



VERIFICATION REPORT FOR “FUEL EFFICIENT COOKING IN SOUTH AFRICA”



Report ID	VCS VerR 2505 01022024-31072024
Project title	Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa
Project ID	2505
Verification period	01-February-2024 to 31-July-2024
Original date of issue	28-November-2024
Most recent date of issue	21-February-2025
Version	4.0
VCS Standard Version	4.7
Client	TASC SA (PTY) LTD.
Prepared by	SustainCERT S.A.
Approved by	Shivraj Sharma

Work carried out by	Director, Validation and Verification Services
	Team Leader: Indrapal Parmar Technical Area Expert (TA 1.1) and Auditor : Sovannmonica Ek Local Expert: Gugu Maggie Zondi Independent Reviewer: Muskan Chawla (T.A 1.1)

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 (PI1-K2C, PI2-WB and PI3-VH). 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 01/02/2024 to 31/07/2024. 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^{5/}.
- 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 5th verification from 01/02/2024 to 31/07/2024 (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.
- Remote audit/^{28/} 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/^{5/}, Version 9.0 and methodology/^{7/}.
- 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 CLs and no 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/^{1/} and VCS guideline V4.4/^{2/}. 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/^{9/} along with relevant supporting evidence and the interview with relevant personnel during remote audit/^{27/} have provided the assessment team with sufficient evidence to confirm to the applicable criteria. 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 01/02/2024 to 31/07/2024 (including both the days) in its implementation is calculated to generate 1,621,768 tCO₂e 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	13
2.5	Resolution of Findings	14
2.6	Eligibility for Validation Activities	15
3	VALIDATION FINDINGS	15
3.1	Methodology Deviations.....	15
3.2	Project Description Deviations.....	15
3.3	New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects.....	15
3.4	Baseline Reassessment	15
4	VERIFICATION FINDINGS.....	16
4.1	Project Details	16
4.2	Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement	18
4.3	Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations.....	29
4.4	Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals.....	60
4.5	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis.....	61
4.6	Verification Summary	61
4.7	Verification Conclusion	62
4.8	Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison	63
	APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION	64
	APPENDIX 2: TABLE OF REFERENCE.....	65
	APPENDIX 3: ABBREVIATIONS.....	70

APPENDIX 4: PROJECT FINDINGS.....	72
APPENDIX 5: COMPETENCY STATEMENTS	109

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 01/02/2024 to 31/07/2024 (including both the days). The verification of project activity is the 5th 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^{/7/}

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 01/02/2024 to 31/07/2024, 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^{/21/22/23/}, and Distribution Database^{/11/} (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 5th 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, no new RocketWorks Zama Zama rocketstoves were distributed in this monitoring period. Since the project start date, a total of 737,489 units have been distributed. A remote audit^{/27/28/} for the project activity was conducted from 10/09/2024 to 12/09/2024. Interviews of the PP representatives, local implementation partner representative, end-user and field team were conducted through Video call to ensure the implementation of the project activity, to verify the habit survey and KPT. Furthermore, it was confirmed that the project involves supply of dissemination of improved cookstoves for period 01/02/2024 to 31/07/2024, leading to 1,621,768 tCO₂e emission reductions.

The start date of the project activity is 20/08/2021 for PI1-K2C, 03/09/2021 for PI2-WB and 27/03/2023 for PI3-VH, verified from distribution database^{/11/} and by cross verifying against previous monitoring period reports^{/32/} and verification reports^{/29/}. 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^{/28/}.

Based on this, the assessment team confirms that the project activity VCS 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 01/02/2024 to 31/07/2024 has been done conservatively and found to be appropriate.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

The Registered Project activity has been undergoing 5th 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^{/9/} and other evidence like monitoring survey data^{/21/22/23/}, signed user agreements^{/14/}, project distribution database^{/11/} (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.

A remote audit for the project was conducted from 10/09/2024 to 12/09/2024. 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^{/9/} 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^{/8/}, 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

A remote audit call^{/28/} was performed by the assessment team from 10/09/2024 to 12/09/2024.

Table 1: Project technology users interviewed

Stove barcode	End-User name	Type of correspondent	Cluster/village	Date of Audit
PI-WB				
57780	Selepana Langa	Household	mohloko	10/09/2024

209717	Mapula Thulare	Household	Gamoleklna	10/09/2024
459530	Matlou Elizabeth Tjelele	Household	Makibelo	10/09/2024
581132	Elizabeth Ramoba	Household	Badimong	10/09/2024
751383	Pricilla Mashapu	Household	Magwareng	10/09/2024
672293	Grace Nhlana	Household	Gamothiba	10/09/2024
417054	Mapula Gladys Mabutla	Household	Mabotsha	10/09/2024
295716	Kgethedi Mehale	Household	Ngwanellela	10/09/2024
PI-K2C				
153014	Mphukwa Khoza	Household	Hungtington	11/09/2024
140535	Thandekile Sambu	Household	Justicia	11/09/2024
91814	Ngwahamungena Sainah Sithole	Household	Acornhoek	11/09/2024
95851	Tinyiko Ngomane	Household	Acornhoek	11/09/2024
159410	Phumzile Sibuyi	Household	Lillydale	11/09/2024
73698	Nomsa Sthembile Makukule	Household	Athurseat	11/09/2024
168954	Mavis Sehlabela	Household	wales	11/09/2024
62104	Arneva Zitha	Household	Lulekani matikoya	11/09/2024
52500	Cindy Khosa- wife of Shelby Nyakana	Household	Majeje	12/09/2024
PI-VH				
733616	Wilson Ndwanto Makondelela	Household	ha_budeli	12/09/2024
635164	Hulisani Netshivhulana	Household	Tshivhulana	12/09/2024
713083	Flora Nkwashu	Household	Matiyani	12/09/2024
730318	Rudzani Makananise	Household	Tshakhuma	12/09/2024
669460	Rivoningo Phumzile Hlatwayo	Household	Madonsi	12/09/2024
677925	Sabinah Shitlhangu	Household	Xhithlelani	12/09/2024
590037	Agnes Manganyi - wife of Amukelani Caswell Makhuvele	Household	Tiyani	12/09/2024
536490	Jane Tshabalala - sister of Mikateko Florence Tshabalala	Household	Xhithlelani	12/09/2024

Tables 1, 2 & 3 provide a comprehensive overview of the remote 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 remote audit, and the main topics of the interviews are summarized in the table below:

Remote audit was emphasized on project technology user with remote 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 remote audit, 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/¹¹/and monitoring survey/^{21/22/23}/. The list of interviewed personals are as followed:

Table 2: Project implementation field team interviewed from 10/09/2024 to 12/09/2024

S.No	Name of the person Interviewed	Affiliation	Details Discussed	Date of Audit
1	Owen Kgobola	Mogalakwena Training_Field Monitor (PI-WB)	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	10/09/2024
2	Mohau Rankapole	Mogalakwena Training_Field Monitor (PI-WB)	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	10/09/2024
3	Sanny Sithole	K2C_Field Monitor	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	11/09/2024
4	Hope Morema	K2C_Field Monitor	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	11/09/2024

5	Khanyisa Mdluli	K2C_Field Monitor	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	11/09/2024
6	Thamathama Ratshili	Vhembe_Field Monitor	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	12/09/2024
7	Mpho Lavengwa	Vhembe_Field Monitor	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	12/09/2024
8	Nanette Botha	Mogalakwena Training_Instance Manager	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	10/09/2024
9	Leon Reynolds	K2C and Vhembe Project Instance Manager	Project monitoring survey execution (habit and KPT survey), monitoring equipment's, communication sensitization sessions, grievances mechanism	11-12/09/2024

The list of PP representatives interviewed by the VVB team during the remote call is as followed/²⁸:

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	Team Leader: Indrapal Parmar Technical Area Expert: Sovannmonica Ek Local Expert: Gugu Maggie Zondi Auditor: Sovannmonica Ek
2	Bianca Stead	TASC SA (PTY) LTD.		

3.	Stephanie Askew	TASC SA (PTY) LTD.	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	
4.	Nick Marshall	TASC SA (PTY) LTD.		
3	Brendon Longhurst	TASC_Country Manager		

2.4 Site Visits

Physical site visit has been conducted in previous monitoring period (MP4) by the VVB assessment team^{/29/} from 18/03/2024 to 22/03/2024 to inspect the project technical design and project implementation.

In the current monitoring period (MP5), the VVB carried out a remote audit from 10/09/2024 to 12/09/2024 and virtual inspected the project technical design and implementation as specified in the VCS PD^{/5/} & MR^{/8/}. The audit was conducted to verify the accuracy and completeness of the project implementation. The views obtained during virtual 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- Ny,i,j and uy) 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 (9 from K2C, 8 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 CAR#7. 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 remote audit 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 0 FAR 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 5th Verification, monitoring period from 01/02/2024 to 31/07/2024. There is no FAR that have been raised during the current verification period, but there are 2 FARs from previous verification period (01/08/2023 to 31/01/2024).

The VVB raised the findings in CL#10 to ensure these 2 FARs have been adequately addressed within the current monitoring period. The VVB team confirms that these findings are now closed and that the previous FARs have been successfully addressed.

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.

3.3 New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects

The project activities for the current monitoring period were already addressed during the project's validation and registration, and they meet all eligibility requirements. No new project activities were added during the second monitoring period.

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^{/8/}.

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 are reflected in section 1.5 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.

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^{/28/} 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)^{/29/}.

The grouped project activity envisages distribution of one models of ICS i.e. Rocket Works Zama Zama which is verified during the remote audit^{/28/}.

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 5th 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/^{8/} 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/^{12/}. 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. The project is not double claiming/^{35/} with other with other emission trading programs or binding emission limits. 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 other emission trading programs or binding emission limits various carbon schemes like CDM, GCC, and Gold Standard. Therefore, it is confirmed by VVB that the project is not double claiming with other emission trading programs or binding emission limits thereby complying with VCS Standard, v4.7; Sections 3.24.3.
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/^{12/} stating that the project is not registered with any other registry (see CL#2). 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 633,069 total households from total 737,489 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, no new improved cookstove units has been distributed from the start date of the project. This is verified through verification from the record of distribution database (737,489 stoves) as well as cross checked with remote audit^{28/} conducted to sampled household users. -SDG 12 impact is claimed through the reduction of wood fuel consumption in project households by an average of 2.67 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 remote audit^{28/}. -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 since the beneficiary households of the project have been provided with an improved cookstove for their personal, private use, verified in project description document ^{/5/} .
Stakeholder diversity and changes over time	Stakeholders is identified to be the same as initial identification process as verified in project description document ^{/5/} .
Expected changes in well-being	The project has positively impacted their lives by reducing smoke emissions and fuelwood consumption. This has been confirmed through the remote audit ^{/28/} .
Location of stakeholders	The stakeholders of this project are located within the Republic of South Africa, spans the Limpopo Province and the northern District of the Mpumalanga Province.
Location of resources	N/A as this is an improved cookstove project.

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 audit call/ ^{28/} , 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 Survey CTO/ ^{10/} presented in form of data summary in spreadsheet which has been verified by the VVB. 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.
Date(s) of stakeholder consultation	7-February-2024 (K2C) 9-February-2024 (K2C) 15-February-2024 (K2C) 15-February-2024 (K2C) 21-February-2024 (K2C) 23-February-2024 (K2C) 27-February-2024 (K2C) 28-February-2024 (VH) 15-March-2024 (K2C) 9-April-2024 (K2C) 10-April-2024 (K2C) 18-April-2024 (VH) 21-April-2024 (K2C) 16-May-2024 (VH) 23-May-2024 (VH)

	24-May-2024 (K2C) 24-May-2024 (K2C) 28-June-2024 (WB) 10-July-2024 (VH) 16-July-2024 (VH) 16-July-2024 (K2C) 18-July-2024 (VH) 18-July-2024 (K2C) 23-July-2024 (K2C) 23-July-2024 (K2C) 24-July-2024 (K2C) 28-July-2024 (K2C) 28-July-2024 (K2C) Dates of the sessions are traced and verified from the community meeting document^{10/}.
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 interviewed during remote audit^{28/}.
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 interviewed during remote audit^{28/}.
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 interviewed during remote audit^{28/}.

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”^{/25/} (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 remote audit interviews^{/28/} 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^{/4/} 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 remote audit^{/27/28/} 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”^{25/} (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 remote audit 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. VVB would like to confirm here that the explanation on grievance procedures has been explained in detail in revised section 2.14 of the monitoring report. The procedure, in accordance to VCS Standard v4.7; Section 3.18.4, is explained in section 2.1.4 of the monitoring report. VVB team has reviewed the following language added by PP in monitoring report which is <i>“Beneficiaries are made aware of the</i>

grievance procedure at sensitization events, where the grievance process is explained. Additionally, they may also follow the normal tribal route where beneficiaries log the grievance with their tribal leader. The leader will then inform the monitoring teams who will then log and deal with the grievance accordingly. In order for a grievance to be logged, the beneficiaries can contact TASC through the provided contact details on the cookstove “How to guide”. They may also contact the monitoring staff. Depending on the nature of the grievance, either monitoring staff can deal with the grievance directly, or TASC project development employees can address the grievance”.

To ensure that the grievance redress is documented at organisation level as well as project level VVB team has verified section 2.2 of registered PD as well as the section “Operational Grievance Mechanism” of supporting evidence “ESG handbook” to confirm that the system is in place to address any grievances. Its worthwhile to mention here that this section of ESG report includes a detailed process of grievances redress process as required by Verra standard required. To ensure that the policies are implemented and followed VVB team has checked the grievance register maintained by the TASC to confirm that there are no grievances reported for the project till date. VVB team checked the objective evidence i.e., “How to use cookstove” and “end-user agreement” that clearly include the contact number and email details of the TASC incl. of top management. To ascertain the above justification VVB team has also done the remote audit interviews to confirm that there are no grievances related to project. Therefore, it is confirmed by VVB team that the no grievances were received during this monitoring period (MR5) and TASC’s grievance procedure ensures all grievances are received, responded to, and attempted to be resolved within a reasonable time period, taking into account culturally appropriate conflict resolution methods

4.2.5 Public Comments

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”/^{25/} (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 remote audit 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/ ^{13/} for project implementation team is verified (see CL#3). TASC’s internal handbook/ ^{24/} are verified for details. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the remote audit/ ^{28/} .
Safety of women and girls	No risk identified. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the remote audit/ ^{28/} . 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/ ^{21/22/23/} and cross checked through verifier’s remote audit/ ^{28/} , 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 remote audit 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/^{30/} 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. This information has been verified in the previous monitoring verification/^{29/}. 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/^{21/22/23/}, 86% of the users reported a reduction in smoke while cooking on the project.
---	--

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 has internal code of conduct and policy/ ^{24/} in place to prevent discrimination and sexual harassment issues. The assessment team has verified the document, and no issues detected from the remote interview with personnel/ ^{28/} .
Management experience	No risk identified. PP has confirmed that no new organization has been involved in the projects for the current monitoring period. This has been verified during the remote audit/ ^{28/} as well as in MR/ ^{8/} section 2.3.1. and 3.2.2.
Gender equity in labor and work	No risk identified. TASC's employee agreements/ ^{13/} for the current monitoring period has been verified. A total of 20 workers were employed across the three PAIs, including 8 men and 12 women. According to a remote interview with personnel/ ^{28/} , no issues were reported.
Human trafficking, forced labor, and child labor	No risk identified. TASC has internal code of conduct and policy/ ^{24/} in place to prevent human trafficking, forced labor, and child labor. The assessment team has verified the document, and no issues detected from the remote interview with personnel/ ^{28/} .

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#2, CAR#3, CAR#4, CAR#5, CAR#6 and CL#13 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. The organizational structure^{/26/}, along with roles and responsibilities throughout project implementation, has been provided in the MR and verified.

PP conducted sampling surveys to gather information needed for the monitoring of $N_{y,i,j}$ and μ_y parameters. Monitoring surveys^{/21/22/23/} were conducted across both PIs between June and July 2024. 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.

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, i.e. Project target population > 1000: Minimum sample size 100. PP has applied a sample size of 101 for K2C, 106 for WB and 105 for VH, both parameters $N_{y,i,j}$ and μ_y . The sampling approach has been demonstrated in the monitoring survey^{/21/22/23/} for each PIs.

Relative precision of data is calculated at 8.2% for K2C, 0% for WB and 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 8.1% for K2C, 5.6% for WB and 7.2% 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.

Inconsistencies, such as sampling data variations and data discrepancies, identified between the MR, ER, and KPT have been addressed in findings CAR#2, CAR#3, CAR#4, and CAR#5. Each of these findings has been thoroughly reviewed and fully resolved to ensure alignment and data accuracy across all reports.

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, 9 users from K2C, 8 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 remote audit on the sampled survey^{/28/} verified against habit survey^{/21/22/23/} and project distribution database^{/13/}.

Parameter	Description of Parameter	Assessment approach
$n_{y,i,j}$ (used to calculate $N_{y,i,j}$)	Number of project devices of type i	-Virtual 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 virtual inspection to determine if a pre-project (replaced) stove is still being used in addition to project stove

Discrepancies sighted between data collected from remote audit^{/28/} carried out by verifier team against records presented by PP in project record (KPT & habit survey^{/21/22/23/} are raised as CAR#7.

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^{/5/} 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:

$$ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,savings,i,j} \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{wood\ fuel} \times (EF_{wf,CO_2} + EF_{wf,non\ CO_2}) \times N_{y,i,j} \times 0.95$$

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#2, CAR#3, CAR#4, CAR#5, CAR#6 and CL#13.

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/} v.1.1. 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 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.	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 MP4 ^{/32/} for WB and VH and their corresponding verification reports ^{/29/} .
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 MP4 ^{/32/} for WB and VH and their corresponding verification reports ^{/29/} .

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/ ^{33/} .
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/ ^{33/} .
5	η_p Efficiency of ICS at the start of project activity	38,3%	Verification against Project Description/ ^{5/} for K2C, Verified Monitoring Report MP4/ ^{32/} for WB and VH and their corresponding verification reports/ ^{29/} . Remote audit/ ^{28/} 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/ ^{21/22/23/} 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 June-July 2024 for MP5 and October-December 2023 for MP4 as verified against monitoring report^{/8/32/}. 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 June-July 2024 for MP5 and October-December 2023 for MP4 as verified against monitoring report^{/8/32/}. 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/}. CAR#4 has been raised in related to method of sampling and discrepancies in the KPT table and MR.
	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 ^{21/22/23/}).
	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?	K2C = 275,664 WB = 296,672 VH = 90,160 The values are verified through data analysis of data presented as survey habit ^{21/22/23/} for each project instances for usage rate of project technology as: K2C= 0.80

		WB= 0.90¹ VH= 0.85 multiplied with total distributed units per project instances as verified in ER calculation/^{9/} tab 'Summary'. Findings related to this parameters has been raised in CAR#2, CAR#3, CAR#5 and CAR#7.
	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 MP4 which 0.85 (K2C), 0.99 (WB) and 0.82 (VH) which in comparison are minor difference than the value obtained in MP5. Remote audit carried out by verifier team including verification using verbal confirmation with project technology user/^{28/} with CAR#7 raised. VVB would like to mention here that usage rate factor for the Waterberg project activity instance during the current monitoring period is 1. VVB team has done the trend analysis previous monitoring period for this and found that it is increasing trend for the this PAI. On detailed root cause analysis and interview with the field team and top management of the TASC VVB team based on following information confirmed that the usage rate factor monitored during the current monitoring period for this PAI is correct and accurate. 1) the monitored survey data from the survey database (Habit Surveys) supports the usage rate factor. The survey data shared by PP is verified by VVB team for review and the VVB team conducted a remote audit to verify this data, during which VVB team found all the stoves to be working and in use. According to this monitored data, which

¹ Actual monitored value is 1 however, project developer has capped it to 0.90 as per available best practice recommended in verba cookstove methodology VM0050 and related correction/clarification published on Verra project page.

		Verra audited whilst the remote site visit was conducted, 100% of the surveyed households reported using their stoves. 2) To ensure that the distributed ICS units is operational and are attended for repair/maintenance PP has used the multifield approach in the project which is as follows: a) PP has distributed how to use your cookstove guide to end-users which include detailed operational measures incl. basic handling/maintenance activities to be carried out to ensure ICS is fit for its intended use by end-user. VVB team has interviewed the field team and end-users to ensure this info is shared. b) As discussed above PP is conducting the community meeting gathering across the all the PAI. The community meeting database include detailed info like meeting facilitator, location of meeting village incl. its geo-coordinates, meeting notes, number of attendees (varying from 10-300 in numbers). Meeting notes include all aspects of cookstove usage, meal type, repair and maintenance aspect. It is evident from the meeting notes that PP is very well engaged with the community leaders, local governments etc. The trend analysis (refer PRR form/^{35/}) demonstrates that the Waterberg instance has continuously seen an increase in ICS usage rates, as well as a steady decline in baseline stove usage factors since MP1 to MP 5. Based on all above rationale VVB team has confirmed that the reported values of monitoring survey in MRV excel sheets for all three PAI are correct, accurate and reproduceable from the objective evidence i.e., sampled raw data checked by VVB team; thereby leading to
--	--	---

		correct calculation of emission reductions for the said monitoring period. Nonetheless, VVB would like to mention here that during the course of verification process and Verra PRR findings were raised with respect to monitored value of 100% usage rate for PI2-WB during the current monitoring period. Even though the monitored value is correct and accurate however, as there are uncertainties associated with using a survey-based approach to measuring usage for this PAI with aging ICS project proponent has used the most recent and robust VM0050 methodology to address the usage rate for PI-2-WB. The VVB team has already verified monitoring surveys and related customer support actions (refer section 4.2.4 and appendix-2) as referred clarification-2² undertaken for the target population covered during the current monitoring period. Nonetheless, VVB team would like to mention that the customer support action point number 1, 2 and 3 are reviewed and found be appropriately addressed by project proponent in section 4.3.5 of revised MR to claim the capped 0.90 usage rate for PI-2-WB. See the assessment below: 1) VVB team has verified the baseline surveys and Kitchen Performance Tests (KPTs) along with the study done by independent consultant, Promethium Carbon for the project. VVB has reviewed the validated project design and surveys revealed open-pit fires and wood as the primary cooking methods, aligning with the target
--	--	---

² VM0050 v1.0 Corrections and Clarifications

		population's practices. And which confirms that the rural communities' low-income levels and reliance on wood for fuel, particularly open fires, due to limited availability and high costs of alternative fuels. Based on review of baseline KPT, study done by Promethium Carbon and ongoing community engagement survey during current monitoring period it is confirmed by VVB team that the selection of ICS technology i.e., rocket works running on wood fuel³ meets the community needs⁴, cooking practices and attitudes of the target population. 2) VVB team based on its site visit interview with end-users, field team and review of objective evidence i.e., community engagement events with stakeholders that include hands-on cooking demonstrations. VVB team has also verified the cookstove guide in English and local language to confirm that the support activities are in place to assist the target population in effectively operating and maintaining their improved cookstoves. The community engagement log includes in person demonstration as to how to operate and maintain the cookstove to prepare common local foods or meals. Its worthwhile to mention here that the TASC field team is communicating these aspects in local with cultural fit manner to ensure that the customer support actions are effective. Therefore, it is concluded by VVB
--	--	--

³ SeTAR Centre. 2013. Stove Thermal Efficiency and Emissions Interim Test Report – RocketWorks Wood Stove

⁴ VVB team verified the community meeting log incl. minutes of meeting that include live demonstration of local meal preparation with end-users, operational and maintenance aspects of ICS.

		team that the documented system (ESG Handbook) is in place and put in practice⁵ in field with end-users using the ICS technology to ensure that the implementation of support activities is effective to assist end-users in effectively operating and maintaining their cookstove. 3) As already assessed in grievance section 4.2.4 in detail there are various means of communication channels developed by TASC management to ensure that the end users can communicate via email/phone/widespread availability of field team, local community/tribal level. VVB team has verified the end-user contract (include the contact details); stove guide in English/local language (email/phone of TASC) and interview crosscheck with the field team and end-users to ensure that the said means of communication channels are in place and effective for access support to end-users for any grievance include stove operation and maintenance related aspects. Therefore, it is assessed by VVB team that the usage rate of 0.90 for the PI-2-WB for the current monitoring period is correct and accurate leading to conservative calculation of emission reductions.
	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 ($n_{y,i,j}$) used in calculating $N_{y,i,j}$ is captured using mobile aps and collected and stored in SurveyCTO. Traceability of the data from the presented excel

⁵ Based on document review (refer appendix-2) by VVB of end-user agreement, ICS usage guidance, ESG handbook, community Meeting log and interview with field team, end-users, and mangement of the TASC.

		data file/ ^{21/22/23/} was performed from the data source using sampled data set during remote audit/ ^{28/} . The discrepancies between the habit survey, KPT of PP/ ^{21/22/23/} and the remote audit/ ^{28/} has been raised in findings CAR#7.
	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#2, CAR#3, CAR#5 and CAR#7	
Conclusion	CAR#2, CAR#3, CAR#5 and CAR#7 were raised and addressed satisfactorily with value of this parameter is accepted as: K2C = 268,467 units WB = 267,005 units VH = 90,160 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 'ER 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 'ER 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 'ER 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 Jun-Jul 2024 MP5 as verified against monitoring report^{/8/32/}. 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/}. CAR#3 has been raised about the discrepancies of the reported value.
-----------------------	---	--

	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 $B_{By,savings,i,j}$ (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^{/29/}. 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 u_y which is using the amount of wood consumption within 4-5 days of KPT. Moisture content data is presented and part of the KPT as presented in data set in each PAI KPT record^{/21/22/23/}. 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 is clarified in this CL#8 -Competence of surveyors: is verified during remote audit/^{8/} and PP has conducted training/^{18/19/20/} for formal monitoring activities (KPTs and Habit Surveys) was done in person with the monitoring staff for each instance. -Procedures of data collection: is clarified in CL#11 with the point closed as important points for KPT is verified as part of the training agenda/^{19/20/21/}. -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/^{28/}. Findings on the discrepancy between data collected during the monitoring survey/^{21/22/23/} and the remote audit/^{28/} has been raised in CAR#7.
	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 is raised as CL#8 for evidence of measure implemented by PP to ensure data accuracy. Evidence provided by PP in form of purchase invoices/receiptsfor both digital weigh scale/^{15/} and moisture tester units/^{16/}. -Scale: Leroy Merlin Portable Crane Scale 300KG -Moisture Meter: Ryobi RS PRO RS-120 Moisture Meter

	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. The date of purchase ^{/15/16/} , calibration frequency is not due as the units were purchased in May and June 2024.
	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. The date of purchase ^{/15/16/} , calibration frequency is not due as the units were purchased in May and June 2024.
	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?	The parameter u_y is calculated to account for the continued use of baseline (pre-project) cookstoves during the project year y, based on data from Kitchen Performance Tests (KPTs) and monitoring surveys. First, the expected baseline fuel consumption that would continue in a project scenario without baseline stove use is calculated using $B_{used} = B_{old} - B_{savings}$, where B_{old} is the baseline fuel consumption, and $B_{savings}$ is the fuel savings achieved by improved cookstoves. Next, the residual fuel usage on baseline stoves is determined for each household by subtracting B_{used} from the total household fuel consumption measured during the KPTs. This residual fuel usage is then divided by the total household fuel consumption to calculate the per-household proportion U_y, reflecting the baseline stove's continued use. Finally, the U_y values from all surveyed households are averaged to determine u_y, which is then applied to adjust emission reduction calculations. Section 4.2 of the monitoring report outlines this. Additionally, this approach has been verified and accepted by Verra during previous issuance requests. Therefore, it is confirmed by VVB team that the monitored values of KPT test conducted by project proponent during the current monitoring period is correct and transparently reported in the ER calculations. Value reported for each project instances as each instance has distinguished $B_{old,i}$ and wood fuel consumption value derived from separate KPT/21/22/23/. Calculated value for this parameter is as: K2C: 0.232 WB: 0.277 VH: 0.236
--	---	---

	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 MP4 is performed, with value sighted as: K2C= 0.22 WB= 0.42 VH= 0.18 Overall, the values for K2C and VH are higher in MP5 compared to MP4, while the value of WB in MP5 is lower than in MP4.
	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: Factors influencing the quality of the data: -Suitability and accuracy factor of the equipment's: is clarified in this CL#8 -Competence of surveyors: is verified during remote audit/^{8/} and PP has conducted training/^{18/19/20/} for formal monitoring activities (KPTs and Habit Surveys) was done in person with the monitoring staff for each instance. -Procedures of data collection is clarified in CL#11 with the point closed as important points for KPT is verified as part of the training agenda/^{19/20/21/}. The hardcopy of the KPT survey has been verified/^{17/} and findings (CL#9) has been raised in regard to the inconsistencies of data transfer between the hardcopy version/^{17/} and the excel version/^{21/22/23/}.
	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	CL#8, CL#11 and FAR#1(from MP4)	
Conclusion	CL#8 and CL#11 which were raised and resolved. FAR#1 which was raised from the monitoring period (MP4) has been verified and addressed correctly. The value of this parameter is verified and accepted as: PI1-K2C = 0.232 PI2-WB = 0.277 PI3-VH = 0.236	

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/^{11/} 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/ ^{11/} which has information on primary baseline stove, secondary baseline stove, 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#2.
	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?	Data anomalies was detected and raised in form of CAR#2 which is in concern with error in baseline stove of PI-WB.
	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 ^{11/} from the start of project date. Data anomalies was detected and raised in form of CAR#2 which is resolved.
Findings	CAR#2	
Conclusion	The value of this parameter is verified and accepted as: 0.1 (for baseline 3-stone fires and open fires) 0.2 (for other baseline stove types)	

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 ^{/21/22/23/} .
	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/ ^{21/22/23/} 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/ ^{30/} for Zama Zama model. Remote audit/ ^{28/} 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 remote audit/ ^{28/} .
Findings	-	

Conclusion	Life span of the distributed stoves is verified as claimed by PP which is 5 years according to the registered PD ^{/5/} . 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. Remote audit ^{/28/} 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 ^{/33/} 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 ^{/21/22/23/} 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 ^{/34/} 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 ^{/21/22/23/} .	
Findings	-		
Conclusion	The value (0.0156 TJ/tonne) 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-Feb-2024 to 31-Jul-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#9. 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^{/28/} to confirm the authenticity of the documents and to check the correctness of the calculation.

The verification team can confirm that sufficient evidence is available for the whole monitoring period and the same is verifiable. 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. Finding has been raised (CAR#7) to address inconsistency between data written in hardcopy of KPT and data collected from remote audit^{/28/}.

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/^{14/}, distribution database/^{11/}, baseline/secondary stove and fuel type; habit survey and KPT data/^{21/22/23/}; technical specification/^{5/30/} and invoice/receipts of purchase/^{15/16/} for measuring equipment's, training sessions/^{18/19/20/} 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 5th monitoring period of the project's fixed crediting period, information regarding project capacity commission and monitoring system are already verified in previous monitoring report/^{32/} which are also cross checked with previous report/^{29/}. 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 5th verification with monitoring period from 01/02/-2024 to 31/07/2024 (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 from August 2024 – November 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 01/02/2024 to 31/07/2024 (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 01/02/2024 to 31/07/2024 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 01/02/2024 to 31/07/2024

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-Feb-2024 to 31-Jul-2024	1,621,768	-	-	1,621,768	-	1,621,768

Total	1,621,768	-	-	1,621,768	-	1,621,768
-------	-----------	---	---	-----------	---	-----------

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-Feb-2024 to 31-Jul-2024	2,531,381.62	1,621,768	-35.93%	There is a 35.93 % 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 baseline amount of woody biomass was reduced by an average of 24.8% to account for ongoing use of baseline stoves alongside the ICS in the project scenario. An additional average reduction of 11% was applied to the ERs to account for project stoves that are not in operation.

APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALY SENSITIVE INFORMATION

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

No commercially sensitive information that is excluded in the public version of the monitoring report.

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	03-Mar-2022
6.	Validation report '2022_03_07 FVR_VERRA-R3-Clean' https://registry.verra.org/mymodule/ProjectDoc/Project_ViewFile.asp?FileID=63004&IDKEY=niqwesdfmnk0iei23nnm435oiojnc909dsflk9809adlkmlkf886882516	1.0	04-Mar-2022
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/) -VCS Methodology VM0050 Energy Efficiency and Fuel-Switch Measures in Cookstoves Version 1.0 dated 9 October 2024. And Correction and Clarifications to VM0050, V1.0 date 03 February 2025.	1.1	
8.	Monitoring report MP5 (01/02/2024 to 31/07/2024)	1.12	20-Feb-2025
9.	Emission Reduction Calculation "2505_MRV5_ER_Calcs_v1.6"	1.6	
10.	Community Meeting "Community_Meetings_2505.xlsx"		

11.	Distribution Database “Distribution Database (31 Jan 2024).xlsx”		
12.	Double counting Declaration “Double_Counting_Declaration_v1.0 signed (MP5).pdf”		03-Oct-2024
13.	Employment Contract 2024 1. Charmaine Thapelo Jan 2024.pdf 2. D. Mbebe LOA Apr 2024_signed.pdf 3. Emily Mokgando March 2024.pdf 4. H Mohlala LOA Apr 2024.pdf 5. H Morema LOA Apr 2024-signed.pdf 6. Isac Kekana Jan 2024.pdf 7. K Mmushi LOA Apr 2024.pdf 8. Khutjo Madiba March 2024.pdf 9. Kleinbooi Kale Jan 2024.pdf 10. KT Mdluli LOA Apr 2024 (1).pdf 11. Lavhengwa Mpho- TASC Monitoring LOA.pdf 12. Mashele Nhlamulo Charity LOA.pdf 13. Mohau Rankapole Jan 2024.pdf 14. Mpho Madiba Jan 2024.pdf 15. Oky Sibashi LOA Apr 2024 (1).pdf 16. Owen Kgobola Jan 2024.pdf 17. Ranenyeni Rofhiwa Enerst LOA.pdf 18. Ratshili Thamatha LOA.pdf 19. S Sithole LOA Apr 2024 (1).pdf 20. Vulani Mabunda LOA Apr 2024 -Signed.pdf		
14.	EndUser Agreement for PAI K2C, Vhembe, and Waterberg 1. Device_EndUserAgreement_K2C_052500.pdf		

	2. Device_EndUserAgreement_K2C_062104.pdf 3. Device_EndUserAgreement_K2C_073698.pdf 4. Device_EndUserAgreement_K2C_091814.pdf 5. Device_EndUserAgreement_K2C_095851.pdf 6. Device_EndUserAgreement_K2C_140535.pdf 7. Device_EndUserAgreement_K2C_153014.pdf 8. Device_EndUserAgreement_K2C_159410.pdf 9. Device_EndUserAgreement_K2c_168954.pdf 10. Device_EndUserAgreement_Vhembe_536490.pdf 11. Device_EndUserAgreement_Vhembe_590037.pdf 12. Device_EndUserAgreement_Vhembe_635164.pdf 13. Device_EndUserAgreement_Vhembe_669460.pdf 14. Device_EndUserAgreement_Vhembe_677925.pdf 15. Device_EndUserAgreement_Vhembe_713083.pdf 16. Device_EndUserAgreement_Vhembe_730318.pdf 17. Device_EndUserAgreement_Vhembe_733616.pdf 18. Device_EndUserAgreement_Waterberg_057780.pdf 19. Device_EndUserAgreement_Waterberg_209717.pdf 20. Device_EndUserAgreement_Waterberg_295716.pdf 21. Device_EndUserAgreement_Waterberg_417054.pdf 22. Device_EndUserAgreement_Waterberg_459530.pdf 23. Device_EndUserAgreement_Waterberg_581132.pdf 24. Device_EndUserAgreement_Waterberg_672293.pdf 25. Device_EndUserAgreement_Waterberg_751383.pdf 26. Device_EndUserAgreement_Waterberg_581132.pdf 27. Device_EndUserAgreement_Waterberg_600767.pdf		
15.	Weigh scale		

	“Gmail - Takealot _ Payment Confirmation _ 153605011.pdf” “Gmail - Takealot _ Payment Confirmation _ 153616831.pdf”		
16.	Moisture meter “Ryobi_14679_E Cogho - 06 2024.pdf” “Ryobi_14681_E Cogho - 06 2024.pdf”		
17.	Scanned Hardcopy KPT survey sheet 1. 095851 Tinyiko Ngomane.jpg 2. 168954 Mavis Sehlabela.jpg 3. 635164 Hulisani Netshivulana.jpg 4. 730318 Rudzani Makananise.jpg 5. Amukelani Caswell Makhuvele 590037.jpg 6. Mikateko Florence Tshabalala 536490.jpg 7. Shelby Nyakana 052500.jpg 8. Waterberg KPTs MRV 5 (Hardcopies).pdf 9. Amelia Rakoma 600767_KPT.pdf 10. 581132 Edward Ramoba KPT.pdf		
18.	K2C and Vhembe Employee training “K2C & Vhembe Attendance Register.pdf”		21-May-2024
19.	Waterberg Employee training		20-May-2024
20.	KPT’s employee training material “KPT & Habit Survey Walkthrough.pptx” “KPT and Habit Survey Print Out - basic overview.pdf”		
21.	KPT survey for PAI K2C (conducted from 10-06-2024 to 05-07-2024).	1.4	

	“2505_MRV5_pKPT_K2C_v1.2.xlsx” 2505_MRV5_pKPT_K2C_v1.4_anonymised		
22.	KPT survey for Vhembe (conducted from 10-06-2024 to 05-07-2024) “2505_MRV5_pKPT_Vhembe_v1.2.xlsx” 2505_MRV5_pKPT_Vhembe_v1.5_anonymised	1.5	
23.	KPT survey for Waterberg (conducted from 10-06-2024 to 05-07-2024) “2505_MRV5_pKPT_Waterberg_v1.3.xlsx” 2505_MRV5_pKPT_Waterberg_v1.5_anonymised	1.5	
24.	TASC ESG Handbook “TASC ESG Handbook.pdf” and section of this handbooks include “Operational Grievance Mechanism” for grievance.		
25.	TASC Cookstove Usage guidance “TASC SA Cookstoves How-To-Guide- Sepedi Venda.pdf” incl. safety, operation and maintenance related aspects.		
26.	TASC Project Organogram “VCS 2505 Project Organogram.docx”		
27.	Remote Interview attendance Sheet 1. Attendance-sheet-VCS2505-MP5-DAY-1.docx 2. Attendance-sheet-VCS2505-MP5-DAY-2.docx 3. Attendance-sheet-VCS2505-MP5-DAY-3.docx		10-Sep-2024 to 12-Sep-2024
28.	Remote Interview Survey Questionnaire to End-user and Field team “Remote Interview_VCS2505_100924-120924.xlsx”		10-Sep-2024 to 12-Sep-2024
29.	Verification Report-MP4 (01/08/2023-31/01/2024) “VCS VerR 2505 01082023-31012024 (5).pdf”	1.0	17-May-2024

30.	Project Stove Website “ https://rocketworks.org/product/izintizama/ ”		Accessed on 12-Nov- 2024
31.	Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities https://cdm.unfccc.int/sunsetcms/storage/contents/stored-file-20210531160756223/Meth_Stan05.pdf	9.0	Accessed on 13-Nov- 2024
32.	Monitoring Report-MP4 (01/08/2023-31/01/2024)	1.8	17-May- 2024
33.	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories; Chapter 2 Stationary Combustion	2006	
34.	VCS Methodology Requirement	4.4	29-Aug- 2023
35.	Project Review Report (PRR) Form by Verra.	-	-

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 Question	Findings/Comments CAR#1	Developer Response
VCS Standard MR Template	PD shall provide summary description of the implementation status of the project, including a summary description of the implementation status of the technologies/measures (e.g., plant, equipment, process, or management or conservation measure) included in the project, including relevant implementation dates (e.g., dates of construction, commissioning, and continued operation periods).	1) Section 1.1, MR: Section 1.1. of the monitoring report states “fourth monitoring period” however this is fifth monitoring period undergoing verification. PP shall clarify. 2) Section 1.1, MR: Section 1.1 as stated by PP i.e., “<i>Implementation dates: The first ICS was distributed on 20 August 2021</i>” however, since there are three PAIs in this grouped project therefore, PP may include the name of PAI for which the start date is stated. 3) Editorial: MR, Table 2 and Table 3 are missing in the report. PP shall correct the numbering format.	1) The text in Section 1.1. of the MR has been changed to “fifth monitoring period”. This was a typing error. 2) The sentence in Section 1.1. of the MR has been changed to: “The first ICS for PI1-K2C was distributed on 20 August 2021”. 3) There is no Table 2 or Table 3 in the VCS Monitoring Report v4.4 Template and the PP does not refer to Table 2 or Table 3 in the MR.
	Round-2	In MR “VCS MR 2505 01022024-31072024_V1.1_TC.docx”,	1. The numbering of the tables has been corrected accordingly in “VCS MR 2505 01022024-31072024_V1.2_TC”.

	1) Section 1.1: PP has corrected to “fifth” monitoring period. The comment is closed. 2) Section 1.1: PP has added the start date of the first ICS of the PAI (K2C). This was also verified with the ER “2505_MRV5_ER_Calcs_v1.2” tab”. The comment is closed. 3) Editorial: Since there is no Table 2 and Table 3, PP shall correct the numbering. Table 4 Example project parameters <table><tr><th>Fixed GP Parameters</th><th>Unit</th><th>Value</th><th>Description</th><th>Source</th></tr><tr><td>EF_{wt,CO2}</td><td>tCO₂e/TJ</td><td>112</td><td>CO₂ emission factor of biomass that is substituted or reduced.</td><td>VMR0006 default</td></tr><tr><td>EF_{wt,non-CO2}</td><td>tCO₂e/TJ</td><td>26.23</td><td>Non-CO₂ emission factor of biomass that is substituted or reduced.</td><td>VMR0006 default</td></tr><tr><td>NCV_{biomass}</td><td>TJ/tonne of wood</td><td>0.0156</td><td>Net calorific value of biomass.</td><td>VMR0006 default</td></tr></table> The comment remains open. CAR#1 remains open for point 3.	Fixed GP Parameters	Unit	Value	Description	Source	EF _{wt,CO2}	tCO ₂ e/TJ	112	CO ₂ emission factor of biomass that is substituted or reduced.	VMR0006 default	EF _{wt,non-CO2}	tCO ₂ e/TJ	26.23	Non-CO ₂ emission factor of biomass that is substituted or reduced.	VMR0006 default	NCV _{biomass}	TJ/tonne of wood	0.0156	Net calorific value of biomass.	VMR0006 default	
Fixed GP Parameters	Unit	Value	Description	Source																		
EF _{wt,CO2}	tCO ₂ e/TJ	112	CO ₂ emission factor of biomass that is substituted or reduced.	VMR0006 default																		
EF _{wt,non-CO2}	tCO ₂ e/TJ	26.23	Non-CO ₂ emission factor of biomass that is substituted or reduced.	VMR0006 default																		
NCV _{biomass}	TJ/tonne of wood	0.0156	Net calorific value of biomass.	VMR0006 default																		
Round-3	In MR section 5.4 “VCS MR 2505 01022024-31072024_V1.2_TC”, PP has corrected the table numbering. CAR#1 is closed.																					

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
------	---------------------	-------------------	--------------------

		CL#1	
VCS Standard MR Template	Check if information for the methodology(s), tools, and modules applied to the project is included.	2. Section 1.9, MR: PD shall clarify the use of tool-19 in relation to the project undergoing verification.	The reference to CDM Tool19 in Section 1.9 of the MR was made erroneously and has been removed. There is also no mention of Tool19 in the PDD ("Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa Grouped PDD_v9_Clean.pdf") and the PDD and MR now correlate.
	Round-2	4) PP has provided clarification that Tool 19 is not relevant in this project, and this has been removed from MR section 1.9. CL#1 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#2	Developer Response
VCS Standard MR Template	Check the double counting and Participation under Other GHG Programs by PP for this project.	3. Section 1.10, MR: In order to avoid the double counting of the credits, PP shall provide a declaration stating the credits generated under this monitoring period will not be used with any other GHG programs and environmental credits	5. The project is not active in any other crediting schemes other than the VCS. A signed declaration labelled "Double_Counting_Declaration_v1.0 signed (MP5)" is included as evidence.
	Round-2	5) .PP has submitted the declaration "Double_Counting_Declaration_v1.0 signed	

		(MP5).pdf” that the current project is not registered under any other GHG program. CL#2 is closed.	
--	--	---	--

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#3	Developer Response
VCS Standard MR Template	Provide a summary description of project activities implemented during the monitoring period that result in SD contributions (i.e., technologies/measures implemented, activity location). Check if evidence of the project’s SD contributions is provided by PP as appendices to monitoring report. Check if table-1 sustainable development	4. Section 1.12, MR: As reported in section 1.12 there are 633,070 households, PD shall clarify the source of the stated information. 5. Section 1.12, MR: As reported in under table-1, section 1.12 the footnote reference no. 15 and 16 doesn’t give the correct reference of the file. PP shall clarify and ensure the reference shall be valid for the current monitoring period undergoing verification. 6. MR Section 1.12, “Employment of local people throughout the manufacturing, distribution and monitoring of the project.” PP is requested to provide employment records for the current monitoring period. 7. PP is requested to provide a transparent calculation on the claim made on SDG 3 in table 1 of the MR that “86% of project households, or 633,070 total (737,490*0.86), reported a reduction in smoke while cooking on the project ICS vs. the baseline fire in this monitoring period”. PP shall add this calculation to ER excel for transparency of SDG claim.	6. The footnote reference 14 relating to SDG3 in Section 1.12 of the MR has been updated to: “Habit surveys were carried out as part of the monitoring plan and data from these surveys were used to inform the SDG 3 impact calculation. Please see cells C23:27 in the ‘Summary’ tab of 2505_MRV5_ER_Calcs_v1.2.xlsx”. The source of each individual value used is also referenced in cells D23:26 of the “Summary” tab of 2505_MRV5_ER_Calcs_v1.2.xlsx 7. Footnote reference 15 has been updated to: “Household wood fuel use measurements as part of the household surveys were carried out as part of the monitoring plan. Please see cell C83, ER Survey Tab, 2505_MRV5_ER_Calcs_v1.2.xlsx”. Footnote reference 16 has been updated to:” Please see

	contributions are aligned with the SDGs.	8. PP to submit an organogram with roles & responsibilities for the applicable staff including the implementation partner.	cells C83:88, ER Survey Tab, 2505_MRV5_ER_Calcs_v1.2.xlsx” 8. Employment records for all monitoring staff will be provided to the VVB (see folder titled “Employment Contracts 2024”). 9. The full calculation for the value given for SDG 3 in Table 1 of the MR is given in cells B22:E27 of the “Summary” tab in 2505_MRV5_ER_Calcs_v1.2.xlsx . The source of each value is also listed in cells D23:D25 of the same spreadsheet. 10. An organogram detailing the implementation partner organisations for each instance, the instance managers and the monitoring staff will be submitted to the VVB. The document title is “VCS 2505 Project Organogram”.							
	Round-2	6) Section 1.12: PP has confirmed that the value is derived from the habit survey for each of the PAI. This has been verified with the submitted Habit Survey for each of the PAI and the ER calculation. The comment is closed.	8.A. There was a typo on the contract for Vulani, this has been corrected and the correct employment contract is shared as evidence with this document. B. Some text and the following table has been added into Section 2.3.1. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Male Staff</th><th>Female Staff</th><th>Total</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PI1-K2C</td><td>3</td><td>5</td><td>8</td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Male Staff	Female Staff	Total	PI1-K2C	3	5
	Male Staff	Female Staff	Total							
PI1-K2C	3	5	8							

		7) Section 1.12: PP has made correction on the footnote 15 and 16. The source of data has been checked and verified. The comment is closed. 8). Section 1.12: the submitted contract of “Vulani Mabunda LOA Apr 2024 -Signed.pdf” is effective from April 2025. A). PP is requested to confirm if the employee was employee during the current monitoring period (01/02/2024-31/07/2024). This contract builds on your previous contracts with the K2C BR NPC and recognises previously earned benefits. Your appointment will be on the following terms and conditions, with effect from 1 April 2025: B). In Section 2.3.1, PP stated that “<i>TASC is an equal opportunity employer and does not discriminate based on any protected characteristic</i>”. Therefore, PP is requested to provide the total number of employees, as well as the number of male and female workers, employed during the current monitoring period." The comment remains open. 9) Section 1.12: SDG3: PP has provided the calculation in ER tab “Summary” cell B22:E27. The comment is closed.	<table><tr><td>PI2-WB</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>8</td></tr><tr><td>PI3-VH</td><td>1</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>8</td><td>12</td><td>20</td></tr></table>	PI2-WB	4	4	8	PI3-VH	1	3	4	Total	8	12	20
PI2-WB	4	4	8												
PI3-VH	1	3	4												
Total	8	12	20												

		10) PP has submitted the organogram “VCS 2505 Project Organogram.docx” with roles & responsibilities for the applicable staff including the implementation partner. The implementation partners for each PAIs were also mentioned in ER section 3.2.2. The comment is closed. CL#3 remains open for point 8.	
	Round-3	8. A). PP has submitted the revised contract “Vulani Mabunda LOA Apr 2024 -Signed.pdf” which is effective from April 2024 and the VVB has checked that this fall under current monitoring period. The comment is closed. B).PP has added the number of the employee for female and male in the MR section 2.3.1. This has been checked with the submitted contracted. The comment is closed. CL#3 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#4	Developer Response
------	---------------------	---------------------------	--------------------

VCS Standard MR Template Rule Clarification	Whether this section describes the process and schedule followed during the monitoring period for obtaining, compiling, and analysing the monitored data and parameters, set out in Section 4.2 (Data and Parameters Monitored)	9. Section 2.1.2, MR: 1. PP shall submit evidence of the community meeting held for stakeholder consultation (meeting invitation, photo, attendance list). 2. PP shall confirm if they received any such comments from stakeholders or from Verra board.	11.1. 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. In the “Community_Meetings_2505” excel spreadsheet a list of community meetings has been recorded. This data is captured in field using SurveyCTO and pre-programmed forms on the Collect app on the monitors smartphone and automatically stored on a cloud server for further analysis. Monitors do also capture photos of the events but in order to access these photos the VVB must have a SurveyCTO account which is linked to the TASC account. 11.2. No formal comments or 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. Feedback and comments from community meetings can be seen in Column O of the “Community_Meetings_2505” excel spreadsheet. As mentioned in the “Stakeholder input” section of the table in Section 2.1.2 of the MR: “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.”
	Round-2	11)Section 2.1.2 of MR: 1.PP has submitted the community meeting log with the date and the meeting location where the stakeholder meeting was held for each PAI during this monitoring period (01/02/2024-31/07/2024). The comment is closed. 2. PP has confirmed no comment were received from Verra board. The comment from the stakeholder meeting in the	

		community “ Community_Meetings_2505 ” are mostly related to the size of the stove and they prefer that the stove can held two pots. CL#4 is closed.	
--	--	---	--

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#5	Developer Response
VCS Standard MR Template	Check how process or methods used to document the outcomes of the stakeholder consultation for the project during the monitoring period.	10. Section 2.1.4, MR: PP shall submit the grievance log-book (s) maintained for the project PAIs during the current monitoring period.	12. The grievance mechanism is communicated to the beneficiaries during the pre-distribution sensitization meetings, during distribution and also contact details for TASC is provided in the stove “How to Guide” distributed along with each device (“TASC SA Cookstoves How-To-Guide- Sepedi Venda.pdf” will be provided to the VVB). No formal grievances have been received during this monitoring period, thus no physical grievance log books are available.
	Round-2	12). PP is requested to provide further details regarding the grievance mechanism, including the process for recording information when a grievance or input is received from stakeholders or end-users. CL#5 remains open.	12. Beneficiaries are instructed to communicate grievances directly to the village leader, chief, tribal authority, or monitoring staff. They also receive a number which they can call to log grievances. In the event of when a formal grievance is received, these grievances will be logged in the grievance logbook and addressed accordingly.

			To date, no formal grievances have been received from beneficiaries, village authorities or other stakeholders. Thus, no formal grievances exist. However, there has been general comments on the cookstoves requesting larger cookstoves or 2 cooking surfaces. But these are not grievances, bur suggestions on project design.
	Round-3	PP has provided the clarification on the grievance process and the verifier has verified during the remote audit as well that no grievance has been receive in regard to the technical aspect of the stove. CL#5 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#6	Developer Response
VCS Standard MR Template	Provide a summary description of project activities implemented during the monitoring period that result in SD contributions (i.e., technologies/measures implemented, activity location).	11. Section 2.3, MR: As reported in this section PP shall submit the TASC ESG Handbook for the project.	13. The TASC ESG Handbook will be submitted to the VVB. See attachment: "TASC ESG Handbook.pdf".

	Round-2	13) Section 2.3, MR: PP has submitted the TASC ESG handbook “TASC ESG Handbook.pdf”, which cover the topic of Environmental, Social, Government policies and practice and ESG Risk Management Framework. CL#6 is closed.	
--	---------	---	--

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CAR#2	Developer Response
VCS Standard MR Template	For all projects, describe the implementation status of the project activity(s), including information on the following: The operation of the project activity(s) during the monitoring period, including any information on events that may impact the GHG emission reductions or carbon dioxide removals and monitoring.	12. Section 3.1, MR: Section 3.1 of the monitoring report doesn't include the information w.r.t non-operational status of project technology reported by household/end-users during the monitoring period to field officer/monitors. PP shall confirm if any such incident were reported by end-users during the monitoring period. 13. Section 3.1, MR: the total number of ICS distributed for each PAI PI1-K2C: 334,747 PI2-WB: 296,673 PI3-VH: 106,070 Wherein, the submitted distribution database “Distribution Database (31 Jan 2024).xlsx”, the number of ICS distributed are	14. Reporting on operational status of devices is not required in section 3.1. However, the number of operational stoves ($N_{y,i,j}$) in each project instance is calculated according to the method described in the parameter table for $N_{y,i,j}$ in Section 4.2 of this monitoring report. During monitoring activities, such as community engagements and internal surveys, households can inform the monitoring staff if their stove is broken or damaged. Additionally, households received a "How-to Guide" with the stove at the time of distribution, which includes contact details for TASC and the stove manufacturer, Rocket Works (refer to "TASC SA Cookstoves How-To-Guide - Sepedi Venda.pdf"). Monitoring staff are trained to repair stoves in cases of

		PI1-K2C: 342,035 PI2-WB: 297,660 PI3-VH: 106,628 PP shall justify these inconsistencies 14. Section 3.1, MR: "As described in the previous monitoring report" – The footnote (22) provided by PP refers to the 3rd Monitoring Report. Since this is the 5th monitoring period currently undergoing verification, the reference may not align with the correct sequence. PP shall update the reference accordingly.	minor damage, and spare parts are available if replacements are needed. No incidents of broken stoves were reported during this monitoring period. 15. As discussed in the previous findings rounds for MRV 4 (see CL6 in the attached document “Final Verification_Findings_V02 Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa 2505 MP4 Rd 5”), end-users who did not indicate any use of wood in the baseline scenario have been removed from the stove count used in the ER calculations. For PI1-K2C, 7288 end -users were removed from the ER calculation stove count, bringing the total stove count for PI1-K2C down from 342,035 to 334,747. For PI2-WB, 987 end -users were removed from the ER calculation stove count, bringing the total stove count for PI2-WB down from 297,660 to 296,673. For PI3-VH, 558 end -users were removed from the ER calculation stove count, bringing the total stove count for PI3-VH down from 106,628 to 106,070. The excel workbook titled “Distribution Database (31 Jan 2024)” is the full distribution database, including end-users who did not indicate wood use in the baseline scenario but still received stoves. Please see cells B2:F5 in the “Summary” tab of “2505_MRV5_ER_Calcs_v1.2”. The following text has also been added to Section 3.1 of the MR: “The table above depicts
--	--	---	--

			the total number of stoves distributed. However, the number of operational stoves ($N_{y,i,j}$) in each project instance is calculated according to the method described in the parameter table for $N_{y,i,j}$ in Section 4.2 of this monitoring report.” 16. Footnote reference 22 in Section 3.1 of the MR has been updated to: “4th Monitoring Report: Fuel efficient cooking in South Africa v1.8; 01 August 2023 – 31 January 2024”. The reference refers to the previous monitoring report, i.e. for the fourth monitoring period.
	Round-2	14)Section 3.1, MR: PP has confirmed that there is no incident of broken stoves was reported in the current monitoring period. The comment is closed. 15) PP has provided the clarification on the discrepancies between the number of ICS in MP5 and the distribution database. The discount on the ICS was due to the end-user which was not using wood as baseline scenario. In the “Distribution Database (31 Jan 2024).xlsx” tab “PI2-WB”, the number of ICS without having wood as baseline is 988, where PP reported in the response as 987. PP shall clarify this difference.	15. The error was fixed and the total number of excluded stoves as a result of the wrong baseline device for WB is now 988. Thus, the number of stoves in the ER sheet for WB decreased to 296672. This has been amended in all sections of the ER sheet and MR. Furthermore, this amendment also resulted in a decrease of technology days in cell “I60” of the “ER Survey” tab in the ER sheet, which decreased the total emission reductions to 1,720,215 VCU’s. All changes have been made in the MR.

		The comment remains open. 16. Section 3.1 of MR, PP has corrected the monitoring period sequence to MP4. The comment is closed. CAR#2 remains open for point 15.	
	Round-3	PP has confirmed the correct value of the baseline device for WB is 988. The verifier has checked the revised ER calculation and the reported value in MR are correct. CAR#2 is closed. However, during the course of verification process and based on Verra's PRR comment the finding is reopened w.r.t to application of usage rate of 1.0 for one of the project activity instances i.e., PAI-2-WB. Therefore, PD shall address this finding based on the Verra PRR form.	Beneficiaries in the Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa project were surveyed to assess the usage rates of the project cookstoves in accordance with Verra guidelines. However, as we recognise that there are uncertainties associated with using a survey-based approach to measuring usage, we strive to adhere to the best practices outlined in the most recent and robust VM0050 methodology. Specifically, when utilising a survey-based approach for quantifying usage, we endeavour to apply the 90% usage rate cap to ensure methodological rigor and conservativeness. This approach is being applied to the grouped project to enhance the accuracy and reliability of the reported usage rates. In this monitoring period, only the PI2-WB instance had a usage rate above 90% (100%), and therefore it is capped at 90%, while the other usage rates for PI1-K2C and PI3-VH remain as determined (82% and 84%, respectively). As per the Correction and Clarifications (Clarification 2) to VM0050 Energy

			Efficiency and Fuel-Switch Measures in Cookstoves, V1.0, for projects employing surveys, the usage rate is capped at 90%. Revised MR, ER sheet is now submitted for further review.
	Round-4	Justification submitted by project proponent is accepted. Revised monitoring report and emission reduction sheet is now checked by VVB team to confirm that the project proponent endeavour to use best available practice which is applying the discount as per VM0050 on usage rates for the PI-2 WB project activity instance. As per this methodology and related clarification / corrections the justification is provided in section 4.3.5, page 37 of the MR for the conservative cap of user rate for PI-2 WB project instance. In this monitoring period, only the PI2-WB instance had a usage rate above 90% (100%), and therefore it is capped at 90%, while the other usage rates for PI1-K2C and PI3-VH remain as determined (82% and 84%, respectively). As per the correction and clarifications (Clarification 2) to VM0050 Energy Efficiency and Fuel-Switch Measures in Cookstoves, V1.0, for projects employing surveys, the usage rate is capped at 90%. Revised section of the monitoring report and	

		emission reduction sheet is checked by VVB team to be correct and lead to conservative calculations of emission reductions. Revised MR, ER, FVerR and supporting evidence are now submitted along with the Verra PRR form to Verra for their next round of review. Finding is closed.	
--	--	---	--

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CAR#3	Developer Response
VCS Standard MR Template	Check for all data and parameters monitored during the project crediting period are calculated corrected and consistent with the emission reduction spreadsheet and other supporting evidence. Check the measurement methods and procedures, any standards or protocols to be followed, and the person/entity responsible for the measurement. Whether any relevant information regarding the accuracy of the	15. Section 4.2, MR: a) $N_{y,i,j}$: For this parameter PP has stated monitoring frequency as at least once every two years. Accordingly, PP shall include the date when this monitoring was completed by PP for this parameter. b) $\eta_{new, l,j}$: For this parameter PD shall correct the source of data. Currently it is stated that “Measurements at project facility” while in actual it is calculated value. PP shall clarify this. 16. μ_y: For this monitoring parameter the “value monitored” for this parameter is not consistent with the values reported in “ER Survey” tab of ER spreadsheet. E.g., for PI1-K2C it is 0.232 in ER sheet while in MR it is 0.23.	17.a. 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 which are conducted once each monitoring period (see “N_y” tab of the KPT spreadsheets for each instance). $N_{y,i,j}$ is calculated by multiplying the number of devices in distributed in each instance with parameter $n_{y,i,j}$ to determine the number of stoves that are in use. For PI1-K2C habit surveys were conducted from 10/06/2024 until 03/07/2024 (see column D0, Habit Surveys tab, 2505_MRV5_pKPT_K2C_v1.1). For PI2-WB habit surveys were conducted from 10/06/2024 until 03/07/2024 (see column D0, Habit Surveys tab, 2505_MRV5_pKPT_Waterberg_v1.1). For PI3-VH

	measurements (e.g., accuracy associated with meter equipment or laboratory tests) is included correctly.		habit surveys were conducted from 10/06/2024 until 02/07/2024 (see column DO, Habit Surveys tab, 2505_MRV5_pKPT_Vhembe_v1.1). 17.b. The following text has been added to the “Source of Data” section in the $\eta_{new, i, j}$ parameter table: “Calculated using methodology default of 0.99 efficiency loss per year (Equation 5). Please see ER Calculation Sheet “ER Survey” tab PI1-K2C: Cells D33:D35 & D40:D42 PI2-WB: Cells D50:D52 & D58:D60 PI3-VH: Cells D68:D70 & D76:D78” 18. The values given for μ_y in the MR had been rounded down to two decimal places. These values have been amended to now have 3 decimal places which align with the values given in the ER calculation sheet.
	Round-2	17). Section 4.2 of MR: a) The response provided by PP is acceptable. However, PP shall add this information in the MR under this parameter “$N_{y, i, j}$”, in the section “Frequency monitoring/recording”.	17.a. The following text has been added to the “Frequency monitoring/recording” section of the $N_{y, i, j}$ parameter table: “At least once every two years 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

		The comment remains open. b).Parameter “$\eta_{new, i,j}$”: PP has revised the wording in MR and refer to the calculation in ER for each PAI. The comment is closed. 18). The value of parameter “uy” for each PAI has been corrected in MR , and match with ER calculation , tab “ER Survey”, cell, D24 (K2C), E24 (WB) and F24 (VH). The comment is closed. CAR#3 remains open for point 17a.	distributed devices with the usage rate of the devices as determined by the Habit surveys which are conducted once each monitoring period. $N_{y,i,j}$ is calculated by multiplying the number of devices in distributed in each instance with parameter $n_{y,i,j}$ to determine the number of stoves that are in use. In MP5: for PI1-K2C habit surveys were conducted from 10/06/2024 until 03/07/2024. For PI2-WB habit surveys were conducted from 10/06/2024 until 03/07/2024. For PI3-VH habit surveys were conducted from 10/06/2024 until 02/07/2024.”
	Round-3	17) a. PP has added the information of the frequency/monitoring of parameter “$N_{y,i,j}$” in the MR section 4.2. CAR#3 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CAR#4	Developer Response
VCS Standard MR Template	Check the process and schedule followed during the monitoring period for obtaining, compiling, and	17. Section 4.3.1, MR: In section 4.3.1 under table the population size is not consistent with the population size reported under tab “Ny” of KPT spreadsheets. PP shall clarify this. 18. Section 4.3.1, MR: In section 4.3.1 it is stated “Analysis of survey questions for parameter $n_{y,i,j}$, indicated a proportion of	19. The total stove count of 737,490 is a sum of all stoves distributed in each instance (SUM of cells D25:F25, ER Survey tab, 2505_MRV5_ER_Calcs_v1.2.xlsx). The population size reported under tab “Ny” of

	analyzing the monitored data and parameters. Check methods used for measuring, recording, storing, aggregating, collating and reporting on monitored data and parameters.	0.82, 1.00, and 0.85 for PI1-K2C, PI2-WB, and PI3-VH, respectively” however, for Vhembe the value are not traceable. PP shall clarify this.	KPT spreadsheets has been updated to 737,490 for each instance as this is the correct value and aligns with the population size given in Section 4.3.1 of the MR. 20. In Section 4.3.5 of the MR the $n_{y,i,j}$ values for each instance are given as 0.82, 1.00, and 0.85 for PI1-K2C, PI2-WB, and PI3-VH, respectively. These values are calculated in the Ny tab of the KPT spreadsheets for each instance, namely “2505_MRV5_pKPT_K2C_v1.1”, “2505_MRV5_pKPT_Waterberg_v1.1” and “2505_MRV5_pKPT_Vhembe_v1.1”.								
Round-2	19) PP has used the entire population data (N) for all the 3 PAIs. This has been verified that by the VVB that the sum of all the stoves is correct (737,490). There are discrepancies in the sampling table in KPT and in MR section 4.3.1. PI-WB A).In MR section 4.3.1, the “expected proportion” is 0.99, wherein KPT “2505_MRV5_pKPT_Waterberg_v1.1.xlsx”, the value is 0.86. <table><tr><th>Input</th><th>Value</th><th>Notes</th></tr><tr><td>Expected proportion, p</td><td>0.86</td><td>enter on a decimal scale</td></tr><tr><td>Confidence level</td><td>90%</td><td>e.g. for 90% enter 90</td></tr></table>	Input	Value	Notes	Expected proportion, p	0.86	enter on a decimal scale	Confidence level	90%	e.g. for 90% enter 90	19.a. The expected proportion has been erroneously stated in the MR and has been changed to 0.86. 19.b. The population size in the sample size calculator is correct at 737,490, please note that this is now different form the total number of stoves as 1more devices has been excluded from the database during this verification round. This has been amended in the sample size calculators; thus, the total population size is now 737,489. This had no effect on the sample sizes.
Input	Value	Notes									
Expected proportion, p	0.86	enter on a decimal scale									
Confidence level	90%	e.g. for 90% enter 90									

	B). In MR section 4.3.1, the “Population size, N” is 737,490, wherein KPT “2505_MRV5_pKPT_Waterberg_v1.1.xlsx”, the value is 747,323. <table><tr><td>Population size, N</td><td>746,323</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Predicted sample size, n</td><td>45</td><td>rounded up to nearest integer</td></tr></table> C). In MR section 4.3.1, the “Predicted sample size,n” is 3, wherein KPT “2505_MRV5_pKPT_Waterberg_v1.1.xlsx”, the value is 45. <table><tr><td>Population size, N</td><td>737 490</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Predicted sample size, n</td><td>60</td><td>rounded up to nearest integer</td></tr></table> PP shall justify these discrepancies. PI-Vhembe D) In MR section 4.3.1, the “expected proportion” is 0.88, wherein KPT “2505_MRV5_pKPT_Vhembe_v1.1.xlsx”, the value is 0.82. <table><tr><th>Input</th><th>Value</th><th>Notes</th></tr><tr><td>Expected proportion, p</td><td>0.82</td><td>enter on a decimal scale</td></tr></table> E). In MR section 4.3.1, the “Predicted sample size,n” is 37, wherein KPT “2505_MRV5_pKPT_Waterberg_v1.1.xlsx”, the value is 60. <table><tr><td>Population size, N</td><td>737 490</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Predicted sample size, n</td><td>60</td><td>rounded up to nearest integer</td></tr></table> PP shall justify these discrepancies.	Population size, N	746,323		Predicted sample size, n	45	rounded up to nearest integer	Population size, N	737 490		Predicted sample size, n	60	rounded up to nearest integer	Input	Value	Notes	Expected proportion, p	0.82	enter on a decimal scale	Population size, N	737 490		Predicted sample size, n	60	rounded up to nearest integer	19.c. This was a typing error and has been amended to 45 in the MR. 19.d. Has been corrected to 0.82 in the MR. 19.e. Value has been corrected to 60 in the MR.
Population size, N	746,323																									
Predicted sample size, n	45	rounded up to nearest integer																								
Population size, N	737 490																									
Predicted sample size, n	60	rounded up to nearest integer																								
Input	Value	Notes																								
Expected proportion, p	0.82	enter on a decimal scale																								
Population size, N	737 490																									
Predicted sample size, n	60	rounded up to nearest integer																								

		CAR#4 remains open.	
	Round-3	19). - PI-WB a. In MR section 4.3.1, PP has corrected the value of “expected proportion” to 0.86 and match with KPT “2505_MRV5_pKPT_Waterberg_v1.2”. The comment is closed. b. PP has confirmed the correct total population is 737,489. The verifier has cross checked that the value is consistent throughout the MR, KPT and ER. The comment is closed. c. PP has confirmed that the value reported in MR is incorrect due to typo error. The correct value (45) has been added to MR. The comment is closed - PI-Vhembe d. PP has confirmed that the value reported in MR is incorrect due to typo error. The correct value (0.82) has been added to MR. The comment is closed. e. d. PP has confirmed that the value reported in MR is incorrect due to typo error. The correct value (60) has been added to MR. The comment is closed.	

		CAR#4 is closed.	
--	--	------------------	--

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#7	Developer Response
VCS Standard	Check the organizational structure, responsibilities and competencies of the personnel that carried out the monitoring activities for the current monitoring period.	19. Section 4.3.6: As reported under this section PP shall submit the training records of the field team/monitors involved during the current monitoring period survey.	21. Training for formal monitoring activities (KPTs and Habit Surveys) was done in person with the monitoring staff for each instance. Two TASC employees, Edwin Cogho and Carl Belger, hosted the training sessions. The PI1-K2C and PI3-VH teams had a joint training session on 21/05/2024 (see “K2C & Vhembe Attendance Register” provided). The PI2-WB team had a training session on 20/05/2024 (see “WB Attendance Register” provided).
MR Template	Round-2	21). PP has submitted the field team attendance list of the training for each PAI (K2C, WB, and VH) “ K2C & Vhembe Attendance Register.pdf ” and “ WB Attendance Register.pdf ” which was held on 20 th and 21 st May 2024. CL#7 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CAR#5	Developer Response
VCS Standard MR Template	Check if the Quantification the GHG emission reductions (reductions) and carbon dioxide removals (removals) for the monitoring period. If these calculation include all relevant equations.	20. Section 5.4, MR table-4: Under section 5.4 under table-4 PP has reported usage factor 0.82 (K2C); 0.85 (Vhembe); while in ER/KPT spreadsheet sheet is it reported as 0.8235 (K2C) & 0.8218 (K2C) and 0.849 (Vhembe). PP shall clarify this.	22. The usage factor values reported in Table 4 in Section 5.4 of the MR have been rounded to two decimal places. For consistency, the usage factor values in the ER/KPT spreadsheets have also been rounded to two decimal places i.e. 0.82 (K2C); 1.00 (Waterberg); 0.85 (Vhembe).
	Round-2	22)Section 5.4 of MR, PP has provided two decimal values. This section has been checked and verified with the KPT excel sheet for the three PAI. CAR#5 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#8	Developer Response
VCS Standard MR Template	Describe the quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) procedures to be applied, including the calibration procedures where applicable.	21. Section 4.2, MR: For µy parameter reported under MR Section 4.2 it is mentioned that new moisture meters and new weight scales were bought on the 30th of May 2024. PP has submitted two invoices of moisture meter "Ryobi_14679_E Cogho - 06	23. The new moisture meters and weight scales bought on 30 May 2024 were used for the KPTs conducted between 10/06/2024 – 03/07/2024. The following text, describing the type and model of equipment used, has been added to

		2024.pdf”, “Ryobi_14681_E Cogho - 06 2024.pdf”. PP has submitted two invoices of weight scale “Gmail - Takealot _ Payment Confirmation _ 153605011.pdf”, and “Gmail - Takealot _ Payment Confirmation _ 153616831.pdf” PP is requested to confirm whether the KPT conducted between June and July 2024 used new moisture meters and new weight scales for all households. Information on the measuring tool i.e., 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 parameter “μy” in section 4.2 of the MR.	the “monitoring equipment” section of the μy parameter table in Section 4.2. of the MR: “Scale: Leroy Merlin Portable Crane Scale 300KG Moisture Meter: Ryobi RS PRO RS-120 Moisture Meter” The following text, regarding calibration information, can be seen in the “QA/QC procedures to be applied’ section of the μy parameter table 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 30th of May 2024 and do not need calibration.”
	Round-2	PP has confirmed that the new moisture meters and weight scale which were bought on 30 May 2024 were used for KPTs conducted between 10/06/2024-03/07/2024. The information describing the type and model of the monitoring equipment and calibration information has been added to MR under parameter “μy” in section 4.2.	

		CL#8 is closed.	
--	--	-----------------	--

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#9	Developer Response
VCS Standard MR Template	Remote audit interview with end-users and field team. PP shall submit the raw data evidence for the sampled household/end-users.	22. Based on remote audit interview with end-users, field team and project proponent PP is requested to submit the following field data for following end-users/Stove Barcode IDs. - PI1-K2C: 52500 ,168954, 95851 - PI2-VH: 635164, 536490, 590037, 730318 - PI3-WB: 417054, 672293, 581132, 459530	24. The hardcopy KPT sheets used for each of these stove barcodes will be provided in the folder titled: "Hard Copy KPT sheets".
	Round-2	24). a.The hardcopy of PI3-WB (581132) is missing. b.For PI2-VH (590037): The Day 4 hardcopy survey lists "0" females over 14 years, whereas the KPT survey in Excel lists "1". PP shall clarify this discrepancy. c.For PI3-WB (459530): The Day 3 hardcopy survey lists "1" female over 14 years, while the KPT survey in Excel lists "2". PP shall clarify this discrepancy. d.For PI1-K2C and PI2-VH, the KPT survey was conducted over 4 days (Day 1–Day 4), but for	24.a. Hardcopy KPT sheet for PI2-WB (581132) is submitted as evidence along with this document. 24.b. This was a typing error when typing in the data in the phone and has been corrected in the excel sheet. This had no effect on the final outcome of the wood usage results, uy or ERs. 24.c. This was a typing error when typing in the data in the phone and has been corrected in the excel sheet. This had no effect on the final outcome of the wood usage results, uy or ERs.

		PI3-WB, it was conducted over 5 days. PP shall explain the difference in survey days. CL#9 remains open.	24.d. Monitors were instructed to do the KPTs for a minimum of 4 consecutive days and a maximum of 5 consecutive days. This is done so that we can get at least 3 24-hour periods of data to do wood use calculations. In this case the Waterberg team conducted 5 days of KPTs for in case any of the days had erroneous data, then we could discount the day and still have enough data. In the KPT version 4 protocol document, it is stated that KPTs can be conducted for a period of 3 – 7 days, thus doing 5 days of KPTs is within the guidance. Furthermore, if the 5th day of KPTs is removed from PI2 – WB, parameter u_y decreases to 0.275 from 0.277 which will result in higher VCUs. Thus, keeping the data as is results in a more conservative final ER value. Monitors have been instructed to be consistent in future monitoring event and practice the same number of days during KPT surveying going forward to prevent inconsistencies between project activity instances.
	Round-3	24). a.PP has submitted the scanned copy of KPT survey for enduser with stove ID #581132 “581132 Edward Ramoba KPT.pdf” and the	

		verifier has verified that the input information in the scanned survey match with the KPT excel “2505_MRV5_pKPT_Waterberg_v1.2.xlsx” submitted. The comment is closed. b. For PI2-VH (590037): the number of female older than 14 years old in KPT has been correct to “0” as per the scanned copy survey. The comment is closed. c. For PI3-WB (459530): the number of female older than 14 years old in KPT has been correct to “1” as per the scanned copy survey. The comment is closed. d. PP has provided clarification over the number of KPT survey for Waterberg and the response is accepted as it results in a conservative value of VCU. The comment is closed. CL#9 is closed.	
--	--	--	--

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL#10	

VCS Standard MR Template	Check whether FAR from previous monitoring verification and applicable for this monitoring period are addressed for the monitoring period undergoing verification.	23. According to previous monitoring verification report (MP4: 01-August-2023 to 31-January-2024), 2 FARs have been raised: 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 u_y. 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. PP shall address above confirm whether these two FARs have been addressed during the current monitoring period (MP5:	FAR #1 – Any irregular moisture data received via SurveyCTO is verified against the corresponding hardcopy records. This text has also been added to the QA/QC section of u_y parameter table in the MR. FAR #2 – All monitoring staff are compensated above South African minimum wage, contracts are provided in evidence of this, please see folder titled “Employment Contracts 2024”.
---	---	--	---

		01/02/24 - 31/07/24) and submit the corrective actions for these FARs.	
	Round-2	25) FAR#1: PP has confirmed that the CTO data has been verified with the corresponding hardcopy records. The statement has been added to the MR section 4.2 under parameter “μ_y”, FAR#2: PP has confirmed that the employee’s salary is above the country’s minimum wage and PP also submitted the employment contracted as evidence. CL#10 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#11	Developer Response
VCS Standard MR Template	Whether this section of MR describes the process and schedule followed during the monitoring period for obtaining, compiling, and analysing the monitored data and parameters, set out in	Section 4.3.3, MR: It is stated that “Data collection was conducted by a dedicated monitoring team of trained individuals, either from TASC SA or the Project Instance Implementer using a survey questionnaire.”	The teams that completed the KPTs and Habit Surveys for MRV5 are employed full-time as monitoring staff in each instance. Before each formal monitoring campaign starts, the monitoring staff attend a training session held by TASC employees where they are shown a powerpoint presentation (“KPT & Habit Survey Walkthrough”), given a printed hand out (“KPT

	Section 4.2 (Data and Parameters Monitored).	PP is requested to provide measures in terms of competence of survey team in form of training evidence for this monitoring period.	and Habit Survey Print Out - basic overview”) and do role play where they practice how to conduct both KPTs and Habit Surveys. The attendance registers for these training sessions, held on 20 and 21 May 2024, have been submitted to the VVB. The majority of the monitoring staff members have conducted numerous rounds of KPTs and Habit Surveys, however all staff members are required to attend the training sessions and newer staff members are paired with more experienced staff members as they work in teams of two.
	Round-2	PP has confirmed the competency of the field team and submitted the field team attendance list of the training for each PAI (K2C, WB, and VH) “ K2C & Vhembe Attendance Register.pdf ” and “ WB Attendance Register.pdf ” which was held on 20 th and 21 st May 2024. CL#11 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#12	Developer Response
VCS Standard	Project and jurisdictional proponents must demonstrate that they have the legal right	24. PP is requested to provide evidence of project ownership from the process that generates GHG emission reductions in the form of End User Agreement as regulated in	The End-User agreements for the following stove barcodes will be provided to the VVB in a folder titled “End-User Agreements”:

MR Template	to control and operate project or program activities	section 1.7 of the PDD v.5.0. for the distributed cookstoves in this monitoring period for the following sampled: PI-WB: 57780, 209717, 459530, 581132, 751383, 672293, 417054, 295716. PI-K2C: 153014, 140535, 91814, 95851, 159410, 073698, 168954, 62104, 52500. PI-VH: 733616, 635164, 713083, 590037, 669460, 730318, 677925, 536490.	PI2-WB: 057780 , 209717, 459530, 581132, 751383, 672293, 417054, 295716. PI1-K2C: 153014, 140535, 091814 , 095851 , 159410, 073698, 168954, 062104 , 052500 . PI3-VH: 733616, 635164, 713083, 590037, 669460, 730318, 677925, 536490.
	Round-2	PP has submitted the end-user signed agreement for the above requested stove IDs, and this has been verified that the end-users name, signed date and stove ID is match with the distribution database "Distribution Database (31 Jan 2024)". CL#12 is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#13	Developer Response
VCS Standard MR Template	Check if the emission reduction calculation is consistent with monitoring report and calculation is done for the monitoring	25. ER spreadsheet: In monitoring report the monitoring period is from 01/02/2024 to 31/07/2024, However in ER, tab "Tech Days – K2C" cell I4, the calculation of total days in 181 which is not include both start and	When calculating the number of days between two dates in Excel, one day is lost due to the way the calculation is performed. For example, the formula =31/01/2024 - 01/01/2024 returns 30 days, even though January has 31 days. To account for this, "1"

	period undergoing verification.	end date. The same calculation was used for PI-VH and PI-WB. PP shall provide a justification as to why the calculation does not include both the start and end dates.	was added to all values in columns E and F, as well as cell I4, in the "Tech Days" tabs for each instance in the ER calculation sheet (2505_MRV5_ER_Calcs_v1.2). This adjustment compensates for the lost day in the Excel formula (the correct amount of days in MP5 is 182 days), resulting in an increase in Tech Days for each instance and a corresponding rise in ERs, as shown below: <table><tr><td></td><td>Previously:</td><td>Corrected to:</td></tr><tr><td>PI1-K2C ERs</td><td>756 127</td><td>760 304</td></tr><tr><td>PI2-WB ERs</td><td>777 014</td><td>781 306</td></tr><tr><td>PI3-VH ERs</td><td>177 624</td><td>178 606</td></tr><tr><td>Total ERs</td><td>1 710 765</td><td>1 720 216</td></tr></table> As shown in the table, the total increase in ERs as a result of the increase in technical days was 9,451 tCO_{2e}. All related values in the MR have been updated accordingly.		Previously:	Corrected to:	PI1-K2C ERs	756 127	760 304	PI2-WB ERs	777 014	781 306	PI3-VH ERs	177 624	178 606	Total ERs	1 710 765	1 720 216
	Previously:	Corrected to:																
PI1-K2C ERs	756 127	760 304																
PI2-WB ERs	777 014	781 306																
PI3-VH ERs	177 624	178 606																
Total ERs	1 710 765	1 720 216																
Round-2		27). PP has confirmed the total days for this monitoring period is counted for both start and end date which is 182 days for all the 3 PAIs (K2C, WB, VH). This has also reflected in the ER calculation excel “2505_MRV5_ER_Calcs_v1.2”.	PP now have regarded households that have responded ‘yes’ to using their cookstove but have indicated that they use their stoves 0 times a week or per day as non-users to be conservative. These include households on row 18 and row 81 of the K2C habit survey sheet															

		CL#13 is closed. However, during the course of verification process Verra PRR comment were raised w.r.t to the habit survey collected data on household stove usage and it is established in columns AP, AO& AT for Waterberg, column AO, AP& AS for Vhembe and columns AP,AQ & AT for K2C that: a) There are cases where there is no correlation between stove use, daily stove use and weekly stove use. b) There are some inconsistencies where the stove is indicated as in use, but the weekly use is indicated zero (0). c) There are other cases where the stove is indicated as not in use but the weekly use has some occurrences of cooking. Therefore, finding is reopened by VVB for the said issue.	(2505_MRV5_pKPT_K2C_v1.4_anonymised). Consequently, the Ny calculation has changed. Please see the updated calculation on the Ny tab. The Ny calculation now counts how many households have reported using their stove from the amended cookstove use in column B. Column B was adjusted by changing the response of households who indicated that they use their stove 0 times a week or per day from a “yes to a “No”. The Ny value subsequently changed from 0,82 to 0,80 for K2C. The amended Ny calculations were also completed for Waterberg and Vhembe (2505_MRV5_pKPT_Waterberg_v1.5_anonymised, 2505_MRV5_pKPT_Vhembe_v1.5_anonymised), but these instances had no occurrences of households responded “yes” to cookstove use and using their stove 0 times per week or per day. Therefore, their Ny values remain unchanged. As K2C’s Ny value changed, the ERs for this instance and for the grouped project have been updated in the revised ER sheet and the monitoring report.
	Round-3	VVB team reviewed the revised KPT sheet for all three project instances (PI-1-K2C, PI-2-WB and PI-3-WB) and checked the Habit Surveys once. Based on review of KPT excel sheet the applicable error is corrected for PI-2-K2C only and there are no cases where such error is identified. Revised KPI sheet for PI-2K2C is checked and since the correction carried out by project proponent led to conservative	

		calculation (Ny value revised from 0.82 to 0.80) of emission reduction therefore same is accepted by VVB team. VVB team has checked the revised ER sheet and monitoring report to confirm that the conservative Ny as input value is correctly taken into emission reduction calculation. In line with the revised ER and MR document VVB team has also updated the relevant sections of the verification report and provide detailed response in Verra PRR form (VCS_R2_PRR_2505_01FEB2024-31JULY2024). Revised KPT sheets for all project instance including K2C project instance along with the revised MR, ER sheet, FVR and PRR form is now submitted to Verra team. Finding is now closed.	
--	--	---	--

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CAR#6	Developer Response
VCS Standard MR Template	Check if the emission reduction calculation is consistent with monitoring report and calculation is done for the monitoring period undergoing verification.	26. ER spreadsheet: In ER “2505_MRV5_ER_Calcs_v1.1”, tab “Ex-ante expected ERs”, the ex-ante calculation was mentioned MP4, i.e. in cell B2, N29, N70, N110.	28. All references to “MP4” have been changed to “MP5” in the “Ex-ante expected ERs” tab of the “2505_MRV5_ER_Calcs_v1.2” spreadsheet.

	Round-2	28) .The monitoring period sequence has been corrected to “MP5” in the ER excel. CAR#6 is closed.	
--	---------	--	--

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CAR#7	Developer Response
VCS Standard MR Template CDM Sampling Standard	Based on onsite visit/remote audit interview with end users check if the sampling method and survey results used by PP are in-line with the onsite/remote audit questionnaire surveys/interviews.	27. Based on remote audit interview with household/end-user by VVB following clarification is requested from PP: - PI-WB: -Stove.ID (672293): In the Habit survey, the end-user reported 6 family members. However, during the remote interview conducted by the auditing team on 10/09/2024, the end-user stated that they are having 5 members. -Stove.ID (417054): In the Habit survey, the end-user reported 9 family members. However, during the remote interview conducted by the auditing team on 10/09/2024, the end-user stated that they are having 6 members. - PI-K2C -Stove.ID (153014): In the Habit survey, the end-user reported 5 family members.	29. in terms of households size, it is very common for household demographics to change in these environments as people often shift in search for employment opportunities or for educational purposes. It should also be noted that these surveys were conducted during school holidays. 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 in the habit survey vs when the remote site visit was conducted.

		However, during the remote interview conducted by the auditing team on 11/09/2024, the end-user stated that they are having 6 members. -StoveID (91814): In the Habit survey, the end-user reported 7 family members. However, during the remote interview conducted by the auditing team on 11/09/2024, the end-user stated that they are having 5 members. -Stove.ID (52500): In the Habit survey, the end-user reported 4 family members. However, during the remote interview conducted by the auditing team on 11/09/2024, the end-user stated that they are having 5 members. PI-VH -Stove.ID (730318): In the Habit survey, the end-user reported 16 family members. However, during the remote interview conducted by the auditing team on 12/09/2024, the end-user stated that they are having 17 members. -Stove.ID (536490): In the Habit survey, the end-user reported 4 family members. However, during the remote interview conducted by the auditing team on	
--	--	--	--

		12/09/2024, the end-user stated that they are having 5 members.	
	Round-2	PP has provided justification that the different in the household size between the habit survey and during the remote audit is due to the demographic displacement in which people leave their household for employment or educational opportunities. The justification by PP is accepted. CAR#7 is closed.	

APPENDIX 5: COMPETENCY STATEMENTS

COMPETENCY STATEMENT	
Name	Muskan Chawla
Years of Experience	2+
QUALIFYING ROLES	
Team Leader	Yes
Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) / CE Region 6 (Hindi)
Technical Expert	Yes (1.1, 1.2)
Financial Expert	No
Independent Reviewer	Yes
APPROVAL	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT
Date	09/05/2023

COMPETENCY STATEMENT	
Name	Sovanmmonica Ek
Years of Experience	1+
QUALIFYING ROLES	
Team Leader	Yes

Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) CE Region 3, (French), CE Region 5 (Chinese), CE Region 6 (Khmer)
Technical Expert	Yes (1.1)
Financial Expert	No
Independent Reviewer	No
APPROVAL	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT
Date	23/02/2024

COMPETENCY STATEMENT	
Name	Indrapal Parmar
Years of Experience	15+
QUALIFYING ROLES	
Team Leader	Yes
Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) / CE Region 6 (Hindi)
Technical Expert	Yes (1.1, 1.2, 1.6)
Financial Expert	Yes

Independent Reviewer	Yes
APPROVAL	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT
Date	15/07/2022

COMPETENCY STATEMENT	
Name	Gugu Zondi
Years of Experience	10+
QUALIFYING ROLES	
Team Leader	No
Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) / Region 6 (Other language: IsiZulu, IsiXhosa)
Technical Expert	No
Financial Expert	Yes
Independent Reviewer	No
APPROVAL	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT

Date	21/08/2024
------	------------

COMPETENCY STATEMENT	
Name	Shivraj Sharma
Years of Experience	19+
QUALIFYING ROLES	
Team Leader	Yes
Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) / CE Region 6 (Hindi)
Technical Expert	Yes (1.1, 1.2)
Financial Expert	Yes
Independent Reviewer	Yes
APPROVAL	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT
Date	15/07/2022