



VERIFICATION REPORT FOR “DELAGUA CLEAN COOKING GROUPED PROJECT IN THE GAMBIA”



Report ID	VA-1004
Project title	DeLaqua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in The Gambia
Project ID	4000
Verification period	01-Jan-2024 to 31-Oct-2024
Original date of issue	17-Dec-2024
Most recent date of issue	20 March 2025
Version	3
VCS Standard Version	VCS Standard Version 4.7 ¹

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

Client	DelAgua Health The Gambia (Voluntary) Limited
Prepared by	SustainCERT S.A.
Approved by	Indrapal Parmar
Work carried out by	Team Leader: Randulph Morales until 05 Jan 2025² Team Leader: Manika Mongia 06 Jan 2025 onwards Technical Area Expert: Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira (TA 1.1) Local Expert: Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira Independent Reviewer: Muskan Chawla

Summary:

A description of the verification of the project

The Verification of the project titled 'DelAgua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in The Gambia' VCS ID – 4000, have been undertaken by SustainCERT, with accordance to the relevant VCS standard, V4.7/^{1/}, VCS Program Guide, V4.4/^{2/}. Relevant requirements of the ISO 14064-2 and ISO 14064-3, as well as applicable criteria for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting has been applied for verification.

The project 4000 involves dissemination of cookstoves in The Gambia. The project proponents are DelAgua Health The Gambia (Voluntary) Limited and DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited (DHRV) who are using carbon finance to support local partners engaged in different activities like production, distribution, and maintenance of various product technologies. The ICSs disseminated under the grouped project are based on a “rocket stove” and designed to improve fuel combustion and heat transfer which by rocket stove design principles reduces the use of biomass fuel through improved combustion efficiency of wood fuel.

The Purpose and scope of verification

Purpose:

Verification service provided by SustainCERT for the project activity 4000 is to perform independent periodic verification for the monitoring period 01/01/2024 to 31/10/2024. The verification of the project is an independent review and ex-post determination by SustainCERT of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions that have occurred, against the VCS standard, V4.7, VCS Program Guide, V4.4, the Project baseline and host party criteria.

Scope of verification

The scope of verification is to establish/verify that:

- The project activity has been implemented and operated as per the approved registered PD.

² 05 Jan 2025 was last working day of Randulph with SustainCERT.

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

The Monitoring Period:

The project activity 4000 is undergoing 2nd verification from 01/01/2024 to 31/10/2024 (both days included), under its first crediting period (7 years) from 23/02/2023 to 22/02/2030.

The Method and Criteria used for Verification.

Desk Review:

- Review of project information, monitoring plan specifically monitoring frequency, 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 v1.2.
- Onsite audit Interview with the relevant personnel to confirm the implementation of the project with paying particular attention to the operational and data collection procedures, in accordance with the registered PD^{5/} and methodology.
- A detailed cross check of the information provided in the monitoring report against the relevant evidence such as data sources, technical specification of measuring equipment.
- A detailed cross check of the calculations made for the estimation of greenhouse gas emissions.
- An evaluation of data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emissions reduction.

The number of findings raised during verification:

A risk-based approach has been followed for the verification of the project. During verification, 01 CARs, 12 CL and 00 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 reviewed the 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. It has been concluded that there are no more uncertainties associated with the project.

Summary of the verification conclusion:

The review of monitoring report^{/8/}, emission reduction calculation sheet along with relevant supporting evidence and the interview with relevant personnel during on site audit have provided the assessment team with sufficient evidence to confirm to the applicable criteria. The SustainCERT confirms the project activity 4000 have been successfully implemented in accordance with the registered PD^{/5/} and applied methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves V1.2 meeting all the relevant VCS requirements. SustainCERT confirms that the monitoring period 01/01/2024 to 31/10/2024 (including both the days) in its implementation is calculated to generate 290,221 tCO₂e of emission reductions from reducing the amount of wood fuel combustion.

The management of DelAqua (=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	8
2	VERIFICATION PROCESS	9
2.1	Method and Criteria.....	9
2.2	Document Review	10
2.3	Interviews.....	11
2.4	Site Visits.....	13
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	17
4	VERIFICATION FINDINGS.....	18
4.1	Project Details	18
4.2	Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement	21
4.3	Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations.....	30
4.4	Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals.....	54
4.5	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis.....	55
5	VERIFICATION OPINION.....	56
5.1	Verification Summary	56
5.2	Verification Conclusion	56
5.3	Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison	57
	APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION	59
	APPENDIX 2: TABLE OF REFERENCE.....	60
	APPENDIX 3: ABBREVIATIONS.....	62

APPENDIX 4: PROJECT FINDINGS.....	63
APPENDIX 5: COMPETENCY STATEMENT.....	91

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The Verification of the project titled “DelAgua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in The Gambia” VCS ID – 4000, have been undertaken by SustainCERT, as requested by DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited (DHRV) & DelAgua Projects Pte. Ltd. project proponent for the monitoring period 01/01/2024 to 31/10/2024 (including both the days). The verification of project activity is the 2nd periodic verification for the crediting period 23/02/2023 to 22/02/2030. The purpose of the verification is to conduct the independent review of the project information and confirm:

- The project activity is implemented in accordance with registered project description document, V10.0^{5/}.
- All physical features (project technology) 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 V1.2^{7/}

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

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of verification for this project activity involves assessing the claims made by the project proponent in the monitoring report^{8/}, emission reduction calculation sheet^{9/} and other supporting evidence (as mentioned in appendix 2) made available to the verifier for this monitoring period from 01/01/2024 to 31/10/2024, in accordance to:

- VCS standard, V4.7^{1/}
- VCS program guideline, V4.4^{2/}
- VCS Methodology from Sectoral Scope 3 –VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.2^{7/}
- Other relevant rules and requirements, including host part requirements^{31/}.

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

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

1.3 Level of Assurance

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

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

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

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

This is the 2nd monitoring report for the "DelAgua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in The Gambia" (VCS ID 4000), Grouped Project ("GP") by DelAgua Health The Gambia (Voluntary) Limited (DHRV) & DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited, which is aimed at distributing fuel-efficient improved cookstoves (ICS) to local communities in The Gambia.

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

The districts in which distribution took place are verified with overlapping districts in between Three Investor Groups. A total of 76,140 Kuniokoa Generation 2 stoves have been distributed across three investor groups since the project start date. No additional units were distributed during this monitoring period.

	Distributed units in MP1	Distributed units in this MP	Total cookstoves distributed
Investor Group 1	26,741	0	26,741

Investor Group 2	24,773	0	24,773
Investor Group 3	24,626	0	24,626
Total	76,140	0	76,140

An onsite audit for the project activity was conducted from 12/11/2024 to 13/11/2024. A detailed Interviews of the PP representatives were conducted through to ensure the implementation of the project activity details of which can be found in section 2.3. Furthermore, it was confirmed that the project involves supply of dissemination of improved cookstoves for period 01/01/2024 to 31/10/2024, leading to 290,221 tCO_{2e} emission reductions.

The start date of the project activity is 23/02/2023 verified from the verification against distribution database/^{11/} and by cross verifying against previous monitoring period report and verification report. The crediting period for the project activity is 23/02/2023 to 22/02/2030, as verified using PD/^{5/}, validation report/^{6/}.

Based on this, the assessment team confirms that the project activity VCS- 4000 'DeAgua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in The Gambia' is implemented and operational in accordance with applied methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.2/^{7/}, Project Description Document/^{5/}, VCS standard/^{1/} and VCS guidelines/^{2/}. It has also been assessed and verified that emission reduction calculation for this monitoring period from 01/01/2023 to 31/10/2024 has been done conservatively and found to be appropriate.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

The Registered Project activity has been undergoing 2nd Verification under its first crediting period (7 years), the approach adapted to ensure the quality and credibility of emission reduction is described in the following sections

2.1 Method and Criteria

The method and criteria used for verification consist of following phases.

A risk-based approach has been applied for the process.

Desk review:

- A document review of the monitoring report/^{8/}, emission reduction calculation sheet and other evidence like monitoring survey data/^{12/}, signed user agreements/^{14/}, project distribution database/^{11/} (as mentioned in Appendix 2 of the report) were strategically reviewed and risk assessment was undertaken.

- Project activity sources contributing to the leakage as well as project emissions are assessed.
- the frequency of measurements, QA/QC procedures and other relevant documents are verified.

An onsite audit for the project was conducted from 12/11/2024 to 13/11/2024. VVB has performed acceptance sampling in accordance with Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities Version 09.0 The grouped project is located in The Gambia, which is a Least Developed Country (LDC) Thus, the verification team can choose a different sample size than one indicated in para 32 of the sampling standard. VVB has randomly selected 10 samples across 3 investor groups such that AQL is 0.5% UQL is 15% Producer risk is 5% and consumer risk is 20%. This is noteworthy all the samples visited during onsite visit have similar cooking habits and climate conditions. Same has been updated in section 2.1 of the FVR. It is noteworthy that all the investment groups are spread across Central River Region, Lower River Region and Upper River Region of Gambia and samples covers all the 3 regions of the host country. Further details regarding the process have been mentioned in section 2.3 and 2.4 of the report.

- Interview of the project representatives were conducted to discuss the implementation and operational status of the project with respect to the registered monitoring plan^{/5/}.
- Discussion of QA/QC procedure, data collection, storage and transfer.
- Interview and visual observation on the condition of the project technology stove, baseline stoves, perceived opinion on SDG claim's of the projects, grievances if any
- monitoring period claimed (01/01/2024 – 31/10/2024) was verified from the ER calculation^{/9/}, as well as from the previous monitoring period^{/5/} and its verification report^{/6/} to ensure that the period claimed is continuing from the last monitoring period and no double claim made.

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

2.2 Document Review

As part of verification of the project, the primary activity performed was the strategic review and risk assessment of the documents submitted using a dedicated protocol. A detailed review of MR^{/8/} and ER calculation^{/9/} was performed to check:

- The completeness of the information with reference to the register PD^{/5/}.
- Review of project information, monitoring plan specifically monitoring frequency, quality assurance and quality control system against the registered PD^{/5/} 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/}.

- Project specific assessment against applicable national framework and legislation requirement/^{31/32/33/}.

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

2.3 Interviews

The assessment team conducted an on-site audit inspection/^{10/} from 12/11/2024 to 13/11/2024

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

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

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

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

Table 1: Project technology users interviewed on site for household visit

No.	Stove barcode	End-User name	Type of correspondent	District/village	Date of Audit
1	CE021094	Jonsaba Barrow	Household	Kiang West / Jiffarong	12/11/2024
2	CE022952	Mai Manneh	Household	Kiang Central / Bambako	12/11/2024
3	CE006779	Fatou Valdeh	Household	Lower Fuladu West / Sare Futa	12/11/2024
4	WA014672	Hoja Sarr Hadam	Household	Upper Fuladu West / Galleh Manda	12/11/2024
5	WA003421	Hoja Gai	Household	Upper Fuladu West / Galleh Manda	12/11/2024
6	TG010014	Kaddy Kora	Household	Fulladu East / Kaba Kamma	13/11/2024
7	TG002739	Fatou Jawara	Household	Fulladu East / Kaba Kamma	13/11/2024
8	TG022002	Fatou B Jallow	Household	Jimara / Sare Talata	13/11/2024

9	TG005082	Fatoumata Baldeh	Household	Jimara / Sare Talata	13/11/2024
10	TG020978	Kaddijatou Jawo	Household	Jimara / Sare Talata	13/11/2024

During the site visit, the verifier team has interviewed with PP's representative and implementation partners employed monitoring teams. Interviews were conducted as part of the verification process for data collection and storage for data sets of distribution database/^{13/}and monitoring survey/^{12/}. The list of interviewed personnel are as follows:

Table 2: Project implementation field team interviewed from 12/11/2024 to 13/11/2024

S.No	Name of the person Interviewed	Affiliation	Details Discussed	Audit Team
1	Ousman Camara (Data and Training Analyst)	DeIAqua	Organizational structure, training sessions, team activities, Project monitoring survey execution, project distribution mechanism, data collection (distribution database), grievances mechanism	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira (Country Expert)
3	Ousman Badjie (Country Representative)	DeIAqua	Project monitoring survey execution, project distribution mechanism, data collection (distribution database), grievances mechanism	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira (Country Expert)
4	Kalidov Ley (Distribution Coordinator)	DeIAqua	Project monitoring survey execution, project distribution mechanism, data collection (distribution database), grievances mechanism	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira (Country Expert)
5	Banna NF Badjie (Distribution Coordinator)	DeIAqua	Project monitoring survey execution, project distribution mechanism, data collection (distribution database), grievances mechanism	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira (Country Expert)
6	Baba Dibba (Distribution Coordinator)	DeIAqua	Project monitoring survey execution, project distribution mechanism, data collection (distribution database), grievances mechanism	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira (Country Expert)
7	Mot Jagne (Village Chief)	Local Stakeholder	Grievance mechanism, labour and work rights, human rights, Cultural heritage	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira (Country Expert)

8	Dembo Mbolloy (Village Chief)	Local Stakeholder	Grievance mechanism, labour and work rights, human rights, Cultural heritage	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira (Country Expert)
9	Jonkong Njie	Local Stakeholder	Grievance mechanism, labour and work rights, human rights, Cultural heritage	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira (Country Expert)

The list of PP representatives interviewed by the VVB team is as followed^{/15/}:

Table 3: List of PP representative

S.No	Name of the person interviewed	Affiliation	Details Discussed	Audit Team
1	David Kitt	DelAqua	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	Randulph Morales (Team Leader, Auditor)
2	Ashutosh Tiwari	DelAqua		

2.4 Site Visits

The VVB carried out an on-site visit from 12/11/2024 to 13/11/2024 and physically inspected the project technical design and implementation as specified in the VCS PD^{/5/} & MR^{/8/}. All the investment groups are spread across Central River Region, Lower River Region and Upper River Region of Gambia and samples covers all the 3 regions of the host country.

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

Duration of the Onsite-Audit: 12-13/11/2024;

S.No	Assessment Criteria	Means of Verification	Assessment Opinion
1	The assessment of the implementation and operation of the registered project activity	Registered PD/ ^{5/} and Validation report Interviews with PP/ ^{10/}	The information mentioned with reference to project implementation, capacity and commissioning in MR is found consistent with the documents and information received during interviews.
2	A review of the monitoring survey for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters.	Monitoring survey/ ^{12/} and emission reduction/ ^{9/} calculation sheet. Interviews with households/ ^{10/}	The information related to the monitoring survey generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters mentioned in MR is found to be consistent with documents crosschecked and information received by interviews.
3	Interviews with relevant personnel to determine whether the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan in the PD/ ^{5/}	Interviews with PP/ ^{10/} Training records/ ^{28/}	All the information related to operational and data collection is found to be inline with the PD/ ^{5/} and MR/ ^{8/} .
4	A check of the monitoring equipment including data transfer and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PD, the applied methodology including the tools applied	Interviews with PP/ ^{10/}	Monitoring practices were verified with interview from PP, and it has been observed that all the practices are found to be in line with the PD.

6	A review on calculation of emission reductions	Monitoring survey/ ^{12/} and emission reduction/ ^{9/}	The values mentioned for ER calculation are found to be in line with the monitoring survey/^{12/}. Methods, formulae, and emission factors for calculating baseline emissions have been followed in accordance with the applied methodology/^{7/}.
7	An identification of quality control and quality assurance procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters	Interviews with PP/ ^{10/}	Methods, formulae, and emission factors for calculating baseline emissions have been followed in accordance with the applied methodology/^{7/}. All the QA/AC procedures were also verified on-site.

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)^{18/} 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”.

Since the PP has monitored parameters ($n_{y,i,j}$ and μ_y) through surveys, verification team conducted acceptance sampling in line with paragraph 30 and 31 of the sampling standard version 9.0/^{18/}.

The verification team selected random sample of PP’s monitoring survey 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. The sample size is calculated in conformance with paragraph 39 “A DOE may select a different sample size than the one indicated in paragraph 32 above, either by choosing a different value for the consumer risk and producer risk (e.g. 20 per cent for the consumer risk) when applying acceptance sampling or by using another approach, if any of the following conditions apply:

(a) The estimated volume of annual GHG emission reductions of the project activity or the PoA being verified is equal to or less than 100,000 t CO₂ eq.;

(b) The security conditions in the project region prevents inspection of many samples (e.g. conflict zones); or

(c) The project activity or the PoA is located in a least developed country or a host Party with 10 or fewer registered CDM project activities at the end of the monitoring period being verified.

The grouped project is located in The Gambia, which is a Least Developed Country (LDC)^{19/} Thus, the verification team can choose a different sample size than one indicated in para 32 of the sampling standard^{7/}.

The verification team selected random sample of PP's monitoring survey records (parameter- $N_{y,i,j}$ and μ_y) 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%	15%	5%	20%	10	0

The verification team covered a total of 10 samples across the 3 Investment Groups to confirm monitoring survey results.

Investment Group	Number of samples	Region
1	3	Lower / Central River Region
2	5	Upper River Region
3	2	Central River Region

All the households interviewed were found to have inefficient three stone stove/metal stoves using firewood and confirmed that the project stove was operational with pot skirt used. 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 site visit process is detailed in section 2.3 of the report.

2.5 Resolution of Findings

As discussed above, a risk-based approach has been applied for the verification of the project activity. During the verification, the assessment team identified the issues which could impact the accuracy and the credibility of the emission reduction claimed by the project. The detailed 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 12 CLs, 01 CARs and 00 FAR were raised. The details of all the issues communicated to the PD can be found in the Appendix 4. The issues raised were closed successfully.

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

The project activity is undergoing 2nd Verification, monitoring period from 01/01/2024 to 31/10/2024. There are no FAR that have been raised during the current verification period and also there is no FAR from previous verification period.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

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

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

NA, no such activity performed.

3.1 Methodology Deviations

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

3.2 Project Description Deviations

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

3.3 New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects

There are no new project activity instances added as the project activity did not distribute any cookstoves during the current monitoring period.

3.4 Baseline Reassessment

Did the project undergo baseline reassessment during the monitoring period?

☐ Yes ☒ No

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

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Details

The project “DelAgua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in The Gambia” (VCS ID 4000) Grouped Project (“GP”) by DelAgua Health The Gambia (Voluntary) Limited (DHRV) & DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited fall into sectoral scope 03 and is appropriately selected in the VCS PD & MR and is implemented in The Gambia. The project category and type are correctly indicated in the VCS PD^{/5/} & MR^{/08/}. It has been indicated as well as accepted that it is a grouped project activity.

The project entity i.e., DelAgua Health The Gambia (Voluntary) Limited & DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited (DHRV) are correctly listed in the VCS PD. No other project proponent or project partners are identified involved in the project implementation. This is verified against project information on Verra Registry, previous verification report as well as confirmation from the field team during interviews in the site visit^{/10/}.

The start date of the Grouped project activity is 23/02/2023, which is verified from the joint validation & monitoring report^{/6/} as the joint PD & MR^{/5/}. The crediting period of the Grouped project activity is from 23/02/2023 to 22/02/2030 and the estimated emission reductions from the Grouped project activity is 6,244,483 tCO₂eq for the entire crediting period and the annual average emission reduction for the group project activity is expected to be 780,560 tCO₂eq.

The project crediting period is correctly filled in VCS PD^{/5/}, which is seven years (twice renewable). The selected crediting period is consistent with the project start date and the first crediting period spans from 23/02/2023 to 22/02/2030 (both days included).

The project is correctly classified as large project as per VCS Standard ^{/1/} as the average annual emission reductions are more than 300,000 tCO₂e. The estimated average emission reduction during this monitoring period is estimated as 683,364 tCO₂e. SustainCERT confirms that the total emission reductions during current monitoring period (01/01/2024 – 31/10/2024) is 290,221 tCO₂e. The estimated emission reductions and achieved reductions are consistent with the corresponding ER spreadsheet ^{/9/}.

Project design, including eligibility criteria for grouped projects:

The project activity involves distribution of improved cookstoves in households of The Gambia. The project is a voluntary initiative as host country laws do not mandate the distribution of ICS to the local communities. The project proponents are DelAgua Health The Gambia (Voluntary) Limited and DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited (DHRV) who are 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^{5/6/}).

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion:																				
Audit history	The project activity is undergoing 2nd Verification during its first crediting period. The assessment team has verified that audit history using the Project webpage ^{/4/} , all the previous verification has been published under Verra. It has been concluded that the information present in section in 1.2 of MR is appropriate.																				
	<table><tr><th>Audit type</th><th>Period</th><th>Program</th><th>Validation /verification on body name</th><th>Number of years</th></tr><tr><td>Validation</td><td>23-February-2023--22-February-2030)</td><td>VCS</td><td>Carbon Check Pvt. Ltd.</td><td>1st Crediting Period (7 Years)</td></tr><tr><td>Verification</td><td>23-February-2023--31-December-2023)</td><td>VCS</td><td>Carbon Check Pvt. Ltd.</td><td>0.85 (311 days)</td></tr><tr><td>Verification</td><td>1-January-2024 - 31-October-2024</td><td>VCS</td><td>SustainC ERT SA</td><td>0.833 Year (305 days)</td></tr></table>	Audit type	Period	Program	Validation /verification on body name	Number of years	Validation	23-February-2023--22-February-2030)	VCS	Carbon Check Pvt. Ltd.	1st Crediting Period (7 Years)	Verification	23-February-2023--31-December-2023)	VCS	Carbon Check Pvt. Ltd.	0.85 (311 days)	Verification	1-January-2024 - 31-October-2024	VCS	SustainC ERT SA	0.833 Year (305 days)
	Audit type	Period	Program	Validation /verification on body name	Number of years																
	Validation	23-February-2023--22-February-2030)	VCS	Carbon Check Pvt. Ltd.	1st Crediting Period (7 Years)																
	Verification	23-February-2023--31-December-2023)	VCS	Carbon Check Pvt. Ltd.	0.85 (311 days)																
Verification	1-January-2024 - 31-October-2024	VCS	SustainC ERT SA	0.833 Year (305 days)																	
Double counting and participation under other GHG programs	The project activity is not registered under any other GHG and non-GHG program or registry. This has been confirmed by means of research on relevant applicable registries and available information in public domain and through declaration from the Project Owner.																				
	The assessment team has searched for similar projects having same nature, project technology, location and project proponent as well as legal owner. The name of the owners mentions in the regulatory licenses are also matched and checked. It was concluded that no such projects having same location and geo-																				

	coordinates, technology or project/legal owners are registered in various carbon schemes like CDM, GCC, and Gold Standard.
No double claiming with emissions trading programs or binding emission limits	The project activity has been thoroughly searched on the various websites of various emission trading programs and or ETS programs running in various countries, using nature, project technology, location and project proponent as well as legal owner as the search option.
No double claiming with other forms of environmental credit	As discussed above the, the project has been thoroughly searched in the currently active environment schemes and found that the project is not registered with any other environmental credits. PP has also submitted a declaration stating that the project is not registered with any other registry (see CL 01). 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 1.14 impact for the total number of ICS distributed under the grouped project is 76,140 hence, 76,140 HHs receiving the project ICS now have access to basic cooking services. This is verified through project database as well as through site visit^{/10/} for the accuracy and completeness of the distribution database. -SDG 3 impact is measured by the percentage of respondents from the monitoring survey who reported a positive impact on the smoke level. According to the survey, 96.59% of households confirmed reductions in the smoke level. This equates to 73,545 households having less risk of respiratory ailments due to less smoke inside the household. Claim is verified against survey monitoring data and verified through site visit^{/10/}. -SDG 5 impact is measured by the percentage of respondents from the monitoring survey who reported a positive impact on the time spent tending fires and collecting wood. According to the survey, 96.59% of households confirmed reduced time spent collecting wood. This equates to 73,545 households benefiting from reduced time in fuel collection and cooking activities. Claim is verified against survey monitoring data and verified through site visit^{/10/}.

	-SDG 7 impact is by the percentage of respondents from the monitoring survey with access to clean fuels and technology. According to the survey, 96.59% of households confirmed the usage of the ICS over the baseline. This equates to 73,545 households having access to clean cooking as compared to the baseline. Claim is verified against survey monitoring data and verified through site visit ^{/10/} .
	-SDG 8.3 impact is claimed by the number of permanent, temporary, and community-based employments that is created by the project implementation. The project claims to the generation of 13 permanent employment, 17 temporary employment, and 528 community-based employments which is calculated using total employed personnel of DelAqua in various positions and locations that are working in VCS 4000. This claim has been verified through employment records and payment records ^{/28/} .
	-SDG 12 impact is calculated by the number households that are educated for stove usage and apply sustainable cooking practices is claimed as per number of units distributed which in total of 76,140 units
	-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.
	CL12 was raised and closed successfully during this verification.
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. 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 the 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	It has been observed and verified during the onsite audit that the project activity is in line with the monitoring plan ^{5/} . No new stakeholders have been identified, and the stakeholder group remains the same as at the validation stage..
Legal or customary tenure/access rights	As the project is not a land use project, it has been observed and verified during onsite audit that there are no legal or customary tenure issues or access rights that are impacted by the project.
Stakeholder diversity and changes over time	It has been observed and verified during onsite audit that the project activity is in line with the monitoring plan ^{5/} and also stakeholders were interviewed during onsite audit (details of which are mentioned in section 2.3 of report) and it can be concluded that there is no change in stakeholder diversity over project lifetime till now.
Expected changes in well-being	It has been observed and verified during onsite audit that the project activity is in line with the monitoring plan ^{5/} and also stakeholders were interviewed during onsite audit (details of which are mentioned in section 2.3 of report) and it can be concluded that the distribution of ICS has brought up positive changes in the surrounding, by reducing Household Air Pollution (HAP), job creations, and improved good health and well-being.
Location of stakeholders	It has been observed and verified during onsite audit that the project activity is in line with the monitoring plan ^{5/} and there is no change in the location of stakeholders. It remains same as the rural communities of the Gambia.
Location of resources	As the project is not a land use project, it has been observed and verified during the onsite audit that the location of resources is not applicable to this project activity.

4.2.2 Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Ongoing consultation	No additional stakeholder consultation was carried out in this monitoring period as the initial stakeholder has the same stakeholder composition as at the validation stage. It has been confirmed during site visit that DelAgua conducts regular household visits to each beneficiary, this is attempted at least once per year, allowing for continuous opportunities for consultation and communication. All households could raise grievances during this household visit. The beneficiaries of the project ICS have been provided with the following means to contact the PP: 1. Directly registering complaints at the nearest cell office. 2. Speaking to the locally employed DelAgua field staff to share their feedback.

	No major grievances have been received during the monitoring period. VVB has reviewed the submitted grievance register and it is confirmed that no major grievances raised during this MP
Date(s) of stakeholder consultation	No additional stakeholder consultation was executed in this MP
Communication of monitored results	No grievances received in this MP. From the site visit carried out by verifier team, it is confirmed that there are no inputs/complaints from users.
Consultation records	PP claimed that there are no inputs/grievances that are recorded that are relevant to the project implementation process. The same is concluded from the data collected from users and stakeholders interviewed during site visit ^{10/} .
Stakeholder input	PP claimed that there are no inputs/grievances that are recorded that are relevant to the project implementation process. The same is concluded from the data collected from users and stakeholders interviewed during site visit ^{10/} .

4.2.3 Free, Prior, and Informed Consent

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Consent	From the communication channel established and communicated to project technology user through: - Directly registering complaints at the nearest cell office. - Speaking to the locally employed DelAgua field staff to share their feedback. From the information collected from site visit interviews with project technology users and project implementer partners' field team, no inputs/grievances that are identified that is evaluated to be material to project design and implementation. VCS standard^{1/} para 3.18.8 is applicable in case the project is affecting property rights. The grouped project is an improved cookstove dissemination which is evaluated to have no risk on affecting any property right, Indigenous Peoples (IPs), local communities, nor customary rights

Outcome of FPIC discussion	N/A.
----------------------------	------

4.2.4 Grievance Redress Procedure

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Grievance received and steps taken to resolve the grievance including the outcomes of the resolution	The verification team conducted on-site assessments and interacted with local stakeholders, as detailed in section 2.3 of the report. Notably, no negative comments or feedback were received from the local stakeholders during these interactions, according to the verification team's records. The PP has a continuous grievance mechanism in place for the local stakeholders. The beneficiaries of the project ICS have been provided with the following means to contact the PP: • Directly registering complaints at the nearest cell office. • Speaking to the locally employed DelAgua field staff to share their feedback. VVB has conducted interviews with the PP representatives and the end users and found that there was constant on-going communication directly with the beneficiary households. The project proponent has disclosed its feedback and grievance redressal mechanism under section 2.1.2 - 2.1.4 of the MR^{8/}. 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. 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. During the current monitoring period, no grievance is claimed received. The same is concluded from the site visit (interviews with users).
Grievance redress procedure	PP has a continuous grievance mechanism in place for the local stakeholders. The beneficiaries of the project ICS have been provided with the following means to contact the PP:

	• Directly registering complaints at the nearest cell office. • A toll-free helpline on which the end users can seek assistance. • Speaking to the locally employed DelAgua field staff to share their feedback. Activities of the field team which includes household visits and trainings/^{23/} have been submitted to the VVB. From the information collected from site visit interviews with project technology users and project implementer partners' field team, no inputs/grievances that are identified that is evaluated to be material to project design and implementation. VCS standard/^{1/} para 3.18.8 is applicable in case the project is affecting property rights. The grouped project is an improved cookstove dissemination which is evaluated to have no risk on affecting any property right, Indigenous Peoples (IPs), local communities, nor customary rights.
--	--

4.2.5 Public Comments

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

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

4.2.6 Risks to Local Stakeholders and the Environment

4.2.6.1 Management Experience

DelAgua has been implementing cookstove projects for over 10 years and has several active projects listed under VERRA. DelAgua does not subcontract any part of this project to external entities. Its management team has extensive expertise and experience in implementing similar projects and engaging with communities.

DeAgua staff are highly trained and experienced in distribution and monitoring activities. Before conducting surveys, they received training on the questionnaire. Training records and personnel competency were verified by the assessment team during the onsite visit^{/10/}

4.2.6.2 Risk Assessment

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Natural and human induced risks to stakeholders' wellbeing	No risks were identified. The ICS structure was verified during the onsite visit ^{/10/} , and end users were interviewed to assess potential risks. It was confirmed that the distributed ICS units are lightweight and portable, allowing users to easily carry them in cases of forced or necessary relocation. This ensures that the project includes a mitigation measure against natural disasters.
Risks to stakeholder participation	From the communication channel established and communicated to project technology user through several mechanisms: • Directly registering complaints at the nearest cell office. • A toll-free helpline on which the end users can seek assistance. • Speaking to the locally employed DeAgua field staff to share their feedback. With this communication approach in place, inputs from stakeholders can 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^{/29/} and follow up on it. From the information collected from site visit interviews with project technology users and project implementer partners' field team, no inputs/grievances that are identified that is evaluated to be material to project design and implementation therefore, no risk to stakeholders have been identified.
Working conditions	No risk identified. DeAgua internal policies and Handbook which are mandatory to be signed by employed personals ^{/17/} is verified. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit ^{/10/} .
Safety of women and girls	No risk identified. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit ^{/10/} . The nature of the project is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which based on technology performance claimed from manufacturer and perceived stove performance from user from monitoring survey ^{/12/} and cross checked through verifier's site visit ^{/10/} , the project implementation benefits women and girls through reduction of smoke during meal preparation and shorter cooking time.

Safety of minority and marginalized groups, including children	No risk identified, PP have code of conduct and policy in place in relevant to hiring workers under legal age in effect. No evidence is detected from the site visit and interaction between verifier team and monitoring field team.
Pollutants (air, noise, discharges to water, generation and release of hazardous materials and chemical pesticides and fertilizers)	No risk identified. Project technology BURN which is provided with manufacturer's technology specification which is verified through BURN Website/ ^{26/} with higher thermal efficiency which in effect reduces wood fuel usage. 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 monitoring survey, majority of the users (96.59%) claimed less smoke is generated from the project stove.

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	No risk identified. PP has their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers both discrimination, sexual harassment issues, gender equity, forced labor, child labor, and human trafficking/ ^{17/} . No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/ ^{10/} .
Sexual harassment	No risk identified. PP has their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers both discrimination, sexual harassment issues, gender equity, forced labor, child labor, and human trafficking/ ^{17/} . No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/ ^{10/} .
Gender equity in labor and work	No risk identified. PP has their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers both discrimination, sexual harassment issues, gender equity, forced labor, child labor, and human trafficking/ ^{17/} . No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/ ^{10/} .
Forced labor	No risk identified. PP has their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers both discrimination, sexual harassment issues, gender equity, forced labor, child labor, and human trafficking/ ^{17/} . No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/ ^{10/} .
Child labor	No risk identified. PP has their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers both discrimination, sexual harassment issues,

	gender equity, forced labor, child labor, and human trafficking ^{17/} . No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit ^{10/} .
Human trafficking	No risk identified. PP has their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers both discrimination, sexual harassment issues, gender equity, forced labor, child labor, and human trafficking ^{17/} . No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit ^{10/} .

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
Preservation and protection of cultural heritage	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which present no risk to Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage.

4.2.7.4 Property Rights

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 PP.
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 PP.
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.
Areas needed for habitat connectivity	N/A

4.2.8.2 Introduction of Species

Species introduced	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
NA	GP is an improved cookstove project.

Existing invasive species	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
NA	GP is an improved cookstove project.

Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion	
Invasive species	NA. GP is a improved cookstove project.

4.2.8.3 Ecosystem conversion

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

4.3 Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations

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

- The monitoring of reductions in GHG emissions resulting from the VCS project activity is verified against the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS-PD/^{5/} and the applied methodology/^{7/}. CL05, CL07, and CL08 were raised to address the issues as well as to obtain additional evidence and clarification.
- All parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied methodologies and relevant standards and requirements have been sufficiently monitored and updated.
- The responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting were in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the monitoring plan.

The monitoring system and all applied procedures are in compliance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS-PD/^{5/} and the applied methodology VMR0006 version 1.2/^{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.

PP conducted sampling surveys to gather information needed for the monitoring of $n_{y,i,j}$ and μ_y parameters. Monitoring surveys were conducted between October 7-12, 2024. Minimum sample size is calculated and verified for each parameter in reference to CDM Guideline Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and PoA/^{27/} using total distributed units as target population in each corresponding Investment Group. Using a stratified random sampling approach, PP identified 50 samples for each investment group, ensuring the collected dataset exceeds the calculated minimum sample size required.

Investment Group	Calculated minimum samples needed		Actual Samples Surveyed for both parameters
	$n_{y,i,j}$	μ_y	
1	15	34	50
2	14	32	50
3	14	32	50

PP's calculation for sample size is presented in transparent spreadsheet in ER calculation/^{9/} tab Sample Size Cal & Results.

Sampling captured information on monitoring variables with required confidence/precision 95/10 confidence/precision basis in corresponding to the scale of the Group Project which is large project in accordance to VCS Standard/^{1/} and CDM Guideline Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and PoA/^{27/}.

The verifier team verified PP's sampling approach as narrated in section 4.3 of the monitoring report. Request for additional evidence to evaluate PP's sampling approach is raised as CL05, CL07, and CL08.

Accuracy and data traceability from the presented survey data is requested to be demonstrated by PP during remote call/^{15/} from the internal data management system to the extracted spreadsheet. Data presented and used for ER calculation is concluded to be complete and accurate. Data analysis post survey into value used for calculation for parameter 'project technology usage' and 'skirt usage' is raised as CL08 for PP to further provide justification and rationale behind data interpretation from the survey data.

Calculation for relative precision from survey data is calculated at for both monitored parameters $n_{y,i,j}$ and μ_y is presented in the ER calculation^{/9/} tab Sample Size Cal & Results with calculated margin of error value less than the precision level limit of 10 %. During the verification process, verifier team has requested PP to demonstrate which formulation from the CDM Guideline Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and PoA^{/27/} is used to calculate margin of error value (CL07)

The Verifier team approach to determine sample site visit in terms of minimum sample as well as sample selection is detailed in section 2.4. of this report.

Details of the sampled users are detailed in section 2.3 of the verification report. Data collected from the site visit on the sampled survey^{/10/} verified against monitoring survey^{/12/} and project distribution database^{/11/}.

Parameter $n_{y,i,j}$, μ_y , % pot skirt usage rate are verified to be matching the monitoring data survey.

Parameter	Description of Parameter	Assessment approach
$n_{y,i,j}$	proportion of commissioned project devices of type I and batch j	-Visual inspection of the premises to see if the project stove is operational and in use. -Interview with end user to verify that project stove is still in use
μ_y	Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y	Interview with end user and visual inspection to determine if a pre-project (replaced) stove is still being used in addition to project stove
% pot skirt usage rate	Fraction of frequency of pot skirt used when project stove is used	-Visual inspection of the presence pot skirt and demonstration of the skirt with the stove - Interview with end user to on the frequency of the pot skirt

The verifier team carried out the site visit concluded that from 10 sampled households, no discrepancy was sighted between the data collected from site visit^{/10/} with monitoring data reported by PP. This finding satisfied para 33 of CDM Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities^{/18/}, thus the coordinating/managing entities' set of records is accepted.

The verification team has cross verified these sample documents during the interviews conducted during on site.

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^{/05/} to calculate the project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions comply with the requirements of the selected methodology including applicable tool(s).

Quantification of leakage emissions:

In accordance with the section 8.3 of the applied methodology, VMR0006, version 1.2^{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 1.2^{7/}, provides a direct equation for the calculation of emission reductions and does not provide calculations of project emissions separately.

Net GHG Emission Reductions

According to section 8.4 of methodology VMR0006, version 1.2^{7/}, emission reductions shall be calculated as:

$$ER_y = \sum_i \sum_j B_{y,savings,i,j} \times N_{0,i,j} \times n_{y,i,j} \times \mu_y \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{biomass} \times (EF_{wf,CO2} + EF_{wf,non\ CO2}) \times Adj_{LE} \times (1 - u_d)$$

Where:

ER_y	Emission reductions during year y in tCO ₂ e
$B_{y,savings,i,j}$	Quantity of woody biomass that is saved in tonnes per project device i and batch j in year y (tonnes)
$N_{0,i,j}$	Number of project devices of type I and batch j commissioned (number)
$n_{y,i,j}$	Proportion of commissioned project devices of type I and batch ($N_{0,i,j}$) that remains operating in year y (fraction)
μ_y	Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y
$f_{NRB,y}$	Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass (%)
$NCV_{biomass}$	Net Calorific Value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted or reduced (TJ/tonne)
$EF_{wf,CO2}$	CO ₂ emission factor for the non-renewable woody biomass (tCO ₂ /TJ)
$EF_{wf,non-CO2}$	Non-CO ₂ emission factor for the non-renewable woody biomass (tCO ₂ /TJ)
Adj_{LE}	Adjustment factor to account for leakage related to the non-renewable woody biomass saved by the project activity
u_d	Uncertainty deduction for $f_{NRB,y}$

Calculation and approach used to lead to ER claim is cross checked with further clarification request is raised as CL04, CL05, CL07, CL08, and CL11

The grouped project employs methodology namely VMR0006^{/7/} v1.2. Following Project Description Document ^{/5/} section 5.1 and 5.2, the parameters determined ex-ante and monitored ex-post as per methodology requirements are as follows.

The data and parameters fixed (ex-ante):

S.No	Parameter	Value	Means of verification
1	B_{old,p} 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	0.839	Verification against Project Description ^{/5/} and their corresponding verification reports.
2	N_{p,HH} Average number of persons served per household prior to project implementation	8.28	Verification against Project Description ^{/5/} and their corresponding verification reports.
3	B_{old,HH} 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.	6.947 ton / household / annum (8.28 * 0.839 = 6.947)	Verification against Project Description ^{/5/} and their corresponding verification reports.

4	$\eta_{old,i,j}$ Efficiency of pre-project device	15%	Verification against Project Description ^{/5/} and their corresponding verification reports.
5	EF_{WF,CO_2} CO ₂ emission factor of biomass that is substituted or reduced for wood	112 tCO ₂ e/TJ	Verification against methodology default value and IPCC Guidelines ^{/25/}
6	$EF_{WF,non-CO_2}$ Non-CO ₂ emission factor of biomass that is substituted or reduced for wood	9.46tCO ₂ e/TJ	Verification against methodology default value and IPCC Guidelines ^{/25/}
7	Adj_{LE} Adjustment factor to account for leakage related to the non-renewable woody biomass saved by the project activity	0.95	Verification against methodology ^{/7/}
8	$f_{nrb,b,y}$ Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass.	0.90	Verification against Project Description ^{/5/} and their corresponding verification reports.
9	U_d Uncertainty deduction for fNRB	0.26	Verification against methodology ^{/7/}

The data and parameters monitored (ex-post):

1. Parameter: $N_{0,i,j}$ (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 the number of project devices distributed. Project Proponent provided the Project Distribution Database/ ^{11/} . The Project Distribution Database also contains the date when the cookstove was given to a specific household.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	N/A. Every distributed cookstove has been added in the Total Distribution Record. Additionally, no new cookstoves has been distributed in this monitoring period.
	Monitoring equipment	The Project Distribution Database/ ^{11/} has been submitted to the VVB for verification and it has been found appropriate
	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	N/A

	accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?									
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A								
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A								
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The total distribution record was submitted to the VVB. The TDR contains the region, district, and village where it was deployed. It also includes unique barcode of the stove, as well as the date at the stove is distributed. Since there were no distributed stoves in the current monitoring period. The value was also verified against the previous verification report^{6/}. 'Summary'. Value of No,i,j is verified: <table><tr><td>Group</td><td>Values (units)</td></tr><tr><td>Investor Group 1</td><td>26,741</td></tr><tr><td>Investor Group 2</td><td>24,773</td></tr><tr><td>Investor Group 3</td><td>24,626</td></tr></table>	Group	Values (units)	Investor Group 1	26,741	Investor Group 2	24,773	Investor Group 3	24,626
	Group	Values (units)								
	Investor Group 1	26,741								
Investor Group 2	24,773									
Investor Group 3	24,626									
If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	Comparison on the value of the number of distributed cookstoves has been cross-check using the previous verification report ^{6/} , as no distribution of cookstoves happened during this monitoring period.									
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The total distribution record has been submitted to the VVB for verification. During the remote call ^{15/} , the PP also showed the dashboard how each data has been electronically stored in their data management system.									

	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	CL11	
Conclusion	CL11 was raised and addressed satisfactorily with value of this parameter is accepted as:	
	Group	Values (units)
	Investor Group 1	26,741
	Investor Group 2	24,773
	Investor Group 3	24,626
	Total	76,140

2, Parameter: $n_{y,l,j}$ (Proportion of commissioned project devices of type l and batch j ($N_{o,l,j}$) that remain operating in year y.

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology ^{/7/} requirement, the parameter is measured directly or based on a representative sample. Project Proponent carried out habit survey ^{/14/} with questionnaire determining whether project technology is used (user vs non-user) for each project instances sample sets. Calculation is carried out for each project instance using respective total units distributed with usage rate % from monitoring survey. As per methodology ^{/7/} requirement and PD ^{/5/} , the monitoring frequency is at least once every two years. The parameter is calculated using usage rate obtained from monitoring survey carried out in
-----------------------	---	--

		Oct. 7-12, 2024 for this monitoring period. Frequency monitoring for this parameter is evident meeting the methodology requirement.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	As per methodology/ ^{7/} requirement and PD/ ^{5/} , the monitoring frequency is at least once every two years. The parameter is calculated using usage rate obtained from monitoring survey carried out in Oct 7-12, 2024 for this monitoring period. 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 95/10 confidence precision relevant to the size of the project. Sampling approach adopted by Project proponent was further requested for evidence in form of CL05 and CL07 as part of assessment against Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programmes of Activities requirement/ ^{18/} .
	Monitoring equipment	N/A. The parameter is calculated using total stove distributed with usage rate.
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	N/A

	Calibration frequency /interval:	N/A, no equipment is used as the parameter is calculated using total stove distributed multiplied with usage rate derived from monitoring survey (survey habit ^{/12/}).							
	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?	Proportion of commissioned project devices of $n_{y,i,j}$ values are verified through data analysis of data presented as survey habit^{/12/} for each investor group for usage rate of project technology is at 100%. The user is determined as user if project stove is used within the last 6 months (factors of proportional of project stove together with baseline stove is calculated in other monitored parameter) multiplied with total distributed units per project instances as verified in ER calculation^{/9/} tab 'Summary'. Value of $n_{y,i,j}$ is verified: <table><tr><td>Group</td><td>$n_{y,i,j}$ Value Applied</td></tr><tr><td>Investor Group 1</td><td>0.94</td></tr><tr><td>Investor Group 2</td><td>0.96</td></tr><tr><td>Investor Group 3</td><td>1.00</td></tr></table>	Group	$n_{y,i,j}$ Value Applied	Investor Group 1	0.94	Investor Group 2	0.96	Investor Group 3
Group	$n_{y,i,j}$ Value Applied								
Investor Group 1	0.94								
Investor Group 2	0.96								
Investor Group 3	1.00								

	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	Comparison on the value of usage rate is carried out against Site visit carried out by verifier team including verification using verbal confirmation with project technology user/ ^{10/} with consistency concluded between the PP's monitoring survey data and verifier's collected data/ ^{10/}
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Monitoring survey as carried out to obtain value for usage rate (ny,i,j) is captured using mobile aps and collected and stored in internal database system. Traceability of the data from the presented excel data file/ ^{12/} was performed from the data source using sampled data set during remote audit/ ^{15/} with no discrepancy sighted. Site visit carried out by verifier team including verification using verbal confirmation with project technology user/ ^{10/} Calculation of the value is verified as well as the value claimed in both ER/ ^{9/} and monitoring report/ ^{8/} .
	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	CL 05 and CL07	
Conclusion	Both CLs were raised and addressed satisfactorily with value of this parameter is accepted as:	
	Group	ny, i,j Value Applied
	Investor Group 1	0.94
	Investor Group 2	0.96
	Investor Group 3	1.00

3. 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 during the monitoring period using one of the options presented. The PP used a third-party laboratory, CREEC, to perform an independent study to determine the efficiency of the cookstoves. Results of the independent study performed by CREEC was submitted to the VVB.												
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Following methodology/^{7/} requirement and PD/^{5/}, there are 4 options to measure this parameter in which each project instance shall apply. In this monitoring report, PP stated that option 3 is used in which the value was obtained using a third-party independent laboratory, CREEC, to perform a WBT to a sample of chosen cookstoves. The report by CREEC was submitted to the VVB and was checked against the ER sheet. The following values used for this parameter are as follows: <table><tr><th>Group</th><th>Pot-skirt usage</th><th>$\eta_{new,i,j}$</th></tr><tr><td>Investor Group 1</td><td>97.16%</td><td>0.4945</td></tr><tr><td>Investor Group 2</td><td>95.14%</td><td>0.5027</td></tr><tr><td>Investor Group 3</td><td>98.00%</td><td>0.5104</td></tr></table>	Group	Pot-skirt usage	$\eta_{new,i,j}$	Investor Group 1	97.16%	0.4945	Investor Group 2	95.14%	0.5027	Investor Group 3	98.00%	0.5104
	Group	Pot-skirt usage	$\eta_{new,i,j}$											
Investor Group 1	97.16%	0.4945												
Investor Group 2	95.14%	0.5027												
Investor Group 3	98.00%	0.5104												
Monitoring equipment	N/A. The parameter was obtained from third-party independent laboratory													

	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?	The verifier team reviewed the laboratory report submitted by CREEC and cross-checked the values against those reported in the ER sheet and the MR. Consistency was confirmed across all documents and submitted evidence. The report by CREEC indicated higher cookstove efficiency for Investment Group 3 during this monitoring period compared to the previous period, MP1 (See CL07). To ensure conservativeness, the PP applied the lower values from MP1 and MP2 where applicable.	
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	N/A.	
	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?	Monitoring is verified to be carried out as per Project Description Document ^{/5/} and methodology ^{/7/} requirement with no deviation.	
Findings	CL07		
Conclusion	The value of this parameter is verified and accepted as:		
	Group	Pot-skirt usage	$\eta_{new,i,j}$
	Investor Group 1	97.16	0.4945
	Investor Group 2	95.14	0.5027
	Investor Group 3	98.00	0.5104

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 monitoring survey data which was executed on survey carried out in Oct 7-12, 2024 for the current monitoring period. 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 95/10. Sampling approach adopted by Project proponent was further requested for evidence in form of CL05 and CL07 as part of assessment against Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programmes of Activities requirement/^{20/} and how the value is calculated.
	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. The parameter is determined by taking average of ratio of frequency of usage of project stove by confirming the frequency to household user under the context of 6 months period for both cooking and boiling water. During the data analysis of the monitoring survey, CL05 was raised to further clarify the data interpretation into value claimed.

		The approach PP has implemented based on the questionnaire format of the survey, data interpretation and analysis for precision level, it is concluded to satisfy methodology requirement ^{7/} .
	Monitoring equipment	NA, as the survey data is obtained by verbal confirmation on the frequency on the use of project technology for boiling water and cooking, which is used to determine μ_y
	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?	NA, as the survey data is obtained by verbal confirmation on the frequency on the use of project technology for boiling water and cooking, which is used to determine μ_y
	Calibration frequency /interval:	NA, as the survey data is obtained by verbal confirmation on the frequency on the use of project technology for boiling water and cooking, which is used to determine μ_y
	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, as no monitoring/measuring equipment used.
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A, as no monitoring/measuring equipment used.
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A, as no monitoring/measuring equipment used.

	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Value reported for each project instances as each instance is calculated as proportional fraction of the use of project stove and baseline stove in the last 6 months for cooking and boiling water. Data analysis on survey data concluded that the value is calculated accordingly. Data Traceability for the survey data presented was carried out during remote call/13//15/.								
	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 value obtained for this MP: <table><tr><td>Group</td><td>Fraction</td></tr><tr><td>Investor Group 1</td><td>0.79</td></tr><tr><td>Investor Group 2</td><td>0.79</td></tr><tr><td>Investor Group 3</td><td>0.84</td></tr></table>	Group	Fraction	Investor Group 1	0.79	Investor Group 2	0.79	Investor Group 3	0.84
	Group	Fraction								
	Investor Group 1	0.79								
Investor Group 2	0.79									
Investor Group 3	0.84									
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The approach PP has implemented based on the questionnaire format of the survey, data interpretation and analysis for precision level, it is concluded to satisfy methodology requirement/7/. The approach resulted in simplified questionnaires that is easily conveyed by survey team and understood by survey participants. The calculation of the value of itself is also simple fraction based on the frequency.									
In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	NA, no such deviation is found.									
Findings	CL05 was raised and resolved.									
Conclusion	The value of this parameter is verified and accepted as: <table><tr><td>Group</td><td>Fraction</td></tr><tr><td>Investor Group 1</td><td>0.79</td></tr><tr><td>Investor Group 2</td><td>0.79</td></tr><tr><td>Investor Group 3</td><td>0.84</td></tr></table>		Group	Fraction	Investor Group 1	0.79	Investor Group 2	0.79	Investor Group 3	0.84
Group	Fraction									
Investor Group 1	0.79									
Investor Group 2	0.79									
Investor Group 3	0.84									

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

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology ^{7/} , the parameter can use default value 0.0156 TJ/tonne (derived from IPCC ^{27/} based on the gross weight of the wood that is 'air-dried' may be used if fuel used in project device is woody biomass/renewable biomass; or test report from laboratories for processed renewable biomass. From JPDMR ^{5/} , this parameter is not monitored as sighted in section 6.2.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	From JPDMR ^{5/} , this parameter is not monitored as sighted in section 6.2.
	Monitoring equipment	From JPDMR ^{5/} , this parameter is not monitored as sighted in section 6.2.
	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?	From JPDMR ^{5/} , this parameter is not monitored as sighted in section 6.2.
	Calibration frequency /interval:	From JPDMR ^{5/} , this parameter is not monitored as sighted in section 6.2.
	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?	From JPDMR ^{5/} , this parameter is not monitored as sighted in section 6.2.
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	From JPDMR ^{5/} , this parameter is not monitored as sighted in section 6.2.

	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	From JPDMR ^{/5/} , this parameter is not monitored as sighted in section 6.2.
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	From JPDMR ^{/5/} , this parameter is not monitored as sighted in section 6.2. Baseline of wood fuel for project stove recipient is confirmed through signed user's agreement and reflected in the project distribution database. The same finding is verified through verbal confirmation from the interviewed households ^{/10/} . PP uses default value as specified by methodology ^{/7/} ie 0.0156 TJ/tonne (derived from IPCC ^{/27/}).
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	PP uses default value as specified by methodology ^{/7/} ie 0.0156 TJ/tonne (derived from IPCC ^{/27/}).
	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 ^{/12/} .
Findings	-	
Conclusion	The value used for this parameter is evaluated valid as the condition set by the methodology for the value applicability is evident and that no new revision is sighted.	

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. Based on site visit observation, purchase invoice ^{/24/} and joint PDMR ^{/5/} , it is verified that the project stove that is distributed across 3 Investment Groups from
-----------------------	---	---

		the start of the project implementation is Kuniokoa 2. The lifetime of the stove technology is verified through validated joint PDMR/ ^{5/} as its corresponding joint validation verification report/ ^{6/} .
	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. Across 3 Investment groups, the age stove of the cookstove is the oldest is between 1-2 years based on project distribution database/ ^{11/} and project start date.
	Monitoring equipment	N/A
	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 10 years for this parameter which is consistent from validated PDMR/ ^{5/} as this value is derived from manufacturer's declaration. Project database is verified with the earliest stove distributed at project start date ie 23/02/2023 which is calculated to be over 1 year old (not yet 2 years).
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	Site visit/ ^{10/} verified the condition and stove operational status through visual observation as well as verbal confirmation with the household users. The result is recorded with 100% of stoves in operational condition which is consistent with the project proponent claim that 100% of the distributed stoves are in operation condition.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	N/A.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	N/A as this is set at is to be determined once at the time of Project stove installation with source of data as manufacturer's specification. PP has monitored the condition of the stove during monitoring survey/ ^{12/} with data verified through site visit/ ^{10/} .
Findings	-	
Conclusion	Life span of the distributed stoves is verified as claimed by PP which is 10 years. The data is derived from manufacturer's specification with actual monitored data obtained from monitoring survey provided the same conclusion that 100% of the stoves used (year 1-3) are operational. Site visit/ ^{10/} conducted by verifier team confirmed the accuracy of the data claimed.	

7. Date of commissioning of batch j

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following JPDMR/ ^{5/} section 6.2 this parameter is monitored and nothing on this parameter is found in the methodology/ ^{7/}
-----------------------	---	---

		section 9.2. In JPDMR/5/ for this parameter under ‘description’ section, it is detailed “Project Participant may opt to group the devices in “batches” and the latest date of commissioning of a device within the batch shall be used as the date of commissioning for the entire batch”. In the monitoring report/^{8/}, the parameter is stated to be ‘Fixed and recorded at the time of commissioning/distribution of the project device’ which is claimed as 23-February-2023 which is consistent with the value claimed in JPDMR/5/. Based on site visit observation/^{10/}, purchase invoice/^{24/} and joint PDMR/5/, it is verified that the project stove that is distributed across 3 Investment Groups from the start of the project implementation is Kuniokoa 2. During the PP interview, it was confirmed that PP has not grouped distributed units into batches as the same stove models are used throughout the 3 Investment Groups for the entire crediting period.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	NA.
	Monitoring equipment	NA.
	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?	NA.
	Calibration frequency /interval:	NA.

	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?	NA.
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	NA.
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA.
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	In the monitoring report ^{8/} , the parameter is stated to be 'Fixed and recorded at the time of commissioning/distribution of the project device' which is claimed as 23/02/2023 which is consistent with the value claimed in JPDMR ^{5/} . Based on site visit observation ^{10/} , purchase invoice ^{24/} and joint PDMR ^{5/} , it is verified that the project stove that is distributed across 3 Investment Groups from the start of the project implementation is Kuniokoa 2. During the interview with the PP call, it was confirmed that PP has not grouped distributed units into batches as the same stove models are used across the 3 Investment Groups for the entire crediting period. Start date of Grouped Project is verified against JPDMR ^{5/} is sighted to be consistent as the date claimed for this parameter.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	N/A as this parameter is project specific parameter.
	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?	No deviation is sighted as PP's approach is to use the date of first stove instalment.
Findings	-	
Conclusion	The parameter is not regulated by the methodology ^{/7/} and following JPDMR ^{/5/} the date claimed under this parameter is concluded to be following JPDMR ie start date of first unit instalment.	

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

The assessment team has thoroughly verified the calculation done for the quantification of the emissions reduction for the project activity, under this monitoring period from 01/01/2024 to 31/10/2024.

4.4 Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals

Verification team was able to confirm that the data presented can 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 to confirm the authenticity of the documents and to check the correctness of the calculation.

The verification team confirms that sufficient and verifiable evidence is available for the entire monitoring period. No cookstoves were distributed during this period, and the total number of distributed cookstoves remains at 76,140, the same as in the first monitoring period. A monitoring survey was conducted from October 7–12, 2024, to determine the values of parameters $n_{y,i,j}$ and μ_y . The verifier team evaluated the approaches chosen by the PP to ensure they align with the conservativeness principle while meeting the requirements of the applied methodology for calculating emission reductions.

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/}, internal database record for distribution database for user's information, baseline stove and fuel type; monitoring survey and; technical specification of ICS model/^{26/}, training sessions for competence evaluation of monitoring personals and survey execution guidance/^{22/}, data quality check for plausibility and accuracy, CL 06 was raised to verify the 4.3.3 and 4.3.4 section of the MR in relation to QA/QC measures and training in relation to the competence of the field team. Evidence provided in form of internal audit reports, training records, project stove training material used for households visit/training/^{30/}.

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 2nd monitoring period of the project's first crediting period, information regarding project capacity commission and monitoring system are already verified in previous monitoring report which are also cross checked with previous report. Thus, a reasonable level of assurance is achieved.

4.5 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

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

5 VERIFICATION OPINION

5.1 Verification Summary

The project activity VCS – 4000, “DelAgua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in The Gambia” has undergone 2nd verification with monitoring period from 01/01/2024 to 31/10/2024 (including both days). Del Agua Health The Gambia (Voluntary) Limited and DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited (DHRV) are responsible for the collection, analysis, aggregation, preparation (conversion factors, assumptions, methodology, calculations) and presentation of activities and related GHG data in its public disclosures (including but not limited to monitoring report, emission reduction calculation sheet, submitted documents/ emails/ communications). Our responsibility of performing this work is to the management of DelAqua and in accordance with terms of reference agreed with the DelAqua in the master service agreement. The verification engagement is based on the assumption that the GHG data provided to us is complete, sufficient, true and free from material misstatements. SustainCERT disclaims any liability or co-responsibility for any decision a person or an entity would make based on this verification statement towards the issuance and utilization of VCUs hereby verified and certified. The verification was carried out during Sep – Dec 2024 by a team of qualified GHG auditors.

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

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

5.2 Verification Conclusion

The Verification of the project titled ‘DelAgua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in The Gambia’ VCS ID – 4000, have been undertaken by SustainCERT, as requested by DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited, project proponent for the monitoring period 01/01/2024 to 31/10/2024 (including both the days) as reported in monitoring report/^{8/}. The project activity is implemented in accordance with the registered monitored plan in PD/^{5/} and the emission reduction from the project activity from the project activity. It is our responsibility to express an independent verification statement on the reported GHG emission reductions from the project activity.

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

In our opinion, the GHG emissions reductions reported for the project activity for the period 01/01/2024 to 31/10/2024 are fairly stated in the project monitoring report⁸/The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly based on the approved baseline and monitoring methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.2 and the monitoring plan contained in the PD⁵.

Verification period: From 01/01/2024 to 31/10/2024

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

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Reduction VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Removal VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCUs (tCO ₂ e)
01-Jan-2024 to 31-Oct-2024	-	-	-	290,221	-	290,221
Total	-	-	-	290,221	-	290,221

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
01-Jan-2024 to 31-Oct-2024	683,364	290,221	-58%	There is a -58% difference between the ex-ante estimates and the actual emission reductions achieved during this monitoring period. The significant difference between estimated and actual emission reductions is primarily due to the non-distribution of ICS (Improved Cookstoves) during the current monitoring period. Additionally, the lower

				emission reductions observed can be attributed to discrepancies between the estimated and monitored values for key parameters, such as μ_y and $n_{y,i,j}$. These discrepancies contributed to a deviation from the anticipated emission reductions as per the ex-ante estimates.
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION

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

APPENDIX 2: TABLE OF REFERENCE

S. No	Document Title	Version	Date
1.	VCS standard https://verra.org/documents/vcs-standard-v4-7/	4.7	16/04/2024
2.	VCS guidelines https://verra.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/VCS-Program-Guide-v4.4.pdf	4.4	29/08/2023
3.	Validation and Verification Manual https://verra.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/VCS Validation Verification Manual v3.2.pdf	3.2	31/10/2024
4.	VCS Project Webpage, VCS ID - 4000 (https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/4000)		
5.	Joint Project Description & Monitoring Report MP1 Document 'PDMR_4000_23022023-31122023'	10.0	19/09/2024
6.	Joint Validation and Verification (MP1) report 'PVR VCS 4000 CCIPL 1690_ISO_FM 4.4 VCS Verification_(CC)'	04	24/09/2024
7.	Applied Methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves (https://verra.org/methodology/vmr0006-methodology-for-installation-of-high-efficiency-firewood-cookstoves/)	1.2	
8.	2 nd Monitoring Report 'VCS MR 4000 01Jan2024-31Oct2024'	3.0	19/03/2025
9.	Emission reduction calculation sheet 'VERRA VCS 4000 MP2 ER ver 2.0 13112024 – EXTERNAL'	2.0	13/11/2024
10.	Onsite audit report (12/11/2024 – 13/11/2024)		
11.	Project distribution database 'ICS Distribution Database'	1.0	
12.	Monitoring Survey 'VERRA VCS 4000 MP2 ER ver 2.0 13112024 – EXTERNAL' tab 'Monitoring Survey Data'	3	13/11/2024
13.	Project platform data collection and retention		Accessed on 05/12/2024
14.	User's signed agreements		

15.	Remote call with Project Proponent (05/12/2024) – to check the dashboard used for storing data		
16.	Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	9	
17.	DeIAqua internal policy and employment handbook: 1) CHSS Policy 2) Risk Register _ The Gambia 3) Anti Child and Modern Slavery signed statements 4) Signed Code of Conduct		
18.	No Double counting declaration (1. formal agreement with Burn addressing double counting 2. project proponent declaration letter ensuring there is no double counting)		02 Dec, 2024
19.	UN List of Least Developed Country (https://unfccc.int/topics/resilience/workstreams/national-adaptation-programmes-of-action/ldc-country-information).		Accessed on 16/12/2024
20.	DeIAqua field team activity log records		
21.	Attendance list for training sessions field team		
22.	Kuniokoa Stove Purchase Order		
23.	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories; Chapter 2 Stationary Combustion	2006	
24.	Burns Website (product specification) Kuniokoa https://www.burnstoves.com/products/wood-stoves/kuniokoa/		Accessed on 22/04/2024
25.	CDM Guideline Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and PoA	4	16/10/2015
26.	VCS Methodology Requirements	4.4	29/08/2023
27.	Local Stakeholder Consultation records: –District collaboration agreements –LSC report in district level –Sampled invitation		2022
28.	Training evidences for monitoring team: - Household Visit photo - Live Well Program Training Manual - MS Training Attendance		

	- VDC Training attendance - Training Photo (monitoring survey team) -1.0 SDG 8 - List of Employees – The Gambia -Proof of payment		
29.	Grievance Register		01/01/2024 to 31/10/2024.

APPENDIX 3: ABBREVIATIONS

MR	Monitoring report
PD	Project description
MP	Monitoring Period
PP	Project Proponent
PAI	Project Instances
ICS	Improved Cook Stove
IG	Investment Group
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

APPENDIX 4: PROJECT FINDINGS

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 01	
VCS Standard, v4.7	VCS Standard, v4.7 3.23.1 Project proponents shall not seek credit for the same GHG emission reduction and carbon dioxide removal under the VCS Program and another GHG program. Projects issuing GHG credits from different time periods under the VCS Program and another GHG program shall also conform with the rules and requirements in the Registration and Issuance Process.	PP is requested to provide confirmation whether project is currently active in any other environment schemes and claiming credits. PP is requested to provide signed declaration stating that the project is not registered with any other registry. In case PP have received or are seeking credit for reductions and removals from a project activity under the VCS Program and another GHG program, PP is requested to provide the required information as per VCS Standard v4.7 para 3.23.2 (1)-(4).	In accordance with Section 3.23 (1)-(4) of the VCS Standard, v4.7, a signed declaration letter is being provided to the VVB to confirm that there is no double counting of credit claims. This declaration confirms, among other assurances, that: ○ The stoves are neither registered nor in the process of registration as a project activity under any other carbon offset program/mechanism. ○ The stoves are not deregistered from any other carbon offset program. ○ The stoves are not rejected or excluded from any other GHG programs. ○ The net GHG emission reductions or removals generated during the monitoring period are not utilized for compliance under any other such mechanism. ○ The stoves are not availing any other forms of environmental credit for the crediting period.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL 01	Developer Response
	Round-2	PP has provided signed declaration with information in specific referring to the VCS project ID, crediting period and monitoring period in corresponding to the monitoring report. The declaration is sighted by both director of project proponents and dated 24-Nov-2024. The declaration is consistent with the claimed information in section 1.10 of the monitoring period. Comment closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL 02	Developer Response
Methodology requirement	Methodology requirement: monitoring record	PP is requested to provide complete record for the date of commissioning of project devices as per AMS II.G. version 13, Monitoring methodology paragraph 45 a), "During project activity implementation, the following data shall be recorded (a) Number of new devices distributed under the project activity, identified	This requirement is no longer applicable under VMR0006 ver 1.2, Section 9.3. Further, the PP is providing the Improved Cookstove (ICS) distribution database, which includes all the necessary information such as the unique IDs and the dates of distribution for each ICS

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 02	
		by the type of devices and the date of commissioning”.	
	Round-2	Distribution database is provided with information sighted within the record: -Location: Region, District, Village -Date of distribution -Corresponding Investor Group number in which the cookstove is clustered -ICS Barcode Total data set presented is 76,140 units which is consistent with the number of distributed cookstove within the crediting period and the current monitoring period. Comment closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 03	
VCS Standard 4.7	VCS Standard 4.7 3.7 Ownership	PP is requested to provide evidence of project ownership from the process that generates GHG emission reductions in form of End User Agreement as regulated in section 1.8 of the	1) At the time of Improved Cookstove (ICS) distribution, each ICS beneficiary transfers the rights of credit ownership to the Project Proponent (PP) through an agreement written on an end user

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 03	
	Project and jurisdictional proponents must demonstrate that they have the legal right to control and operate project or program activities	JPDMR for the distributed cookstoves in this monitoring period for the following: 1) Samples distributed units: pending with record of the distributed units to be provided by PP (see CL 02) photograph of user with signature on poster and justification whether the level of understanding of user on agreement is adequate depending on the medium used for communicating details of agreements. 2) PP shall submit written and signed documents from: a) Memorandum of Understanding with the Government of Gamba, b) Manufacturer agreements with specifics confirming that DelAgua is the sole owner of all technologies purchased under this project as well as carbon credit generated from the technology implementation is within the jurisdictions of DelAgua.	receipt poster. These posters are available in both English and the local language to ensure that the beneficiaries have a clear understanding of the agreement before signing it. A photograph of the end user holding the poster is taken and stored in the PAI database. A sample PDF containing such distribution evidence, including the photograph of the user holding the poster, is being submitted. 2) i) Signed MoU with the Government of The Gambia is being submitted. ii) The manufacturer agreement is being submitted. This document explicitly states that the manufacturer acknowledges that it has no right, title or claim to any carbon or impact credit earned or registered by DelAgua or any of its affiliates and associates pursuant to the use of the Products. Please note that no new PP was added.
	Round-2	1) Agreement with end user/recipient of the ICS is drawn using acknowledgement on project	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 03 receipt poster. Details of the agreement include the following: a. Details on project implementation partners: Ministry of Petroleum and Energy / DelAgua Health The Gambia (Voluntary) Limited b. Statement of acknowledgement that: i. the household shall be part of the project and that the project is part of 'Live Well', a program of the Government of the Gambia and implemented under the "DelAgua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in the Gambia". ii. stove received is not for sale and shall be maintain in the house iii. carbon credit generated is DelAgua Health The Gambia (Voluntary) iv. household shall not receive/purchase other improved cooking stove. v. Confirmation that prior to receiving the ICS that the household is using wood biomass for cooking vi. Signature and name of user vii. Signature and name of local authority. No cookstove distribution occurred during this monitoring period. All cookstoves	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 03 included in the project were verified during the joint validation and verification process. Comment closed 2) PP submitted the written and signed documents: a. Memorandum of Understanding with the Ministry of Petroleum and Energy on Behalf of The Government of Gambia and DelAqua Group b. Statement letter issued by ICS's manufacturer BURN Manufacturing is provided and verified. The statement acknowledgment that BURN has no right over carbon credit generated from DelAqua and its affiliates. Comment closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 04 1) The PP is requested to provide evidence that all distributed units in MP2 are Burn Kuniokoa G2 stoves, such as purchase invoices from the manufacturers. Additionally, the PP is asked to explain the inclusion of the efficiency values for the SSM Dura S-32X, with and without the pot skirt, in the ER calculation sheet, given that all distributed cookstoves up to this	
	Eligibility criteria		1) Please note that only Kuniokoa G2 ICS units have been distributed from the start of the project to date. Furthermore, no ICS units were distributed during this monitoring period, and hence purchase invoices are not applicable. However, the PP is sharing the previous monitoring period purchase order for reference. The SSM Dura stove was included in the PDMR solely for ex-ante calculations as

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 04 monitoring period are claimed to be Kuniokoa G2 stoves. 2) In the monitoring survey, the PP shall clarify which stove refers to Burn Kuniokoa G2 stoves, as they have been referred to as Live Well Stoves and Tubebo Stoves. The PP is requested to ensure consistent naming of the cookstove across all documents.	an additional ICS option for potential future distribution. Consequently, the efficiency values for the SSM Dura stove, both with and without the pot skirt, are mentioned in the 'Fixed Ex-Ante Parameter' tab of the ER calculation sheet. 2) Regarding the discrepancy noted by the VVB, please refer to columns AG and AH of the "Usage Survey Data" tab in the ER sheet. These columns list the local and English names of the stoves. The "Live Well Stove" is the local name for the DelAgua project ICS, also referred to as the "DA Stove." Both terms refer to the project ICS, which is the Burn Kuniokoa G2 stove, as stated in the PDMR. In Rwanda, this stove is also known locally as "Tubebo Neza." This local nomenclature was inadvertently included in the spreadsheet and has now been corrected to reflect "Live Well Stove," the appropriate local name for The Gambia. Thus, it pertains to differences in local nomenclature rather than an actual discrepancy.
	Round-2	1. During the current monitoring period, no additional cookstoves have been distributed. The total number of 76,140 units distributed cookstoves were verified as Burn Kuniokoa G2 stoves during the joint validation and verification of the project activity. Comment closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 04	
		2. PP updated the ER calculation sheet to clarify the cookstove nomenclature. Since this project is not in Rwanda, the local name of the Kuniokoa G2 Stove was changed from “Tubehe Neza Stove” to “Live Well Stove,” as it is known in The Gambia. Comment closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 05	
Guideline Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities Version 04.0	Sampling approach	Section 4.3.6 of the MR 1) In the calculation for minimum samples needed for monitoring survey parameter μ_y , PP is requested for base of justification for the value used as 0.80 (reflected in tab ‘Sample Size Cal & Results’) as expected value in expected value for use of project technology all across all Investor Groups. For parameter ‘Stove Operating Fraction for determination of $N_{y,i,j}$ ’ sample calculation as sighted in ER calculation tab ‘Sample Size Cal & Results’ that Expected operational proportion (SoF) is set at 0.90 across all investor groups. PP is requested to provide clarification and/or justification on the value used.	a. The rate of monitored usage for all the investor group is above 94% in this MP. In the previous monitoring period, the rate was in range from 99-100%. Given this, if PP was used a nexpected value of 99% for the variable $N_{y,i,j}$, the required sample size would be only 30. To ensure a larger sample size, PP has reduced the expected value of $N_{y,i,j}$ to 0.9 across all investor groups. Regarding the expected value of μ_y , the same approach was taken as with $N_{y,i,j}$. PP, drawing on their experience, decided to reduce this expected value to 0.80, taking into account the usage of additional

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 05	
		2) PP is requested to provide clarification on the sampling design plan taking into account seasonality factor to obtain data monitored parameters to ensure that the data is representative for the whole year: i. 'Stove Operating Fraction for determination of Ny,i,j ii. Utilization of Project stoves - for μ_y	baseline stoves along with the project stoves. b. The monitoring survey questionnaire has been designed to capture long-term trends, specifically by focusing on usage patterns over six months by asking a question: "On average of the last 6 months - How many times a week are you using a stove that is the Live Well stove?". Overall, the country's two climactic seasons are represented through the dry season: November to May, and wet season: June to October. The monitoring surveys were carried in October 2024, which corresponds to country's dry season. However, since the survey question refers to an average over the past six months, the data inherently includes responses that span both wet and dry seasons. This approach helps ensure that the data reflects a broader range of conditions and usage patterns. Thus, the period chosen for the survey and the questionnaire is representative of whole year.
	Round-2	1) Parameter Ny,i,j: For parameter 'Stove Operating Fraction for determination of	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 05 Ny,i,j' sample calculation as sighted in ER calculation tab 'Sample Size Cal & Results' that Expected operational proportion (SoF) is 0.90 which is the same across the other Investment Groups. Expected operational proportion (SoF) of 0.9 used in this monitoring period sampling plan is plausible based on the usage rate obtained from the MP1 at 99%, This is verified following CDM-EB50-A30-STAN Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programmes of Activities v9 para 13. "The target value, that is, the expected value of the parameter, which should be determined using the project participants' or the coordinating/managing entity's knowledge and experience". At the end, the minimum sample is calculated at 43 for each Investor Group, the actual data obtained at 50 for each Investor Group is much higher than the minimum sample required. Parameter μ_y : In the calculation for minimum sample required for parameter μ_y, operational proportion (SoF) of 0.8 used. With value obtained in MP1, the SoF value used in the sample calculation in this MP2 is plausible and verified following CDM-EB50-A30-STAN Sampling and	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 05 Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programmes of Activities v9 para 13. At the end, the minimum sample is calculated at 96 for the whole project, the actual data obtained is 50 for each IG, totalling 150, which is much higher than the minimum sample required. Comment closed. 2) PP's approach to address seasonality factor is justified through the format questionnaire. The monitoring data presented is verified with questions that are formatted with reference of the household's cooking/boiling water activities for average in the last 6 months. With this format of questionnaire, the 6 months period in principle covers long dry season, short rain season and short dry season. Information provided by PP to address seasonality factor in the sampling approach is accepted. Comment closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 06	
	VCS Standard (v4.7) 3.16.2 Quality management procedures to manage data and information shall be applied and established ISO 14064-2 (2019) Clause 6.10 Monitoring the GHG project The monitoring plan shall include the following, as applicable: h) controls that include internal data check for input, transformation and output, and procedures for corrective actions;	Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.4 of MR PP is requested to provide evidence on the measures implemented within the MP in relation to competence of the interested entities i.e., contractors involved in project implementation and monitoring in form of: 1) Training record 2) List of contractors used and their role. 3) Internal audit record and improvements as claimed in section 4.3.3 and 4.3.4 of the MR.	The monitoring surveys were carried out by DelAgua's internal staff. These enumerators are well-trained and have previous experience conducting monitoring. Before the surveys, they received training on the questionnaire. The training attendance sheet from the training session is provided as supporting evidence. PP conducts internal audits regularly. These audits are performed by the DelAgua team for their QA/QC processes and team training. It's important to note that these internal audits are independent of the annual monitoring surveys and are only for DelAgua's internal purposes. Household visits were subject to a quality audit which is evidenced through the submission of Quality Audit Report to the supervise for internal purposes. Regular checking of quality by DA staff is part of their regular roles, with schedules created that allow 1 day per HHV team to be supervised by DA staff. In this MP, however, no audits were conducted given there were no new ICS distributed in this MP.
	Round-2	PP submitted the following documents:	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 06 1) Training record is provided as followed: Attendance list 'MS Training Attendance' with title indicating for monitoring survey with 10 names and respective signatures. The date of the attendance record is from 3rd Oct 2024. 2) Information sighted in section 1.4 of the monitoring report that the project proponents are DelAgua Health The Gambia (Voluntary) Limited and DelAgua Projects Pte. Ltd. Based on PP's clarification on the relationship between the 2 PPs and both are under the same DelAqua group. During the verifier site visit, confirmation in relation to the project implementer and participants is concluded the same. No subcontractor nor other project implementer is found for the project and that the parties involved is confirmed the same as claimed in section 1.4 of the monitoring period. 3) Internal Audits is performed during the distribution of the cookstoves to ensure that quality of the data of the distributed cookstoves are accurate. As no ICS have been distributed during this monitoring period, no internal auditing has been performed during this monitoring period.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 06	
		The PP has updated the MR to include this information in the MR. Comment closed	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 07	
	Monitored parameters and Monitoring Survey	Monitoring parameters: PP is requested to provide evidence on parameters: 1) Traceable evidence of the survey data provided in excel form from its initial raw data collected form. In section 4.3.3 of the MR that monitored data is collected on smart phone-based surveys. PP is requested to provide evidence on this. 2) PP shall submit the third party laboratory test for the parameter $\eta_{new,i,j}$ obtained for this monitoring period (MP2) as well as previous monitoring report (MP1). Additionally, PP shall clarify the increase of the efficiency parameter $\eta_{new,i,j}$ for cookstoves under Investor Group 3 this monitoring period as compared to previous monitoring period.	1) All monitoring surveys were conducted using phone-based applications. Once a survey is completed and submitted, the survey details are sent to the DelAgua server and are no longer stored or accessible through the phone-based app. The data extracted from this server is then transferred to an excel sheet, which is later submitted in the ER sheet. To provide evidence of this process, we are sharing dummy sample screenshots taken from the phone-based app. These screenshots illustrate how the surveys were conducted on the smartphone app. Additionally, the PDF of the monitoring survey questionnaire, which was extracted from the phone-based app, is also included for further verification. 2) The efficiency test results are being submitted as requested. Please note that variations in results are beyond the control of the Project Participant

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 07	
		3) PP shall clarify the high number of people living in a household obtained from the monitoring survey. PP shall explain how the number of people in each household was determined and provide evidence if possible.	(PP), as the tests for both MP1 and MP2 were conducted by an independent third party, CREEC, a well-known and reputable organization. However, as a conservative approach, the PP has used the lower values from MP1 and MP2 where applicable. For details, please refer to the "Ex-Post Survey Results" tab, rows 7 and 8 3) The number of people living in each household was determined through direct questioning during the monitoring survey. This information is recorded in column Z of the " Monitoring Survey Data " tab for reference. The observation of a high number of people living in a household is typical in The Gambia, where extended families commonly reside together in combined households. This cultural practice accounts for the higher household sizes noted in the survey.
	Round-2	1) PP has provided extract from the template of questionnaire used for monitoring survey. During remote call (05 Dec 2024), data traceability was demonstrated from PP from internal database system with sampled dataset verified as consistent with the data set provided. Comment closed. 2) The efficiency tests of the cookstoves were conducted by an independent third party, the same organization for both MP1 and MP2. The submitted test results align with the ER	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 07 sheet provided by the PP. To maintain conservativeness, the PP applied the lower values from MP1 and MP2 where applicable. Comment closed. 3) The number of people per household reported in the ER sheet comes from a direct question in the monitoring survey, asking how many individuals live in the household. The high household size is attributed to extended families living together and the polygamous nature of households in The Gambia. This information was also verified during the onsite audit. Comment closed	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 08	
ER calculation	3.15 Quantification of GHG Emission Reductions and Carbon Dioxide Removals	ER calculation file: In the monitoring survey in relation to usage rate parameter questionnaire, it is sighted that 5 users are claiming that their usage of the stove is not with pot skirt with column BB ('Monitoring Survey' Tab of 'VERRA VCS 4000 MP2 ER ver 2.0 13112024 - EXTERNAL') is left as blank. Review on	Please refer to column S of the "Monitoring Survey Data" tab, titled "Is the Live Well stove available?". The responses from the five households in question indicate "No." Consequently: • Their usage in column AZ is recorded as "0," and • Their usage status in column BA is marked as "No." This indicates that these five households do not have the ICS present, and their usage has already

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 08 formulation to calculate value of 'Usage of Pot-skirt with project ICS' ('VERRA VCS 4000 MP2 ER ver 2.0 13112024 - EXTERNAL' tab 'Ex-post Survey Results') row 6 that with leaving the column BB blank instead of using actual value is giving higher value instead of a more conservative value. This ultimately affects the value of the efficiency parameter $\eta_{new,i,j}$ in the ER Calculation tab of the ER sheet. PP is requested to provide clarification on how the data is considered in usage rate calculation.	been considered as 0% and discounted in the ER calculation. As the ICS is not available in these households, pot-skirt usage is not applicable. Marking pot-skirt usage in column BB as "0" for these households would result in double discounting the ER, which is unnecessary. For this reason, column BB is intentionally left blank for these five households.
	Round-2	The 5 cookstoves that were left blank correspond to households that do not have the ICS available. The usage rate for these households is recorded as zero, and since they do not have ICS, the question regarding the usage rate of ICS with a pot skirt is not applicable. Comment closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 09	
VCS Standard v4.7	2.1 Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation VCS standard v4.7 a.Clause 3.18.1 b.Clause 3.18.2-3 c.Clause 3.18.7-8 d.Clause 3.18.3-14	1) Under section 2.1.2 Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication, PP is requested for evidence on local stakeholder meetings that were claimed carried out before distribution of stoves in each sector and evidence on how inputs received during the local stakeholder meetings is affecting project design and its justification if no such change is required. Distribution record is not made available at this point, it is unable to determine whether the distribution carried out in this MP is on different sectors than in previous MP. 2) Under section 2.1.3 Free, Prior, and Informed Consent, PP is requested to provide evidence of signed Collaboration Agreements with all of districts in which distribution have taken place. Distribution record is not made available at this point, it is unable to determine the districts in which project implementation has taken place. 3) PP shall provide evidence regarding the existence of a grievance register maintained at the local office. Additionally, PP is requested to provide confirmation whether there have been any comments received in between the submitted monitoring report (VCS MR 4000 01Jan2024-31Oct2024). If there is any, PP is requested to provide evidence on	1) The stakeholder consultation meeting was conducted prior to validation of the project, as detailed in section 2.1 of the registered PD. In addition to this national-level LSC, the PP conducts local stakeholder meetings in sectors prior to distributing stoves or sign a regional MoU. This is to ensure that the project is communicated effectively at all levels and to incorporate feedback from local communities. As part of the ongoing communication with local stakeholders, end users were informed about the grievance register, which is maintained at the local office locations of the PP. Local field staff and resource persons also serve as a medium for escalating grievances from project beneficiaries within their respective zones to the PP. Moreover, DelAgua, the implementing partner, provides a toll-free helpline for stakeholders to connect with them for assistance or to raise concerns. The participating stakeholders generally appreciated the project, recognizing its

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 09 how the comments are responded and its progress.	benefits, such as reduced indoor air pollution, reduced greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and employment generation. No negative comments were raised during these meetings. Feedback received from stakeholders were non-materialistic and thus, no change in documentation was required. 2) Please note that no ICS were distributed in this MP. However, the ICS database and Regional MoU are being submitted. 3) Grievance register is being submitted. Please note that there were not any comments received in between the submitted monitoring report.
	Round-2	1) The stakeholder consultation took place before the project's start date, as detailed in the validated JPDMR. No new stakeholder consultation was carried out in this Monitoring Period. For ongoing stakeholder communication, the PP maintains a grievance register at local office locations. Additionally, a toll-free helpline is available for stakeholders to seek assistance or raise concerns. Comment closed. 2) The PP has provided Regional MoUs for the Central River Region, Lower River Region, and Upper River Region of The	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 09 Gambia. Verification of the project distribution database confirms that the provided agreements cover the districts where the cookstoves were distributed. Comment closed. 3) Grievance register was submitted by the PP, and the register does not record any negative comments that could affect the emission reduction claims of the project. Comment closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 10	
VCS standard, v4.7	VCS standard Clause 3.19.2-22	Under section 2.2 and 2.3.1 of the monitoring report, PP is requested to provide evidence on: 1) Result of risk assessment and its implemented measures during the entirety of the MP in relation to work condition of DelAqua employees. 2) Signed code of conduct (in respect to child labor and women/girls exploitations, discriminations, sexual harassment) signed by employees, vendors and suppliers. PP is requested to provide clarification whether this requirement is	1) DelAqua workers/employees involved in the distribution process are trained professionals, and mostly, the VDCs are among these people where distribution is taking place. The risk from working in remote locations is mitigated by employing people who belong to that local community. VDCs inform the senior team involved in the distribution process about any identifiable risk and the possible measures to mitigate them. DelAqua maintains a health, safety & security policy for all staff in The Gambia. In addition, DelAqua maintains a risk register (as part of an overall risk management policy) that tracks all risk types (in addition to safety and security.)

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 10 applicable to all Community Health Workers claimed to be employed in this MP (in total of 528 as stated in section 1.12 Sustainable Development Contributions) 3) PP is requested to provide a sample of consent forms taken from end-users during the monitoring survey, ensuring that individuals being surveyed are 18 years and above. 4) PP is requested to provide evidence on inclusion of in its implementation on local stakeholder meetings, employments and invitations into project participants for all stakeholders, local communities and indigenous people (IPs) as claimed in section 2.3.2 & 2.3.3 of the monitoring report.	This is updated on a quarterly basis. The risk register and country Health, Safety & Security Plan – The Gambia is being submitted. 2) PP confirms that all employees, vendors, and suppliers involved in the project have signed employment contracts or code of conduct's, which cover child labor, exploitation of women/girls, discrimination, and sexual harassment. TG staff has signed an act on modern slavery which covers Child labor and Women/Girls exploitation. Sexual harassment and discrimination are talked about in the code of conduct and every employee that has a contract has signed to abide with it. PP confirms that the code of conduct applies to all Community Health Workers involved in this project. Sample signed code of conduct is being submitted for reference. 3) PDF of sample of consent forms taken from end-user during the monitoring survey is being submitted. 4) Refer registered PD section 2.1 for the detailed on LSC meeting. DelAgua works with a team composed of people from diverse fields, ethnicities, communities, nationalities, and backgrounds. DelAgua is inclusive in its approach of hiring any of its workforce at any level.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 10	All the job positions specific to host country operations are released on local employment portals, job description and minimum eligibility criteria are mentioned. The VDCs are selected on the basis of an assessment test, where they are assessed on the basis of their analytical and reasoning ability. The workers are generally selected for the set of skills they possess, and the considerable amount of experience deemed necessary to fill the specific position. The logistics team is selected on the basis of their relevant work experience, and physical health. Irrespective of the gender of the team member, the staff is selected on the basis of their previous skills, performances, and the diversity they bring to the team. Therefore, DelAgua always encourages talent from all the sections of society (irrespective of their political views, their background, their nationalities, race, cultural beliefs, etc.) to apply to the positions that are available. DelAgua ensures during its selection of employees and workers that more and more women are encouraged to apply and are

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 10	
			selected for the job roles posted from time to time. This aligns with the The Gambia's national culture on women participation in different fields. DelAgua's approach to both stakeholder engagement and employment reflects a broad and inclusive perspective, promoting diversity and equal opportunities for local communities, indigenous peoples, and women.
	Round-2	1. The PP has provided a risk assessment covering various areas, including operational activities, safeguarding principles, and road safety. The Country Health, Safety & Security Plan (last reviewed on 26/01/24) has been provided and verified. This document details the identification of potential risks and corresponding mitigation measures, including issues such as, sexual violence and Health and Welfare. Comment closed. 2. A sample of the signed code of conduct was submitted by the PP. The signed code of conduct aligns with DelAgua's internal policy and applies to all employed personnel, including temporary workers such as Community Health Workers. Comment closed. 3. PP has submitted the consent forms collected from households during the monitoring survey. It is noted that all signatories of the consent forms are above 18 years old. Comment closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 10	
		4. From CL09, stakeholder consultation occurred prior to project implementation, and no new consultations were conducted during the MP. The details of the grouped-level consultation were verified in the JPDMR and its joint validation and verification report. The grievance/communication mechanism, as described in section 2.1.2 of the monitoring report and verified during the site visit by the verifier team, allows inputs from all parties, with no restrictions on local communities and indigenous people (IPs). Comment closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 11	
VCS standard, v4.7	Project Description Deviations	The PP shall clarify why no cookstove distribution occurred during this monitoring period. According to the JPDMR, an additional 100,000 ICS units were expected to be distributed between 01-Jan-2024 and 31-Dec-2024. However, by the end of this monitoring period (MP2), the number of distributed ICS units remains the same as in the previous monitoring period.	It is important to note that the distribution plan outlined in the JPDMR, which expected an additional 100,000 ICS units to be distributed between 01-Jan-2024 and 31-Dec-2024, is based on tentative projections. PDMR section 1.1, footnote 2 on page 4 clearly states: <i>'This plan is tentative and subject to change based on actual implementation, influenced by market demand and user preferences, deemed outside the control of the PP, and shall not be considered a deviation from the project's</i>

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL 11	Developer Response
			<i>description. The number of ICS units outlined in the table serves as an approximate figure for ex-ante calculations and is non-binding.'</i> Therefore, in line with this footnote, the distribution plan is provisional and subject to change due to factors outside the control of the PP. Consequently, the distribution plan is not binding and may evolve based on actual conditions during implementation.
	Round-2	No additional cookstoves were distributed during this monitoring period. The distribution of an additional 100,000 cookstoves is provisional and subject to changes beyond the control of the PP. This has been verified using the validated and verified JPDMR. Additionally, the PP submitted the purchase order for the cookstoves, all dated before the start of the CP. Comment closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL 12	Developer Response
VCS Monitoring	VCS Monitoring Report Template	In table 1 of section 1.12 of the monitoring report:	1. There are a total of 528 staffs employed by DelAgua in the Gambia for project VCS 4000. The list of total VDCs/ staffs

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 12	
Report Template	Section 1.12 Sustainable Development Contributions	a. under SDG 8.3.1 Proportion of informal employment in total employment, by sector and sex impact claim, PP is requested to provide evidence on statement made 'Till the end of MP2, a total of 528 informal employment has been created with the project activity'. The same statement is sighted claimed under column 'Current project contributions' and 'Contributions over project lifetime' PP is requested to provide clarification whether the statement stands valid for both MP2 only or only for both MP1 and MP2. b. Under SDG 12.8 impact claim, PP is requested to provide evidence in form of training material, dates, records of attendance. c. PP shall update the Table of Contents to illustrate that the evidence of the project's SD contributions are placed in the Appendix Section, in line with the Monitoring Template 4.4 Guideline.	employed by DelAgua is being shared. PP confirms that this figure is valid for both MP1 and MP2, as all these employees are currently active. 2. Training evidence for SDG 12.8 are being submitted. 3. The evidence of the project's SD contributions has already been added in appendix of the monitoring report. Evidence for SDG 8 (employment list) and SDG 12 (training records) is shared directly with the VVB, which involves numerous pages. Including them in the appendix would add more pages to the MR, so to keep the document manageable, this information is shared separately.
	Round-2	1. The PP has shared the employment list containing the permanent and temporary employees that the project activity has employed. Proof of payments were also submitted by PP. Comment closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 12 2. Under SDG 12.8 impact claim, training evidence is provided in form of: - Attendance list for community health workers by the district - Photograph of household visit - Training material: sighted with illustration and in native language. Topic sighted includes the benefit of using the project stove (less smoke) Comment Closed. 3. The Appendix of the MR has been updated to reflect SD contributions of the project activity. Evidence for SDG 8 and SDG 12 were submitted to the VVB for verification. Comment closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR 01	
VCS Monitoring Report Template	VCS Monitoring Report Template 5.4 GHG Emission Reductions and Carbon Dioxide Removals	GHG Emission Reductions and Carbon Dioxide Removals claim: With reference to the instructions in the Monitoring Report v4.4 template, in Section 5.4 of the Monitoring Report, the table showing the breakdown of ER achieved versus ex-ante estimation should summarize	As per the MR template version 4.4, Table 1 requires the provision of Verified Carbon Units (VCUs) for the entire crediting period. However, Table 2 is specifically intended to provide ex-ante estimated VCUs and ex-post VCUs for the monitoring period only. Section 5.4 of the submitted MR aligns with these requirements as

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CAR 01	
		data for the entire project crediting period, not just the claimed monitoring periods (MP1: 23-February-2023 to 31-December-2023 and MP2: 01-January-2024 to 31-October-2024). The PP is requested to include data for MP1 in the table.	outlined in version 4.4 of the template. Therefore, the current presentation of data in Section 5.4 adheres to the prescribed guidelines.
	Round-2	No necessary changes need to be done in Table 2 of Section 5.4 of the MR. The MR templates states that Table 2 shall only contain values for the current monitoring period and not the whole crediting period. Comment closed.	

APPENDIX 5: COMPETENCY STATEMENT

COMPETENCY STATEMENT	
Name	Randulph Morales
Years of Experience	1+
QUALIFYING ROLES	
Team Leader	Yes, until 05 Jan 2025
Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) / CE Region 6 (Filipino)
Technical Expert	No
Financial Expert	No
Independent Reviewer	No
APPROVAL	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT
Date	04/08/2023

COMPETENCY STATEMENT	
Name	Manika Mongia
Years of Experience	4+
QUALIFYING ROLES	
Team Leader	Yes, 06 Jan 2025 onwards
Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) / CE Region 6 (Hindi)
Technical Expert	Yes (TA 1.1)
Financial Expert	No

Independent Reviewer	No
APPROVAL	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT
Date	27/10/2023

COMPETENCY STATEMENT	
Name	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira
Years of Experience	-
QUALIFYING ROLES	
Team Leader	No
Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English), CE Region 6 (Other language Kinyarwanda, Swahili)
Technical Expert	Yes (1.1)
Financial Expert	No
Independent Reviewer	No
APPROVAL	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT
Date	05/02/2024

COMPETENCY STATEMENT	
Name	Muskan Chawla
Years of Experience	2+
QUALIFYING ROLES	
Team Leader	Yes

Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) / CE Region 6 (Hindi)
Technical Expert	Yes (1.1, 1.2)
Financial Expert	No
Independent Reviewer	Yes
APPROVAL	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT
Date	05/09/2023