	-Visual inspection of the premises to see if the project stove is operational and in use. -Interview with end user to verify that project stove is still in use
μ_y	Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y	Interview with end user and visual inspection to determine if a pre-project (replaced) stove is still being used in addition to project stove

Discrepancies sighted between data collected from site visit carried out by verifier team against records presented by PP in project record (KPT & habit survey/^{14/} and project distribution database is raised as CL#10.

Verification team has cross verified these sample documents during the remote interviews.

Emission reduction (ER)

The methodology does not calculate baseline and project emissions separately. The steps taken and the equations and parameters applied in the VCS-PD/B04/ to calculate the project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions comply with the requirements of the selected methodology including applicable tool(s).

$$ER_y = \sum_i \sum_j ER_{y,i,j} - LE_y$$

Quantification of baseline emissions:

According to section 8.4 of methodology VMR0006, version 1.1/^{7/}, emission reductions shall be calculated as:

$$ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,savings,i,j} \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{wood\ fuel} \times (EF_{wf,CO2} + EF_{wf,non\ CO2}) \times N_{y,i,j} \times 0.95$$

Where;

i = Indices for the situation where more than one type of project device is introduced to replace the pre-project devices

j = Indices for the situation where there is more than one batch of project device

ER_y = Emission reductions during year y in tCO₂e

ER_{y,i,j} = Emission reductions by project device of type i and batch j during year y in tCO₂e

Since the grouped project activity involves the deployment of improved cookstove, the following equation 2 is applicable as per methodology VMR0006, version 1.1/^{7/}.

Calculation and approach used to leading to ER claim is cross checked with further clarification request is raised as CAR#5, CAR#6, CAR#7 and CL#5

Quantification of leakage emissions:

In accordance with the section 8.3 of the applied methodology, VMR0006, version 1.1/^{7/}, a default factor of 0.95 to account for leakage has been applied.

Verification team confirms that all relevant assumptions and data are listed in the project description, including their references and sources and that all data and parameter values used in the project description are considered reasonable in the context of the project and all estimates of the baseline emissions can be replicated using the data and parameter values provided in the project description. No uncertainties associated with the calculations of emissions have been observed by the verification team.

Quantification of project emissions:

Project emissions are not applicable to the grouped project activity as the applied methodology, VMR0006, version 1.1/^{7/}, provides a direct equation for the calculation of emission reductions and does not provide calculations of project emissions separately.

The grouped project employs methodology namely VMR0006/^{7/} v1.1. Following Project Description Document v.09/^{5/} section 5.1 and 5.2, the parameters determined ex-ante and monitored ex-post as per methodology requirements are as followed.

The data and parameters fixed (ex-ante):

S.No	Parameter	Value	Means of verification
1	Bold	5.49 ton/year for PI1-K2C 5.00 ton/year for PI2-WB 3.98 ton/year for PI3-VH	Verification against Project Description/ ^{5/} for K2C, Verified Monitoring Report MP2 for WB/ ^{12/} and MP3 for VH/ ^{11/} and their corresponding verification reports.

	Annual quantity of woody biomass that would have been used in the household in the absence of the project activity to generate useful thermal energy equivalent to that provided by the project devices.		
2	$f_{nrb,b,y}$ Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass.	0.89 for PI1-K2C 0.99 for PI2-WB 0.88 for PI3-VH	Verification against Project Description ^{/5/} for K2C, Verified Monitoring Report MP2 for WB ^{/12/} and MP3 for VH ^{/11/} and their corresponding verification reports.
3	EF_{WF,CO_2} CO ₂ emission factor of biomass that is substituted or reduced for wood	112 tCO ₂ e/TJ	Verification against methodology default value and IPCC Guidelines ^{/27/}
4	$EF_{WF,non-CO_2}$ Non-CO ₂ emission factor of biomass that is substituted or reduced for wood	26.23 tCO ₂ e/TJ	Verification against methodology default value and IPCC Guidelines ^{/27/}
5	η_p Efficiency of ICS at the start of project activity	38,3%	Verification against Project Description ^{/5/} for K2C, Verified Monitoring Report MP2 for WB ^{/12/} and MP3 for VH ^{/11/} and their corresponding verification reports. Site visit ^{/10/} observation on the project technology confirmed the stove model.

The data and parameters monitored (ex-post):

1. Parameter: $N_{y,i,j}$ (Number of project devices of type i and batch j operating during year y)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology/ ^{7/} requirement, the parameter is measured directly or based on a representative sample. Project Proponent carried out habit survey/ ^{14/} with questionnaire determining whether project technology is used (user vs non-user) for each project instances sample sets. Calculation is carried out for each project instance using respective total units distributed with usage rate % from habit survey. As per methodology/ ^{7/} requirement and PD/ ^{5/} , the monitoring frequency is at least once every two years. The parameter is calculated using usage rate obtained from monitoring survey carried out in Oct-Dec 2023 for MP4 and in May and July 2023 MP3 as verified against monitoring report/ ^{11/} . Frequency monitoring for this parameter is evident meeting the methodology requirement.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	As per methodology/ ^{7/} requirement and PD/ ^{5/} , the monitoring frequency is at least once every two years. The parameter is calculated using usage rate obtained from monitoring survey carried out in Oct-Dec 2023 for MP4 and in May and July 2023 MP3 as verified against monitoring report/ ^{11/} . Frequency monitoring for this parameter is evident meeting the

		methodology requirement. Sampling requirement for the survey to obtain the data parameter is assessed with presented data that Project Proponent sampling plan is adjusted to satisfy sample size to achieve 90/10 and section 8.4 of the methodology ^{7/} . Sampling approach adopted by Project proponent was further requested for evidence in form of CL#8 as well as seasonality factor in CAR#4 as part of assessment against Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programmes of Activities requirement ^{20/} .
	Monitoring equipment	N/A. The parameter is calculated using total stove distributed with usage rate.
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	N/A
	Calibration frequency /interval:	N/A, no equipment is used as the parameter is calculated using total stove distributed multiplied with usage rate derived from monitoring survey (survey habit ^{14/}).
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in	N/A

	accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	K2C = 285,673 WB = 293,706 VH = 76,476 The values are verified through data analysis of data presented as survey habit^{14/} for each project instances for usage rate of project technology as: K2C: 0.85 WB: 0.99 VH: 0.72 multiplied with total distributed units per project instances as verified in ER calculation^{9/} tab 'Summary'.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	Comparison on the value of usage rate is carried out against data reported in MP3 which 0.86 (K2C), 0.99 (WB) and 0.88 (VH) which in comparison are higher than the value obtained in MP4. Site visit carried out by verifier team including verification using verbal confirmation with project technology user^{10/} with CL#10 raised.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Survey habit as carried out to obtain value for usage rate (ny,i,j) used in calculating Ny,i,j is captured using mobile aps and collected and stored in SurveyCTO. Traceability of the data from the presented excel data file^{14/} was performed from the data source using sampled data set during remote audit^{29/} with no discrepancy sighted. Site visit carried out by verifier team including verification using verbal confirmation with project technology user^{10/} with CL#10

		raised. Calculation of the value is verified as well as the value claimed in both ER ^{/9/} and monitoring report ^{/8/} with inconsistency sighted and raised as CAR#4.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	Monitoring is verified to be carried out as per Project Description Document ^{/5/} and methodology ^{/7/} requirement with no deviation.
Findings	CAR#4 and CL#10	
Conclusion	Both CAR and CL#10 were raised and addressed satisfactorily with value of this parameter is accepted as: K2C = 285,673 units WB = 293,706 units VH = 76,476 units	

2. Parameter: $\eta_{new,i,j}$ (Efficiency of the device of each type I and batch j implemented as part of the project activity)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology ^{/7/} requirement, the parameter is to be measured annually. Value presented for this parameter is verified as annual reflection for each stove age group: Stoves less than 1 year old = 0.3637 Stoves more than 1 year old and less than 2 years old = 0.3600 Stoves more than 2 years old and less than 3 years old = 0.3564 Frequency monitoring for this parameter is evident meeting the methodology requirement. Throughout all three project instances, the earliest stove distributed is on 20-Aug-2021 which is calculated to be in the category of more than 2 years and less and 3 years old.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	As per methodology ^{/7/} requirement and PD ^{/5/} , there are 5 options to measure this parameter in which each project instance shall apply. In this monitoring report, PP stated that option 5 is used in which the value is calculated using

		equation 5 of the methodology to calculate loss in efficiency per year, and therefore this parameter does not need to be monitored. The calculation is verified with evidence of equation 5 of the methodology is applied and thermal efficiency of project technology at 38.3% is applied.
	Monitoring equipment	N/A. The parameter is calculated using equation 5 of the methodology.
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	N/A
	Calibration frequency /interval:	N/A. The parameter is calculated using equation 5 of the methodology.
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A

	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Value presented for this parameter is verified as annual reflection for each stove age group: Stoves less than 1 year old = 0.3637 Stoves more than 1 year old and less than 2 years old = 0.3600 Stoves more than 2 years old and less than 3 years old = 0.3564 As the same project technology is distributed in each project instances, the same value for this parameter is used across three project instances.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	NA, as this is a calculated value using methodology equation.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The value is calculated using project technology new value ie at 38.3% which is an ex-ante validated parameter and equation 5 of the methodology. The calculation presented in ER file/ ^{9/} under tab 'Survey' for each stove age group and verified to be carried out correctly.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	Monitoring is verified to be carried out as per Project Description Document/ ^{5/} and methodology/ ^{7/} requirement with no deviation.
Findings	No finding raised.	
Conclusion	The value of this parameter is verified and accepted as: Stoves less than 1 year old = 0.3637 Stoves more than 1 year old and less than 2 years old = 0.3600 Stoves more than 2 years old and less than 3 years old = 0.3564	

3. Parameter $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ (Quantity of woody biomass used by project devices in tonnes per device of type i)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology/ ^{7/} requirement, the parameter is to be obtained from survey.
-----------------------	---	--

		As per PD/ ⁵ /, this parameter is optional as $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ (in which $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ is used for) can be estimated using either Equation 3 or 4 as per the methodology. Cross check against methodology/ ⁷ / requirement, parameter $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ is not required when parameter $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ is calculated using equation 3 which is verified to be the approach that PP has chosen as evident in section 5.4 of the monitoring report/ ⁸ / as well as reflected in ER calculation/ ⁹ / tab 'Survey'
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Following methodology/ ⁷ / requirement, the parameter is to be obtained from survey. As per PD/ ⁵ /, this parameter is optional as $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ (in which $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ is used for) can be estimated using either Equation 3 or 4 as per the methodology. Cross check against methodology/ ⁷ / requirement, parameter $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ is not required when parameter $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ is calculated using equation 3 which is verified to be the approach that PP has chosen as evident in section 5.4 of the monitoring report/ ⁸ / as well as reflected in ER calculation/ ⁹ / tab 'Survey'
	Monitoring equipment	N/A. The parameter is not calculated as the parameter $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ is calculated using equation 3.
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	N/A

	Calibration frequency /interval:	N/A
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	N/A. The parameter is not calculated as the parameter $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ is calculated using equation 3.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	N/A. The parameter is not calculated as the parameter $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ is calculated using equation 3.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	N/A. The parameter is not calculated as the parameter $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ is calculated using equation 3.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	N/A. The parameter is not calculated as the parameter $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ is calculated using equation 3 which is following one of the option presented by the methodology ^{7/} to obtain ER value.
Findings	No finding raised.	
Conclusion	This parameter is listed as one of the monitored parameters both in methodology ^{7/} and in project description document ^{5/} .	

	Looking at the methodology requirement, the parameter $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ is set to be monitored from survey which is used to calculate value for $B_{y,savings,i,j}$. The parameter $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ as per methodology/^{7/} can be calculated using equation 3 or 4. PP has opts for option 3 (evident from the claim made in section 5.4 of the monitoring report/^{8/} and ER calculation/^{9/} which does not require value of parameter $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$. In conclusion, that monitoring parameter $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ is claimed as optional by Project Proponent even though it is part of methodology requirement as verified, however, the parameter itself does not serve any function in ER calculation due to the equation chosen by PP for calculation $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ and eventually ER claimed.
--	--

4. Parameter μ_y (Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology/^{7/} requirement, the parameter is to be obtained from survey at minimum once every two years. The parameter is to be monitored using 2 options with option a is to be used when baseline stoves are decommissioned and no longer used; and option b is to be used when both the improved cookstove and baseline cookstoves are used together. Parameter μ_y is sighted derived from KPT data which was executed on survey carried out in Oct-Dec 2023 for MP4 and in May and July 2023 MP3 as verified against monitoring report/^{11/}. Frequency monitoring for this parameter is evident meeting the methodology requirement. The sampling requirement for the survey to obtain the data parameter is assessed with presented data that Project Proponent sampling plan is adjusted to satisfy sample size to achieve 90/10 and section 8.4 of the methodology/^{7/}. Sampling approach adopted by Project proponent was further requested for evidence in form of CL#8 as well as seasonality factor in CAR#4 as part of assessment against Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programmes of Activities requirement/^{20/}.
-----------------------	---	--

	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Following methodology/^{7/} requirement, under option b the parameter is to be obtained from survey designed to capture the cooking habits and stove usage of households in the region, including quantification of use of baseline cookstoves, to obtain evidence on the frequency of usage of both the improved cookstoves and baseline cookstoves. Examples of methods presented in the methodology are using simplified proportional from the number of baseline stoves used together with project technology stoves, percentage of cooking needs met with baseline stove as well as proportional using time usage of baseline stoves together with project stove from estimates derived from survey participants. PP's approach is presented in section 4.3.1, 4.3.5 and 5.2 of the monitoring report/^{8/} is through KPT where data of average wood fuel consumption/household/day is obtained. Details of the approach is provided under the 'Calculation Method' under this parameter section 5.2 of the monitoring report/^{8/}. The steps are followed through the narrative section 5.2 and μ_y calculation in KPT file/^{14/} tab 'μ_y': -B_{used} : wood fuel consumption calculated between baseline wood fuel consumption and $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ (using equation 3 of the methodology) - When value of wood fuel consumption obtained from survey is calculated annually is higher than B_{used}, deviation between annual household consumption and B_{used} which is determined as residual fuel usage on the baseline stove. - Proportional use of baseline stove is then calculated by calculating proportional residual fuel usage on baseline stove from
--	---	--

		the household consumption from survey. The same approach and clarification provided in previous verification process as evident in verification report^{11/}. The approach used by Project Proponent is further verified for its suitability as this option is not among the examples presented in the methodology. From the excel calculation, the process of obtaining ER value which is related to KPT is calculation of parameter uy which is using the amount of wood consumption within 5 days of KPT. Moisture content data is presented and part of the KPT as presented in data set in each PAI KPT record example '2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.2' tab 'Day 1', 'Day 2', 'KPT Calculation'. In comparison of this approach with example provided by the methodology ie through survey confirming the use of baseline stoves through the numbers of the baselines used in parallel together with technology stoves, as the approach is through measured parameter, the approach is evaluated to be able to lead to more accurate result as data obtained through perceived claims from users from a period of time has lower confidence level. With the approach that PP has implemented, several factors are influencing the data accuracy such as suitability and accuracy factor of the measuring equipment's, competence of the surveyors, procedures of how the data is obtained, error risk in data accuracy during recording and collection and QA/QC measure post survey during data management system.
--	--	--

		Factors influencing the quality of the data: -Suitability and accuracy factor of the equipment's: is clarified in this CL#5 -Competence of surveyors: is clarified in CAR#3 -Procedures of data collection: is clarified in CAR#3 with the point closed as important points for KPT is verified as part of the training agenda. -Error risk in data accuracy during recording and collection: tracing back data from presented summary of excel to raw data collected and stored in SurveyCTO during remote call/^{29/}.
	Monitoring equipment	Moisture tester and weigh scale is used in KPT to obtain weight data of residual wood during 5 days of KPT as well as % moisture content. Calibration status of the measuring equipment are raised as CL#5 for evidence of measure implemented by PP to ensure data accuracy. Evidence provided by PP in form of purchase invoices/receipts/^{23/} for both digital weigh scale and moisture tester units. Technical specifications of the units are provided/^{22/} as well and further verified for the suitability of the equipment for KPT execution. Technical capability of the equipment is evaluated to be suitable in terms of range of reading as well as suitability of the material to be measured: -Weight scale: Portable Crane Scale 300KG with OCS-03-L with capacity 300 kg/600 lb, 0.1 kg/0.2 lb resolution. -Moisture tester: RS PRO RS-120 Moisture Meter, Maximum Measurement 0.2 → 2 %, 6→44 %' by RS Pro for model RS-120. Specification of the meter for wood in specific is stated as material wood is at 6%-44% Measuring Range, ±2% accuracy and 1% resolution.

	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	Monitoring plan has not specified accuracy requirement of the equipment nor the calibration frequency. Following technical specification of the equipment/ ^{22/} and date of purchase/ ^{23/} , calibration frequency is not due as the units were purchased in July 2023 and the KPT was executed in Oct-Dec 2023.
	Calibration frequency /interval:	Calibration requirement is not due within the monitoring period. The suitability of the equipment used is evaluated not presenting risk to data accuracy.
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	The monitoring plan has not specified accuracy requirement of the equipment nor the calibration frequency. Following technical specification of the equipment and date of purchase, calibration frequency is not due as the units were purchased in July 2023 and the KPT was executed in Oct-Dec 2023.
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	Calibration requirement is not due within the monitoring period. The suitability of the equipment used is evaluated not presenting risk to data accuracy.
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Calibration requirement is not due within the monitoring period. The suitability of the equipment used is evaluated not presenting risk to data accuracy.
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Value reported for each project instances as each instance has distinguished B _{old,1} and wood fuel consumption value derived from separate KPT/ ^{14/} . Calculated value for this parameter is as: K2C: 0.22 WB: 0.42 VH: 0.18
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	N/A as this parameter is derived from monitoring survey which is project specific. Verification comparing the value claimed in MP3 is performed, with value sighted as: K2C: 0.22 WB: 0.42

		VH: 0.41 Overall, the value for K2C and VH is sighted the same, whilst the value for VH for MP3 is sighted to be lower in MP4 compared to MP3.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The approach executed by PP to monitor this parameter is detected with several factors that influence the quality of the data: -Suitability and accuracy factor of the equipment's: is clarified in this CL#5 -Competence of surveyors: is clarified in CAR#4 -Procedures of data collection: is clarified in CAR#3 with the point closed as important points for KPT is verified as part of the training agenda. Through survey CTO, data can be retrieved into several format including excel file for calculation, traceability and other functions which is demonstrated by PP during remote call^{29/}. From samples data, 1 survey data set is sighted to be inconsistent in term of the weight data between excel data and SurveyCTO which is traced to KPT files that being removed from the data set as outlier and 1 survey data set is sighted to be inconsistent in term of the moisture content between excel data and SurveyCTO and since moisture content is not affecting calculation, it is not counted as error in data transfer and no correction is made. -Number of minimum samples: addressed in CAR#4 for details -Timing of survey execution: addressed in CAR#4 for details -Representative random samples from each population to obtain representative data: addressed in CL#8 for details

		-QA/QC measures: PP has performed elimination for outliers ie for average weigh of wet wood consumption data is performance through confidence precision analysis performed for the average of the weight wet wood consumption. As raised points in this CL#5 that there are few data sets anomalies that sighted which detected as risk in data quality such as: -Low moisture content of woods recorded below the normal range of moisture content for wood fuel. It understandable that with the approach implemented % moisture content is not influencing ER calculation and since the rest of data used for calculation does not have moisture content incorporated, this would be able to be incorporated in MP4 since baseline consumption has no such data. With that understanding, it is also noted moisture content is highly affecting weight of the wood fuel and that the approach chosen is highly dependent on the accuracy and quality of the data obtained. With this factor identified that is yet to be monitored as part of data quality management, FAR#1 is raised for internal quality control to be carried out with parameter in concern ie moisture content of wood fuel as part of KPT to ensure that only the accurate data obtained for weight of wet wood consumption is used for calculation of the parameter uy. Internal data management shall be applied to those data sets that is sighted to be out of the equipment's capability as well as to perform cross check during data transfer process from SurveyCTO to excel summary that is used for ER calculation and reporting.
--	--	--

	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	The approach adopted by Project Proponent for calculating this parameter is not as following examples provided in the methodology. As per methodology requirement, “surveys should be designed to capture the cooking habits and stove usage of households in the region, including quantification of use of baseline cookstoves, by formulating questions and/or collecting evidences to determine the frequency of usage of both the improved cookstoves and baseline cookstoves”. PP’s approach to collect data of average 5 days of wood fuel consumption using KPT as guidance which is used to calculate the residual wood fuel consumption using baseline stove can present a more accurate data representative for the parameter in comparison to the examples provided by the methodology which all are highly depended on verbal confirmation and household’s data recollection for a period of time.
Findings	CAR#4, CL#5, CL#8 which were raised and resolved. FAR#1 is raised for the next monitoring period verification.	
Conclusion	Looking at the methodology requirement, measuring approach for this parameter is presented in several examples with emphasize that the survey shall capture evidence for determining frequency of the use of baseline and project technology. In conclusion, that monitoring approach used by PP is not among the examples provided by the methodology but with the provided evidence of measures implemented by PP, it is accepted with identified risk to be incorporated in next verification as FAR#1.	

5. Parameter η_{old} (Efficiency of baseline stove)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology^{7/} requirement, the parameter is fixed for each individual household at the time of project Implementation. In the PD^{5/}, the baseline device replaced within each household will be captured at the point of ICS distribution and recorded in the monitoring database. PP has provided project distribution database^{13/}
-----------------------	---	--

		which has information on primary baseline stove, secondary baseline stove, secondary baseline other, and baseline fuel type. This data set is presented for each project instances.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Following methodology/ ^{7/} requirement, the parameter is fixed for each individual household at the time of project Implementation. In the PD/ ^{5/} the baseline device replaced within each household will be captured at the point of ICS distribution and recorded in the monitoring database. PP has provided project distribution database/ ^{13/} which has information on primary baseline stove, secondary baseline stove, secondary baseline other, and baseline fuel type. This data set is presented for each project instance.
	Monitoring equipment	Following the options presented in the methodology: - default value of 0.1 and 0.2 can be used or -surveyed prior to implementation of project activity No equipment is needed for monitoring this value.
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	N/A as the parameter is collected during the distribution point through verbal confirmation and collected using SurveyCTO.
	Calibration frequency /interval:	N/A as the parameter is collected during the distribution point through verbal confirmation and collected using SurveyCTO.

	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A.
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A.
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A.
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Data analysis is performed with the presented project distribution database in which anomalies were detected and raised as CAR#3.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	N/A as methodology default value is applied which requires evidence for satisfying conditions set by methodology in order for the value to be applied.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Through survey CTO, data can be retrieved into several format including excel file for calculation, traceability and other functions which is demonstrated by PP during remote call ^{29/} . Data anomalies was detected and raised in form of CAR#3 which is in concern with data quality between information collected on primary/secondary baseline stove and baseline fuel type which is raised as concern of data validity during the initial data collection.

		Erroneous data sets is confirmed by PP for users with primary/secondary/secondary other's baseline stove that are not probable of using wood fuel and that the information is not available to determine value for η_{old} . 1,597 users with baseline stove unavailable to determine parameter η_{old} is assumed to be under the category of other stoves and thus with 0.2 default value is used. Requirement of methodology for condition to use the default value is reviewed and verified. Further analysis is performed to calculate the impact of the error and in aggregated the error is calculated to be 4,978 tCO ₂ eq or 0.327% from the total 1,524,641 tCO ₂ eq ER claimed in the monitoring period which is under the materiality threshold set by VCS standard ^{/1/} at 1% for large project scale.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	PP has provided evidence of data monitoring as presented in form of project distribution data ^{/13/} from the start of project date. Data anomalies was detected and raised in form of CAR#3 which is resolved.
Findings	CAR#3 was raised and resolved. FAR#1 is raised for next monitoring period verification.	
Conclusion	Project proponent has presented evidence in conformance against monitoring method and data collection as per methodology requirements. During data analysis, anomalies were detected in each PAI in which CAR#3 is raised for project proponent to further addressed the issue in order to use the value of default value of 0.1 as claimed in monitoring report and ER calculation. As corrective action, PP has removed data set of users that are not evident on meeting the methodology eligibility requirement as well as provided adjustment and clarification for those data sets that are detected as erroneous. With this adjustment and revision, the potential impact of such data set in overall ER calculation is within the materiality threshold thus it is accepted.	

6. Life Span (Operating lifetime of project device)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology ^{/7/} requirement, the parameter is to determined once at the time of
-----------------------	---	--

		Project stove installation with source of data as manufacturer's specification.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Following methodology/ ⁷ / requirement, the parameter is to be determined once at the time of Project stove installation with source of data as manufacturer's specification.
	Monitoring equipment	Following methodology/ ⁷ / requirement, the parameter is to be determined once at the time of Project stove installation with source of data as manufacturer's specification as well as monitored as per project PD/ ⁵ /. Data monitoring is presented in form of habit survey/ ¹⁴ /.
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	N/A
	Calibration frequency /interval:	N/A
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A

	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	PP is claiming 5 years for this parameter which is consistent from last monitoring report as this value is derived from manufacturer's declaration. Project database is verified with the earliest stove distributed at project start date ie 20/08/2021 which is calculated to be over 2 year old (not yet 3 years) which is concluded that it is very plausible that PP is claiming 100% of the stoves are in operation status with 5 years lifecycle. Data collected during habit survey/ ¹⁴ / which is capturing the condition of the stove condition as well as photo evidence is verified with data consistency sighted.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	This claim is cross checked against publicly available data from Rocket Works Website/ ²⁸ / for Zama Zama model. Site visit/ ¹⁰ / verified the condition and stove operational status through visual observation as well as verbal confirmation with the household users. The result is recorded with 100% of stoves in operational condition which is consistent with the project proponent claim that 100% of the distributed stoves are in operation condition.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	N/A.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	N/A as this is set at is to be determined once at the time of Project stove installation with source of data as manufacturer's specification. PP has monitored the condition of the stove during monitoring survey/ ¹⁴ / with data verified through site visit/ ¹⁰ /.
Findings	-	

Conclusion	Life span of the distributed stoves is verified as claimed by PP which is 5 years. The data is derived from manufacturer's specification with actual monitored data obtained from monitoring survey provided the same conclusion that 100% of the stoves used (year 1-3) are operational. Site visit/ ^{10/} conducted by verifier team confirmed the accuracy of the data claimed.
------------	---

7. NCV_{biomass} (Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass, renewable biomass, briquettes or pellets used in project devices)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology/ ^{7/} , the parameter can use default value 0.0156 TJ/tonne (derived from IPCC/ ^{27/} based on the gross weight of the wood that is 'air-dried' may be used if fuel used in project device is woody biomass/renewable biomass; or test report from laboratories for processed renewable biomass. As baseline wood fuel type is non-renewable wood as evident in baseline scenario as sighted in PD/ ^{5/} section 1.11, 1.13 and 3.2.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Following methodology/ ^{7/} , the parameter can use default value 0.0156 TJ/tonne (derived from IPCC/ ^{27/} based on the gross weight of the wood that is 'air-dried' may be used if fuel used in project device is woody biomass/renewable biomass; or test report from laboratories for processed renewable biomass. As baseline wood fuel type is non-renewable wood as evident in baseline scenario as sighted in PD/ ^{5/} section 1.11, 1.13 and 3.2.
	Monitoring equipment	N/A as default value is used.
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	N/A as default value is used.
	Calibration frequency /interval:	N/A as default value is used.

	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A.
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A.
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A.
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Value used in monitoring report ^{/8/} and ER calculation ^{/9/} for this parameter is verified consistent as per value set in methodology ie 0.0156 TJ/tonne. Condition for this value to be used is verified through habit survey data ^{/14/} which is sighted wood fuel as primary fuel type.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	Value used in monitoring report ^{/8/} and ER calculation ^{/9/} for this parameter is verified consistent as per value set in methodology ie 0.0156 TJ/tonne. Condition for this value to be used is verified through habit survey data ^{/14/} which is sighted wood fuel as primary fuel type. As per VCS Methodology Requirements ^{/30/} para 2.5.2, verification to IPCC website is carried out to check whether any updated value is available. The current value as per set by methodology is verified as valid as no new value issued.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	N/A
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	PP has provided evidence of data monitoring for baseline fuel type which is non-renewable wood fuel from baseline study for each PI

		as well as the data captured monitoring survey ^{/14/} .	
Findings	-		
Conclusion	The value used for this parameter is evaluated valid as the condition set by the methodology for the value applicability is evident and that no new revision is sighted.		

Full assessment of value and data used in ER calculation is verified as detailed above. Clarifications and inconsistencies raised as CLs and CARs have been resolved as provided in each specific parameter.

The assessment team has thoroughly verified the calculation done for the quantification of the emissions reduction for the project activity, under this monitoring period from 01-Aug-2023 to 31-Jan-2024.

4.4 Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals

Verification team was able to confirm that the data presented is able to be traced to initial raw source of record/data. The spreadsheets used to calculate the VCUs calculations and all figures were tracked, checked and found to be consistent.

The quality of supporting evidence submitted to the VVB for verification is evaluated with data anomaly and error raised as CL#6. The transfer of carbon rights and other supporting documents related to quality and maintenance were checked by the verification team during the remote audit assessment to confirm the authenticity of the documents and to check the correctness of the calculation. FAR#2 is raised for PP to add internal quality control to be carried out with moisture content of wood fuel as part of KPT to ensure that only the accurate data obtained for weight of wet wood consumption is used for calculation of the parameter uy. Internal data management shall be applied to those data sets that is sighted to be out of the equipment's capability as well as to perform cross check during data transfer process from SurveyCTO to excel summary that is used for ER calculation and reporting.

The verification team can confirm that sufficient evidence is available for the whole monitoring period and the same is verifiable. Data error and inconsistency sighted in monitored parameter ie baseline stove type is detected and with the revision done in ER calculation, verifier accepted the error as it is calculated within the materiality threshold. Inconsistency between data stored in SurveyCTO and data presented in detected during data trace^{/15/} in remote call^{/29/}. Whilst the inconsistency is evaluated not material for this monitoring period, project's internal data system management is detected with risk of data inconsistency which can affect ER calculation thus FAR is raised for future verification process.

In accordance with the above details the verification team confirms that:

- A complete set of data for the monitoring period was available for the monitoring period and the verification of each monitoring parameter is elaborated under this of this report.
- The complete monitoring data is also presented in the corresponding ER sheet and the final monitoring report.

- The information provided in the monitoring report was cross checked with other sources, wherever appropriate and available, and such information is also included under this of this report.
- The calculations of baseline emissions as presented in the corresponding ER sheet of final Monitoring Report were checked and found to be consistent with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan/^{05/} and the applied methodology.
- All assumptions used in the emission calculations were found appropriate and therefore justified.
- Appropriate emission factors and other reference values have been correctly applied.

The assessment team has verified all the primary supporting related to operations, quality, and generation of data during the monitoring period such as cross verification against initial/raw data source (users' signed agreements/16/, internal database record maintained in SurveyCTO for distribution database for user's information, baseline/secondary stove and fuel type; habit survey and KPT data; technical specification and invoice/receipts of purchase for measuring equipment's, training sessions for competence evaluation of monitoring personals and survey execution guidance, data quality check for plausibility and accuracy, ER calculation with formulations and units conversion as well as data transfer from data sources into reports. The photographs were only used as means of secondary cross check of the information verified from Primary sources. As this is the 4th monitoring period of the project's fixed crediting period, information regarding project capacity commission and monitoring system are already verified in previous monitoring report which are also cross checked with previous report. Thus, a reasonable level of assurance is achieved.

4.5 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

VCS standard/^{1/} section 2.4, non-permanence risk analysis is applicable for Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use (AFOLU) and Geologic Carbon Storage (GCS) projects.

4.6 Verification Summary

The project activity VCS – 2505, “Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa” has undergone 4th verification with monitoring period from 01/08/-2023 to 31/01/2024 (including both days). TASC is responsible for the collection, analysis, aggregation, preparation (conversion factors, assumptions, methodology, calculations) and presentation of activities and related GHG data in its public disclosures (including but not limited to monitoring report, emission reduction calculation sheet, submitted documents/ emails/ communications). Our responsibility of performing this work is to the management of TASC and in accordance with terms of reference agreed with the TASC in the master service agreement. The verification engagement is based on the assumption that the GHG data provided to us is complete, sufficient, true and free from material misstatements. SustainCERT disclaims any liability or co-responsibility for any decision a person or an entity would make based on this verification statement towards the issuance and utilization of VCU's hereby verified and certified. The verification was carried out during December 2023 – May 2024 by a team of qualified GHG auditors.

SustainCERT applies its own quality management system and compliance policies for quality control, in accordance with ISO/IEC 17029:2019 – Conformity Assessment Requirements for Validation and Verification bodies providing environmental information (ISO 14065:2020) and greenhouse gas audit (ISO 14064-3:2019) and certifications, and accordingly maintains a comprehensive system of quality control including documented policies and procedures regarding compliance with ethical requirements, professional standards and applicable legal & regulatory requirements.

We have complied with the VCS standard^{/1/} and other requirements mentioned, during the verification engagement and maintained independence. SustainCERT was not involved in the preparation of any statements or reports or data except for this Verification Statement and Report. SustainCERT maintains complete impartiality toward stakeholders interviewed during the verification process. SustainCERT did not provide any services to TASC and its subsidiaries in the scope of verification that could compromise the independence or impartiality of our work.

4.7 Verification Conclusion

The Verification of the project titled Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa VCS ID – 2505, have been undertaken by SustainCERT, as requested by TASC, project proponent for the monitoring period 01/08/2023 to 31/01/2024 (including both the days) as reported in monitoring report^{/8/}. The project activity is implemented in accordance with the registered monitored plan in PD v9^{/5/} and the emission reduction from the project activity from the project activity. It is our responsibility to express an independent verification statement on the reported GHG emission reductions from the project activity.

SustainCERT Verification approach was based on understanding the risk associated with reporting of GHG emission data and the controls in place to mitigate these. SustainCERT planned and performed the verification by obtaining evidence and other information and explanations that SustainCERT considered necessary to give reasonable assurance that reported GHG emission reductions are fairly stated.

In our opinion, the GHG emissions reductions reported for the project activity for the period 01/08/ 2023 to 31/01/2024 are fairly stated in the project monitoring report^{/8/}The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly based on the approved baseline and monitoring methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1 and the monitoring plan contained in the PD version 9^{/5/}.

Verification period: From 01/08/2023 to 31/01/2024

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

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Reduction VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Removal VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCUs (tCO ₂ e)
01-Aug-2023 to 31-Dec-2023	1,255,174	-	-	1,255,174	-	1,255,174

01-Jan-2024 to 31-Jan-2024	269,467	-	-	269,467	-	269,467
Total	1,524,641	-	-	1,524,641	-	1,524,641

4.8 Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison

Vintage period	Ex-ante estimated reductions/removals	Achieved reductions/removals	Percent difference	Explanation for the difference
01-Aug-2023 – 31-Jan-2024	2,436,489.07	1,524,641	-37.42%	There is a 37.42 % difference in the ex-ante estimates and the actual emission reductions obtained for this monitoring period. The lower ER achieved is observed due to the difference in the estimates made for the parameters to be monitored and the actual values obtained. The discrepancy results from lower monitored values for project stove usage rate, higher baseline stove continued use rate, and portion of the user with baseline stove efficiency of 0.2 for those of categorized as non-three stone fire. Therefore, lead to a difference in the estimates and actuals for the ERs/VCUs.

APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION

<i>Section</i>	<i>Information</i>	<i>Justification</i>	<i>Assessment method and conclusion</i>
N/A			

APPENDIX 2: TABLE OF REFERENCE

S. No	Document Title	Version	Date
1.	VCS standard https://verra.org/documents/vcs-standard-v4-7/	4.7	16-Apr-2024
2.	VCS guidelines https://verra.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/VCS-Program-Guide-v4.4.pdf	4.4	29-Aug-2023
3.	Validation and Verification Manual https://verra.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/VCS Validation Verification Manual v3.2.pdf	3.2	19-Oct-2016
4.	VCS Project Webpage, VCS ID - 2505 (https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/2505)		
5.	Project Description Document 'Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa Grouped PDD_v9_Clean' https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/2505	9	
6.	Validation report '2022_03_07 FVR_VERRA-R3-Clean' https://registry.verra.org/mymodule/ProjectDoc/Project_ViewFile.asp?FileID=63004&IDKEY=niquwesdfmnk0iei23nnm435oiojnc909dsflk9809adlkmlkf886882516		
7.	Applied Methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1 (https://verra.org/methodology/vmr0006-methodology-for-installation-of-high-efficiency-firewood-cookstoves/)	1.1	
8.	Monitoring report MP4 (01/08/2023 to 31/01/2024)	1.8	17-May-2024
9.	Emission reduction calculation sheet		
10.	Onsite audit report (18/03/2024 – 22/03/2024)		
11.	Monitoring report MP3 (01/02/2023 – 31/07/2023) '2505_MRV3_MR_v2.4_Clean'		

	(https://registry.terra.org/mymodule/ProjectDoc/Project_ViewFile.asp?FileID=109551&IDKEY=f097809fslkjf09rndasfufd098asodfjlkduf09nm23mrn87d151070829); and its corresponding Verification Report 'CC IPL1936 VCS FVR_CC' (https://registry.terra.org/mymodule/ProjectDoc/Project_ViewFile.asp?FileID=109552&IDKEY=f0e98hfalsuf098fnsdalfkjfoijmn4309JLKJFjaksjfla9K151072208)		
12.	Monitoring report MP2 (10/02/2022 to 31/01/2023) 'MRV2_Monitoring Report_v4.2_SurveyApproach_clean' (https://registry.terra.org/mymodule/ProjectDoc/Project_ViewFile.asp?FileID=93144&IDKEY=lq934lkmsad39asjdkfj90qlkalsdkngaf98ulkandDfdvDdfhd128445576); and its corresponding Verification Report 'CC IPL1630 VCS FVR v3 (clean)' (https://registry.terra.org/mymodule/ProjectDoc/Project_ViewFile.asp?FileID=93145&IDKEY=38723kfnf7kjandsaslmv09887vaks mrmnwqkjoiuanfnfuq0n128446955)		
13.	Project distribution database 'Distribution Database_20240506'		
14.	Kitchen Survey Data & Habit Survey: - 2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.2 - 2505_MRV4_pKPT_WB_v1.1 - 2505_MRV4_pKPT_VH_v1.1		
15.	Project platform (SurveyCTO) data collection and retention		Accessed on 3-May-2024
16.	User's signed agreements		
17.	TASC agreements with implementation partners (K2C BR NPC) & Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd		
18.	KML files for VH, WB and K2C		
19.	Stakeholders/community sensitization meetings record		
20.	Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	9	
21.	No Double counting declaration		

22.	Technical specification of weigh scales and moisture meters		
23.	Purchase receipts/invoice for weigh scales and moisture meters		
24.	Training recording and attendance list for surveyor team (K2C BR NPC) & Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd		
25.	Employment agreements for 10 employed field teams (K2C BR NPC) & Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd		
26.	National regulations for labor section: -Basic Conditions of Employment Act https://www.gov.za/sites/default/files/gcis_document/201409/a75-97.pdf - Government Gazette Staatskoerant Republiek Van Suid Afrika Regulation Gazette No . 11546 Regulasiekoerant Vol. 692 21 February 2023 No. 48094 – minimum salary for year 2023 - Government Gazette Staatskoerant Republiek Van Suid Afrika Regulation Gazette No . 11664 Regulasiekoerant Vol. 704 2 February 2024 No. 50073 – minimum salary for year 2024		
27.	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories; Chapter 2 Stationary Combustion	2006	
28.	Rocket Works Website (product specification) model Zama Zama (https://rocketworks.org/product/zamazama/) https://www.engineeringforchange.org/solutions/product/zama-zama/#performance_use		Accessed on 5-Mar-2024
29.	Remote call with Project Proponent (03-May-2024 and 10-May-2024)		
30.	VCS Methodology Requirements	4.4	29-Aug-2023
31.	CDM Standard Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities	9	27-May-2021

APPENDIX 3: ABBREVIATIONS

MR	Monitoring report
PD	Project description
MP	Monitoring Period
PP	Project Proponent
PAI	Project Instances
ICS	Improved Cook Stove
VH	Vhembe
K2C	Kruger to Canyons
WB	Waterberg
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
VCU	Verified Carbon Unit
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
AQI	Acceptable Quality Level
UQL	Unacceptable Quality Level
GP	Grouped Project

APPENDIX 4: PROJECT FINDINGS

Rule	Assessment	Findings/Comments CAR#1	Developer Response
VCS Standard, v4.5 (revised to VCS 4.7)	VCS Monitoring Report Template	PP submitted Monitoring report ie '2505_MRV4_MR_v1.0' which is sighted using the format of 'Monitoring Report: VCS Version 4.2' instead of version 4.3 which is released on 29 August 2023. Name of the file shall be following the instruction of the monitoring report in format of VCS MR Project ID DDMMYYYY-DDMMYYYY.	The MR template was updated to use template version 4.3 and the name was changed to follow the stipulated naming logic i.e. "VCS MR 2505 01082023-31012024". Please note, in transferring the text from the previous template version to the new template version, the changes in "track change" mode has been lost.
Monitoring report template	Rd 2	Revised monitoring report is provided in file name of 'VCS MR 2505 01082023-31012024_V1.2' following the instruction in the template. During the Round 2 review, Verra has released VCS Standard version 4.7 (released 16 April 2024) which is effective immediately. PP is requested to use the latest VCS standard 4.7 as reference in monitoring report cover page. CAR#1 remains open.	Latest VCS standard version (4.7) has been added in the monitoring report cover page.
	Rd 3	Revised Monitoring Report (v1.3 03/05/2024) submitted with stated VCS standard as version 4.7 in title page. CAR#1 is closed off.	Closed

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CAR#2	Developer Response
VCS Standard,	VCS Monitoring Report Template	In the monitoring report, under section 1.8 Title and Reference of Methodology, link provided for the tool used ie 'CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for	The link has been replaced with the correct link to the document.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#2	
v4.5 (revised to VCS 4.7) Monitoring report template	Section 1.8 Title and Reference of Methodology	CDM project activities and programmes of activities, v4' is invalid.	
	Rd 2	Link provided in revised section of 1.8 is verified and source is cross checked to be accurate. CAR#2 is closed.	Closed

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#3	
VCS Standard, v4.5 revised to VCS 4.7) Monitoring report template	VCS Monitoring Report Template 3.1 Implementation Status of the Project Activity	a) Under section 3.1 Implementation Status of the Project Activity, claim made related to the number of stove recipients directly engaged with, just through community meetings and household surveys ie at 9272. PP is requested to provide clarification whether such meetings listed in table Table 2 Summary of stakeholder consultations in the form of community meetings in MP4 are evidently attended only stove recipients or that the number stated covers all attendees in general as some of the locations listed are public places such as school grounds, municipality centre, community halls and many more. Based on the numbers of participants stated in the list, the total of participants are calculated to be 9015, PP is requested to provide clarification on this discrepancy. Document stated provided in form of '2505_MRV2_Community Meetings_v1' is not available.	a) Community meetings/engagements are informal activities conducted by the monitoring team outside of the regular required verification monitoring. These activities are conducted as an internal exercise to gauge stove uptake and helps us to focus monitoring efforts in places with lower adoption. When transferring the text to the new MR this table was removed and data from the community meetings are presented in the Excel sheet titled "Community_Meetings". b) This statement was incorrect and amended in the text. Only 10 permanent monitors were employed during this period. This is evidenced by the employment contracts shared.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#3	
		b) Statement sighted in relation to employment of 12 permanent monitors during this monitoring period. PP is requested to provide supporting evidence on this claim.	
	Rd 2	A) In revised MR (v1.2), the paragraph under section 3.1 for the claim of “9,272 stove recipients have been directly engaged with, just through community meetings and household surveys in this monitoring period, however it is expected that significantly more end users will have been reached by the various stakeholder engagement platforms” is sighted removed. Table 2 Summary of stakeholder consultations in the form of community meetings in MP4 in section 2.2 is sighted also not present in the revised MR. Table in section 2.1.2 2.1.2 Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication is sighted with information provided in form of: dates of execution of the session for each PAI, data collection and storage for each Ongoing community engagement/ sensitisation details are provided in “Community_Meetings” excel sheet. Provided excel file is verified with summary of details of meetings/sessions provided. Links provided for evidence is verified requires log-in account. PP is requested to demonstrate internal system in place used to collect, store and retrieve data in relation to the community meetings record over remote discussion. b)Revision is sighted in the claim made in terms of number of employment ie from 12 to 10 permanent monitors as project impact in MP4. Verified work agreements for employees: -Keneilwe Mmushi	a.) Please note due to the template change, the sections within the MR changed and the information is presented in a different manner. In the new template version, a table is provided in Section 2.1.2 for any “Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication”. Some of the contents (i.e. meeting dates) in Table 2 of the previous MR was transferred into the new table in section 2.1.2 of the MR and further information around the community engagements are presented in the excel sheet titled “Community_Meetings”, which was shared in the previous round with the VVB. The links mentioned in the “Community_Meetings” excel sheet are links to photos captured during the events. To access these links, the VVB must have a SurveyCTO account which is linked to the TASC account. Data is captured in field using the SurveyCTO and pre-programmed forms on the Collect app on the monitors smartphone and automatically stored on a cloud server for further analysis. b.) - The correct employment contracts for Charmaine, Isaac, Mohau and Owen is shared in addendum to this document which covers the correct MP and are signed by the employee. Please note that during this time the employees were still formally employed as distribution officers. However,

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#3 -Hope Mpho Morema -Vulani Mabunda -Khanyisa Mdluli -Dipheko David Mbebe -Okya Sibashi with period of agreement stated as 1 April 2023 – 31 March 2024; is verified as evidence of direct project impact during MP4 with signature/handwritten name of employee and dated sighted in each agreement. As part of verification, salary as stated is verified against minimum salary as per regulation in South Africa. Reference is taken from Government Gazette Staatskoerant Republiek Van Suid Afrika Regulation Gazette No . 11546 Regulasiekoerant Vol. 692 21 February 2023 No. 48094 with minimum salary of R25.42/hour. Requirement for minimum salary in 2024 is referencing Government Gazette Staatskoerant Republiek Van Suid Afrika Regulation Gazette No . 11664 Regulasiekoerant Vol. 704 2 February 2024 No. 50073 R27.58/hour effective 1 March 2024. Maximum working hour/week is regulated as 45 hour (reference Chapter 2 of the BCEA section 9 from Acts (labour.gov.za)) From the agreements verified for employees above, the lowest salary is used for analysis (as sighted in agreement). Using the lowest salary, rate of salary/hour is calculated using 45 hour/week, thus the rate/hour is calculated to be meeting the host country minimum wage requirement for year 2023 and 2024. Follow up action needed: Agreement documents provided in form of: -'Charmaine Thapelo Employment Contract - 13 Jan 2023' -'Isaac Kekana Employment Contract - 13 Jan 2023'	they were also involved in the monitoring of the project. - Furthermore, the K2C code of ethical behavior is also shared in addendum to this document.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#3 - 'Mohau Rankapole - Employment Contract - 13 Jan 2023' - 'Owen Kgobola Employment Contract - 13 Jan 2023' are sighted without any signature/ acknowledgement from the employee on agreement on accepting terms/condition of the employment. Detail in the agreement is sighted that the date of commencement is 1 Feb 2024 (clause 4) which is beyond the claimed MP. PP is requested to provide clarification whether earlier agreement is present with these employees that are relevant for the monitoring period verified (01/08/2023 - 31/01/2024). Within the provided agreements, clause is sighted as part of the agreement employees are to adhere to TASC Code of Conduct (for those hired under Mogalakwena Training). The agreements sighted made between employees and K2C are sighted with reference to K2C Code of Ethical Behaviour. PP is requested to provide clarification and evidence that K2C Code of Ethical Behaviour contains same policy as TASC for employment's condition. CAR#3 remains open.	
	Rd 3	a) Excel sheet provided 'Community_Meetings_v1.0' which contains summary of the claimed community session meetings for each PAI. Photos as part of record keeping is still sighted is provided with link sources to SurveyCTO account which is linked to the TASC account. Recording is provided by PP demonstrating the use of SurveyCTO in relation to the records of community sessions in form of the dashboard of SurveyCTO with data entries which is sighted related to the community meetings as well as KPT & habit survey data.	a. Closed b. In the employment contracts the following is stated: "Your ordinary working hours will be forty (45) hours in any work week." The number in brackets were erroneously stated and should be "(40)". In contract law, it is a presumption in substantive law that words will prevail over figures in a contract (as well as over words printed in a form). Thus, the employment

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#3 Demonstration includes simulation on how data can be downloaded in excel form. The link provided for photo of the summary of community sessions presented in 'Community_Meetings_v1.0' is demonstrated working and presented as photos thus providing confidence that the data summary of community meetings in file 'Community_Meetings_v1.0' is traceable. Remote call with Project Proponent (3 May 2024) where demonstration on how community sensitization meetings record is collected in SurveyCTO, verified for its accuracy against provided excel summary 'Community_Meetings_v1.0'. Data presented in section 2.1.2 of the monitoring report 'VCS MR 2505 01082023-31012024_V1.3 (3/05/2024)' is verified to be accurate. b) Kruger to Canyon Biosphere Region's Code of Ethical Behaviour is provided with signature of Chair Person dated 7/9/2022. Within the document it is sighted that aspect of equal opportunity, safety & health practices, fair competition, anti-corruption, as well as its policy on conflict of interest, & misuse of official position. Agreement documents provided in form of: - 'Charmaine Thapelo 01 Nov 2022 – signed' - sighted with signature and dated 1 November 2022 for duration of 15 months which is covering the duration of monitoring period - 'Mohau Rankapole 01 April 2022 – signed' - sighted with signature and dated 1 April 2022 for duration of 15 months which is covering the duration of monitoring period - 'Owen Kgobola 01 Nov 2022 – signed' - sighted with signature and dated 1 November 2023 for duration of 15 months which is covering the duration of monitoring period	hours should be read as forty hours in any working week rather than 45 hours. In this regard, the employees are paid above the minimum wage. The supplied employment contracts were drafted and signed before the minimum wage increase on 1 March 2023. The minimum wage for 2022 was R23.19. Considering a working week of 40 hours and 4 weeks per month, the monthly wage should be R3710.40. The minimum wage from 1 March 2023 was R25.42. Considering the same working hours and weeks, the required minimum wage is R4067.20. In both cases the employees are paid above the minimum wage.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#3 - 'Isac Kekana 01 June 2023 – signed' – sighted with signature and dated 1 June 2023 for duration of 15 months which is covering the duration of monitoring period With the 4 newly submitted signed work agreements, total of 10 employed monitors are verified (even though the work agreement is for fixed period, terms is stated that possibility of extension and that the period has covered the full monitoring period claimed) Within the agreement, working hour specified as 45 hour/week and monthly gross salary calculated under the minimum wage of year 2023 and 2024. PP is requested to provide clarification on how the employees are receiving the remuneration as per minimum wage applicable in the area and year of employment. CAR# remains open for point b.	
	Rd 4	Verifier has reviewed response provided and noted that 3 of the signed agreements are dated in 2022 in which minimum salary of year 2022 is applicable ie at R23,19/hour which is calculated meeting the host country minimum salary with 45 working hour. Verifier team also takes into account TASC agreements with Implementation Partner Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd in which 4 of the surveyors are employed under. In the signed agreement is specified details of gross salary set for each position/role which the lowest gross salary set is verified is higher than the minimum salary set by host country (for year 2022 and 2023) as the cut off date for applicable new minimum salary 2024 is 01-March-2024 and monitoring period ends at 30-Jan-2024. With this enforced agreement between TASC	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#3	
		and Implementation Partner Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd, the scope of responsibility of TASC for meeting host country applicable requirement is evident. VCS Standard 4.7 para 3.19.15 "The project proponent shall prohibit the use of forced labor, child labor, and victims of human trafficking, and protect staff and contracted workers employed by third parties in project design and implementation" that is effective for all project requests submitted on or after 1 January 2025, FAR#2 is raised for contracted VVB carrying next verification to cross check this requirement for all employed personals involved in project implementation. CAR#3 is closed off with FAR#2 raised.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#4	
CDM Survey & Sampling Standard	Whether project proponent has utilised the sampling for determination of parameter values for calculating GHG emission reductions that shall include a sampling plan with a description of the sampling approach,	Monitoring survey data: a) It is sighted that cookstove ID 035552 recorded as one of the sampled data is not found in project database K2C, instead it is sighted under project database for Waterberg. PP shall review and make necessary changes. b) Within the recorded data presented, one questionnaire was intended to determine whether the interviewee is the primary user (under the tab of Habit Survey). Among the recorded data, few are recorded as not the primary users (12 from 119 in Waterberg, 11 out of 117 in K2C, 4 out of 111 in Vhembe). With the interviewee not the primary user, PP is requested to provide justification on the data	a. The household is within the Waterberg district and is also in the distribution database under the Waterberg area. This is confirmed by the captured GPS coordinates (-23.8743051 31.0743882). The household was erroneously included in the K2C survey data and has been removed. The removal of this HH from the K2C survey data resulted in the number of samples changing to 116 and parameter uy increased from 0.258 to 0.261. This had a corresponding reduction in the ERs generated in P11-K2C (785,655 to 782,478) and total ERs (1,515,216 to

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
	important assumptions, and justification for the selection of the chosen approach.	CAR#4 accuracy obtained from the survey such as for frequency of improved stove and baseline stove usage, perceived improved stove's performance (column AI to DM under tab of Habit Survey). c) PP is requested to provide justification on the classification of user vs non-user in the KPT analysis. Definition of user has been provided in MR section 4.3.5. Data survey is question is as followed: -PI K2C for KPT Barcode 215487, under the column of AI tab 'Habit Survey', the status is stated as yes (as user), whilst it is sighted that data recorded under column AJ 'Stove Use Day' is 0, under column AM 'Stove Use Week' is recorded as 3. The user is recorded to use baseline stove which is electrical stove 2 x a day (column AY) and 7x week (column AZ). d) PP is requested to provide traceable evidence on the survey data from the initial source of data record ie smartphone-based app as stated in section 4.3.2 of the monitoring report. e) PP is requested to provide measures in terms of competence of survey team in form of training evidence as stated in section 4.3.3 of the monitoring report. f) KPT is recorded executed in Oct – Dec 2023 in which majority of the survey is recorded in Nov and few data in Oct and Dec 2023. Information in section 4.3.6 of the MR is sighted with statement "The test was performed in the austral spring and summer between October and December 2023". Verification uses publicly available information ie South Africa - Summary Climate Change Knowledge Portal (worldbank.org) in which Oct - Dec is sighted to be in high season for precipitation and temperature. The trend shows an exponential	1,512,039). All changes have been made in the MR. b. It is not always possible to have interviews with the primary owner of the cookstove as they might be out in the field or away for work. Thus, it is possible that the interviews might occur with other persons within the household. Although the user is not the primary user, the user is assessed by the monitoring team to have knowledge of the general usage of the stove and cooking habits within the household as they are a member of the household. c. We have noted through numerous rounds of monitoring that beneficiaries often misunderstand monitoring questions, which can cause discrepancies within the data. This is why we ask numerous similar questions to deduce the actual answer. A user is defined as answering 'yes' to the question "do you use the stove" and in column AI the beneficiary indicated that they are using the stove when asked this question. In column AJ when asked how many times per day the beneficiary uses the stove, the beneficiary indicated "0" times. It is our belief that the beneficiary understood the question as "How many times did you use the stove today?". When asked in column AM, "How many times <i>per week</i> do you use the cookstove", the user indicated that he/she is using it 3 times a week. Thus, the device is deemed to be in

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#4 increase from Sept to end of the year with the highest data presented in Jan and decrease in trend is visible leading to lowest in May- July. Data is presented as average from 1991-2022. Based on the timing in which the survey was carried out, the risk that data presented is contributing to the risk of overestimation of wood consumption is detected. PP is requested to justify the approach to conduct the survey in such time of the year.	use as per the description in the MR, however the beneficiary is deemed to be using the device in conjunction with other devices, which is captured in the KPT data. d. The data captured on the SurveyCTO smartphone data collection app is sent to the SurveyCTO cloud-based data platform. Data from these platforms have been shared in the provided excel sheets. Furthermore, in addition to this document screenshots of the various SurveyCTO dashboards proving the data collection is shared in the document titled "SurveyCTO_Dashboards". e. Training evidence is shared as the recording of refresher training conducted in October 2023 and the attendance registers of the training session both from K2C and Waterberg. f. If there is an overestimation of wood consumption due to the increase in weather events such as rain, this would actually impact the emission reductions negatively (i.e. less emissions reductions) and the result would thus be more conservative. More importantly, TASC is implementing bi-annual monitoring periods for the project (see MP3) and will thus measure fuel consumption of project households during the dry and rainy seasons, balancing the risk of over-estimation or under-estimation of fuelwood use.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#4	
	Rd 2	a) KPT data for PAI K2C v1.1 (2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.1) is provided and verified that stove ID 035552 is no longer part of the sample pool. The sample pool thus has been reduced from 117 to 116. With the removal of stove ID 035552 from sample pool, changes are sighted in the end value of: -Ny: from 0.8547 to 0.8534 -uy: from 0.258 to 0.261 Values calculated both parameters based on survey are sighted with no analysis for precision level. Following methodology requirement for these 2 parameters under section 9.2 that if simplified approach proposed in option (b) under Section 8.4 is used for determining sample size 90/10 confidence precision is not obligatory. -Mean Wet Wood use: from 5.117 kg/day or 1.868 ton/year to 5.128 kg/HH or 1.872 ton/year. Outlier removed: 11 with end sample size of 104 from 105. The change in sample size from 117 to 116 for PAI K2C is still meeting the requirement of both calculated sample size and methodology VMR0006 section 8.4 which is minimum of 100. With the new values on Ny and uy, ER calculation is verified to have been revised reflecting the new values for parameter 'Baseline stove usage factor (Uy)' while 'Stove usage rate (ny,i,j)' value is sighted with the old value ie 0.8547 instead of 0.8534. Follow up action needed:	a.) - Analysis for precision for parameter Mean Wet Wood use ('2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.1' tab 'KPT Summary') has been re-done reflecting the new mean and sample size. Based on the revised calculations, the precision is now 5.2%, which is still within the required 10%. ER calculation – The ERs for PI1-K2C was recalculated using $n_{y,i,j}$ of 0.8534 which decreased the ERs for K2C from 782,478 to 781,288. The values have been amended in the relevant sections of the MR. Thus, the total ERs have also decreased to 1,510,849 originally. Due to CL#6 the ERs were reduced further to 764,699 for PI1-K2C and 1,493,619 in total. However, based on calculating parameter uy with the outlier corrected data for K2C (VH and WB were correct), the ERs increased to 1,531,906. Furthermore, the reference in Section 4.3.1 to “small scale” has been removed as the PAIs are not regarded small scale. b.) The approach to gathering data via surveys has not changed over the 4 distinct monitoring periods completed for this project. Survey teams are trained to understand user habits and survey forms are designed to capture data that minimizes errors in survey responses. If

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#4 Analysis for precision with the new value obtained is sighted still reflecting the original sample size and average for parameter Mean Wet Wood use ('2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.1' tab 'KPT Summary') PP is requested to review and revise the following: -Analysis for precision for parameter Mean Wet Wood use ('2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.1' tab 'KPT Summary') reflecting the new mean and sample size -ER calculation for K2C PAI with the new Stove usage rate (ny,i,j) value 0.8547. The narrative sighted in section 4.3.1 of the monitoring report is claiming that the project is categorized under small scale under CDM. Based on VCS standard 4.7 section 3.10.1 that project categorization for project and large projects is based on claimed VER per year whether under or over 300,000 tonnes of CO₂e. Based on the ER calculated for MP4, the claimed VERs are meeting large projects definition. PP is requested to provide clarification and revision needed for this point. Point a remains open. b) It is well understood that availability of primary user is not always present during the survey, however looking at how the survey data is the only data used to derive value of ny,i,j that is directly affecting ER calculation and for SDG 3 impact claim, PP is requested to provide measures on how survey is designed to collect the most representative data for	the surveyor deems that there is a household representative present who is capable of answering the survey questionnaire accurately, then a survey is completed. If not, or if there is no representative present, then a survey cannot be completed. See the above answer to point c – the survey has been designed to double-check information provided, and then triple-checked by conducting KPTs in representative households. The combination of these approaches is considered best practice in survey design and implementation for ICS carbon projects. c.) Closed d.) Raw data is downloaded directly from the SurveyCTO platform and processed further by the PD before submission to the VVB. This process will be demonstrated to the VVB via a conference call, recorded as evidence. e.) The group of monitors joined the call remotely from a single computer i.e. the K2C/Vhembe team joined using Keneilwe Mmushi's computer while the Waterberg team joined with Brendon Longhurst's computer. Furthermore, attendance registers labelled "KPT Training Attendance Waterberg" and "KPTtraining_attendance231018 K2C" of the training event were shared in the

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#4 project claim. Training session recording provided 'KPT Training-20231018_101104-Meeting Recording' which is verified for agenda points/discussion during the session does not provide evidence of guidance on this specific point. Point b remains open. c) Categorization of user vs non-user is made clear as it is determined by verbal confirmation whether project technology is used (regardless the frequency). It is sighted consistent with narrative provided in section 4.3.5 of the MR. From the formulation leading for ER claimed, it is sighted that the frequency is taken into factor in other parameter ie through the calculation for determine fraction of baseline stove used in parallel with project technology in formulation for uy based on the amount of wood fuel recorded used in 5 day KPT. Comparison is done with the data derived from site visit in which based on the sampled users verbal confirmation, 100% is claimed using project technology. With this point c is closed off with approach to obtain value of usage rate for calculating parameter $N_{y,i,j}$ is evaluated to be accepted. d) Document titled "SurveyCTO_Dashboards" is verified with content includes several screenshots of the dashboard of each PAI data entry sets. PP is requested to demonstrate data traceability to verifier to evaluate how data retrieved from SurveyCTO to presented excel summary without the risk of error. Point d remains open. e) Evidence provided in form of recording (KPT Training-20231018_101104-Meeting Recording) with participants visible:	previous round as proof of attendance. It is clearly not just 1 monitor who attended the training and that monitors from both K2C and Mogolakwena training attended the training sessions as a group. Furthermore, the monitors have participated in previous rounds of monitoring and are well versed in the procedures to conduct KPTs and habit surveys as confirmed by the on site.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#4 -Edwin Cogho (TASC) -Keneilwe Mmushi -Bianca Stead -Brendon Longhurst with topic presented includes habit survey and KPT. Keneilwe Mmushi is sighted to be one of the employees under K2C BR NPC. Details instruction for the survey includes: -time of execution (avoid weekend) -approximately same time for 5 day of KPT -equipments and steps on how to use -frequency and number of samples -use of SurveyCTO application PP is requested to provide clarification on measures in terms of competence of the surveyor (KPT and habit survey) for the 10 employed personals. The recording is sighted attended for 1 person employed from K2C BR NPC. Whether same training was performed for Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd. within the MP. Point e remains open. f) Cross checking with monitoring report MP3 (2505_MRV3_MR_v2.4_Clean) for the habit survey, it is stated carried out between May and July 2023. With the survey carried out for MP4, the timeline is sighted in Oct – Dec 2023. With this factor and PP's clarification it is concluded that the design of the sampling plan in specific with the time of the survey execution is representative as the previous MP is reflecting the dry season of the users condition and that this MP is capturing the high precipitation condition. Point f is closed off. CAR#4 remains open for point a, b, d and e.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#4	
	Rd 3	a) Analysis for precision for parameter Mean Wet Wood use ('2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.3' tab 'KPT Summary') is sighted with revised using the revised mean and sample size. The calculated wet wood 5.128 kg/day/household derived from survey data is at precision 5.2% (from initial 5.1%) which still meet the precision level at 10%. ER calculation file '2505_MRV4_ER_Calcs_v1.3' is verified for parameter Stove usage rate (ny,i,j) value for K2C PAI at revised value of ie 0.8534 (revised from 0.8547) Narrative with claim on the project size as small under CDM has been removed in section 4.3.1. Point a is closed off b) From the survey questionnaire format, it is sighted that survey is designed to identified primary users as the interviewee which is counted as PP's measure to obtain survey data from the household member that can provide most accurate data/claim. It is visible that in several cases, primary users are not the interviewed personal in the survey which is part of daily lives where the primary users are unavailable during the survey. From the questionnaires sighted in habit survey are found to be repeated in different ways as clarified by PP during the remote call (3 May 2024) that this is the approach they have adopted as sighted from previous surveys that questions are often misunderstood thus providing contradicting answers/claims. This is sighted from questions visible in column AJ-BG under tab 'Habit Survey' to determine whether project stove is used and baseline stones used and theirs frequencies. Uy is	Closed

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#4 calculated using KPT and other parameters and not from the data collect from this part of the questionnaire but this is observed that the same approach is used with questions in different ways to get same conclusion. Comparing the data collected from habit survey & KPT against site visit data collected by auditor (19-23 March 2024), data set is concluded as free from material with discrepancies raised in CL10. Point b is closed off. d) PP has provided a recording of the use of SurveyCTO including the dashboard with entries visible for habit survey and KPT. Remote call with Project Proponent has taken place on 3 May 2024 with one of the agenda includes demonstration of data tracing from the entries within the SurveyCTO into summary of KPT and habit survey as well as project distribution database. The data presented in excel file provided is verified traceable from its raw source ie downloaded from SurveyCTO which provides assurance how project internal system for monitoring and maintaining records is carried out. With high reliance of SurveyCTO for data collection and record keeping, risk of error during data transfer for calculation is evaluated to be minimized. Verifier concluded that the data presented as claimed from monitoring survey ie habit survey, KPT, distribution record and community meetings are traceable and accepted as valid record of the project implementation. e) Confirmation from PP as well as attendance list with dates stated as 18 Oct 2023 (KPTtraining_attendance231018 K2C & KPT Training Attendance Waterberg). Names listed in the attendance list of training is cross checked against the names of surveyor and community sensitization sessions and	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#4	
		verified that only those that have attended refresher trainings to carry out survey and community meeting sessions. This evidence is accepted as record of training for the personals involved in project implementation for the MP as measure for addressing competence for carrying out the responsibilities for the role. Point e is closed off. CAR is closed off.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#5	
ER calculation	3.15 Quantification of GHG Emission Reductions and Carbon Dioxide Removals	ER calculation file: a. Parameter B_{old,i} Waterberg PI (cell E17 as 5,00) tab ER Survey is sighted to be inconsistent as this value is sighted as 4,99 ton/household/year in the baseline study (“Field Baseline Report_Waterberg” 19 May 2021) b. PP is requested to provide clarification on the approach used for calculating value for monitored parameter μ_y as the approach chosen is not among the examples on how the calculation is to be carried out in methodology and that the calculation for value of parameter B_{old,adjusted} is using equation 6 where value of μ_y is required. PP is requested to state information on the calculation method applied in table for this parameter in section 4.2 of the Monitoring Report. c. Parameter (N_{y,i,j}) at row 22 in ER calculation excel file under the tab of ‘ER Survey’ is sighted to be inconsistent with the information in Monitoring report. In the ER calculation, the parameter is used to reflect the value of usage rate whilst in the Monitoring report	a) The accepted value for B_{old} PI2-WB as per the inclusion of the PAI during the 1st verification and issuance review of the instance was 5.00 and is thus correct. This is the rounded value of 4.99 and was accepted by both the VVB and Verra in the previous monitoring period issuance reviews. b) The approach adopted to calculate parameter μ_y is consistent with the approach adopted in the previous monitoring period (MP3), which was verified and approved by Verra. An explanation on how KPT data was used to determine parameter μ_y is presented in Section 5.4 of the MR under the heading “Example calculations”. Further explanation is presented below.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#5 (section 4.2), the parameter is for number of project devices of type i and batch j operating during year y.	The parameter table for uy in the PDD states: If both the improved cookstove and baseline cookstoves are used together then surveys shall be conducted to record the average continued operation of baseline cookstoves in a sample of households As the PDD also states (Section 5.3.2): “Field-based monitoring activities to determine monitored parameter values will be either a field survey, KPT or WBT”, in determining uy, habit surveys are complimented by household fuel use surveys following the KPT Protocol. During this monitoring period, the KPT measurements are considered as a survey component, which is used in combination with the qualitative questionnaire to inform the percentage of household cooking needs being met by either the project ICS or the continued use of baseline fires. In the MR, uy is described as the proportion of household cooking needs still being met by the baseline fire. This proportion is calculated as follows: Using Equation 3, we calculate the expected amount of the

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CAR#5	Developer Response
			baseline fuel consumption that would continue to be used on a project ICS, in a project scenario where there is no continued baseline fire usage. This we call “Bused” in the survey worksheets and is calculated using results of Equation 3 (Bold – By,savings) 2. Bused is then subtracted from the total household fuel consumption, as determined by KPTs, for each monitored household in the project scenario. This determines each households’ residual fuel usage on the baseline fire. 3. This residual household fuel usage is then divided by the total household fuel usage to obtain a per-household parameter proportion u_y 4. We then average this value from all monitored households to obtain the project parameter proportion u_y c) Parameter $N_{y,i,j}$ is defined as the number project devices which are operational during the MP. This is calculated by multiplying the number of distributed devices with the usage rate of the devices as determined by the Habit surveys. The stove usage rate in the ER calculation sheet was

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CAR#5	Developer Response
			labelled incorrectly and has been amended. $N_{y,l,j}$ has been amended to $n_{y,l,j}$ in the ER calculation sheet. $N_{y,l,j}$ is calculated by multiplying the number of devices in distributed in each instance with parameter $n_{y,l,j}$ to determine the number of stoves that are in use.
	Rd 2	a)Parameter $B_{old,l}$ Waterberg PI is reflected of 5.00 as reflected in MP2 verification report (CC IPL1630 VCS FVR v3 (clean)) as validated ex-ante parameter in section 4.4 of the verification report. Verifier has carried out cross checking calculation using the value of 4.99 instead of 5.00 to identify whether the deviation affecting ER calculation is material. By using this rounded value, the ER calculation is sighted to be 575,482.98 tCO2 instead of 576,636.26 tCO2 with deviation calculated as 0.20%. With the parameter value validation by appointed DOE at MP2 and issuance approved by Verra as well as that the deviation % is calculated to be under the materiality threshold, the value of 5.00 tonnes/year for parameter $B_{old,l}$ PAI-WB is concluded of not presenting as risk of overestimation of the ER claim made. b)Details on how parameter μ_y has been added under section of 'Calculation method' of this parameter in section 4.2 of the MR. The narrative provided is verified against the calculation reflected for this parameter in each file provided (2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.1, 2505_MRV4_pKPT_Waterberg_v1.1, 2505_MRV4_pKPT_Vhembe_v1.1) tab 'uy'. c)Revision is sighted for project technology usage rate in ER calculation '2505_MRV4_ER_Calcs_v1.1' tab 'ER Survey' (cell D22, E22 and F22) from $N_{y,i,j}$ to $n_{y,i,j}$ providing clarity the difference of the 2 parameters.	a.) Closed b.) Closed c.) In cells K30, K40 and K50 of sheet "ER Survey" in "2505_MRV4_ER_Calcs_v1.2" the reference to $N_{y,l,j}$ has been amended to $n_{y,l,j}$. Furthermore, the references to $N_{y,l,j}$ in Section 4.3.5 in the MR have been amended to $n_{y,l,j}$.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#5	
		Information sighted in table of ER calculation in cell K30, K40 and K50 is that the 'ERy after discount' is calculated "$ERy * Ny_{i,j}$" instead of "$ERy * ny_{i,j}$" as what the calculation is reflecting. Follow up action needed: PP is requested to provide revision on cell K30, K40 and K50 in ER calculation '2505_MRV4_ER_Calcs_v1.1' tab 'ER Survey' to correct formulation used to obtain 'ERy after discount' value. Revision is also needed in section 4.3.5 in which it is still sighted that fraction of usage rate derived from survey ie $* ny_{i,j}$ is still being referred to $Ny_{i,j}$, ie "Analysis of survey questions for parameter $Ny_{i,j}$, indicated a proportion of 0.85, 0.99, and 0.72 for PI1-K2C, PI2-WB, and PI3-VH, respectively...." CAR#5 remains open.	
	Rd 3	ER calculation '2505_MRV4_ER_Calcs_v1.3' (03/05/2024) is verified with change made referring to the correct parameter $ny_{i,j}$ instead of $Ny_{i,j}$, as sighted in tab 'ER Survey' cell K30, K40 and K50. Same revision is sighted as well in monitoring report section 4.3.5 & 5.4. CAR#5 is closed off.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#6	
VCS Standard, v4.5 (r	Net GHG Emission Reductions and Removals	Values of monitored ERs achieved summarized in Table 7 Section 5.4 Net GHG Emission Reductions and Removals of the monitoring report is verified with previous monitoring report (MP3) ie	Values were amended to reflect the correct values as per the ER calculation sheet and the previous MP results.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response																
evised to VCS 4.7) Monitoring report template		CAR#6																	
		‘2505_MRV3_MR_v2.4_Clean.pdf’ and sighted with inconsistent values below:																	
		<table><tr><td>PI</td><td>MP</td><td>Table 7 MR MP4</td><td>Table 7 MR MP3</td></tr><tr><td>K2C</td><td>2</td><td>607,605</td><td>607,604</td></tr><tr><td>WB</td><td>3</td><td>382,642</td><td>390,655</td></tr><tr><td>VH</td><td>3</td><td>22,834</td><td>24,378</td></tr></table>		PI	MP	Table 7 MR MP4	Table 7 MR MP3	K2C	2	607,605	607,604	WB	3	382,642	390,655	VH	3	22,834	24,378
		PI		MP	Table 7 MR MP4	Table 7 MR MP3													
		K2C		2	607,605	607,604													
WB	3	382,642	390,655																
VH	3	22,834	24,378																
Average ER per ICS value summarized in Table 7 Section 5.4 Net GHG Emission Reductions and Removals of the monitoring report is verified with previous monitoring report (MP3) ie ‘2505_MRV3_MR_v2.4_Clean.pdf’ and sighted with inconsistent values for MP1 and MP3 performance as below:																			
<table><tr><td></td><td>MP1</td><td>MP2</td><td>MP3</td></tr><tr><td>MR MP3</td><td>3.883</td><td>3.157</td><td>3.479</td></tr><tr><td>MR MP4</td><td>3.852</td><td>3.157</td><td>4.105</td></tr></table>		MP1	MP2	MP3	MR MP3	3.883	3.157	3.479	MR MP4	3.852	3.157	4.105							
	MP1	MP2	MP3																
MR MP3	3.883	3.157	3.479																
MR MP4	3.852	3.157	4.105																
Rd 2		Values are sighted to have been revised for the points above as reflected in section 5.4 of the MR v1.2 (VCS MR 2505 01082023-31012024_V1.2). CAR#6 is closed off.																	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#7	
VCS Monitoring Report Templ	Section 5.4 Net GHG Emission Reductions and Removals	Following instruction of the monitoring report template V4.3, section 5.4 Tables in this section is to be completed by vintage period (calendar year). As of right now the section is	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR#7	
ate 4.3		claimed by the monitoring period (regardless the vintage). Ex-ante expected ER's in table 8 section 5.4 of the MR is sighted inconsistent between value in ER file '2505_MRV4_ER_Calcs_v1.3' under tab 'Ex-ante expected ERs' as 2,497,919 tCO₂eq vs 2,470,661.32 tCO₂eq.	
	Rd 2	CAR#6 is sighted without any response and evidence on revision for the points raised in the submitted evidence in specific for table in section 5.4 to be presented in vintage period (calendar year) as per monitoring report template v4.3. The ex-ante expected ER in table 8 section 5.4 is sighted revised and consistent with calculation in ER calculation ie at 2,466,926.95 ton CO₂eq. No follow up action needed for this point. CAR#7 remains open.	Vintages has been added in Table 6 of Section 5.4 of the MR and in the ER calculation sheet. Please note, the total ER from the project was reduced by 1 tCO₂ based on rounding down the vintage quantities. The total ERs are 1,524,641 tCO₂ with vintage split as follows: 2023: 1,255,174 2024: 269,467
	Rd 3	Monitoring report submitted v1.6 dated 07/05/2024 (revised into version 1.7 dated 10/05/2024) is sighted with section 5.4 table 6 is presented in vintage (calendar) break which is for period of 01/08/2023 - 31/12/2023 and 01/01/2024-31/01/2024. ER calculation for the value claimed is sighted in 2505_MRV4_ER_Calcs_v1.5 section under the tab of 'ER survey' for the calculation in each PAI and tab 'Summary' for the total of the three PAIs. The calculation is verified using the corresponding technology days for each PAI in each calendar period for both 2023 and 2024. The resulted value is consistent throughout MR and ER calculation. CAR#7 is closed off.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#1	
VCS Standard 4.5 (revised to VCS 4.7)	VCS Standard 4.5 (revised to VCS 4.7) Project and jurisdictional proponents must demonstrate that they have the legal right to control and operate project or program activities	PP is requested to provide evidence of project ownership from the process that generates GHG emission reductions in form of End User Agreement as regulated in section 1.7 of the PDD for the distributed cookstoves in this monitoring period for the following sampled: a) K2C PI: Cookstove ID 735040, 726819, 734230, 733914, 309133, 038120, 278272, & 187050 b) Vhembe PI: Cookstove ID 730171, 727872, 732978, 736902, 568325, 648451, 649577, & 655090 c) Waterberg PI: Cookstove 035552, 709572, 740398, 222229, 032447_2024, 036262, 670848	The end user agreements for the requested end users are shared in addition to this document.
	Rd 2	Provided evidence is reviewed and it is sighted in form of signed statement/acknowledgement with specifics: -project technology unit: Rocket Works wood efficient cookstove -provider of the technology: TASC -programme: Verra programme of activities: Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa -name of user -cookstove series number -cookstove is received free of charge -TASC SA (Pty) Ltd will claim the CO2 emissions reductions from the stove and sell these as carbon credits. -signature (dated) -location -signature of witness The user agreement is verified individually for:	- End user agreement labelled "Device_EndUserAgreement_K2c_187050" for user with ICS barcode 187050 is shared in addendum to this document.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#1 a) K2C PI: Cookstove ID 735040, 726819, 734230, 733914, 309133, 038120, 278272, & b) Vhembe PI: Cookstove ID 730171, 727872, 732978, 736902, 568325, 648451, 649577, & 655090 c) Waterberg PI: Cookstove 035552, 709572 740398, 222229, 032447_2024, 036262, 670848 Follow up action needed: 1 user agreement under cookstove ID 187050 (PAI K2C) is not provided. CL#1 remains open for 1 missing signed agreement.	
	Rd 3	User agreement under cookstove ID 187050 (PAI K2C) is provided and verified for its information against project distribution database. Traceability was performed using SurveyCTO demonstration in the remote call (3 May 2024) with the data under Distribution Record with the excel file provided 'Distribution Database_20240430' and signed sampled user's carbon transfer agreement. CL#1 is closed off with evidence of carbon transfer agreement between individual users and TASC verified with information reflected in project database distribution is accurate.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#2	
VCS v4.3	VCS Monitoring Report Template	PP is requested to provide a transparent calculation on the claim made on SDG 3 in table 1 of the MR that '71% of project households, or 529,889 total	The calculation for SDG 3 has been added into the "Summary" tab of the ER calculation sheet. The 71% is calculated from taking the

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response						
		CL#2							
Monitoring report template	1.11 Sustainable Development Contributions	(746,323*0.71), reported a reduction in smoke while cooking on the project ICS vs. the baseline fire in this monitoring period'. The reference provided is the data for kitchen survey in which this value is not sighted.	average of the percentages of households indicating that the stove smoke is better in each instance. These values can be found in cell C2 of the "SDGs" tab in the excel sheets titled 2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C/Vhembe/Waterberg_v1.1. After doing this calculation in the ER calculation sheet, the number of households decreased to 529,516. This has been amended in the MR.						
	Rd 2	Within the ER calculation file provided '2505_MRV4_ER_Calcs_v1.1' tab 'Summary' is sighted with section of SDG 3 % of value for each PAI: <table><tr><td>PI1-K2C</td><td>73.50%</td></tr><tr><td>PI2-WB</td><td>81.70%</td></tr><tr><td>PI3-VH</td><td>57.65%</td></tr></table> Each value used in SDG3 calculation in table above is traced based to KPT files for each under tab of 'SDG' with data count for data recorded from questionnaire whether stove smoke is recorded as 'better' and calculated into % from the total data surveyed. The average of % of value used as % users perceived better smoke stove from each PAI is sighted using average function flat across all 3 PAIs which arrived at 71% and calculated into unit of households by multiplying with total cookstoves distributed. Follow up action needed: Value sighted used for PI1-K2C in ER calculation tab 'Summary' as 73.5% which is inconsistent with the value calculated in KPT file of K2C '2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.1' tab 'SDG' cell C2 which	PI1-K2C	73.50%	PI2-WB	81.70%	PI3-VH	57.65%	- The value for SDG 3 in cell "C24" of the summary sheet in the ER calculation sheet has been amended to be consistent with the calculation done in "2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.1" and is now consistent. The value for PI1-K2C was amended from 73.5% to 73.27%. - Furthermore, the average across all 3 instances was recalculated using the weighted average by weighing in accordance with number of ICS devices distributed. This resulted in an increase from 71% to 74% of households reporting a reduction in smoke since receiving the project device. This resulted in the number of households affected to increase from 528,944 to 555,268. The relevant changes have been made in Table 1 of section 1.12 in the MR. However, due to CL#6 the number of affected HHs further changed to 549,675.
PI1-K2C	73.50%								
PI2-WB	81.70%								
PI3-VH	57.65%								

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#2	
		is 73.27586%. PP is requested to review and make the revision accordingly. PP is requested to provide justification on basis of approach on the use of average function across all 3 PAIs instead of using weighted average of each units distributed per PAI for the calculation of SDG 3 impact claim. CL#2 remains open.	
	Rd 3	Calculation for SDG3 impact claim as presented in '2505_MRV4_ER_Calcs_v1.3' tab 'Summary' is sighted with revision made on the value claimed for %value claimed (cell C24) revised into 73,27%. The calculated % of averages of users recorded with perception that stove smoke is recorded as 'better' from habit survey across three PAIs is revised using weighted average (with number of cookstoves distributed in each PAI) which the value calculated as 74.42% and claimed as rounded down value into 74% (from the initial 71%). This in effect changes the SDG 3 impact claim as reflected in MR (VCS MR 2505 01082023-31012024_V1.3 03/05/2024) section 1.12 table 1. CL#2 is closed off.	Closed

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#3	
VCS Standard, v4.5 (	VCS Standard, v4.5 (revised to VCS 4.7) 3.23.1 Project proponents shall not seek credit for the same GHG emission reduction and carbon	PP is requested to provide confirmation whether project is currently active in any other environment schemes and claiming credits. PP is requested to provide signed declaration stating that the project is not registered with any other registry. In case PP have received or are seeking credit for reductions and removals from a	The project is not active in any other crediting schemes other than the VCS. A signed declaration labelled "Double_Counting_Declaration_v1.0 signed" is included as evidence.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#3	
revise d to VCS 4.7)	dioxide removal under the VCS Program and another GHG program. Projects issuing GHG credits from different time periods under the VCS Program and another GHG program shall also conform with the rules and requirements in the Registration and Issuance Process. PDD 3.2 Applicability of Methodology against VRM0006 v11.1 point 7 “Each PI will include a statement on the uniqueness of the Project and by listing other similar activities (from other GHG programme registries) that are taking place within the project boundary to demonstrate its uniqueness”.	project activity under the VCS Program and another GHG program, PP is requested to provide the required information as per VCS Standard v4.5 (revised to VCS 4.7) para 3.23.2 (1)-(4). PP is requested to provide a statement on the uniqueness of the project and list of similar projects activities within project boundary as evidence of its conformance to Project Design Document ‘Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa Grouped PDD_v9_Clean’	It is not clear why the finding of the uniqueness of the project is raised, as this was already confirmed during the validation and inclusion of the project instances. As this is a verification review, with no new instances being included, this finding is not considered relevant. Currently, there is only one other registered cookstove VCS project in South Africa with ID3941. This project involves the distribution of TLC-CQC rocket stoves, which is of a completely different design to the RocketWorks stoves which TASC distributes.
	Rd 2	Signed statement by CEO of TASC is provided (Double_Counting_Declaration_v1.0 signed) dated 4 April 2024 with reference on project ID and title. Statement includes information that the project is only registered under VCS programme and not seeking nor registered with other GHG programmes. CL#3 is closed off.	- Closed

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#4	
VCS Standard, v4.5 (revised to VCS 4.7)	Project Location VCS Standard 4.5 (revised to VCS 4.7) 3.11.1 The project location shall be specified in the project description. Project location requirements for AFOLU and GCS projects are specified below and in the GCS Requirements respectively.	PP is requested to provide additional supporting evidence in relation to project location following requirement as per VCS Standard v4.5 (revised to VCS 4.7) para 3.11.1 All other projects shall provide: 3) For projects with multiple project activity instances (see Sections 3.6.4 –3.6.22) and grouped projects (see Section 3.6.10), either: a) A geodetic coordinate for each instance, provided in a KML file; or b) Geodetic polygon(s) provided in a KML file that: i) Encompass all instances in the project, and ii) Delineate the smallest administrative division of land for the local government (e.g., if the activity takes place within six villages, the six villages must each have their own polygon).	As per CL#3, this information was validated during the inclusion of the PAIs in previous monitoring periods. The assessment of PAI boundaries is not part of the scope of a verification where there is no inclusion of new PAIs in the GP. As this is a verification review, with no new instances being included, this finding is not considered relevant.
	Rd 2	With no inclusion of new PAI in this MP, in reference to the VCS standard and monitoring report template section 1.8, CL#4 is closed off with kml files for each PAI are provided and verified: - PI1-K2C - PI3-VH - PI2-WB The kml file is verified to be reflecting the location of users' location ie project technology distribution as per geo-coordinates captured in the project distribution database 'Distribution Database_20240430'.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#5	
The VCS Standard, v4.5 (revised to VCS 4.7) Monitoring report template	Calibration records ISO 14064-2:2019 Clause 6.10 Monitoring the GHG project Where measurement and monitoring equipment is used, the project proponent shall ensure that calibrated or verified monitoring and measurement equipment is used and maintained, as appropriate.	PP is requested to provide the calibration certificate for both measuring equipment used for carrying out monitoring plan ie weigh scale and moisture tester used in KPT used for calculating parameter μ_y . Information on the measuring tool ie type and model shall be added in section of 'Monitoring equipment' and calibration information shall be added in section 'QA/QC procedures to be applied' for this parameter in section 4.2 of the MR.	The monitoring equipment has been bought new before the onset of the monitoring activities and thus do not need calibration. Sales invoices/receipts of the equipment labelled "LEROY MERLIN_Scales" and "RSComponents_Moisture Meters" are shared in addition to this document. The scales were purchased on the 4 th of July 2023 and the moisture meters on the 5 th of July 2023. Furthermore, the following information on the measuring equipment has been added in section 4.2 of the MR: "Equipment used for KPTs are bought new before the onset of each round of monitoring. For this MP the moisture meters and scales were bought on the 4th and 5th of July 2023 and do not need calibration. These scales can measure up to 300kg in increments of 0.1kg and is in accordance with the OIML R76 standard. The moisture meters used can measure moisture levels for wood from 6% to 44% with an accuracy of 2%."
	Rd2	Order confirmation communication (email) are provided for: -8 units of Portable Crane Scale 300KG Dated from July 4, 2023 Leroy Martin (supplier) with estimated arrival on July 8, 2023. User Guide document is provided for Crane Scale model OCS-L.Technical specification of accuracy: Chinese GB/T 11883-2002 Class III Equivalent to OIML R76 Invoice 76491351 of order issued 5 July 2023 is provided with information sighted for:	- The approach to calculating wood use via KPTs has not changed from the previous monitoring period, as approved by the VVB and Verra. In the KPT calculations the wood as weighed by the monitors is used for the calculation and the values are not adjusted further based on moisture content. Thus, the moisture measurements are not relevant to

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#5 -7 units of Pocket Moisture Meter Product specification is provided for 'RS PRO RS-120 Moisture Meter, Maximum Measurement 0.2 → 2 %, 6→44 %' by RS Pro for model RS-120. Specification of the meter for wood in specific is stated as material wood is at 6%-44%Measuring Range, ±2% accuracy and 1% resolution. Information under section of QA/QC of parameter μ_y section 4.2 of the MR is sighted added with date of purchase of the scales and moisture testers ie 4th and 5th of July 2023 with specification of measurement capacity and accuracy level. With the date of KPT execution sighted from the excel summary is 30 Oct 2023 – 1 Dec 2023 for all 3 PAIs, both the scales and moisture tester units are purchased before the date of execution. Based on the technical specification of the measuring equipment provided, data presented from the KPT is reviewed. For weight of wood stock data presented in highest weight recorded is 69.3 kg and lowest at 1.7 kg which are within the capability of the scale claimed used. Follow up action needed: The data presented for the % moisture content obtained from KPT is verified with finding that few of the data in KPT for K2C sighted in very low value ie: - 0.4 - 1.2% for cookstove 154663, 439035, 382739, 026433 & 046197 in day 1 ('2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.1' tab 'Day 1') - cookstove 390189 & 409936 data presented for day 5 is sighted with same low value.	the calculation and have no effect on the final value achieved. The same KPT approach has been followed during the baseline determination for the respective instances and all project related KPT done for previous rounds of verification and in none of these cases was the wood adjusted based upon moisture content. Therefore, to be consistent the wood weight is used as weighed and not adjusted according to moisture content. For the wood weight values with more than 2 decimals, this is not possible with the scale provided, and so the additional decimals were added erroneously. These values have been adjusted conservatively (rounded down) to 2 decimal places. This resulted in an increase in the observed project KPT value to 5.131kg per day. However, this had no effect on the calculation for parameter μ_y and therefore had no effect on the calculated emission reductions. Please note, this has caused the calculated precision to change to 5.2%. This value was amended in the MR. Please note that for PI2-K2C, parameter μ_y was amended to use the outlier corrected wood weight data from the KPT sheet to be consistent with PI2 and PI3.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#5	
		PP is requested to provide clarification on the QA/QC measure on data quality for moisture content collected with reference on moisture tester capability as referenced from product specification on wood material in specific. Within the data of weight stocks in KPT K2C ('2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.1' tab 'Day 1', 'Day 2', 'Day 3', 'Day 4', 'Day 5') sighted with few of data sets that with data of weight recorded with 4 and 5 decimals format ie data sets on cookstove ID 475236, 439035, 477581, 434634, & 447670. From the specification of the scale model provided ie for 300 kg capacity the corresponding model based on the product user guide is OCS-03-L with capacity 300 kg/600 lb, 0.1 kg/0.2 lb resolution. PP is requested to provide clarification whether the data presented for the cookstove stated above is plausible using the technical capability of the claimed scale used. CL#5 remains open	The new value for uy in PI1-K2C is 0.222, this has led to an increase in ERs to 1,531,906. All corresponding changes have been made in the MR.
	Rd 3	The approach chosen to calculate this parameter is verified against Methodology VMR0006-Methodology-for-Installation-of-High-Efficiency-Firewood-Cookstoves-v1.1 requirement under 'Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied:' that the parameter can be calculated using proportional of how many units of baseline stoves compared to technology stove under the claim that they are continuously used in parallel or calculating percentage of baseline stoves in cooking needs with no details specified on how the calculation/measuring is performed. Project Proponent approach is as claimed following Kitchen Survey Test Protocol v4 of the Clean Cooking Alliance following with number of measurements for weigh and moisture content of the wood fuel for minimum 3 days. The data is presented in KPT files for each PAI and data accuracy is traced from initial raw source which is captured and	- The value uy for PI3-VH was amended in the ER calculation sheet and the MR from 0.17 to 0.181. The resulted in a decrease in total ERs to 1,529,883. A further reduction to 1,527,727 was observed after CL#6.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#5 stored in SurveyCTO platform during remote call 3 May 2024. From the excel calculation, the process of obtaining ER value which is related to KPT is calculation of parameter uy which is using the amount of wood consumption within 5 days of KPT. Moisture content data is presented and part of the KPT as presented in data set in each PAI KPT record example '2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.2' tab 'Day 1', 'Day 2', 'KPT Calculation'. Even though the data is recorded, uy is calculated with parameters: - kg wood fuel consumption/HH/day and converted to ton wood fuel consumption/HH/year (from KPT) - By,savings: using formulation 3 of the methodology -The deviation between Bold,I - By,savings is calculated as the amount of wood used by improved stove -Deviation between the ton wood/HH/year consumed (from KPT) and wood that improved stove can consumed is claimed as wood used in baseline stove which then calculated into fraction. The same approach and clarification provided in previous verification process. The steps of calculation for this parameter are provided in section 'Calculation Method' in table 4.2 for this parameter in monitoring report. With this approach, % moisture content is not a factor influencing the calculation is carried out with the assumption that % moisture content of wood measured in Bold,I, By,savings, and amount wood consumed derived from KPT are in same value. In comparison of this approach with example provided by the methodology ie through survey confirming the	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#5 use of baseline stoves through the numbers of the baselines used in parallel together with technology stoves, as the approach is through measured parameter, the approach is evaluated to be able to lead to more accurate result as data obtained through perceived claims from users from a period of time has lower confidence level. With the approach that PP has implemented, several factors are influencing the data accuracy such as suitability and accuracy factor of the measuring equipment's, competence of the surveyors, procedures of how the data is obtained, error risk in data accuracy during recording and collection and QA/QC measure post survey during data management system. Factors influencing the quality of the data: -Suitability and accuracy factor of the equipment's: is clarified in this CL#5 -Competence of surveyors: is clarified in CAR#4 -Procedures of data collection: is clarified in CAR#4 with the point closed as important points for KPT is verified as part of the training agenda. -Error risk in data accuracy during recording and collection: tracing back data from presented summary of excel to raw data collected and stored in SurveyCTO during remote call 3 May 2024. Through survey CTO, data can be retrieved into several format including excel file for calculation, traceability and other functions. From samples data, 1 survey data set is sighted to be inconsistent in term of the weight data between excel data and SurveyCTO which is traced to KPT files that being removed from the data set as outlier and 1 survey data set is sighted to be inconsistent in term of the moisture content between excel data and SurveyCTO and since moisture content	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#5 is not affecting calculation, it is not counted as error in data transfer and no correction is made. -Number of minimum samples: addressed in CAR#3 for details -Timing of survey execution: addressed in CAR#3 for details -Representative random samples from each population to obtain representative data: addressed in CL#8 for details -QA/QC measures: PP has performed elimination for outliers ie for average weigh of wet wood consumption data is performance through confidence precision analysis performed for the average of the weight wet wood consumption. As raised points in this CL#5 that there are few data sets anomalies that sighted which detected as risk in data quality such as: -Low moisture content of woods recorded below the normal range of moisture content for wood fuel. It understandable that with the approach implemented % moisture content is not influencing ER calculation and since the rest of data used for calculation does not have moisture content incorporated, this would be able to be incorporated in MP4 since baseline consumption has no such data. With that understanding, it is also noted moisture content is highly affecting weight of the wood fuel and that the approach chosen is highly depended on the accuracy and quality of the data obtained. With this factor identified that is yet to be monitored as part of data quality management, FAR is raised for internal quality control to be carried out with parameter in concern ie moisture content of wood fuel as part of KPT to ensure that only the accurate data obtained for weight of wet wood consumption is used for calculation of the parameter uy. Internal data	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#5 management shall be applied to those data sets that is sighted to be out of the equipment's capability as well as to perform cross check during data transfer process from SurveyCTO to excel summary that is used for ER calculation and reporting. For the data used in this monitoring report, analysis is performed to see whether there is direct correlation between data with anomalies in % moisture content has any correlation with data of weight of wet wood. From the analysis, it is observed that few of the data sets that has moisture content out of normal range are removed due to the average wet wood consumption is out of lower/higher bound, whilst few sets are still retained and used in calculation of uy. With no direct correlation that can be seen and that PP has used quality control in removing data outliers using confidence/precision analysis, for the data set of K2C's KPT used in this monitoring report, it is accepted that the data is still under acceptable quality and does not presenting risk of over- or under claim for the ER calculation. Analysis for precision for parameter Mean Wet Wood use ('2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.3' tab 'KPT Summary') is sighted with revised using the revised mean and sample size. The calculated wet wood 5.128 kg/day/household derived from survey data is at precision 5.2% (from initial 5.1%) which still meet the precision level at 10%. The analysis is used to identified outliers with lower 1.17 kg/day/HH and upper boundary at 9.70 kg/day/HH for the measured wet wood consumption average for each household from KPT. Outliers are removed following the lower and upper boundary as sighted in column K in '2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.3' under tab 'KPT calculations'. With the change made, the calculation of	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#5 parameter uy is affected and the new value is calculated at 0.224. Revision is sighted in KPT files for Waterberg (2505_MRV4_pKPT_Waterberg_v1.1) for values used in calculation uy, with the linked values is revised from average wet wood consumption derived from 5 days KPT to the same parameters with outliers removed with values of uy of 0.419. The KPT files for Vheme (2505_MRV4_pKPT_Vhembe_v1.1) is sighted with the same revision with values of average wet wood consumption is revised with link of the values to those with outliers removed. The value of uy is calculated to be 0.181. The ER calculation (2505_MRV4_ER_Calcs_v1.3) tab 'ER Survey' cell F23 is inconsistent ie at 0.17 instead of 0.181. The same inconsistent is sighted with the value claimed under the parameter uy in section 4.2 and 5.4 (page 51) of the monitoring report (VCS MR 2505 01082023-31012024_v1.3). Data of weigh records that raises concern is sighted in revised K2C KPT data '2505_MRV4_pKPT_K2C_v1.2' is sighted revised with only 2 digits decimals. Follow up needed: Revision of the value uy for Vhembe in monitoring report section 4.2 and 5.4 (page 51) as well as ER calculation under tab 'ER Survey' cell F23. CL#5 remains open for point above.	
	Rd 4	ER calculation (2505_MRV4_ER_Calcs_v1.4) is verified with change of value for uy parameter of Vhembe from 0.17 to 0.181 (consistent with the uy calculated in KPT Vhembe (2505_MRV4_pKPT_Vhembe_v1.1) which in effect resulted in ER calculation claimed for Vhembe from	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#5	
		152,626 to 150,213 tonCO2eq and total ER claimed in the MP. This change is reflected in monitoring report v1.4 section 5.4. CL#5 is closed off.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#6	
VRM006 v1.1	Methodology Eligibility Criterion	a.PP is requested to provide justification on how demonstrate eligibility of methodology VMR0006 v1.1 as accordance to PDD (Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa Grouped PDD_v9_Clean) section 3.2 criterion 2 “The project stove shall have specified high-power thermal efficiency of at least 25% per the manufacturer’s specifications and shall exclusively use woody biomass and can be single pot or multi-pot; in case of project stove replacing fossil fuel baseline stove, it shall exclusively use renewable biomass” with information sighted in the Project Database ‘Distribution Database (31 Jan 2024)’ for stove recipients that are recorded with baseline & secondary stoves; primary & secondary fuels are not wood/charcoal (either electric hob, kerosene, paraffin, or gas) as recorded for stoves ID: A) Under Vhembe PI with a total of 241 of registered stove users B) Under Waterberg PI a total of 20 registered stove users C) Under K2C PI a total of 7275 registered stove users b.PP is requested to provide evidence of measure that project implementation is as per methodology	a) In an improved cookstove project the baseline scenario is compared with the project scenario (for each MP) and emission reductions are based on the reduction in fuel being used. This is also why KPTs are the most accurate way of monitoring this parameter value, because they isolate fuel use in the household (i.e. exclusively wood use), so that there is a clear like-for-like comparison between the baseline device and the project device using the same fuel; any other fuel use is not captured as it is not relevant to the project as the project only places focus on the reduction of fuel wood being used. Even though users might have used and still use other types of fuel sources/cooking sources in the baseline scenario they also indicated that they are wood users. The project aims to lessen the continued reliance on wood fuel in households irrespective of other sources of fuel

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#6 requirement in domestic premises, or in community-based kitchens.	being used which is not of relevance to the project. This approach has been validated and approved by Verra in 3 previous monitoring periods. b) The distributed technology is not suited to use in any other circumstances than for domestic use. Furthermore, GPS coordinates and household information is captured with distribution and shared in the distribution database. Furthermore, in the supplied End User Agreements states the following: <i>"I hereby give consent for TASC SA (Pty) Ltd to collect personal information and other information and data, as voluntarily disclosed by me or the members of my household to the Interviewer."</i> This statement clearly indicates that the beneficiary is part of a household.
	Rd 2	a) It is well understood that emission reduction is calculated using wood fuel used as reflected in KPT survey procedure thus taking into calculation only the use of wood fuel reduction as compared to baseline consumption, not affected by the use of baseline stove/fuel type that are not utilizing wood fuel. As part of eligibility assessment for each PAI sighted in monitoring report MP3 (2505_MRV3_MR_v2.4_Clean) section 3.3 measure on point 3 is stated that "End users will be asked to state their source of energy and baseline	a.) Devices flagged as not using biomass in the baseline/upon distribution was removed from the database and ER calculation sheet was updated. The ERs were adjusted down to 1,493,619 as a result of this. However, due to amending parameter uy for K2C, the ERs increased to 1,531,906. All sections in the MR relating to this has been updated.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#6 appliance at the point of distribution and during the project monitoring”. The project database is sighted with information including: -primary stove type -primary fuel type -secondary stove type -secondary stove others -secondary stove use frequency part of data set collected during the dissemination process satisfying data collection claimed for the point of distribution. The same information is sighted as part of project implementation in form of habit survey. PP is kindly requested on provide clarification on data sets of users with baseline stove, baseline fuel, secondary stove that are not using wood fuel and/or 3 stone fire as sighted in project database record ‘Distribution Database (31 Jan 2024)’ taken into account in the assessment of eligibility to take place in project. PP is requested to demonstrate the procedure from initial data collection to eligibility assessment over remote discussion. b.Users agreement provided with details specified as part of acknowledgement that the user is part of household. From the visited sampled users from all three PAIs, 100% of the users are recorded as households. From the specification of the stove technology, it is evaluated suited for households due to its size. With these factors evaluated that the project implementation in relation to type of technology users, no evidence is detected that project users are other than households.	b.) Closed

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#6 Point b is closed off. CL#6 remains open for point a.	
	Rd 3	a)Submitted project database ‘Distribution Database_20240430’ is sighted with reduced number of users within each PAI: -WB: 297,496 users/cookstoves -K2C: 334,773 users/cookstoves -VH: 106,387 users/cookstoves The new project distribution list is sighted with those users with data set under column (T, U, V, W) data for baseline stove, baseline fuel, secondary stove indicating the use of three stone fire or wood fuel in any of the column. Remote call (3 May 2024) includes data traceback from project database from initial raw data collected by monitoring team stored in SurveyCTO which involves verification on data accuracy for name of users, stove ID, location, date, baselines primary & secondary stove and primary fuel type. From the samples (randomly generated data set), data in the project distribution ‘Distribution Database_20240430’ is sighted to be accurate. Within the revised project distribution, it is still sighted for users: - 003733 (PAI K2C) with database primary baseline stove as gas burner and primary fuel as charcoal. -109538 & 092379 (PAI K2C) with database primary baseline stove as charcoal grate and primary fuel as charcoal. -173979 (PAI WB) with database primary baseline stove as charcoal grate and primary fuel as gas	- All users who have not indicated any use of wood in the baseline scenario was removed from the database for crediting. This resulted in a decrease in ERs from 1,531,906 to 1,527,727. Respective changes have been made in the MR and ER calculation sheet.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#6 - 689011 (PAI VH) with database primary baseline stove as kerosene burner, primary fuel as charcoal and secondary stove as gas burner. Relation between primary stove type and primary fuel type is questioned for plausibility such as mentioned above. This data set is sighted not consistent with value for parameter η_{old} ie as 0.1 as set by methodology used if baseline device is a three-stone fire using firewood (not charcoal), or a conventional device with no improved combustion air supply or flue gas ventilation, that is without a grate or a chimney. CL#6 remains open.	
	Rd 4	Submitted project distribution database (Distribution Database_20240506) is verified for the revision made. The number of users/cookstoves under each PAI is verified as: -K2C: 334,747 units -WB: 296,673 units -VH: 106,070 units with total stoves distributed throughout the project's crediting period as 737,490 units and new distributed units in the MP is at 118,792 units. ER calculation (2505_MRV4_ER_Calcs_v1.4) is reflecting the change with new list of cookstoves/users used in calculating technology days and in effect to the ER calculation claimed. Within the revised project database (Distribution Database_20240506), verifier still observed data sets under column T, U, V and W (primary stove type, primary fuel type, secondary stove type, secondary stove others) that are observed as anomalies such as: -VH: stove 537631 with primary stove as gas burner, primary fuel type as wood and secondary stove as gas burner; stove 731528 with primary stove as kerosene	ICS devices are distributed to households based upon an observation of the household that wood fuel is being used. If a household indicated that they use wood as a fuel source, regardless of it being a primary or secondary stove, they are eligible to receive an ICS. This is indicated in eligibility criteria 2 & 3 of the Project Description. Furthermore, in the baseline scenario of the three instances, it was reported that there are other stove types, and fuel types, used in households within the project boundary. However, wood was determined to be used in most households as the primary fuel source. The baseline and project KPTs account for these fuel usage patterns and are applied to the usage rate calculation. As the KPTs are completed at the household level, they quantify wood used on all devices

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#6 burner, primary fuel type as wood and secondary stove as gas burner. - K2C: stove 594913 with primary stove as gas burner, primary fuel type as wood and secondary stove as gas burner; 471670 with primary stove as electric hob, primary fuel type as wood and secondary stove as electric hob. - WB: stove 425450 with primary stove as charcoal grate, primary fuel type as wood and secondary stove as paraffin burner; 643666 with primary stove as Kerosene_burner, primary fuel type as wood and secondary stove as Electric_hob. PP is requested to kindly provide clarification on how data of primary/secondary stove type and primary fuel is correlated and used as part of eligibility process. Another point to be clarified is for the value of η_{old} as claimed in section 4.2 of the monitoring report with value of 0.1 which is reflected as well in ER calculation. Following the methodology VRM0006 default value of 0.1 shall be used if baseline device is a three-stone fire using firewood (not charcoal), or a conventional device with no improved combustion air supply or flue gas ventilation, that is without a grate or a chimney;". <i>PP is kindly requested to provide clarification on how this value is applied in cases where baseline stove (primary & secondary) as reflected in distribution database (as sampled above) are not recorded as three stone fire nor as conventional device as per methodology requirement.</i> <i>CL#6 remains open.</i>	in a household and does not differentiate between different biomass stove types. These mixed usage patterns are accounted for in the emissions calculations, whereby the ERs are adjusted based on the monitored ICS usage (K2C 85%, WB 99% and VH 72%) and continued baseline stove usage (K2C 0.22, WB 0.42 and VH 0.18). This significantly reduces the ERs claimed. Lastly, the anomalies observed in the data could be simply attributed to recording errors during distribution, which are not material to the overall ER calculations (for the above reasons). The data inconsistencies affect approximately only 0.6% of the total devices distributed, which is not considered material. It can be assumed that there was a mistake when selecting stove type on the survey CTO form in the field, but the crucial aspect is that the households indicated that they use wood as a fuel source, prior to receiving the ICS. As per the baseline surveys, the common device for burning wood fuel in the baseline was established as a 3 stone fire. Thus, the value of 0.1 for parameter η_{old} is applicable for baseline devices recorded as 3-stone fires or open fires. However, where it is unclear what the baseline device was but the household indicated the use of wood fuel in the baseline scenario, parameter η_{old} was set as 0.2 to be conservative. This resulted in a

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#6	
			corresponding decrease in ERs to 1,524,641.
	Rd 5	As per project description section 5.2, parameter η_{old} “The baseline survey for PI1-K2C shows predominant use of wood fuel amongst households in the first PI Project Boundary. Pls will expressly targeted households that cook predominantly on an open fire, hence the application of Option A as the ex-ante parameter value. In all cases, the baseline device replaced within each household will be captured at the point of ICS distribution and recorded in the monitoring database.” This parameter is set in the PDD as either 0.1 or 0.2 and shall be adjusted accordingly as ex-post parameter. In distribution database, few of users with primary baseline fuel of wood are recorded with baseline stoves that are not plausible to be using wood fuel due to the specification of the device such as electric hob or kerosene or gas burner. No record under primary, secondary nor secondary other stove type under these users are indicating open fire as per default value set by methodology and as per conditions set in project description for the use of value 0.1 for monitored parameter η_{old}. Information on the baseline stoves types that is used by household with the wood fuel is not reflected in project database. The use of value of 0.1 for η_{old} in case baseline stove is not evident as three-stone fire using firewood (not charcoal), or a conventional device as methodology requirements present risk of overclaiming for ER calculation. ER calculation submitted ‘2505_MRV4_ER_Calcs_v1.6’ is verified with changes made in the approach under tab ‘Tech Days-K2C/VH/WB’ and ‘ER survey’. Under technology days data set in each project instances,	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#6 segregation is sighted between stove IDs/users which is traced back to project distribution database that segregation is performed between users that are recorded with three stone fire as primary/secondary baseline stove and those with baseline stoves (primary/secondary/others) as others than three stone fire. Data analysis performed in project database 'Distribution Database_20240506' is sighted with users with baseline stoves (primary/secondary/others) as other than three stone fire: -K2C: 1,257 units/users (731 users with charcoal grate & 526 users with baselines stoves that are 'others') -VH: 1,481 units/users (594 users with charcoal grate & 887 users with baselines stoves that are 'others') -WB: 1,702 units/users (1518 users with charcoal grate & 184 users with baselines stoves that are 'others') Users with recorded charcoal grate are the data sets that following methodology condition to use 0.2 default value for η_{old}. 1,597 users with baseline stoves under the category of 'others' are the data set that is with no valid information to determine value for parameter η_{old}. This is verified to be consistent with the number of users reflected in the segregation under technology days used in ER calculation. Data consistency is checked for consistency in the dates of installation as this affect the calculation for technology days for each user/stove unit. ER calculation is sighted revised with the segregation of users which is calculated into technology days which then calculated for ER calculation using two η_{old} value ie 0.1 or 0.2. In effect the ER calculated is segregated ie into users with recorded baseline stove as three stone fire and	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#6 those with others. Based on interview with PP and subsequent justification and response that there are data anomalies detected for portion of user's data set for baseline stove type which is not providing information on what is needed to determine η_{old} value as per methodology requirement. Users with no data on baseline stove type that uses wood fuel are sighted categorized under 'other stove baseline using wood fuel' as reflected in ER calculation as well as in section 5.2 of the monitoring report in which value of 0.2 is used for η_{old}. Based on the evidence provided and available for evaluation, this revised approach is using assumption that data sets of users that do not have information on baseline stove that uses wood fuel were with baseline stove as 'others'. Following methodology condition for default value of 0.2 for this parameter is "a default value of 0.2 shall be used for other types of devices". Through site visit, baseline stove is verified from 25 sampled users that 100% were using three stone fires (with 2 users that claimed using electrical stove together with three stone fire as baseline stove) providing plausibility that the baseline stove on users in majority is as three stove fire. Analysis on ER calculated impact from the number of stoves/users that are under the category of 'other baseline stove with wood fuel' is totalled at 4,978 tCO₂eq or 0.327% from the total 1,524,641 tCO₂eq ER claimed in the monitoring period. The rest of the formulation and approach for the ER calculation is sighted with no change and verified to be following the methodology requirement. With all of the factors above taken into evaluation, verifier team has concluded that data used for ER	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#6 calculation for this monitoring period is detected with erroneous data entry in specific for 1,597 users with the baseline stove type which is monitored parameter used to determine ηold value which is affected ER calculation. This detected set of data error is revised by PP by taking more conservative value of 0.2 following condition set by methodology under 'other types of devices'. The approach is calculated for its impact in ER calculation overall which is as 0.327% (which already include users with record of charcoal grate as baseline stove) from the overall ER claim. The ER value claimed is accepted as the error detected & verified within the acceptable range of material threshold following VCS standard 4.7 para 4.1.10 "The threshold for materiality with respect to the aggregate of errors, omissions, and misrepresentations relative to the total reported GHG emission reductions and/or removals shall be five percent for projects and one percent for large projects". The project is categorized as large project following categorization of VCS standard 4.7 para 3.10.1 project with 300,000 tonnes of CO₂e per year as in this MP4 the grouped project is claiming for 1,524,641 tCO₂eq for period of 0.47 year. The approach for the ER calculation as reflected based on the PP's respond and the submitted ER calculation is accepted. During the Internal Technical Review, it is detected that in section 1.1 of the monitoring report (v1.7), inconsistency in the number of cookstove distributed in this monitoring period (119,116 units) and distributed in total (738,656 units) is sighted with the rest of the monitoring report. The final submitted project distribution database, the number of is verified to be	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#6	
		118,792 units for the MP and 737,490 units for the entire CP. PP is requested to make the necessary revision and resubmit the monitoring report in track change mode and clean version both in version 1.8 as well as the date in which the version is issued. CL#6 remains open.	
	Rd6	Revision is sighted in respect for number of cookstove distributed in section 1.1 of the monitoring report v1.8 (17-May-2024) CL#6 is closed off.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#7	
VCS Standard, v4.5 (revised to VCS 4.7) Monitoring report template	Ongoing mechanism and its effectiveness in addressing stakeholder concerns	Section 2.12 of MR: In line with VCS standard 3.18.3 and 3.18.4, The PP shall provide appropriate evidence for execution of invitation letter and photographs for the claim made in table presented in section 2.12 of the MR. Few of the meetings are recorded with high number of attendees such as 1328 participants on 2023/09/12 in Badimong village, 1204 participants 2023/09/20 in Mashoahleng village and others. PP is requested to provide supporting evidence on such claim made.	The meetings with high number of participants were wrongfully stated as community engagements. These meetings were centralized distribution events where beneficiaries came to pick up their ICS devices using a token that was received when their household data was captured <i>in situ</i> . Furthermore, the VVB has referenced paragraphs 3.18.3 and 3.18.4 of the VCS standard. These paragraphs are in relation with local stakeholder consultations that need to take place before implementation of new PAIs. As there are no new PAIs, the finding and the monitoring community engagements referred to in the MR are part of TASC own internal auxiliary monitoring done in addition to the formal monitoring required by Verra. The finding raised is therefore not

			considered relevant and the paragraphs are not applicable.
	Rd 2	Section 2.1.2 (previously as section 2.2) in monitoring report template has been revised. Table 2 Summary of stakeholder consultations in the form of community meetings in MP4 in section 2.2 is sighted also not present in the revised MR. Note that the revised MR is using monitoring report template 4.3 which is released on 29 August 2023 as corrective action for CAR#1. Table in section 2.1.2 2.1.2 Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication is sighted with information provided in form of: dates of execution of the session for each PAI, data collection and storage for each Ongoing community engagement/sensitization details are provided in "Community_Meetings" excel sheet. Provided excel file is verified with summary of details of meetings/sessions provided. Links provided for evidence is verified requires log-in account. PP is requested to demonstrate internal system in place used to collect, store and retrieve data in relation to the community meetings record over remote discussion. VCS standard 4.7 point 3.18.3 and 3.18.4 is relevant for any stages throughout project implementation thus these are relevant parts of verification. CL#7 remains open	- Community engagements are recorded using the SurveyCTO and Collect platforms and data is exported and stored in the "Community_Meetings" excel sheet. Any comments received during the village engagements are added in column "R" of the sheet. If the comment received warrants any further consideration it is highlighted. The following language has been added into the Table under section 2.1.2 in the 'Stakeholder Input' section: <i>"In general, feedback from these meetings are positive towards the stove. The communities recognize how the stove can save them time in collecting wood and in cooking, as well as reducing the amount of wood needed to cook with. None of the comments received during the monitoring period are related to the design of the project, and the design has therefore remained unchanged during this monitoring period."</i>
	Rd 3	Excel sheet provided 'Community_Meetings_v1.0' which contains summary of the claimed community session meetings for each PAI. Photos as part of record keeping is still sighted is provided with link sources to SurveyCTO account which is linked to the TASC account. Digital media recording is provided by PP demonstrating the use of SurveyCTO in relation to the records of community sessions in form of the dashboard of SurveyCTO with data entries which is sighted related to the community meetings as well as KPT & habit survey data. Demonstration includes simulation on how data can be downloaded in excel	

		form. The link provided for photo of the summary of community sessions presented in 'Community_Meetings_v1.0' is demonstrated working and presented as photos thus providing confidence that the data summary of community meetings in file 'Community_Meetings_v1.0' is traceable. Narrative has been added in the table 2.1.2 Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication under Stakeholder Input section that overall inputs received is positive and that nothing is evaluated to be incorporate in the way the project design. CL#7 is closed off	
--	--	--	--

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#8	
Guideline Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities Version 04.0	Sampling approach	Section 4.3.1 of the MR" It is stated that the sampling method applied is random sampling for each PI. PP is requested to provide evidence of process flow leading to the sample population. Narrative sighted in section 4.3.1 of MR is found incomplete. "However, to satisfy the minimum sample size according to Section 8.4 Option (b) of the VMRO006 v1.1 methodology, i.e., Project target population > 1000: Minimum sample size 100, a random sample of 117, 120 and was selected in PI1-K2C, PI2-WB and PI3-VH, respectively".	The sample populations are based on the number of stoves distributed in each PAI. Seeing as in all instances the number of stoves distributed (number of households serviced) exceeds a 100, the selection of >100 samples for each instance is deemed appropriate as per the methodology guidelines. The sentence in section 4.3.1 as been amended to: <i>"a random sample of 117, 120 and 111 and was selected in PI1-K2C, PI2-WB and PI3-VH, respectively. The parameter μ was determined for the same sample set."</i> and is now correct.
	Rd 2	Sample selection as the sampling approach stated as random sampling is crucial to ensure representatives of the data derived to the project user population. PP is requested to provide evidence that the summary of the	- Excel sheets with the random sample selections for PI1-K2C, PI2-WB and PI3-VH are shared along with this document. The sheets are labelled PI1-K2C_Sample_Selection, PI2-

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#8 samples selected are derived from the steps as detailed in section 4.3.1. Narrative in section 4.3.1.d is sighted revised in submitted monitoring report (v1.2). CL#8 remains open.	WB_Sample_Selection and PI3-VH_Sample_Selection.
	Rd 3	PP has provided excel files for each PAI. Within the excel sheet, tabs of data are sighted leading form initial data population, assigned user data set with random number, which top data sets are selected as sample pool and extras. From the tabs of the excel sheets, process flow is well understood and verified matching with the information provided in section 4.3.1 of monitoring report. The data sets used in the sample selection is sighted those with distribution date up to 16 Oct 2023. The survey is recorded executed on late Oct – Dec 2023. The cut off dates used to filter data pool for sample selection is logical. Data sets presented in KPT and habit surveys are traced back to the record of sample selection process for: -WB: barcode 658731, 418765, 203028 -VH: barcode 610349, 554033, 545907 -K2C: barcode 152750, 546602, 447108 Those barcodes are traced back to the samples pool selections and 1 is from the extra pool data sets. It is concluded that the process of sample selection is carried out appropriately following the requirement of CDM sampling standard and applied methodology along with the supporting evidence provided. CL#8 is closed off.	- Closed

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#9	
VCS standard and Rule Clarification	Grievances mechanism and resolution: Whether project proponent has developed a grievance redress procedure to address disputes with stakeholders that may arise during project planning and implementation, including with regard to benefit sharing and all other safeguard and stakeholder engagement requirements mentioned in Sections 3.18 and 3.19 respectively of VCS standard.	PP shall submit any ongoing stakeholder comments feedback grievances received for the project till date. PD shall confirm if they received any such comments from stakeholders or from Verra board. From the site visit interviews, grievance/input mechanism is not well understood by the users in Waterberg Pls. PP is requested to provide clarification on how the mechanism is communicated to stakeholders.	No formal grievances have been received through any available channels by stakeholders in the project. Moreover, no comments were received from the Verra board. The monitoring team generally receive minor verbal comments/feedback from stove recipients which often relates to stoves not being able to hold 2 pots at once or that their specific pot type might not be suitable for the stove. However, these are common to all cookstove projects and are as a result of user preference rather than actual failings in project design. The grievance mechanism is communicated to the beneficiaries during the pre-distribution sensitization meetings, during distribution and also contact details for TASC is provided on the stove “How to Guide” distributed along with each device.
	Rd 2	From the information collected on the field, inputs are evaluated to be positive with households of fewer members are more eager to switch the majority of their cooking to the ICS. Households with larger family size is sighted to retain the use of baseline stove for preparing larger meals using larger pots which current project stove model does not accommodate due to its feature. Positive responses in general is also sighted from the habit survey data as well as records of on-going community engagement sessions provided (see CAR#3). Provided evidence “12_tascSA Cookstoves How-To-Guide- Sepedi Venda” is verified as guidance book on how to use the project stoves including information on how to reach TASC and Rocket Stove’s contact person.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#9	
		Finding that the grievance mechanism is not well understood based on interview conducted with Waterberg Pls users is noted with measures done from TASC and implementing partners are also noted. At the moment, no evidence that due to this lack of understanding of grievance mechanism, risk of negative project impacts (if any) are not communicated by stakeholders are not detected. This aspect shall be monitored throughout the project crediting period as one of the VCS standard requirements. Therefore, it is confirmed by verification team that grievance redress procedure is defined and followed appropriately to address any possible disputes with stakeholders during the current monitoring period. CL#9 is closed off.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#10	
	Data accuracy	From the interview carried out during site, inconsistency of data is sighted when cross checking with Habit Survey presented: i) baseline method - e.g. barcodes 194886 (K2C) and 670848 (WB) - Habit Survey did not indicate open fire as a baseline method whereas open fire was indicated as a baseline method used during the site visit/interview + barcodes 586851 (WB) and 350738 (WB) - Habit Survey indicates the continued usage of the baseline, however, it was indicated during the site	i) For barcodes 194886 and 670848 it was indicated upon stove distribution that the baseline devices were 3 stone fires and the primary fuel was wood. This is evident in the distribution database. Thus, the baseline situation for these households are 3 stone fires using wood as fuel. For barcodes 586851 (WB) and 350738 (WB), we shall retain the baseline fuel use deduction for conservativeness. ii) It is common for discrepancies to arise between the surveys completed by our

		visit/interview that only the ICS is being used; ii) ICS usage – e.g. barcodes 619071 (VH), 670934 (VH), 649577 (VH) and 653955 (VH) – Habit Survey did not indicate that the ICS is used whereas it was indicated during the site visit/interview that the ICS is indeed used; iii) household size – e.g. barcode 586851 (WB) – Habit Survey data (4 people – no males above 60 years old) did not reflect the site visit/interview (1 person – male above 60 years old); iv) baseline type – e.g. barcodes 069820 (WB), 156600 (WB) and 254440 (WB) – Habit Survey data indicates an electric stove as the baseline method whereas it was indicated during the site visit/interview that the baseline is an open fire v) Habit survey datasheet: KPT code incorrectly aligned with the stove serial number for the Vhembe data (e.g. barcodes 619071, 611483, 670934, 649577).	monitoring team and the checks done by the VVB. This can be a result of numerous factors like household demographics changing or in this case it was most likely the household started to use the stove after the monitoring team visited them. We will retain the households as non-users in this MP for conservativeness. iii) Household demographics are common to change in these environments as people often shift in search for employment opportunities. It should also be noted that these surveys were conducted during the end of the year. During these times it is common for family member to travel back home to the rural areas to spend the holidays there. This is most likely the cause for the discrepancy between household numbers for the household. iv) For barcodes 069820, 156600 and 254440 the baseline device and fuel as captured during distribution were 3 stone fires using wood. Thus, it can be assumed that the baselines for these households were 3 stone fires using wood and it was erroneously reported otherwise by the beneficiary during the monitoring activities. No change required. v) The barcodes were erroneously transferred and has been amended in the calculation sheet.
	Rd 2	i)& iv) Baseline stove and fuel is determined during the distribution point as stated clearly in project design section of PDD (Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa Grouped	iii.) - In the habit survey dated 2023/11/20 for the user with barcode 586851, it was indicated by the user that there was 1 child between ages 0-14, 2 females aged above 14 and one male aged

	PDD_v9_Clean) thus when inconsistencies found between baseline stove in project distribution database and habit survey data; project distribution data set is provided higher assurance. Barcodes 194886's (K2C), 670848's (WB) 069820's (WB), 156600's (WB) and 254440's (WB) data set in project distribution are sighted with 3 stone fire which is consistent with the data collected during site visit. Barcode 586851 (WB), 350738 (WB) are claimed discontinued use of baseline stove in habit survey which is inconsistent with the data derived from site visit. PP has chosen to use the data derived from habit survey which resulted in more conservative ER claim as factor of baseline stove is in effect will result in lower ER value. ii). Deviation on the use of ICS between habit survey and survey carried out by verifier team is acknowledged and that PP's decision to still counted these users as non-users are accepted under conservative approach. Deviation in this aspect is considered by verifier team professional judgment as part of variation in daily live as it is sighted from habit survey and survey carried out by verifier that users are using baseline stove in parallel with project technology. Referring to Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities Version 09.0 para 34 that "DOE may allow for factors affecting individual measurements, leading to discrepancies" iii). Deviation in user barcode 586851 (WB) in specific on household size between habit survey and survey carried out by verifier is sighted. PP is requested to provide	between 15-59. When the site visit occurred, the user indicated that there was 1 male aged 60 and above living in the household. It is possible that the male aged between 15 – 59 turned 60 between the initial habit survey date and when the audit site visit occurred. As per the previous explanation, it is common in South Africa for families to return to their homelands towards the end of the year to be with family. Thus, it is assumed that this is the cause of the discrepancy between household size numbers between visitation dates. - No clarification has been sought from the beneficiary is this value is in no way used to determine emission reductions and whether the household contains 4 or 1 members has no effect on the Emission Reductions.
--	---	---

		clarification on the deviation, whether additional information/justification from this household has been obtained on the cause of such. v).Inconsistencies between KPT barcode and stove serial number sighted in KPT file submitted have been resolved and sighted to be consistent. In effect this consistency is not affecting data accuracy nor completeness and concluded as editorial error that is resolved. CL#10 remains open for point iii above.	
	Rd 3	iii) Deviation in family size for barcode 586851 (WB) between data collected in habit survey and auditor's survey (19-23 March 2024) is acknowledged and the result is not affecting any SDGs claimed thus concluded as immaterial. CL#10 is closed off.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#11	
VCS standard section 3.2.3	Whether roles and responsibilities of implementation partner(s) with respect to the project, including but not limited to implementation, management, and monitoring of the project, over the project crediting period are addressed by PP.	PD to submit an organogram with roles & responsibilities for the applicable staff involved in the project next week	We do not have an organogram of the relationship between TASC and the implementing partners and this is not a requirement in the VCS standard. TASC is the project developer with K2C and Mogalakwena Training are the implementation partners. The roles and responsibilities of the implementation partners are presented in the MOUs shared in addendum to this document.
	Rd 2	Narrative provided in section 4.3.3 in regards to organizational structure and 4.3.2 on how data collection is carried out. The role of	- The signed addendum of the MOU between TASC and Mogalakwena Training labelled "Addendum to TASC Kwena MOU - final

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#11	
		implementing partners is verified during interviews in site visit. Provide MOUs are: -between TASC and K2C BR NCP (Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region non-profit Company) signed 4 June 2021 with details on both parties' responsibilities. Addendum signed and dated 26 & 31 July 2023 is verified with points in relevance to additional volumes of stoves distributed and details of responsibilities that comes with it. -between TASC and Mogalakwena Training signed on 20 July 2021 and 2 Aug 2021. Addendum dated 12 January 2023 with points in relevance to additional volumes of stoves distributed. The addendum is sighted with no signature from both parties, PP is requested to provide the signed copies. CL#11 remains open	signed" dated 12 January 2023 is shared in addendum to this document.
	Rd 3	Addendum to agreement between TASC and Mogalakwena Training is provided in form of 'Addendum to TASC Kwena MOU - final signed' for the additional 120,000 units of stoves. The agreement is sighted with signature between 2 parties dated 17 Jan 2023. CL#11 is closed off.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#12	
	Monitoring Report Section 1.2	Revised monitoring report (VCS MR 2505 01082023-31012024_V1.2) submitted from round 1 review finding, with information on the table of section 1.2 is	The VVB name for the current MP has been erroneously stated as Carbon

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
VCS Stand ard and MR Templ ate		CL#12 sighted with incorrect information which is the name of VVB in the current monitoring period (01-August-2023 to 31-January-2024)	Check, this has been amended to reflect SustainCERT.
	Rd 2	Revision is sighted in the submitted monitoring report (v1.3 dated 3 May 2024) with information of the name of VVB as SustainCert for MP4 verification. CL#12 is closed off.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
Monito ring report 4.3 sectio n 1.6, VCS standa rd 4.7 para 3.6.17		CL#13 Information provided in section 1.6 of the monitoring report as the start date of the project is sighted only reflecting 1 date. The grouped project contains 3 PAIs, with different start date providing clarity on one of eligibility of PAI inclusion criteria (VCS standard 4.7 para 3.6.17)	Start dates for the separate instances (PAIs) have been provided in section 1.6.
	Rd 2	Start date in the revised monitoring report (v1.3 dated 3 May 2024) has been amended with start date for each PAI as followed: -WB: 03-September-2021 -K2C: 20-August-2021 -VH: 27-March-2023 These has been verified against previous verified monitoring period (MP3) and its verification report to be accurate. CL#13 is closed off.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		FAR#1	
VCS Standard 4.7 para 3.16.2	VCS Standard 4.7 para 3.16.2 Quality management procedures to manage data and information shall be applied and established. Where applicable, procedures to account for uncertainty in data and parameters shall be applied in accordance with the requirements set out in the methodology.	FAR is raised for internal quality control to be carried out with parameter in concern i.e., moisture content of wood fuel as part of KPT to ensure that only the accurate data obtained for weight of wet wood consumption is used for calculation of the parameter uy. Internal QA/QC and data management shall be applied to those data sets that is sighted to be out of the equipment's capability as well as to perform cross check during data transfer process from SurveyCTO to excel summary that is used for ER calculation and reporting. Associated Verra VVB shall check the compliance of the same during the next monitoring period verification.	
	Rd 2		

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		FAR#2	
VCS Standard 4.7 para 3.19.15	VCS Standard 4.7 para 3.19.15 "The project proponent shall prohibit the use of forced labor, child labor, and victims of human trafficking, and protect staff and contracted workers employed by third parties in project design and implementation" (para effective 1 January 2025)	FAR#2 is raised taking into account effective date of the requirement as per 1 January 2025 in which employment rights in specific for salary for those personals employed under implementation Partner is ensured against applicable regulatory requirement as this comes under the scope of responsibility of Project Proponent. Project proponent shall ensure this requirement is addressed during the next monitoring period and associated Verra VVB shall check the same and provide it assessment opinion on this.	
	Rd 2		

