



VERIFICATION REPORT FOR

“FUEL EFFICIENT COOKING IN SOUTH AFRICA”



Report ID	VCS VerR 2505 25012025-31072025
Project title	Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa
Project ID	2505
Verification period	25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025 (inclusive both days)
Original date of issue	06-November-2025
Most recent date of issue	03-February-2026
Version	03
VCS Standard Version	4.7
Client	TASC SA (PTY) LTD.

Prepared by	SustainCERT S.A.
Approved by	Mr. Agustín Calle de Miguel Director of GHG Auditing
Work carried out by	Team Leader, Auditor and Technical Area Expert (TA 3.1): Dr. Atul Takarkhede Local Expert: Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira Independent Reviewer: Muskan Chawla (TA 3.1) Independent Reviewer in Trainee: Deepak Pundlik (TA 3.1)

Summary:

A description of the verification of the project

The 07th Verification of the project titled 'Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa' VCS ID – 2505, has 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 14064-2:2019 and ISO 14064-3:2019, as well as applicable criteria for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting has been applied for verification.

The project involves distribution of cookstoves under three project instances (PI1-K2C, PI2-WB and PI3-VH) in South Africa. During this Monitoring Period additional stoves have been distributed in Kruger 2 Canyons: Waterberg : PI1-K2C (86), PI2-WB (88,378) and Vhembe : PI3-VH (75,328). The cookstoves distributed are Rocket Works Zama Zama rocket stoves which are designed to reduce 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 grouped project activity is to perform independent periodic verification for the monitoring period 25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025 (inclusive both days). 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 grouped 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 grouped project activity is undergoing 07th verification from 25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025 (inclusive both days), under its fixed crediting period (10 years) from 20-August-2021 to 19-August-2031 (inclusive both days).

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, 01 CARs, 06 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 grouped project activity 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 25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025 (including both the days) in its implementation is calculated to generate 2,155,013 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	7
1.1	Objective.....	7
1.2	Scope and Criteria	7
1.3	Level of Assurance.....	8
1.4	Summary Description of the Project	9
2	VERIFICATION PROCESS	10
2.1	Method and Criteria.....	10
2.2	Document Review	12
2.3	Interviews.....	12
2.4	Site Visits.....	14
2.5	Resolution of Findings	16
2.6	Eligibility for Validation Activities	17
3	VALIDATION FINDINGS	17
3.1	Methodology Deviations.....	17
3.2	Project Description Deviations.....	17
3.3	New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects.....	17
3.4	Baseline Reassessment	26
4	VERIFICATION FINDINGS.....	26
4.1	Project Details	26
4.2	Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement	29
4.3	Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations.....	40
4.4	Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals.....	63
4.5	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis.....	64
5	VERIFICATION OPINION.....	64
5.1	Verification Summary	64
5.2	Verification Conclusion	65
5.3	Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison	66
	APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION	67
	APPENDIX 2: TABLE OF REFERENCE.....	68

APPENDIX 3: ABBREVIATIONS	70
APPENDIX 4: PROJECT FINDINGS.....	71
APPENDIX 5: BRIEF CVS OF TEAM	82

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 25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025 (including both the days). The verification of *grouped* project activity is the 7th verification for the crediting period 20-August-2021 to 19-August-2031(including both the days). The purpose of the verification is to conduct an independent review of the project information and confirm:

- The *grouped* 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 *grouped* 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 25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025 (inclusive both days), 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.

SustainCERT has planned and performed the verification by obtaining evidence and other information and explanations that assessment team considers necessary to give reasonable assurance that reported estimated GHG emission reductions are fairly stated. All documentary evidences were verified during the remote audit and through photos & supportive evidences were shared by PP to arrive at a positive verification conclusion by the assessment team.

The level of assurance of the verification report falls under reasonable assurance engagements. Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance regarding material misstatements, but not an absolute one.

Reasonable assurance includes the understanding that there is a likelihood that material misstatements will not be prevented or detected on a timely basis. To achieve reasonable assurance, the Auditor needs to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to reduce audit risk to an acceptably low level.

Through an exhaustive process of documentary review, interviews with the project proponents, remote audit, assessment on GHG Emission Reductions calculations against applicable methodology and any other regulatory document and reporting of objective evidence, the VVB is able to reach a reasonable level of assurance on the conduction of the verification process. The achieved level of assurance for this verification is thus a reasonable level of assurance as per the requirements set out in the applied VCS Standard version 4.7 clause 4.1.10 (1) /1/.

VVB applied a materiality threshold of 1% with respect to omission or misstatements concerning reported quantities as per VCS Standard version 4.7, clause 4.1.10 (4) /1/.

In our opinion, the achieved GHG emissions reductions for the monitoring period 25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025 (both days included) were calculated correctly on the basis of the approved monitoring methodology “VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1./7/ and the VCS standard v.4.7 (paragraph 4.1.10) /1/.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

This Grouped Project (“GP”) by TASC, which is aimed at distributing fuel-efficient improved cookstoves (ICS) to local communities in South Africa which do not have access to clean cooking. The ICS distributed 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, 163,792 were distributed in this monitoring period, 75,328 have been distributed in Project Instance 3 – Vhembe, 88,378 have been distributed in Project Instance 2 – Waterberg (PI2-WB) and 86 stoves have been distributed PA1- K2C. Since the project start date, a total of 935,824 units have been distributed in the project. A remote audit^{/27/28/} for the grouped project activity was conducted. Interviews of the PP representatives, local implementation partner representative, end-user, field team and stakeholders were conducted to ensure the implementation of the grouped project activity, to verify the habit survey and KPT. Furthermore, it was confirmed that the project involves distribution of improved cookstoves for period 25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025, leading to 2,155,013 tCO₂e emission reductions.

The start date of the grouped project activity is 20-August-2021 for PI1-K2C, 03-September-2021 for PI2-WB and 27-March-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 grouped project activity is 20-August-2021 to 19-August-2031, as verified using PD^{/5/} and validation report^{/6/}.

Based on this, the assessment team confirms that the grouped project activity 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 25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025 has been done conservatively and found to be appropriate.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

The Registered *grouped* Project activity has been undergoing 7th 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

Verification Process: The project assessment is based on the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, Version 03.0, “VCS program guide v.4.4 and VCS standard v.4.7” and is conducted using standard auditing techniques and pre-approved audit plan to assess the correctness of the information provided by the project proponent as per following verification schedule:

Scope of the assessment	Date
Initial meeting/Interview	29-September-2025
Interview with relevant personnel	29-September-2025 to 01-October-2025
Final meeting	01-October-2025

The Verification process has been conducted following the regulatory documents and based on the ISO 14064-3:2019 and ISO 14065:2020 using standard auditing techniques as required by the VCS Standard v4.7.

Before the assessment begins, members of the team covering the technical scope(s), sectoral scope(s), and relevant host country experience for evaluating the VCS project activity are appointed in accordance with the SustainCERT procedures and policies, that are in accordance with ISO 14065:2020 regulatory provisions.

SustainCERT has completed a strategic review and risk assessment of the project activities and processes in order to gain a full understanding of:

- Activities associated with all the sources contributing to project emissions and emission reductions, including leakage if relevant;
- Protocols used to estimate or measure GHG emissions from these sources;
- Collection and handling of data;
- Controls on the collection and handling of data;
- Means of verification; and
- Compilation of the information in the VCS MR.

Based on the above, the VVB prepared a Verification Plan and applied an evidence-gathering plan designed to collect sufficient and appropriate evidence upon which to base the conclusion and to consider the inherent risk for the verification. The evidence-gathering plan is based on analytical procedures & tests and considers thresholds for materiality as per the regulatory documents applied for

this verification (five percent for projects and one percent for large projects as per the applied para 4.1.10 (4) of VCS Standard version 4.7).

The applied evidence-gathering plan is used by VVB to determine the conformity of the statements made by client against the principles and requirements of applied regulatory documents during current verification.

The evidence-gathering plan designed by the VVB takes into consideration, as a minimum:

- The selection and management of the data and information;
- The processes for collecting, processing, consolidating, aggregating and reporting the data & information;
- Systems and processes in place to ensure the validity and accuracy of the data and information;
- The design and maintenance of the system to control the data and information;
- Systems, processes and personnel that support system in place, including activities for ensuring data quality;
- The plans for instrument maintenance and calibration where appropriate;

Once the project's initial documentation is received by the assessment team, the members of the assessment team carried out:

- *SustainCERT* has verified the implementation of the monitoring plan and the data presented in the Monitoring Report for the monitoring period applicable to this verification process.

The process of verification involved the following relevant milestones:

- The signature of the contract for verification between the PP and the VVB;
- A kick-off meeting/communication to require the documentary material to perform an initial desk review;
- An initial desk review of the documentary evidences prepared by the PP;
- The issuance of findings coming from this initial desk review (if any);
- The conduction of an onsite visit/remote audit, including interviews with project proponent and project stakeholders (see Sections 2.3 and 2.4 below);
- The issuance of findings from the Site Visit/remote inspection and communication of such deviations (if any) to the PP;
- The assessment of their resolution and closure, when appropriate;
- Once all the findings have been closed, the elaboration of this Verification Report, in which such findings (if any) are described;
- The conduction of an independent Technical Review;
- Upon conclusion of the Technical Review, signature of the corresponding Verification Deed & issuance of Final Verification Report (FVR) done.

The process of this verification assessment has implied sampling plan for remote audit interviews, data/document verification and described/explained in relevant sections.

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 registered 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

The grouped project activity is undergoing 7th MP verification. *In line with the para 4.1.12 of VCS Standard, Version 4.7*, the VCS Program does not explicitly mandate site visits as part of the verification process (except first verification). Further, as per para 4.1.13 of *VCS Standard, Version 4.7*, VVB shall identify whether a site visit is needed based on an independent risk assessment. Such risk assessment shall identify the risk of a material misstatement or nonconformity with the audit criteria. VVB carried out the risk assessment for the project activity and in outcome carried out remote audit to achieve a reasonable level of assurance during verification.

During the remote audit, the PP representatives were questioned about the implementation of the grouped project activity. Several topics like the distribution date, Stove serial numbers, location, stove usage etc. were discussed. To cross check the information provided by PP/users, other documents like distribution database, survey results, previous verification reports & independent web search etc. were also verified. The details of the persons interviewed during remote audit is given below;

The remote audit was carried out between 29-September-2025 to 01-October-2025.

Table 1: Project technology users interviewed

Sr. No.	Name of Household User	Location (Village, District/Province/state, Country)	Stove Id Number	Date of Remote Interviews	Mode of Visit	VVB Team
1.	Happiness Langa	Masodi (Waterberg)	222284	29-September-2025	Remote	Dr. Atul Takarkhede

Sr. No.	Name of Household User	Location (Village, District/Province/state, Country)	Stove Id Number	Date of Remote Interviews	Mode of Visit	VVB Team
2.	Ramasela phina Ndlovu	Ga-Mapela (Waterberg)	059558	29-September-2025	Remote	& Mr. Jean Bosco
3.	Elyna Ngobeni	Ga-Matlapa (Waterberg)	310643	29-September-2025	Remote	
4.	Tshepho Mashigo	Dibula (Waterberg)	602088	29-September-2025	Remote	
5.	Makongo Advice Mudau	Mavambe (Vhembe)	569485	30-September-2025	Remote	
6.	Colbert Azwimbavhi Tshimomola	Tshitereke (Vhembe)	A84138	30-September-2025	Remote	
7.	Shonisani Muswazi	Mukande (Vhembe)	709575	30-September-2025	Remote	
8.	Msarah Hlamalani Makhubele	Bungeni (Vhembe)	605081	30-September-2025	Remote	
9.	Maropene Hellen Moremi	Ga-Matipane (K2C)	509015	01-October-2025	Remote	
10.	Winny Mathye	Majeje (K2C)	055840	01-October-2025	Remote	
11.	Girly Malapane	Bushbuckridge (K2C)	044086	01-October-2025	Remote	
12.	Nwahoxana Khoza	Athurstone (K2C)	105087	01-October-2025	Remote	

Table 2: List of PP representative & local stakeholders

S. No.	Name of the person interviewed	Affiliation	Details Discussed	Date of Interviews	Audit Team
1.	Brendon Longhurst	Country Manager, TASC SA (PTY) LTD.	Project implementation and operation, Project design, monitoring procedure, data and information flow, compliance of monitoring plan with monitoring methodology and approved VCS-PD, Roles and responsibility, Qualification and Training, VCU calculation and completeness of monitoring report, Electronic Monitoring system, Data collection and data flow, Monitoring surveys, Sample size, ER calculations etc.	01-October-2025	Dr. Atul Takarkhede & Mr. Jean Bosco
2.	Stephanie Askew	TASC SA (PTY) LTD.		01-October-2025	

S. No.	Name of the person interviewed	Affiliation	Details Discussed	Date of Interviews	Audit Team
3.	Hope Morema	Local villager. Community engagement and learning officer at K2C	Grievance mechanism, stakeholder consultation etc.	01-October-2025	
4.	Miriam Malepe	Village Tribal Authority (Nduna)		01-October-2025	
5.	Mr. Ngoako	Local villager (Village committee member)		30-September-2025	

Tables 1 & 2 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 *grouped* 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 above:

Remote audit was emphasized on project technology user 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}/.

2.4 Site Visits

In the current monitoring period (MP7), the VVB carried out a remote audit from 29-September-2025 to 01-October-2025 and inspected the project technical design and implementation as specified in the VCS PD/⁵/ & MR/⁸/. The remote audit was conducted to verify the accuracy and

completeness of the project implementation. The views obtained during remote audit observations 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.
0.5%	20%	10%	10%	11 (however VVB selected 12 samples (4 from each PAI)	0

The verification team covered a total of 12 samples (VVB has done oversampling of total 18 samples as a good practice to mitigate the risk of non-response associated with a sampling) from 3 PAIs to confirm monitoring survey results.

The purpose of the sampling was to verify the accuracy and representativeness of the PP’s monitoring survey data and to assess implementation consistency of improved cookstoves in domestic or community settings across all PAIs. PP has carried out the monitoring surveys from 26-05-2025 to 04-07-2025 [PI1-K2C: 26-05-2025 to 04-07-2025 ; PI2-WB: 27-05-2025 to 04-07-2025 & PI3-VH: 26-05-2025 to 03-07-2025]. Based on the survey results for three PAIs, assessment team noted that stove usage behaviour, implementation practices, and cooking patterns are consistent across the three PAIs. Thus, based on the till date distribution in each PAI [PI1-K2C: 335,080 ICS; PI2-WB: 405,413 ICS & PI3-VH: 195,331 ICS], samples were selected equally justifying a PAI level sampling frame. Thus, samples were equally allocated (4 from PI2-WB, 4 from PI1-K2C, and 4 from PI3-VH). The minimum sample size of 12 was determined as mentioned above and assessment team has interviewed total 12 samples from chosen 12+6 samples as the non-response rate was zero and the minimum has been achieved at the first attempt.

The remote verifications were conducted by both the audit team leader and the local expert. The team remotely inspected stove installations and conducted interviews to confirm correct usage, installation, and distribution integrity.

All the households interviewed confirmed that the project stove was operational. The team re-confirmed through household interviews and remote observations that stove usage behaviour, implementation practices, and cooking patterns are consistent across the three PAIs..

The verification team would like to conclude that based on acceptance sampling approach the project participant's sample record meets the requirement.

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 *grouped* 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 1 CARs, 6 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 *grouped* project activity is undergoing 7th Verification. There is no FAR that has been raised during the current verification period, and no FAR has been raised during previous verification as well.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

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

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

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. However, there have been project description deviations that have been approved in the previous monitoring period related to change in the implementation partner. The new partners that were added to the project are Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region Non-Profit Company (K2C BR NPC) and Mogalakwena Training (Pty) Ltd. These new implementation partners are PI3-VH, PI1-K2C. The deviation has also been assessed in the previous verifications.

3.3 New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects

The grouped project activity for the current monitoring period has added 163,792 stoves making total of 935,824 ICS.

PI3-VH	75,328
PI2-WB	88,378
PI1-K2C	86

Assessment on the eligibility Criteria:

S.No.	Eligibility Criterion	Required Condition	Assessment opinion
1.	Project Instances (PIs) must meet the applicability conditions set out in the applied methodology	Each new PI must demonstrate compliance with the applicability conditions set out in the employed methodology: VMR0006.	The project has added new Stoves in the already existing PAI, the stoves added has been assessed and are inline with methodology, assessment related to the same is mentioned in

S.No.	Eligibility Criterion	Required Condition	Assessment opinion
			the table below/11/. Therefore, criteria met.
2.	Use the technologies or measures specified in the project description.	Only ICS that conform with the GP description are to be distributed in the project. The ICS will be chosen to deliver a level of service at least equivalent to the baseline appliance.	It has been confirmed with the help of distribution database and remote visit conducted (visual inspection) that stoves distributed are the Rocket Works Zama Zama rocket stove and are more efficient than baseline stove. (confirmed through manufacture specification and efficiency reports)/11/,/30/. Therefore, condition is met.
3.	Apply the technologies or measures in the same manner as specified in the project description	The ICS distributed in the PIs will adhere to the GP description and replace biomass burned in the baseline scenario.	The ICS distributed in the project are improved cookstove compared to the baseline stove, as verified through the manufacture specification and also through efficiency test reports/11/,/30/. Therefore, the condition is met.
4.	Are subject to the baseline scenario determined in the project description for the specified project activity and geographic area.	All new PIs will be implemented only in regions within the geographic borders of South Africa subject to the same baseline scenario determined in Section 3.4 of the latest version of the Project Description.	PP has submitted the KML file for distribution database and it has been confirmed that all the ICS distributed in the project meets the eligibility requirement/35/. Therefore, criteria have been met.
5.	Have characteristics with respect to additionality that are consistent with the initial instances for the specified project activity and geographic area	All new PIs will use the activity method for demonstration of additionality and of: Step 1: Regulatory Surplus There is no government mandated programme or	It has been conformed through independent search that there is no policy mandating the requirement for distribution of stove ¹ . All the stoves distributed are provided to end users

¹ <https://www.gov.za/about-government/government-system/justice-system/legislation-and-policies>

S.No.	Eligibility Criterion	Required Condition	Assessment opinion
		policy in host country of this project ensuring the distribution of new project activity instances. Step 2: Positive List The inclusion of new project activity instances will comply with the positive list as it satisfies criterion 1 where it meets all the applicability conditions of the methodology. 1. Where the project activity installs or distributes stoves at zero cost to the end-user and has no other source of revenue other than the sale of GHG credits, the project activity shall be deemed additional. 2. Project activities that are implemented as part of government schemes or are supported by multilateral funds cannot be considered additional even if the stoves are distributed free of cost or at a highly subsidized rate and hence are not eligible to use this methodology. PIs under the GP will not result in the diversion of official development assistance.	free to cost, as confirmed during remote audit by the means of interview/11/,/27/,/28/. Therefore, the criteria are met.
6.	Where a capacity limit applies to a project activity included in the project, no project instance shall exceed such limit. Further, no single cluster of project activity instances shall exceed the capacity limit, determined as follows: Each project activity instance that exceeds one percent of the capacity limit shall be identified.	The VMR0006 methodology does not contain a capacity limit	The project applies VMR0006, the methodology does not put any Capacity limit/7/.

S.No.	Eligibility Criterion	Required Condition	Assessment opinion
	- Such instances shall be divided into clusters, whereby each cluster is comprised of any system of instances such that each instance is within one kilometre of at least one other instance in the cluster. Instances that are not within one kilometre of any other instance shall not be assigned to clusters. - None of the clusters shall exceed the capacity limit and no further project activity instances shall be added to the project that would cause any of the clusters to exceed the capacity limit.		
7.	Occur within one of the designated geographic areas specified in the project description	a) New project activity instances will be located within the geographic boundaries of South Africa and defined in the instance description document. b) GPS/location data captured from each end user will demonstrate the location of the project and of each PI.	PP has submitted the KML file for distribution database and it has been confirmed that all the ICS distributed in the project meets the eligibility requirement and are within the boundary of south Africa/35/. Therefore, criteria have been met
8.	Comply with at least one complete set of eligibility criteria for the inclusion of new project activity instances. Partial compliance with multiple sets of eligibility criteria is insufficient.	Compliance of new PIs will be evaluated exclusively against the eligibility criteria listed in this table.	The assessment team has thoroughly reviewed the ICS added in the already existing PAIs, and it has been confirmed that they meet all the eligibility criteria/8/,/11/.
9.	Be included in the monitoring report with sufficient technical, financial, geographic, and other relevant information to demonstrate compliance with the applicable set of eligibility criteria and enable sampling by the validation/verification body.	New PIs will be described in the monitoring report with sufficient technical, financial, geographic, and other relevant information to demonstrate compliance with the applicable set of eligibility criteria and enable sampling by the validation/verification body.	All the New ICs added in already existing PAI have been confirmed with the eligibility criteria and PP has provided all the records, site visit was conducted by the assessment team to verify the details/8/,/11/. All the documents verified to meet the criteria are mentioned in appendix 2

S.No.	Eligibility Criterion	Required Condition	Assessment opinion
		Monitoring data of PIs will be stored in the monitoring database, which will also allow for sampling by the validation/verification body. Evidence of relevant information such as local stakeholder engagements, baseline surveys and applicable provisions will be included when submitting for PI validation at verification.	of the report. Therefore, it has been confirmed that condition is met,
10.	Be validated at the time of verification against the applicable set of eligibility criteria.	New PIs will be submitted for validation against the applicable set of eligibility criteria at the time of verification.	PP has submitted the distribution database and KML files and it has been confirmed that the ICS added meets all the eligibility criteria mentioned/8/,/11/. All the evidences related to the project have been checked, details can be found in appendix 2 of the report. Therefore, the condition is met.
11.	Have evidence of project ownership, in respect of each project activity instance, held by the project proponent from the respective start date of each project activity instance (i.e., the date upon which the project activity instance began reducing or removing GHG emissions).	New PIs will demonstrate ownership by the project proponent, from the start date of the PI. Project ownership, as described in Section 1.7 of the latest version of the PDD, is applicable to all PIs included in this GP.	PP has provided the end user agreement on the sample basis; the assessment team has verified the details and it has been confirmed that the emission reduction ownerships remain with PP/14/. Therefore, the criteria is met.
12.	Have a start date that is the same as or later than the grouped project start date.	New PIs will have a start date that is the same as or later than the GP start date. Distribution of the efficient cookstoves in the respective PIs will begin at the start date of the GP, or later. Distribution data including distribution dates will be collected and stored on the	It has been confirmed through the distribution data base and emission reduction calculation sheet that all the stoves start date after the project start date and it was confirmed with the interview with PP regarding the implementation/9/,/11/. therefore, the criteria are met,

S.No.	Eligibility Criterion	Required Condition	Assessment opinion
		distribution database. The sale of the first device marks the start date.	
13.	Be eligible for crediting from the start date of the instance through to the end of the project crediting period (only).	New PIs will be eligible for crediting from the start date of the instance through to the end of the project crediting period (only). New PIs will be eligible for crediting from the start date of the instance through to the end date of the project crediting period on 19 August 2031.	It has been confirmed through PP interview that all the new ICS added to already existing PAI will be eligible only till the end of Crediting period/11/,/27/.

Methodology applicability criteria;

S. no	Criteria	PP assessment	Assessment team opinion
1	Project activities shall be implemented in domestic premises or in community-based kitchens.	a) The project ensures the distribution of ICS to households or in community-based kitchens only. Evidenced by the manufacturer's technology description. All newly distributed ICS are the RocketWorks' "Zama Zama" fuel efficient cookstoves which are designed specifically for domestic premises. b) Household or community-based kitchen information, including GPS coordinates and the recipient's details will be collected at point of distribution which will be kept in the PI monitoring database.	Assessment team has verified the distribution database and conducted the remote visit to verify the selected samples, it has been confirmed that all the new ICS distributed meet the applicability criteria of distribution of distribution of ICS to households or in community-based kitchens only/27/.
2	The project stove shall have specified high-power thermal efficiency of at least 25% per the manufacturer's specifications and shall	a) The ICS distributed in this project has a thermal efficiency of at least 25%. The manufacturer's specification from RocketWorks for the	It has been confirmed that the all the ICS distributed in the project meet the eligibility criteria of minimum efficiency of 25% and decline in the

	exclusively use woody biomass and can be single pot or multi-pot; in case of project stove replacing fossil fuel baseline stove, it shall exclusively use renewable biomass.	Zama Zama rocket stove indicates a thermal efficiency of 38.3%. To ensure that stoves remain above the 25% efficiency threshold equation 5 is applied to estimate a reduction in stove efficiency: $\eta_{\text{new},i,y} = \eta_p \cdot (DF_n)^{y-1} \cdot 0.94$ $\eta_{\text{new},i,y} = 0.3637 \text{ for stoves distributed in this monitoring period, } \eta_{\text{new},i,y} = 0.3600 \text{ for stoves older than one but younger than two years old, } \eta_{\text{new},i,y} = 0.3564 \text{ for stoves older than two but younger than three years old, and } \eta_{\text{new},i,y} = 0.3529 \text{ for stoves older than three years but younger than four years old.}$ b) End-users will be asked to state their source of energy at the point of distribution. c) This information will be stored in the monitoring database.	efficiency of the stove is inline with the methodology requirement, More details can be found section 4.3. Stove efficiencies during this MP/9/,/30/. 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 Stoves more than 3 years old and less than 4 years old = 0.3529. Therefore, the condition is met.
3	Both 'Projects' and 'Large Projects' can use the methodology.	The project size is allowed for the GP and Pls. The total ERs estimated ex-ante from PI1-K2C, PI2-WB and PI3-VH over the crediting period are 5,262,443; 5,325,057 and; 4,039,305 tCO₂e respectively, and is therefore defined as a "Large Project" according to the guidelines set out in the VMRO006 methodology. The Pls therefore comply with the GP and methodology requirements.	The project size is defined as large and the ER generated are in line with VCS standard, Applied methodology/9/. Therefore, the criteria are met.

4	Non-renewable biomass has been used in the project region since 31 December 1989, using survey methods or referring to published literature, official reports or statistics; and	Non-renewable biomass has been used in South Africa, the geographic boundary of the GP since 31 December 1989. Evidence was provided at validation of all three PIs.	It has been conformed during remote visit that population there was using non-renewable biomass in the baseline/28/, and similar details were also cross verified from the previous verification reports/29/. Therefore, the criteria is met.
5.	For the specific case of biomass residues processed as a fuel (e.g. briquettes, wood chips), it shall be demonstrated that: a) It is produced using exclusively renewable biomass (more than one type of biomass may be used). b) The consumption of the fuel should be monitored during the crediting period and Energy use for renewable biomass processing (e.g. shredding and compacting in the case of briquetting) may be considered as equivalent to the upstream emissions associated with the processing of the displaced fossil fuel and hence disregarded	Not applicable. The ICS is distributed as an energy efficiency measure to replace stoves under the baseline stove scenario of burning non-renewable biomass. The baseline fuel information will be collected on the distribution data collection app at the point of distribution.	The GP is about distribution of energy efficient stove, therefore the condition is not applicable.
6.	The Project Design Document shall explain the proposed method for distribution of project devices including the method to avoid double counting of	In order to avoid double counting of emission reductions through the method of distribution, each cookstove has a unique identifier number and the distribution of	PP has submitted end user agreement and also confirmed avoiding of double counting. End user agreement clearly mentions transfer of right for emission reductions to

	emission reductions such as unique identifications of product and end-user locations (e.g. programme logo)	each stove is logged onto a database which includes unique information for each recipient (i.e. National identification number, geographic coordinates, etc.). Each PI will have system for avoiding double counting with data being collected via a smartphone app (where possible), or via paper forms, including: a) Date of distribution b) A unique serial number on each technology c) GPS coordinates of the end-user (where possible) Available end-user data: name, phone number, address/physical location, ID number. All data will be backed up physically in case of outage	the PP/14/. It has also been confirmed by cross checking the distribution database that there has been no duplication of the database entered/11/. Therefore, the criteria is met.
7	The Project Design Document shall also explain how the proposed procedures prevent double counting of emission reductions, for example to avoid that project stove manufacturers, wholesale providers or others claim credit for emission reductions from the project devices.	The End User Agreement confirms that the ownership rights of the ER/VCUs generated by the PI reside with the CME. The signature of each end user confirming their understanding of this agreement will be collected at the point of distribution. The End User Agreement will be in English and translated into a local language where required. If necessary, it will be read out to the End User. Each ICS will have a serial number, made to order by the manufacturer, to	PP has submitted end user agreement and also confirmed avoiding of double counting/14/. End user agreement clearly mentions transfer of right for emission reductions to the PP, additionally PP has provided the KML file and distribution database to make sure that there is no double counting of the stove. The assessment team has verified the details therefore, the criteria is met.

		uniquely identify it. All rights to distribute the delivered stoves and claim the resultant emissions reductions belong to the PP. The GP will not include any PI that has been rejected by another GP, or CPA-DDs of any other GHG programs. Each PI will include a statement on the uniqueness of the Project and by listing other similar activities (from other GHG programme registries) that are taking place within the project boundary to demonstrate its uniqueness.	
--	--	---	--

Through above assessment it has been confirmed that all the new PAI added in the project activity meets the applicability condition and therefore, a reasonable level of assurance is achieved.

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” is 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 *grouped* 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 <i>grouped</i> project activity is undergoing 07 th Verification under its fixed crediting period. The assessment team has verified that audit history using the Project webpage ^{/4/} ,		
	Type	Period	Program
	Validation	08-November-2021	VCS
	Verification	20-August-2021 to 09-February-2022	VCS
	Verification	10-February-2022 to 31-January-2023	VCS
	Verification	01-February-2023 to 31-July-2023	VCS
	Verification	01-August-2023 to 31-January-2024	VCS

	Verification	01-February-2024 to 31-July-2024	VCS
	Verification	01-August-2024 to 24-January-2025	VCS
	Verification (Ongoing)	25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025	VCS
	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 <i>grouped</i> project activity is not registered under any other GHG and non-GHG program or registry. This has been confirmed by means of research on relevant applicable registries and available information in public domain and through declaration from the Project Owner. The assessment team has searched for similar projects having same nature, capacity and project proponent as well as legal owner. The name of the owners mentions in the regulatory licenses are also matched and checked. It was concluded that no such projects having same location and geo-coordinates, technology or project/legal owners are registered in various carbon schemes like CDM, GCC, and Gold Standard.		
No double claiming with emissions trading programs or binding emission limits	The <i>grouped</i> 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. 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 814,571 total households from total 935,824 improved stoves units distributed during this MP. The households are calculated based on the 87% 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 have been distributed from the start date of the project. This is verified through verification from the record of distribution database (935,824 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 2.43 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 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	PP has conducted ongoing consultation meetings during this monitoring period. Assessment team checked the dates provided under Section 2.1.2 of the MR and cross-checked with meeting records submitted by PP. Details of the ongoing consultation found correct. CL 03 was raised and successfully closed.
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^{/1/} para 3.18.8 is applicable in case the project is affecting property rights. The grouped project is an improved cookstove dissemination which is evaluated to have no risk on affecting any property right, Indigenous Peoples (IPs), local communities, nor customary rights
Outcome of FPIC discussion	N/A.

4.2.4 Grievance Redress Procedure

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

Grievance received and steps taken to resolve the grievance including the outcomes of the resolution	The verification team conducted 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 *“Beneficiaries are made aware of the 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 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

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/4/	N/A	N/A

4.2.6 Risks to Local Stakeholders and the Environment

4.2.6.1 Management Experience

The project is managed by TASC SA (PTY) LTD, which has been active in the carbon project space, checked through internet search. The MR details clearly define roles and responsibilities of the Country Manager, Field Coordinator, and Field Assistants, demonstrating structured delegation were, also cross verified during the interviews. Field teams have been recruited locally and trained in stove distribution, data collection, quality assurance, and monitoring survey procedures.

Assessment conclusion: The verification team concludes that the project proponent demonstrates sufficient expertise and capacity to manage the project. Where additional expertise is needed PP engages with local experts verified through the PP interview. The management structure and operational procedures are robust and suitable for the scale and nature of the project activity.

4.2.6.2 Risk Assessment

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 could 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. 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 utilizes 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. From the employee contracts submitted by PP, both genders are employed without gender biasness/ ^{13/} .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

Risks identified	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

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Indigenous Peoples and protection of	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

cultural
heritage

4.2.7.4 Property Rights

Risks identified	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 *grouped* project activity is verified against the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS-PD/^{5/} and the applied methodology/^{7/}.
- 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 May and July 2025 across all the PAI. 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. 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.

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 0.5 % and UQL of 20 %, producer risk 10 % and consumer risk 10 % which sample size of 11 and acceptance number of 0 is determined. During the remote audit, end-user interviews and field checks confirmed that the selected households reflected consistent stove use behavior and technology implementation. The team verified that the newly distributed ICS units were installed in eligible settings and that the sampling methodology was suitable for confirming monitoring results across the grouped project area. Details on the sampling can be found in section 2.4 of the report

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	-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 inspection to determine if a pre-project (replaced) stove is still being used in addition to project stove

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/}.

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,CO2} CO2 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-CO2} 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 May to July 2025. ^{/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 May to July 2025.^{/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/}.
	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	N/A

	with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	
	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?	PI1-K2C = 261,362 PI2-WB = 364,872 PI3-VH = 175,798 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= 0.90 WB= 0.90 VH= 0.90 multiplied with total distributed units per project instances as verified in ER calculation ^{/9/} tab 'Summary'.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	Remote audit carried out by verifier team including verification using verbal confirmation with project technology user ^{/28/} .

	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Habit/monitoring survey as carried out to obtain value for usage rate ($n_{y,i,j}$) used in calculating $N_{y,i,j}$ is captured using mobile apps and collected and stored in SurveyCTO. Traceability of the data from the presented excel data file/ ^{21/22/23/} was performed from the data source using sampled data set during remote audit/ ^{28/} .
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	Monitoring is verified to be carried out as per VCS PDt/ ^{5/} and methodology/ ^{7/} requirement with no deviation.
Findings	No finding raised,	
Conclusion	The parameter has been calculated accurately.	

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 Stoves more than 3 years old and less than 4 years old = 0.3529 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 3 years and less and 4 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 Stoves more than 3 years old and less than 4 years old = 0.3529 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 findings.	
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 Stoves more than 3 years old and less than 4 years old = 0.3529	

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	N/A

	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?	
	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 in May to July 2025 MP7 as verified against previous monitoring report ^{/8/32/} For MP7 of the project. 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/} .
	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 μ_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.
	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 was verified as 08-May-2025 and 09-May-2025 for moisture meter and weight scale respectively Evidence provided by PP in form of purchase invoices/receipts for both digital weigh scale^{/15/} and moisture tester units^{/16/}.

	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 2025.
	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 2025.
	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: PI1-K2C = 0.222 PI2-WB = 0.100 PI3-VH = 0.205
--	---	---

	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. The survey records have been appropriately verified.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes the survey records have been verified and it has been assumed that data collection is appropriate,
	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	No finding raised	
Conclusion	The value of this parameter is verified and accepted as: PI1-K2C = 0.222 PI2-WB = 0.100 PI3-VH = 0.205	

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.
	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?	Yes, Data analysis is performed with the presented project distribution database. it is found to be accurate.
	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.
Findings	No finding raised	
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 be 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-August-2021 which is calculated to be over 3-year-old (not yet 4 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 used 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 used 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	No finding was raised.	
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 *grouped* project activity, under this monitoring period from 25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025.

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 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.

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 7th 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.

5 VERIFICATION OPINION

5.1 Verification Summary

SustainCERT has been contracted by TASC SA (PTY) LTD to perform the 7th verification of GHG Emission Reductions for the project activity "Fuel Efficient Cooking in South Africa" VCS 2505. The monitoring period included in the Monitoring Report/^{8/} for which this verification applies is: 25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025 (both days included).

The management of TASC SA (PTY) LTD is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions on the basis set out within the project's Monitoring Plan in the registered Project Description/^{5/} and the approved methodology, VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1/^{7/}.

VVB confirms that, GHG statement is the responsibility of the project proponent. The project activity fulfills the criteria for the verification as established in section 4 of the VCS standard version 4.7/^{1/}. Verification team has reviewed the monitoring report including registered VCS PD and subsequently carried out the remote audit/ follow-up interviews with PP representatives and confirm the fulfilment of stated criteria. Verification team has the unmodified opinion regarding the project activity, VVB team has checked all the details and found it consistent and free of material errors or misstatements.

SustainCERT's verification approach has been based on the requirements of the applicable regulatory documents (defined within this Verification Report and listed in the Appendix 2). Our approach is risk-based, drawing on an understanding of the risks associated with reporting GHG emissions data and the controls in place to mitigate these.

The verification can confirm that:

- The project is implemented and operated as per the registered PD^{/5/};
- The monitoring plan in registered PD is as per the applied methodology^{/7/};
- The monitoring complies with the monitoring plan in the registered PD^{/5/};
- The monitoring report and other supportive documents provided are complete and verifiable and in accordance with the applicable VCS requirements and any other applied regulatory document;
- The installed ICS being essential for generating emission reductions runs reliably and are regularly used by end users (where applicable);
- The monitoring/survey system is in place and generates GHG emission reductions data;
- The GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements.

A Reasonable Level of assurance was achieved as planned, during verification process.

As per VCS Standard version 4.7 Para 4.1.10, VVB team verified that, the criteria for verification of the project activity are in line with the relevant VCS Version 4.7 criteria. The objective of this verification activity is to have an independent third party for the assessment of the Monitoring report, emission reduction sheet and to ensure a thorough assessment of the project activity against the applicable regulatory requirements.

VVB concluded the assessment, as per para 4.1.18 of the VCS standard version 4.7, with a positive verification opinion regarding the project activity. The VVB team has raised 01 Corrective action requests (CARs), 06 Clarification (CLs) and no FAR (forward action request). All the issues identified as CARs and/or CLs have been successfully closed and mentioned in Appendix 4 of this verification report. The VVB team clearly state that there is no material misstatement at the level of the GHG statement and GHG declarations made by the Project Proponent. VVB declared that the validation and/or verification of the GHG statement was conducted in accordance with ISO 14064-3:2019 and ISO 14065:2020.

5.2 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 25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025 (including both the days) as reported in monitoring report^{/8/}. The grouped project activity is implemented in accordance with the registered monitored plan in PD v9^{/5/} and emission reductions from the grouped project are calculated in a manner that ensures they are free from material errors or misstatements. 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 grouped project activity for the period 25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025 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 25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025

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 VCU (tCO ₂ e)	Removal VCU (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCUs (tCO ₂ e)
25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025	2,155,013	-	-	2,155,013		2,155,013
Total	2,155,013	-	-	2,155,013	-	2,155,013

5.3 Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison

Vintage period	Ex-ante estimated reductions/removals	Achieved reductions/removals	Percent difference	Explanation for the difference
25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025	2,970,415.55	2,155,013	-27.46%	The significant decrease in the survey values, particularly in PI1-K2C and PI2-WB, ERs achieved are less which is evident from the monitoring data (survey data).
Total	2,970,415.55	2,155,013	-27.46%	

APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALLY 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-April-2024
2.	VCS guidelines https://verra.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/VCS-Program-Guide-v4.4.pdf	4.4	29-July-2023
3.	Validation and Verification Manual https://verra.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/VCS Validation Verification Manual v3.2.pdf	3.2	19-October-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-March-2022
6.	Validation report '2022_03_07 FVR_VERRA-R3-Clean' https://registry.verra.org/mymodule/ProjectDoc/Project_ViewFile.asp?FileID=63004&IDKEY=niquwesdfmnk0iei23nnm435oiojnc909dsflk9809adlkmlkf886882516	1.0	04-March-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/)	1.1	-
8.	Monitoring report MP7 (25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025)	1.5	23-January-2026
9.	Emission Reduction Calculation	1.3	19-November-2025
10.	Community Meeting records (excel and software output)	-	-
11.	Project Distribution Database	-	-
12.	Double counting Declaration	-	-
13.	Employment Contract	-	-
14.	EndUser Agreement for PAI K2C, Vhembe, and Waterberg	-	-

S. No	Document Title	Version	Date
15.	Weigh scale invoice	-	-
16.	Moisture meter invoice	-	-
17.	Scanned Hardcopy KPT survey sheet	-	-
18.	K2C and Vhembe Employee training	-	-
19.	Waterberg Employee training records	-	-
20.	KPT's employee training material	-	-
21.	KPT survey for PAI K2C	1.1	-
22.	KPT survey for Vhembe	1.1	-
23.	KPT survey for Waterberg	1.1	-
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	-	-
27.	Remote Interview attendance Sheet -29-September-2025 to 01-October-2025	-	-
28.	Remote Interview Survey Questionnaire to End-user and Field team-29-September-2025 to 01-October-2025	-	-
29.	Previous Verification Report-MP4, MP-5 and MP 6	-	-
30.	Project Stove Website "https://rocketworks.org/product/izintizama/"		Accessed on 06-Nov-2025
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 06-Nov-2025
32.	Previous Monitoring Reports	-	-

S. No	Document Title	Version	Date
33.	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories; Chapter 2 Stationary Combustion	2006	-
34.	VCS Methodology Requirement	4.4	29-Aug-2023
35.	KML file for grouped project	-	-

APPENDIX 3: ABBREVIATIONS

MR	Monitoring report
PD	Project description
MP	Monitoring Period
PP	Project Proponent
PAI	Project Activity 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 01	Developer Response
Para 3.5.5 & 3.5.6 of VCS Standard, v4.7	Is the MR completed as per the instruction described in the MR template (font, font size, dates etc.)?	1. Monitoring report not clear about inclusion/exclusion of first & last dates. Corrective action raised for same. 2. Recent date of MR completion cannot be before initial date of issue. Corrective action requested. 3. Date format found not inline with template requirements throughout MR. Corrective action requested. 4. Some of shortforms found used in the MR. However, their full-form missing in the MR. Corrective action sought. 5. PP requested to review column "Current project contributions" for SDG 3 under Table 1 of MR.	1. The first and last dates of the MP are included. In the sentence "This monitoring report covers the period of 25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025", the word 'inclusive' was added to clarify. 2. The recent date of issue has been updated to "13-October-2025". 3. The date formatting has been updated to DD-Month-YYYY. 4. All acronyms have been checked to ensure they are defined before used again in the MR document. 5. The wording has been updated in the MR to "Across the GP, 87% of project households, or 814,571 total (935,824*0.87), reported a reduction in smoke while cooking on the project ICS vs. the baseline fire in this monitoring period. As 163,792 stoves were distributed in this MP, 142,499 project households (163,792*0.87) reported a reduction in smoke while cooking on the project ICS. The calculations and reported reductions are based on the habit surveys from all three PIs (PI1-K2C, PI2-WB, and PI3-VH) and the average value is reported."
	Rd 2	1. Monitoring report first page still missing details of inclusion/exclusion of first & last dates. Finding is open. 2. Recent date of MR completion now revised appropriately. Finding is closed. 3. Date format is now consistent and inline with template requirements. Finding is closed. 4. MR is now revised for the details of shortform used. Finding is closed. 5. Table 1 of MR is now revised for project contributions during this	The word "inclusive" was added to the first page of the MR after '25-January-2025 to 31-July-2025'.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CAR 01	Developer Response
		MP and over lifetime and found correct. Finding is closed.	
	Rd 3	1. PP has updated the VCS MR and found it inline with template requirements. Both the start & end dates are inclusive and there is no gap in monitoring period observed. CAR is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 01	Developer Response
Para 3.6.17 of VCS Standard, v4.7	Has grouped project provided the inclusion of new project activity instances subsequent to the initial validation of the project appropriately.	The sum of stoves distributed in this MP not consistent within Sections 1.1 and Section 3.1 of the MR. Kindly clarify.	The number of stoves are consistent in Section 1.1 and Section 3.1, however, it was noted that in Section 1.1 in the MR it said "In Vhembe, 75,328 stoves were distributed during MP6, in Waterberg, 88,378 stoves were distributed, and in K2C, 86 stoves were distributed." This has been updated to say MP7 and not MP6.
	Rd 2	PP has revised MR for editorial mistake and information found correct inline with distribution database. CL is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 02	Developer Response
Para 3.23 & 3.24 of VCS Standard, v4.7	GHG emission reductions and carbon dioxide removals generated by a project must not be double counted or	PP requested to clarify the framework for avoidance of double counting and overlapping with other GHG projects. PP requested to submit agreements for same with stove manufacturer/s and sample copies with end users. PP also requested to submit double counting of the emission reductions	We confirm that the carbon credits generated during this monitoring period are not registered, claimed, or used in any other greenhouse gas (GHG) programme, environmental credit scheme, or offset mechanism. All credits from this monitoring period are exclusively allocated to VCS 2505 and will not be sold, transferred, or

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 02	Developer Response
	double sold. Have PP implemented appropriate framework avoidance of double counting?	achieved from the project activity. Kindly submit.	retired under any other registry or programme. To prevent double-counting and overlapping claims we apply the following control framework and operational procedures: 1. Unique stove and beneficiary identification at distribution (primary control): Every distributed stove carries a unique barcode. The barcode is recorded at distribution and can be validated against a photograph of the stove. At distribution, each beneficiary completes a distribution survey that captures identifying information, including full name and surname, ID number (where available), GPS coordinates and address (village), and phone number. This creates a link between the stove barcode and the individual household receiving the stove. 2. At distribution, beneficiaries are explicitly asked whether they (a) already own an improved cookstove (ICS) or (b) have participated in another carbon offsetting/cookstove project. If the beneficiary indicates prior participation or ownership that would result in overlap, they are not eligible to receive an ICS. 3. Once a stove barcode is linked to a beneficiary record, the record is retained and used to demonstrate that each stove (and each stove-related emission reduction) is assigned to a single household. The distribution database provides this information. 4. For each stove distribution we retain supporting photographs (stove barcode and beneficiary, with consent). This provides visual confirmation that the stove associated with a barcode was given to the recorded household.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 02	Developer Response
			5. A stove that has been recorded and validated in the distribution database is linked to VCS 2505 only. We do not register, claim, or market the same stove-based reductions under any other programme. Because ER calculations rely on the validated distribution database (each stove barcode is linked to a beneficiary record), there is a direct, auditable link between each stove and the emission reductions claimed under VCS 2505. Double counting declaration letters from TASC and from Rocket Works (Pty) Ltd have been submitted.
	Rd 2	PP shall cover all these no double counting safeguards in the monitoring report appropriately. CL is open.	The following text was added to the MR under section 1.10: "To prevent double-counting and overlapping claims, TASC applies the following framework and procedures: 1. Unique stove and beneficiary identification at distribution (primary control): Every distributed stove carries a unique barcode. The barcode is recorded at distribution and can be validated against a photograph of the stove. At distribution, each beneficiary completes a distribution survey that captures identifying information, including full name and surname, ID number (where available), GPS coordinates and address (village), and phone number. This creates a link between the stove barcode and the individual household receiving the stove. 2. At distribution, beneficiaries are explicitly asked whether they (a) already own an improved cookstove (ICS) or (b) have participated in another carbon offsetting/cookstove project. If the

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 02	Developer Response
			beneficiary indicates prior participation or ownership that would result in overlap, they are not eligible to receive an ICS. 3. Once a stove barcode is linked to a beneficiary record, the record is retained and used to demonstrate that each stove (and each stove-related emission reduction) is assigned to a single household. The distribution database provides this information. 4. For each stove distribution, TASC retains supporting photographs (stove barcode and beneficiary, with consent). This provides visual confirmation that the stove associated with a barcode was given to the recorded household. 5. A stove that has been recorded and validated in the distribution database is linked to VCS 2505 only. TASC does not register, claim, or market the same stove-based reductions under any other programme. Because ER calculations rely on the validated distribution database (each stove barcode is linked to a beneficiary record), there is a direct, auditable link between each stove and the emission reductions claimed under VCS 2505.”
		PP has appropriately updated monitoring report for no double counting mechanism adopted and clearly no mentioned under Section 1.10 of the MR. CL is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 03	Developer Response
Para 3.18.5	Have project proponent has established	PP has submitted the records of the grievances received during	We would like to confirm that no formal grievances were raised during this

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 03	Developer Response
of VCS Standard, v4.7	mechanisms for ongoing communication with stakeholders to allow stakeholders to raise concerns about potential negative impacts during project implementation?	consultation period recorded through cloud-based data collection app on smartphones (i.e. SurveyCTO) by filling in a pre-programmed form. PP requested to submit evidence/sample screenshots for primary source i.e. SurveyCTO. Kindly submit. Further, usage issues discussed/observed during these meetings found missing in Section 2.1.2 of the MR. Kindly clarify.	monitoring period through the project's dedicated grievance channels. All stove users receive a how-to-use guide at distribution, which clearly lists the designated grievance contact persons — Leon Reynolds (Regional Manager) and Brendon Longhurst (Project Development & Implementation Manager). No complaints were received via phone, email, or in person through these channels during the monitoring period. During community meetings conducted as part of ongoing stakeholder engagements, the monitoring team record general stakeholder comments in the “Notes” column of the meeting forms. These typically include general feedback, opinions on the stoves, suggestions for future project improvements, positive comments or neutral remarks. These notes are not formal grievances as they do not reflect complaints or issues requiring escalation through the grievance mechanism, nor do they relate to the design of the project. For this reason, they were not included in Section 2.1.2 of the Monitoring Report. The printable version of the K2C SurveyCTO form will be submitted as an example. All PI forms are the same, just the village options change.
	Rd 2	Most of the notes are discussion notes and does not warrant any action. However, an informal feedback received related to project activity which PP shall respond to stakeholders or	This feedback is appreciated and has been noted, as similar requests have been received from other households. We understand that some families, particularly larger ones, may feel that a single improved cookstove does not fully meet all their

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 03	Developer Response
		provide opinion in the monitoring report for below; <i>Next time the stove needs to be doubled because this one doesn't accommodate their families.</i> CL is open.	cooking needs. However, it is challenging to identify a single stove model that can accommodate every household size and cooking practice. Even so, the use of one improved cookstove already provides substantial benefits, including reduced fuel use, lower smoke exposure, and significant time and cost savings, when compared to traditional open-fire cooking. From an implementation and carbon accounting perspective, the project is designed on a one-to-one replacement basis (one project stove replacing one baseline stove). Providing multiple devices per household would divide the emission reductions and make the project economically unviable. That said, TASC is exploring the possibility of a replacement campaign, through which existing stove users could receive an additional or upgraded stove in the future. This approach would help address the needs of larger households while maintaining the project's integrity and sustainability. The following text was added to the MR in section 2.1.4: "However, one informal piece of feedback was received during community engagement activities, where a participant commented: "Next time the stove needs to be doubled because this one doesn't accommodate their families." While this comment does not constitute a formal grievance, it reflects a common request among larger households. The

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 03	Developer Response
			project team acknowledges this feedback and understands that cooking needs vary between families. TASC understands that some families, particularly larger ones, may feel that a single improved cookstove does not fully meet all their cooking needs. However, it is challenging to identify a single stove model that can accommodate every household size and cooking practice. In addition, the project follows a one-to-one replacement approach, one improved cookstove replacing one baseline device, which ensures consistency in emission reduction calculations and maintains the project's economic feasibility. Even so, a single stove provides substantial benefits at the household level, including reduced fuel use, time savings, less smoke and lower carbon dioxide emissions."
	Rd 3	Assessment team checked the PP responses and revisions in the monitoring report. The grievance is appropriately justified and accepted by assessment team. CL is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 04	Developer Response
Para 3.18.5 of VCS Standard, v4.7	Have project proponent established mechanisms for ongoing communication with stakeholders to allow stakeholders to raise concerns about potential negative impacts during project implementation?	PP requested to clarify Eligibility criteria number 10 under Section 3.3 of the MR where only 2 project instances are mentioned whereas distribution happened in all there project instances. Kindly clarify.	Thank you for noting the error. The MR wording has been updated to: "All news stoves have been distributed in the pre-existing instances, more specifically, Kruger 2 Canyons (PI1-K2C), Waterberg (PI2-WB) and Vhembe (PI3-VH)" to reflect that distribution took place in all three instances.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 04	Developer Response
	Rd 2	Editorial mistake has been corrected now. CL is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 05	Developer Response
Para 3.16.1 of VCS Standard, v4.7	Data and parameters used for the quantification of GHG emission reductions and/or removals are provided in accordance with the methodology by PP?	During remote audit interviews it was noted that some of users using project stoves for 4-6 days and remaining days, baseline stoves. Thus, PP has applied Baseline stove usage factor (Uy) in emission reduction calculations. However, project KPY survey for Waterberg showing no usage of baseline stoves (except one sample) and thus Uy for this PI has been taken as zero. Kindly clarify.	During the remote audit interviews for the Waterberg households, every single participant confirmed that they use their improved cookstove (ICS) on a daily basis and that they have stopped using their baseline stoves. This can be evidenced by the remote audit recordings. This is fully aligned with the findings from the Kitchen Performance Test (KPT) and habit surveys, where only one respondent reported baseline stove use. However, we have changed PI2-WB's Uy value to 0.1 due to the following justification, which has been incorporated into the MR in section 4.3.5: "Although the monitoring survey results for baseline stove usage in PI2-WB indicated a value of 0%, we have decided to apply a conservative floor value of 10% for Uy across the entire GP. While the monitoring methodology and sampling protocol were implemented in line with the approved procedures and produced a valid result, a 0.000 baseline usage rate may not fully reflect the potential for occasional or marginal baseline stove use over the monitoring period. Applying a 10% floor value ensures a conservative approach, minimizing the risk of overestimating emission reductions.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 05	Developer Response
			This approach also maintains internal consistency with the 90% cap applied to ICS usage (ny,i,j), reflecting a realistic assumption that even with high adoption rates, some minimal level of baseline stove use may persist in practice. Importantly, this introduces an additional layer of conservativeness in line with good practice monitoring principles. This floor value will apply across the grouped project but will only affect PI2-WB in this monitoring period, where baseline usage was observed as 0.000, therefore PI2-WB's Uy has been adjusted to 0.100."
	Rd 2	PP requested to clarify Uy for PI2-WB under cell E24 ER Survey tab in ER sheet where Uy value taken as 0. Finding is open.	Please see version 1.2 of the ER calc sheet, where the Uy value is 0.100 for PI2-WB.
	Rd 3	ER sheet & MR is revised now revised appropriately for the correct Uy value. Finding is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 06	Developer Response
Para 3.16.1 of VCS Standard, v4.7	Data and parameters used for the quantification of GHG emission reductions and/or removals are provided in accordance with the methodology by PP?	PP requested to clarify actual sample size calculated for PI2-WB which is mentioned zero under Section 4.3.1 of MR. Kindly clarify.	We would like to clarify that the value of '0' appearing under Section 4.3.1 of the Monitoring Report refers to the predicted sample size, not the actual sample size. The actual sample size used for PI2-WB was 115 households. The reason the predicted sample size is reported as 0 is due to the way the CDM Sample Size Calculator determines required sample sizes when the expected proportion is equal to 1 (100%).

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 06	Developer Response
			The expected input values are informed by the results of the previous monitoring period, during which the usage rate was 100%. When an expected proportion of 1 is entered, the calculator determines that no additional sample is required to demonstrate precision, hence returning a predicted sample size of "0". However, the project team nevertheless conducted a usage survey with 115 sampled households.
	Rd 2	At 100% usage rate predicted sample is 0. However, as best practice, usage rate is already considered 90%. In this sense, PP shall calculate predicted sample size using same value and report in MR. Finding is open.	The predicted sample size has been re-calculated using the value of 0.9 for usage rate for PI2-WB and the values have been updated in the MR. In addition, as PI3-VH also adopted the best practice usage rate of 0.9, the predicted sample size was accordingly updated for this instance too. Please see changes to the tables on page 49 and 54 of the MR.
	Rd 3	PP has corrected predicted sample size in the monitoring report. The PP has met the minimum sample requirements and precision level through the actual samples done which are higher than predicted. CL closed.	

APPENDIX 5: BRIEF CVS OF TEAM

Dr. Atul Takarkhede (TL, TE)	Dr. Atul Takarkhede holds a Ph.D. in Environmental Sciences from the Institute of Science, RTM Nagpur University, Nagpur. With over 18 years of experience in environmental auditing, consulting, and accreditation, he has established himself as a leading expert in the field. His academic contributions include several technical publications focused on environmental sciences. Dr. Takarkhede specializes in ISO 9001 and ISO 14001 standards, CO₂/GHG reporting, carbon footprint analysis, and comprehensive environmental performance assessments. His professional portfolio encompasses: • Conducting GHG audits • Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) • Performing QA/QC reviews of EIA reports • Leading environmental and water audits • Ensuring compliance with NABET requirements • Serving as a Functional Area Expert in Water Pollution and Solid & Hazardous Waste Management He brings robust expertise in carbon auditing frameworks such as CDM, VCS, GS, GCC, and ICR. With 12 years of experience working with Designated Operational Entities (DOEs) and Validation/Verification Bodies (VVBs), Dr. Takarkhede has contributed to projects across renewable energy, cement, biomass, community development, and waste management sectors under the UNFCCC CDM and other global carbon schemes. Currently, Dr. Takarkhede serves as a Senior GHG Auditing Specialist at Sustain-Cert, where he leads GHG audits across various international standards. His previous roles include positions with True Quality Certifications Pvt. Ltd. (Applus+ Certification's outsourced entity), Earthood Services Pvt. Ltd., Enviance, VKU Certifications and Gold Standard (as a Roster Expert). Based in Nagpur, India, Dr. Takarkhede is participating in this audit as a Lead Auditor and Technical Expert.
Mr. Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira (Local Auditor)	Mr. Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira is a multilingual professional fluent in French, English, and Kinyarwanda, with working knowledge of Swahili and Lingala, and strong technical writing skills. He holds a university degree in Financial and Administrative Management (Entrepreneurship), a diploma in Business Management (Canada), and is certified as a Gold Standard Auditor (96%) and GHG Auditor (75%). He has extensive auditing and verification experience across Africa, serving as Local Auditor and Objective Observer for more than 20 projects under VCS, GS, and related frameworks between 2014 and 2025. His assignments cover improved cook stoves, solar, hydro, clean water, and sustainable energy projects in Rwanda, Uganda, Tanzania, Nigeria, Gambia, Comoros, and DRC. His responsibilities include verification, validation, monitoring, and appraisal reporting according to international standards. He also contributed as Household Energy Expert for Rwanda's GEF-6 project (2017–2018), delivering baseline assessments, sustainable charcoal analyses, and recommendations on energy-efficient technologies. He has actively participated in technical working groups on biomass, energy efficiency, electricity access, and generation under Rwanda's Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA)

	and has contributed to Rwanda's National Energy Policy and Strategy and technical working groups under MININFRA 2008-2020. He has contributed to the water resource management and environmental policy processes. He has also been Member of Technical Committees of REMA (Rwanda Environment Management Authority), 2009-2020, member of the CDM/DNA (Designated National Agency) Steering Committee and member of the National (TNA) Technology Needs Assessment Team. Based in Rwanda, Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira is participating in this audit as a Local Auditor.
Ms. Muskan Chawla Independent Reviewer	Muskan Chawla has completed her masters in Environment Science. She has over 3.5+ years of experience in Greenhouse gas emission reduction project. She is based in India and is fluent in both Hindi and English language. Her qualification included TA 1.2 and TA 3.1. She is also qualified ISO 14001:2015 Lead Auditor and have robust understanding of GS, VERRA and GCC standards.
Mr. Deepak Pundlik Independent Reviewer in Trainee	Mr. Deepak Pundlik has completed his Masters in Environment Sciences from Pune University, India. He has over 15+ years of experience in climate change, waste management and environmental management. As a part of professional work, he has worked on the following: a. Preparation of Environment management Plans b. Conducting Environmental Impact Assessment c. Planning and execution of waste management plans for urban local bodies and organizations As a GHG expert, he has 9 years of experience in advisory and auditing field. As a advisory services, Mr. Deepak led 60+ projects to register them with CDM and VCS registries and got carbon credit issuances for similar number of projects. He was associated with MITCON and Thermax Limited for carbon advisory role. In GHG auditor role, he has validated/verified projects from renewable energy, energy demand, waste management sectors over the last 5 years. He has experience in validation/verification assessments under Article 6, CDM, VCS, GS, GCC and ICR registries. Earlier Mr. Deepak has worked with KBS certification pvt. ltd. and Applus+ Certification through True Quality Certifications pvt. ltd. as a lead auditor and technical expert. Mr. Deepak Pundlik is based in Pune, India. He is participating in this audit team as Independent Reviewer in Trainee role.