Verification and certification report form for Gold Standard project activities

BASIC INFORMATION	
Title and GS reference number of the project activity	TASC Clean Cooking PoA – VPA2 (Zimbabwe) (GS11551) TASC Clean Cooking PoA – VPA7 (Zimbabwe) (GS12144)
Scale of the project activity	☒ Large-scale ☐ Small-scale
Version number of the verification and certification report	1.2
Completion date of the verification and certification report	30/12/2025
Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period	VPA02: 5th MP (01/09/2024 - 30/11/2025) (Inclusive) VPA07: 2nd MP (14/12/2024 - 30/11/2025) (Inclusive)
Version number of the monitoring report to which this report applies	v7, 30/12/2025
Crediting period of the project activity corresponding to this monitoring period	VPA 2 (GS 11551): 23/09/2021 – 22/09/2026 VPA 7 (GS 12144): 20/04/2023 – 19/04/2028
Project representative(s)	The African Stove Company Ltd. (TASC)
Host Country	Zimbabwe
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption (TPDDTEC), version 3.1
Mandatory sectoral scopes	03 (3.1)
Conditional sectoral scopes, if applicable	-
Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring duration in the registered POA-DD/VPA-DDS	VPA02: 809,834 tCO_2e VPA07: 279,268 tCO_2e
Certified amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring period	VPA02: 734,464 tCO_2e VPA07: 289,923 tCO_2e

SDG Impacts:	1) SDG 1: No poverty 2) SDG 3: Good health and wellbeing 3) SDG 5: Gender Equality 4) SDG 7: Affordable and Clean Energy 5) SDG 8: Decent work and Economic Growth 6) SDG 12: Responsible Consumption & Production 7) SDG 13: Climate Action
Name and UNFCCC reference number of the VVB	E-0052: Carbon Check (India) Private Limited
Name, position and signature of the approver of the verification and certification report	 Amit Anand, CEO

SECTION A. Executive summary

Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. has conducted the periodic verification of the VPAs “TASC Clean Cooking PoA – VPA02 (Zimbabwe)” (GS11551) and “TASC Clean Cooking PoA – VPA07 (Zimbabwe)” (GS12144), implemented under the registered PoA titled “TASC Clean Cooking PoA” in Zimbabwe (PoA ID–GS11009), in accordance with the requirements of the Gold Standard for the Global Goals (GS4GG) /B01/. The verification covered the following monitoring periods:

a) VPA02: 5th Monitoring Period from 01/09/2024 to 30/11/2025 (inclusive)
b) VPA07: 2nd Monitoring Period from 14/12/2024 to 30/11/2025 (inclusive)

Both VPAs involve the dissemination of Kuniokoa model wood-fuel Improved Cookstoves (ICS) manufactured by Burn Manufacturing LLC with a tested thermal efficiency of 41.6% /20/. Stove distribution for VPA02 commenced on 23/09/2021 /08/, while for VPA07 distribution began on 20/04/2023 /08/.

The African Stove Company Ltd. (TASC) serves as the Coordinating/Managing Entity (CME), with Cicada Carbon Ltd. (Cicada) as a Project Participant and MyTrees Trust (MyTrees) as the Implementer for both VPAs . According to the registered PoA-DD, VPA-DDs /03/ and the Monitoring Reports /01/, both VPAs contribute to SDG achievement /21/ through the distribution and long-term use of ICS in households across Zimbabwe, reducing non-renewable biomass consumption, improving indoor air quality, and enhancing socio-economic well-being.

This Verification and Certification Report summarises carbon Check’s assessment carried out in line with GS4GG requirements /B01/ to ensure transparent monitoring, reporting, and operational consistency. Under GS4GG, verification is the independent, ex-post assessment of monitored information required to confirm achieved GHG emission reductions, while certification is the VVB’s written assurance that the verified reductions occurred during the specified period.

The objective of this verification was to verify and certify the emission reductions reported for:

- VPA 02 (GS11551) during the period of 01/09/2024 – 30/11/2025; and
- VPA 07 (GS12144) during the period of 14/12/2024 – 30/11/2025.

Carbon Check reviewed the monitoring plan /03/, the monitoring reports /01/, and evidence provided by the CME and Implementer to determine whether the monitoring methodology was applied correctly in accordance with the approved methodology TPDDTEC, Version 3.1 /B02/, and whether the monitoring data is complete, conservative, transparent, and free from material error.

The verification confirms that both VPAs have been implemented in accordance with the registered PoA-DD, VPA-DDs /03/ and comply with GS4GG requirements /B01/ and Host Party regulations. All clarifications and Corrective Action Requests (CARs), where raised were satisfactorily addressed prior to the issuance of this report.

Scope

The scope of this verification is as follows:

- To verify the project implementation and operation of both VPAs in MR /01/ against the requirements stipulated in the registered PoA-DD, VPA-DDs /03/.
- Verify that the monitoring plan and methodology TPDDTEC Version 3.1 /B02/ were implemented correctly.
- Assess whether the monitoring systems and procedures applied by the CME and Implementer align with the registered monitoring plan.
- Evaluate the reported GHG emission reduction data /02/ and confirm it is free from material misstatement.
- Ensure all reported emission reductions are adequately supported by evidence.

The verification ensures that the reported emission reductions for VPA02 and VPA07 are complete, accurate, conservative, and fit for certification under GS4GG.

Verification Process

The verification included a detailed review of the Joint Monitoring Report for both VPAs, covering their respective monitoring periods. The assessment was conducted against the requirements of the registered PoA-DD, VPA-DDs /03/, the applied methodology TPDDTEC v3.1 /B02/, and the monitoring plan.

The VVB reviewed:

- Monitoring parameters and sampling approaches /01/
- Monitoring and QC/QA procedures /01/
- Emission reduction calculation spreadsheets /02/
- Supporting documentation and field evidence /03-23/
- Records from Implementer MyTrees Trust and other project partners
- Stove distribution records, usage monitoring, and evidence trails
- Data management systems and data traceability

The verification also included on-site inspections from 03/12/2025 to 06/12/2025 and interviews with the CME (TASC), Implementer (MyTrees), distribution agents, and end-users. Field checks were performed for both VPAs in their respective geographic areas to confirm stove presence, usability, and monitoring integrity.

The verification team assessed whether:

- The monitoring methodology was applied correctly
- The monitoring system was implemented and maintained appropriately
- Collected data was reliable, conservative, and free from material misstatement
- The project activities remained in accordance with registered documentation

All clarifications, Corrective Action Requests (CARs), and Forward Action Requests (FARs), where raised, were addressed satisfactorily before finalizing this report. Attached in appendix 4.

Conclusion

Based on the document review, field visits, monitoring assessment, and interviews, Carbon Check concludes that the Monitoring Report /01/ for both VPA02 and VPA07 comply with the requirements of the Gold Standard for the Global Goals (GS4GG) /B01/. Both VPAs were implemented in

accordance with TPDDTEC v3.1 /B02/, the registered PoA-DD, VPA-DDs /03/, and the approved monitoring plan.

The monitoring systems were installed, maintained, and operated appropriately, and the monitored data was found to be consistent, traceable, and adequate to support the verified GHG emission reductions. Carbon Check is therefore pleased to issue a positive verification opinion reflected in the Certification Statement.

Verified Emission Reductions
The verified emission reductions for the two VPAs, based on the review of monitoring data and field verification, are as follows:

VPAs	Vintage	VERs (tCO_2e)	Total
VPA 02	01/09/2024 – 31/12/2024	195,319	734,464
	01/01/2025 – 30/11/2025	539,145	
VPA 07	14/12/2024 – 31/12/2024	14,826	289,923
	01/01/2025 – 30/11/2025	275,097	

Carbon Check, acting as the Validation & Verification Body (VVB), is therefore pleased to issue a positive verification opinion, as presented in the accompanying Certification Statement, confirming that the emission reductions for both VPAs during the respective monitoring periods have been correctly monitored, calculated, and reported.

SECTION B. Verification team, technical reviewer and approver

B.1. Verification team member

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of VVB or outsourced entity)	Involvement in			
						Desk/document review	On-site inspection	Interviews	Verification findings
1.	Team Leader/Technical Expert	IR	Raj	Piyush	Carbon Check	X	X	X	X
2.	Trainee Assessor	IR	Areaya	Temesgen	Carbon Check	X	-	-	X
3.	Local Expert	ER	Liberty	Mandishona	Carbon Check	-	X	X	-

B.2. Technical reviewer and approver of the verification and certification report

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of VVB or outsourced entity)
1.	Technical reviewer	ER	Seshan	Ranganathan	Carbon Check
2	Approver	IR	Anand	Amit	Carbon Check

SECTION C. Means of verification

C.1. Desk/document review

The verification was primarily conducted through a comprehensive desk review of the Monitoring Report/01/ and all supporting documentation submitted by the CME. This included an assessment of the completeness, consistency, and traceability of monitoring data, as well as a review of the applied monitoring plan and the requirements of the approved methodology TPDDTEC v3.1 /B02/. All relevant project documentation, records, and evidence were evaluated to determine compliance with the registered PoA-DD, VPA-DDs /B04/ and GS4GG requirements /B01/.

A detailed list of documents reviewed is provided in Appendix 3..

C.2. On-site inspection

An On-site inspection was conducted from 03/12/2025 to 06/12/2025 /15/, during which the Team Leader and Local Expert carried out field checks, interviews, and simple random sampling activities for both VPAs. The purpose of the site visit was to verify the physical presence and continued use of distributed stoves, assess the effectiveness of monitoring procedures, and confirm the accuracy of reported data.

The on-site inspection was implemented in accordance with the Site Visit and Remote Audit Requirements and Procedures, Version 2.0 /B05/. Specifically, the approach followed the provisions outlined in Section 3.1.1(b) of /B05/, ensuring that the audit met all procedural and quality requirements established under GS4GG.

C.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee		Date	Subject	Team member
	Name	Affiliation			
/01/	Machalin Parsaramen	TASC	03/12/2025 to 06/12/2025	MR preparation, GS requirements, Emission reduction calculations, methodology applicability, start date justification, Project Design, ownership	Piyush Raj, Mandishona Liberty

/02/	Guy Hammond	Cicada Carbon		details, carbon credit ownership arrangements, monitoring and reporting arrangements, QA/QC procedures, baseline assessment, Project technology etc.	
/03/	Mcdonald Munezi				
/04/	Regina Marumahoko	Cicada Carbon	03/12/2025 to 06/12/2025		Piyush Raj, Liberty Mandishona
/05/	Eiman Mosiya	My Tress Trust – Field Officer			
/06/	Faszayin Mugumbate				
/07/	Welsie Nyatsine				
/08/	Simbarashe Bhiza				
/09/	Esther Kawocha				
/10/	Washington Enock			Details of survey, methodology, Survey results, QA/QC procedure etc.	
/11/	Rebecca Matekenga				
/12/	Malcom Ndaza				
/13/	Tondorai Ndaza				
/14/	Albrischurs Chibayamagora				
/15/	Christabel Sirimina				
/16/	Perfect Mbwana				
/17/	Elozabeth Kurwakumire				
/18/	Ephraim Mumba	End User - KPT Survey (ZM90350)	03/12/2025 to 06/12/2025	KPT Survey, VPA 2	Piyush Raj, Liberty Mandishona
/19/	Kulson Chikoko	End User - KPT Survey (ZM96465)			
/20/	Win Kafamauro	End User - KPT Survey (ZM32892)			
/21/	Mlota Admire	End User - KPT Survey (ZM102772)			
/22/	Sarah Musona	End User - KPT Survey (ZM82745)			
/23/	Alice Suwari	End User -			

		KPT Survey (ZM82591)			
/24/	Cain Goremusandu	End User - KPT Survey (ZM110208)			
/25/	Dina Zvigadza	End User - KPT Survey (ZM97920)			
/26/	Roseline Bunhu	End User - KPT Survey (ZM111146)			
/27/	Fungai Kasosera	End User - KPT Survey (ZM81867)			
/28/	Enarah Tembo	End User - KPT Survey (ZM37948)			
/29/	Grace Chakamanga	End User - KPT Survey (ZM126603)	03/12/2025 to 06/12/2025	KPT Survey, VPA 7	Piyush Raj, Liberty Mandishona
/30/	Bessie Muruka	End User - KPT Survey (ZM120770)			
/31/	Victor Bhasera	End User - KPT Survey (ZM118235)			
/32/	Matava Netsai	End User - KPT Survey (ZM126053)			
/33/	Rodger Komechi	End User - KPT Survey (TZM4S2E)			
/34/	Knowledge Chiweshe	End User - KPT Survey (ZM134603)			
/35/	Angeline Maponga	End User - KPT Survey (TZM33T5)			
/36/	Nyasha Chakanyuka	End User - KPT Survey (ZM130389)			
/37/	Losewinter Dzobo	End User - KPT Survey (TZM49HC)			
/38/	Beauty Zindimo	End User - KPT Survey (ZM129132)			
/39/	Phannuel Siachikalanga	End User - KPT Survey (TZM4N7K)			
/40/	Mascline Nhamburom	End User - KPT Survey (TZM33TR)			
/41/	Cardwell Siamanjira	End User – MS (ZM40626)	03/12/2025 to 06/12/2025		Piyush Raj, Liberty

/42/	Gift Murubira	End User – MS (ZM97418)		VPA 2 Monitoring/Habit Survey, Grievnace Mechanism, SDG contribution	Mandishona
/43/	Elias Pambele	End User – MS (ZM105479)			
/44/	Juliet Chituwi	End User – MS (ZM01953)			
/45/	Sandra Wasakara	End User – MS (ZM113737)			
/46/	Sosana Phiri	End User – MS (ZM02161)			
/47/	Obert Kadawafewa	End User – MS (ZM24496)			
/48/	Linda Kagoro	End User – MS (ZM102011)			
/49/	Susan Chisaira	End User – MS (ZM89849)			
/50/	Spiwe Beremani	End User – MS (ZM104417)			
/51/	Isable Kavande	End User – MS (ZM103656)			
/52/	Abhisha Cheitewere	End User – MS (ZM31077)			
/53/	Tabeth Dema	End User – MS (ZM95737)			
/54/	Hamunyari Beremauro	End User – MS (ZM123000)	03/12/2025 to 06/12/2025	VPA 7 Monitoring/Habit Survey, Grievnace Mechanism, SDG contribution	Piyush Raj, Liberty Mandishona
/55/	Elizabeth Magwira	End User – MS (ZM122775)			
/56/	Joyce Zingora	End User – MS (ZM121298)			
/57/	Quizzyline Ben	End User – MS (TZM43AK)			
/58/	Manuel Madhangi	End User – MS (ZM133206)			
/59/	Takesure Sibanda	End User – MS (ZM121086)			
/60/	Erina Mukawo	End User – MS			

		(ZM126456)			
/61/	Angeline Yotam	End User – MS (ZM112694)			
/62/	Grace Mudyanegava	End User – MS (ZM136680)			
/63/	Gladys Zindimo	End User – MS (TZM29ER)			
/64/	Rudo Chavi	End User – MS (TZM4F3F)			
/65/	Valentine Gupa	End User – MS (ZM134754)			
/66/	Ottilia Chitate	End User – MS (TZM448R)			
/67/	Loveness Chigumise	End User – MS (ZM93634)	03/12/2025 to 06/12/2025	(VPA 2 + VPA 7) Monitoring/Habit Survey, Grievnace Mechanism, SDG contribution	Piyush Raj, Liberty Mandishona
/68/	Tendai Mundodzo	End User – MS (ZM18493)			
/69/	Aaron Hmunyari	End User – MS (ZM24760)			
/70/	Leeroy Mubvirakanda	End User – MS (ZM17464)			
/71/	Edmores Zunza	End User – MS (ZM86769)			
/72/	Vimbai Chigwagwa	End User – MS (ZM85343)			
/73/	Raginai Kachuwende	End User – MS (ZM81339)			
/74/	Dorcas Taruvinga	End User – MS (ZM37403)			
/75/	Esther Chimwanja	End User – MS (ZM40444)			
/76/	Vusa Sibanda	End User – MS (ZM39452)			
/77/	Rudo Chinembiri	End User – MS (ZM47911)			

C.4. Application of materiality

Consideration of materiality in planning the verification

No.	Risk that could lead to material errors, omissions or misstatements	Assessment of the risk		Response to the risk in the verification plan and/or sampling plan
		Risk level	Justification	
1.	Human Error: Recording and reporting of the information in the ER spreadsheet.	Medium	All the ER spreadsheet data of the ICSs including sales database, determination of parameters for efficiency testing including data calculation. This includes all the parameters to be monitored ex-post as per the PDD	The risk has been mitigated by reviewing the training records of the personnel involved in the data capture and calculations. The monitoring responsibilities were reviewed. Also, the ER data/calculations have been cross-checked to ensure the error free data.
2.	Information System: Use of spreadsheets without adequate controls related to data changes/updates, version tracking, traceability, security	Medium	The data is recorded in spreadsheets based on the raw data collected during the field visits. Access the spreadsheets for calculation of ERs, monitoring and sales database and baseline stove efficiency testing, project & baseline KPT, and other quality test records.	The identified risk has been mitigated by reviewing the management of access to the records. It has been confirmed through interviews whether the raw data is collected by the field personnel and then transmitted and stored electronically to the PP's office. The data quality control has been checked.
3.	Accuracy of the measuring equipment	High	Check the calibration records for the measurement equipment used for KPT.	The risk due to accuracy of the measuring equipment has been ensured by planning to check calibration certificates/purchase records /16/ of the measuring equipment used for KPT.
4.	Sample	Medium	The sample size is not suitable; or the surveyed houses are not random	Cross-check the procedure to identify the sample size against the sampling guideline and standard and confirm the sample size is calculated correctly.
5.	Competence of personnel involved in conducting standardized tests viz., monitoring survey, WBT, Usage Survey, and another quality test etc.	Low	Interview the personnel involved and check the training records/accreditation certificates involved in conducting such tests.	The risk has been mitigated by reviewing the training records/10/ of the personnel conducting such tests and following the monitoring responsibilities. The training records/10/ have been reviewed which also has been

				confirmed during the onsite interviews.

C.5. Sampling approach

The target population for both VPAs is considered homogeneous; therefore, the CME applied a simple random sampling approach using 90/10 as confidence/precision level, consistent with the requirements of the applied methodology TPDDTEC v3.1 /B02/. The sampling design and sample size determination followed the *Guidelines for Sampling and Surveys For CDM Project Activities and Programme of Activities Ver. 4.0* /B05/ in accordance with paragraph 27 of the sampling standard.

In accordance with paragraph 27 of the Sampling Standard /B05/, the verification team also applied a simple random sampling approach during on-site interviews for both VPAs. The CME conducted monitoring surveys /04/ for each VPA using the same statistical framework, and the VVB applied acceptance sampling as per paragraph 39(c) of the Sampling Standard, Version 09 /B04/.

For the user habit survey, a sample size of 11 was selected based on an Acceptable Quality Level (AQL) of 0.5%, an Upper Quality Level (UQL) of 20%, and symmetric producer and consumer risk levels of 10%. The acceptance number (c) was 0, meaning no discrepancies were allowable. Following the same methodology, the Kitchen Performance Test (KPT) survey /05/ also required a sample size of 11, with an acceptance number of c = 0.

During the on-site verification, the monitoring survey data /11/ for both VPAs were cross-checked. No discrepancies were identified in any of the selected samples; therefore, the PP's monitoring datasets were accepted in accordance with §33 of the Sampling Standard, Version 09 /B05/.

Sampling Summary – VPA02

Parameter	Verification approach	Population (for VVB's sample)	VVB's Sample Size
Usage & monitoring surveys /07/	Acceptance Sampling	102	11
KPT Surveys/08/	Acceptance Sampling	62	11

Sampling Summary – VPA07

Parameter	Verification approach	Population (for VVB's sample)	VVB's Sample Size
Usage & monitoring surveys /07/	Acceptance Sampling	102	11
KPT Surveys/08/	Acceptance Sampling	55	11

Sampling Summary – VPA02 and VPA 07

Parameter	Verification approach	Population (for VVB's sample)	VVB's Sample Size

Usage & monitoring surveys /07/	Acceptance Sampling	103	11

The details of the samples interviewed for both VPA02 and VPA07 are provided in Section C.3 (List of Interviewed Persons). No discrepancies were identified in any of the 33 samples selected for the user habit surveys or the 22 samples selected for the KPT surveys, resulting in an acceptance number of c = 0, meaning no discrepant records were observed. According, the PP's monitoring datasets for both VPAs have been accepted in accordance with §33 of the Sampling Standard (Version 09.0) /B05/.

For the impact parameters, the CME prepared and implemented structured questionnaires during field surveys. The verification team cross-checked all sampled impact parameter records during the on-site inspections and confirmed that no inconsistencies were found. The training and competency records of personnel /10/ responsible for conducting surveys and KPTs were reviewed and verified to be adequate. The team also interviewed these personnel to ensure that procedures, measurement methods, and quality control protocols were correctly understood and consistently applied. Overall, the sampling techniques used for both VPAs were found to be appropriate, and the sample collectors demonstrated sufficient competence to carry out their tasks in line with the approved methodology and sampling standard requirements.

C.6. Clarification requests (CLs), corrective action requests (CARs) and forward action requests (FARs) raised

The VVB has raised 03 clarifications (CLs) and 04 corrective action requests (CARs) which are satisfactorily closed. 00 forward action requests (FAR) are raised.

SECTION D. Verification findings

D.1. Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form

Means of verification	Document Review, Interview
Findings	CAR 01 is raised. Please refer Appendix 4 for further details.
Conclusion	Carbon Check confirms that the Monitoring Report submitted for VPA02 and VPA07 (v7, dated 30/12/2025) /01/ have been prepared using the Gold Standard Monitoring Report Template, Version 1.1 dated 14/10/2020 /B04/, which remains the latest applicable template. Both Monitoring Reports have been reviewed against the relevant GS4GG guidelines, PoA-DD/VPA-DD requirements, and the applied methodology TPDDTEC v3.1 /B02/. All issues identified during the verification process for the two VPAs have been addressed and satisfactorily resolved by the CME. Section A.3 – Reference of Applied Methodology (Subject to closure of finding) For both VPA02 and VPA07, the list of methodologies and methodological tools referenced by the applied methodology has now been fully updated. All references have been corrected to eliminate inconsistencies and ensure methodological completeness in accordance with the Gold Standard Monitoring Report Template requirements.

	Based on the clarifications, revised documents, and corrective actions submitted by the CME, all previously identified deficiencies for both VPAs have been satisfactorily addressed. The Monitoring Reports for VPA02 and VPA07 are now considered complete, consistent with the applied methodology, and fully compliant with the Gold Standard Monitoring Report Template Version 1.1 /B06/.

D.2. Remaining forward action requests from validation and/or previous verifications

During the design review and previous verification cycles, several Forward Action Requests (FARs) were raised for VPA02 and VPA07. The status of each FAR has been assessed as part of this verification.

VPA07 – Forward Action Requests from Validation

FAR 1:

"The verifying VVB shall check and confirm whether the target communities/regions of the VPA overlap with other VPAs covered under the PoA. The Project Developer shall clarify the measures undertaken to avoid any double counting of emission reductions."

As part of this verification, the VVB reviewed the geographic distribution maps, stove tracking records, and household allocation procedures for all VPAs under the PoA. The CME confirmed that VPA07 operates in distinct, non-overlapping geographic zones, and stove IDs are uniquely assigned and traceable. No overlap with other VPAs was identified. This FAR is **closed**.

VPA02 – Forward Action Requests from Validation

FAR 1:

"Since the validation was conducted through a remote audit, the VVB must ensure that a physical site visit is mandatorily undertaken at the time of the first verification in accordance with §3.2.2 of the Site Visit and Remote Audit Requirements and Procedures v1.0."

A physical site visit was completed by the verifying VVB during the **first verification of VPA02**, fulfilling this requirement. This FAR is **closed**.

FAR 2:

"The Project Developer shall conduct a physical stakeholder consultation prior to the next verification. The VVB shall verify this."

The physical stakeholder consultation was conducted on 15/11/2022, followed by an LSC Feedback Round from 09/01/2023 to 11/02/2023. The LSC Report ('TASC GS11009 – Stakeholder-Consultation-Report Zimbabwe_v1.0') was submitted to SustainCERT during the first verification/performance review. Documentation was reviewed and confirmed. This FAR is closed.

FAR 3:

"The CME shall conduct a baseline KPT to determine the value of By before the first verification."

Baseline KPTs were conducted from 24/01/2022 to 27/01/2022, and the results and calculation sheets were included in the Monitoring Report for the first verification. This FAR is **closed**.

FAR from the 1st Performance Review of VPA02

FAR 1:

"For all future verifications, the VVB shall clearly describe how the monitored SDGs were assessed, the verification method used, and the type of interview questions applied to confirm compliance with SDG parameters."

This FAR applies directly to the VVB.
During the current verification, the VVB assessed SDG monitoring through:

- Review of in-person habit survey tools and sampling procedures
- Review and verification of KPT implementation for impact parameters
- Interviews with CME, Implementer staff, and sampled households
- Review of data collection methods, questionnaires, and QC/QA procedures

The VVB concludes that the SDG monitoring approach applied by the CME complies with both the MR requirements and GS4GG guidelines. This FAR is addressed in this verification report and is now considered closed.

D.3. Compliance of the project implementation and operation with the registered project design document

Means of verification	Document Review, Interview
Findings	CL 01 is raised. Please refer Appendix 4 for further details.
Conclusion	Based on document review, on-site verification activities, household interviews, and cross-checks against the registered PoA-DD/VPA-DDs, the verification team confirms that the implementation and operation of **VPA02** and **VPA07** are consistent with the registered project design documents. For VPA07, the starting date of stove distribution is 20/04/2023, as confirmed through the registered PoA-DD/VPA-DDS /03/, while for VPA02, the commencement of stove deployment was verified to have occurred on 23/09/2021, supported by documentation reviewed during the audit /15/. The verification team observed that the actual project boundaries correspond fully with those defined in the registered design documents, and no inconsistencies were identified during the field inspection. Through on-site visits and interviews with a representative sample of end users, Carbon Check confirmed that the project cookstoves under both VPAs remain operational and in active use within the households. Each stove is uniquely identified by a permanent identification number that is physically marked on the stove body and consistently recorded in the project database, together with end user details such as name, address, stove technology type, and commissioning date. These identifiers were cross-checked against the database /06/ entries and end-user agreements, and were found to be accurate. In total, 39,672 stoves have

	been distributed under VPA07 since the project start date, while a total of 79,000 stoves have been distributed under VPA02, as verified through the MR /01/ and distribution database /06/. No changes have been observed that could impact the additionality of either VPA. Specifically, there have been no modifications to installed technologies, no addition or removal of project sites, and no changes to operational parameters that influence emission reductions under the control of the Project Participant. Further, there have been no revisions affecting the applicability of the baseline and monitoring methodology "Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Energy Consumption" (Version 3.1) /B02/. The verification team also confirms that all end users have relinquished their rights to carbon credits as documented in the submitted evidence /07/, and that the unique identification and tracking of all ICSs eliminate the risk of double counting, even with both VPAs being implemented within the same host country. It is noted that no changes have been observed or identified, that may impact the additionality. No addition of component nor extension of technology, no addition nor removal of project sites, no change of values of the actual operational parameter relevant to determination of emission reductions which are within the control of the PP; no change has been observed or identified that may impact the scale of the project activity or applicability of baseline and monitoring methodology Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Energy Consumption (version 3.1) /B02/. The first ICS distribution was commissioned from 20/04/2023 for VPA 7 and 23/09/2021 for VPA 2. A total of 39,672 (VPA 7) cookstoves were distributed since the VPA start date while a total of 79,000 stoves have been distributed under VPA02, as verified through the MR /01/ and distribution database /06/. Upon reviewing the Monitoring Report /01/ and comparing it against the registered PoA-DD/VPA-DDs /03/, the verification team confirms the internal consistency of monitored data, monitoring procedures, and compliance with the monitoring plan. The project activities under VPA02 and VPA07 are implemented in accordance with the registered design documentation, and the actual operation is consistent with the registered or revised PoA-DD/VPA-DDS /03/. The applied methodology /B02/ and monitoring requirements have been followed appropriately, and the Monitoring Report for the current period is aligned with all applicable rules and procedures. The verification team also reviewed the functioning of the grievance redress mechanism and confirms that an effective system is in place. No Grievances recorded for the current monitoring period, as documented in /09/ and in Section G.1 of the Monitoring Report /01/.. In conclusion, the verification team confirms that the monitoring period is appropriate and that the project activities under both VPA02 and VPA07 are being implemented and operated in accordance with the registered or revised PoA-DD/VPA-DDS /03/. The monitoring requirements have been met, and no deviations or issues have been identified that would affect the eligibility or integrity of the emission reductions generated during the monitoring period.proect activity is in accordance with the registered/revised POA-DD/VPA-DDS /03/.

D.4. Post-registration changes

D.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents[1]

Not applicable

D.4.2. Corrections

For VPA07, no corrections were identified or required.

For VPA02, two corrections were noted in relation to parameters established during validation:

Parameter Bb,y – Annual Quantity of Fuelwood Used in the Baseline Scenario

The VPA-DD initially indicated a value of 6.3056 tonnes of wood per household per annum, derived using national statistics. A Forward Action Request (FAR 3) was raised requiring a baseline KPT prior to the first verification. This FAR has been fully addressed, and based on the baseline KPT results, the corrected value of 5.4880 tonnes of wood per household per annum has been applied in line with empirical field data.

Parameter EFb,I,nonCO_2 – Non-CO_2 Emission Factor for Fuel Combustion

The VPA02-DD listed the value as 0.56 tCO_2/tfuel. This has been corrected to 0.5588 tCO_2/tfuel, reflecting the unrounded methodological value. The corrected value is more conservative and therefore strengthens the integrity of the emission reduction estimate.

All corrections have been assessed and deemed accurate and compliant with the applied methodology and monitoring requirements.

D.4.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

No changes to the start date of the crediting period were identified for either VPA02 or VPA07.

D.4.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan

No changes involving the inclusion of a new monitoring plan occurred during the verification period.

D.4.5. Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents

No permanent deviations or revisions from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology were reported for either VPA02 or VPA07.

D.4.6. Changes to the project design

For VPA07, no changes to the project design were identified.

For VPA02, a revision was applied to the fNRB value used for emission reduction calculations. The value was updated from 0.89 to 0.79 starting in the 4th monitoring period. This adjustment is based

[1] Other standards, methodologies, methodological tools and guidelines (to be) applied in accordance with the applied(selected) methodologies are collectively referred to as the other (applied) methodological regulatory documents).

on the most recent and conservative fNRB assessment for Zimbabwe, prepared by Promethium Carbon on 14 June 2024. The same fNRB value (0.79) is also used in VPA07 (GS 12144), ensuring methodological consistency across VPAs implemented in the same host country.

D.4.7. Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities

The project activities under both VPAs do not fall under afforestation or reforestation categories.

D.5. Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with applied methodologies, applied standardized baselines, and other applied methodological regulatory documents

Means of verification	Document Review, Interview
Findings	No finding raised.
Conclusion	The verification team reviewed and confirmed that the monitoring plan described in the registered VPA-DD /03/ and the associated methodological tools has been correctely and consistently applied for both VPAs during the current monitoring period. Based on the document review and in-site interviews with enumerators, project staff, stakeholders, and end users, the verification team verified that the monitoring procedures for VPA02 and VPA07 have been implemented in accordance with the requirements of the registered VPA-DDs /03/ and in full alignment with the applied methodology TPDDTEC Version 3.1 /B02/. The verification took cognizance of GS4GG VVS, version 02.0 /B01/.

D.6. Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan

D.6.1. Data and parameters fixed ex-ante or at renewal of crediting period

Means of verification	Document Review, Interview
Findings	No finding raised.
Conclusion	The verification team has reviewed whether the monitoring activities have been conducted in full compliance with the registered monitoring plan as per the VPA - DD /03/ and Gold Standard requirements /B01/. This includes verification of monitoring procedures, data collection processes, and QA/QC measures. The following parameters have been fixed ex-ante for the VPA considered under this monitoring period:

Parameter	Description of the parameter	Value (VPA 2 / VPA 7)	Source	Assessment by VT
$B_{b,y}$	Quantity of fuel consumed in baseline scenario b during year y, in tonnes	VPA 2: 5.4880 tonnes VPA 7: 5.4880 tonnes	Baseline kitchen performance tests (KPTs)	The values are consistent with the registered VPA-DDs for VPA 2 and VPA 7 /03/ and correctly applied as fixed ex-ante parameters for the crediting period.
$EF_{b,i,CO2}$	CO_2 emission factor for fuel type i in baseline scenario	Fuelwood: 1.68 $tCO_2/tfuel$ (VPA 2 & VPA 7)	2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.2, Ch.2, Table 2.5	The value is consistent with the registered VPA-DDs /03/ for VPA 2 and VPA 7 and

				fixed ex-ante for the crediting period.
$EF_{b,i,nonCO2}$	Non-CO_2 emission factor for fuel type i in baseline scenario	Fuelwood: 0.5588 $tCO_2/tfuel$ (VPA 2 & VPA 7)	2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.2, Ch.2, Table 2.5	The value is consistent with the registered VPA-DDs /03/ for VPA 2 and VPA 7 and fixed ex-ante for the crediting period.
$EF_{p,i,CO2}$	CO_2 emission factor for fuel type i in project scenario	Fuelwood: 1.68 $tCO_2/tfuel$ (VPA 2 & VPA 7)	2006 IPCC Guidelines, Ch.2, Table 2.9; Gold Standard Cookstove Methodology	The value is consistent with included VPA -DD /03/ and fixed ex -ante for the duration of the crediting period.
$EF_{p,i,nonCO2}$	Non-CO_2 emission factor for fuel type i in project scenario	Fuelwood: 0.5588 $tCO_2/tfuel$ (VPA 2 & VPA 7)	2006 IPCC Guidelines, Ch.2, Table 2.9; Gold Standard Cookstove Methodology	The value is consistent with the registered VPA-DDs /03/ for VPA 2 and VPA 7 and fixed ex-ante for the crediting period.
$NCV_{b,i}$	Net calorific value of the fuel type i used in the baseline	Fuelwood: 0.015 TJ/tonne (VPA 2 & VPA 7)	2006 IPCC Guidelines, Ch.1, Table 1.2	The value is consistent with the registered VPA-DDs /03/ for VPA 2 and VPA 7 and fixed ex-ante for the crediting period.
$NCV_{p,i}$	Net calorific value of the fuel type i used in the project scenario	Fuelwood: 0.015 TJ/tonne (VPA 2 & VPA 7)	2006 IPCC Guidelines, Ch.1, Table 1.2	The value is consistent with the registered VPA-DDs /03/ for VPA 2 and VPA 7 and fixed ex-ante for the crediting period.
$f_{NRB,b,i,y}$	Fraction of biomass used in year y for baseline scenario b that can be established as non-renewable biomass	Fuelwood: 0.79 (VPA 2 & VPA 7)	fNRB Assessment for Zimbabwe (Promethium Carbon, 2024)	The value is consistent with the registered VPA-DDs for VPA 2 and VPA 7 /03/ and appropriately fixed ex-ante for the crediting period.

In light of these assessments and taking cognizance of para. 17.2 of GS4GG VVS, version 2.0 /B01/, the verification team concludes that all data and parameters fixed ex ante have been implemented in full compliance with the registered monitoring plan. This finding is therefore considered resolved, with no outstanding issues is remaining.

D.6.2. Data and parameters monitored

<table>
<tr><td>Means of verification</td><td>Document Review, Interview</td></tr>
<tr><td>Findings</td><td>CL 02 was raised and closed satisfactorily. Please refer Appendix 4 for further details.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Conclusion</td><td>The verification team confirms that the data and parameters monitored are in compliance with the registered PoA-DD/VPA-DDS /03/ and the monitoring plan.
<table>
<tr><th>SDGs</th><th>Parameter</th><th>Value (VPA 2 / VPA 7)</th><th>Assessment by Verification Team (VT)</th></tr>
<tr><td>13</td><td>Quantity of fuel consumed in project scenario (Bp,y,i)</td><td>0.8129 tons/household-day (VPA 2) /

0.8878 tons/household-day (VPA 7)</td><td>VT confirms values are derived from baseline Kitchen Performance Tests (KPTs) /05/ conducted from 17/06/2025 to 02/08/2025 for VPA 2 and from 16/06/2025 to 04/07/2025 for VPA 7, consistent with the respective VPA-DDs /03/ (VPA 2-DD / VPA 7-DD) and applied methodology /B02/. Data is acceptable for emission reduction calculations.</td></tr>
<tr><td>13</td><td>Usage rate in project scenario p during year y ($U_{p,y}$)</td><td>90% (VPA 2) / 90% (VPA 7)</td><td>The parameter Up,y has been assessed based on the Usage Rate Surveys: VPA 2 – 5th Project Habit Survey conducted from 21/05/2025 to 24/07/2025 /04/; VPA 7 – 2nd Project Habit Survey conducted from 21/05/2025 to 03/07/2025 as well as Joint Habit survey for both VPAs from 10/11/2025 to 30/11/2025 for MP more than 365 days/04/. The verification team also conducted interviews with officers responsible for survey implementation. The team confirms that the applied methodology aligns with the approved VPA-DDs /03/ approach and that the data is suitable for use in emission reduction calculations.</td></tr>
<tr><td>13</td><td>Project technologies credited (units) ($N_{p,y}$)</td><td>79,000 (VPA 2) / 39,672 (VPA 7)</td><td>As reported in the Monitoring Report /01/ and supported by the sales and distribution record database /06/, the Np,y values for both VPA 2 and VPA 7 are deemed correct. The verification team confirms that the reported numbers reflect the actual project technologies listed in the Monitoring Database and are acceptable for use in the emission reduction calculations for the current monitoring period.</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
</table>

	13	Leakage in project scenario p during year y ($LE_{p,y}$)	0 (VPA 2 & VPA 7)	The leakage assessment confirms no leakage sources applicable for this activity. The verification team reviewed the qualitative/quantitative justification and agrees that a leakage value of zero is consistent with the VPA-DD /03/ and methodology /B02/.
	1	Proportion of population living in households with access to basic services (BSA/HHS)	79,000 (VPA 2) ICS in use 39,672 (VPA 7) ICS in use	Based on Monitoring Database distribution records and ex-post usage surveys, the verification team confirms that the values represent ICS in operation and align with the VPA-DD. Data is suitable for SDG 1 reporting.
	3	Air Quality in project households (SPM_{HH})	97% (VPA 2) 100% (VPA 7)	Based on ex-post Habitat surveys /04/ assessing perceived smoke/PM reduction, the verification team confirms that the survey approach is consistent with the VPA-DDs /03/ and methodology /B02/. The values are supported and acceptable for SDG 3 reporting.
	5	% of households reporting time savings (HHTS)	96% (VPA 2) 100% (VPA 7)	The verification team verified the Ex-post Monitoring Survey results on time saved during cooking. The applied values are consistent with the Monitoring Report /01/, and the survey approach is in line with the requirements of the registered VPA-DDs (VPA 2-DD / VPA 7-DD) and the applicable methodology.
	7	Households with access to reliable energy ($AACS_{HH}$)	79,000 (VPA 2) / 39,672 (VPA 7)	VT confirmed number of ICS distributed under each VPA from the Monitoring Database /06/. Reported Values in MR are consistent with distribution database.
	8	Quantitative employment & income generation (QE IG)	24 employees (VPA 2 & VPA 7)	VT confirmed number of employment generated both both VPA combined from the Employment records /12/. Reported Values in MR are consistent with records and SDG tool /21/.
	12	Domestic fuel savings (By,savings)	4.6752 t (VPA 2) / 4.6003 t (VPA 7)	VT confirmed fuel savings via KPT survey data /05/. Values consistent with applied methodology /B02/ and VPA-DDs (VPA 2-DD / VPA 7-DD).

	It is confirmed that the verification team assessed the data/information flow from the point of monitoring to emission reduction calculation and found no gap in the same. Please refer to Annex 2 for an assessment of each parameter.

D.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan

Means of verification	Document Review, Interview
Findings	CAR 04 is raised. Please refer Appendix 4 for further details.
Conclusion	The verification team reviewed the sampling approach and survey implementation described in the Monitoring Report /01/ and confirms that the CME applied the requirements of the TPDDTEC Version 3.1 /B02/ and the sampling and survey standard /B05/. A simple random sampling method was used, which is appropriate given the homogeneity of the target population across both VPAs. For the Habit Surveys, the methodology requires a minimum of 100 samples for populations greater than 1,000. In line with this requirement, the CME initially selected 140 households to allow for oversampling, from which 102 households were successfully surveyed in VPA 2 and 102 households in VPA 7. And for monitoring period more than one year CME has conducted joint Habit survey for both VPA and surveyed 103 samples. Sampling procedures were applied correctly, and the achieved sample sizes meet methodological requirements. The resulting 90% usage rate for both VPAs is supported by survey evidence and is acceptable for use in emission reduction calculations. For the KPTs, the sample size was determined using the CDM sample size calculator and the TPDDTEC requirements /B02/, resulting in a minimum target of 45 samples for each VPA to meet 90/10 precision. Oversampling was conducted, with 65 KPTs completed for VPA 2 (of which 62 valid samples were retained) and 55 KPTs completed for VPA 7 (all 55 samples valid). Outlier treatment and statistical analysis were reviewed and found consistent with methodological guidance. The verification team confirms that the final sample sizes and resulting precision meet the requirements of the applied methodology. Based on the review of sampling methods, implementation, and QA/QC procedures, the verification team concludes that sampling activities for both VPA 2 and VPA 7 were correctly executed and are acceptable for verification purposes.

D.7. Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments

Means of verification	Document Review, Interview
Findings	No finding raised.
Conclusion	The verification team assessed the compliance of measurement instruments used during the pKPT surveys for VPA 2 and VPA 7 with the calibration and procurement-age requirements stipulated in the applied methodology /B02/ and monitoring plan in the registered VPA-DDs (VPA 2-DD / VPA 7-DD). Following measurements instruments were used:

Instrument	Purchase Date/Calibration date
Ryobi MM-210 2 in 1 moisture testers	09/06/2025

	ACCUD 75kg x 10g (0.01kg resolution) scales | 19/05/2025 The CME provided purchase documentation and manufacturer specifications /16/, supported by invoices /11/, for the moisture meters (Ryobi MM-210) and digital weighing scales (ACCUD 75 kg × 10 g). Both instruments were purchased on 09/06/2025 and 19/05/2025, respectively /16/. These procurement dates fall within 12 months prior to the KPT implementation periods, satisfying the methodology requirement that measurement devices must be either newly purchased or calibrated within one year prior to use. The pKPT surveys were conducted as follows: • VPA 2: 17/06/2025 – 02/08/2025 • VPA 7: 16/06/2025 – 04/07/2025 Since the methodology /B02/ does not mandate periodic recalibration when devices are newly purchased within one year of survey implementation, the verification team confirms that both instruments meet the validity and calibration requirements for the monitoring period under review.

D.8. Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals

D.8.1. Calculation of baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	Document Review, Interview
Findings	No finding raised.
Conclusion	The Verification Team has reviewed the baseline emissions calculations for the current monitoring period prepared by the CME and confirms that the calculations have been performed in accordance with the formulae and procedures set out in the registered VPA-DDs /B04/ and the applied methodology TPDDTEC v3.1 /B02/. Specifically, the Verification Team reviewed the following: the expansion formula: $BE_{b,y}$ Baseline emissions for baseline scenario b in year y (tCO_2e/yr) $BE_{b,y} = \sum_{b,p} N_{p,y} * U_{p,y} * (ER_{b,p,y,CO2} + ER_{b,p,y,nonCO2}) - \sum LE_{p,y}$ Where: $\sum_{b,p}$ Sum over all relevant (baseline b) couples $N_{p,y}$ Cumulative number of project technology-days included in the sales/distribution database for project scenario p against baseline scenario b in year y $U_{p,y}$ Cumulative usage rate for technologies in baseline scenario p in year y, $ER_{b,p,y,CO2}$ Specific CO_2 emission savings for an individual technology of Baseline b in year y, in tCO_2/day as derived from the statistical analysis of the data collected from the field tests

	$ER_{b,p,y,nonCO2}$ Specific non-CO_2 emission savings for an individual technology of Baseline b in year y, in tCO_2/day as derived from the statistical analysis of the data collected from the field tests $ER_{b,p,y,CO2}$= $\sum_i \{ f_{NRB,b,i,y} * B_{b,y,i} * NCV_{b,i} * EF_{b,i,CO2}\}$ Where: $f_{NRB,b,i,y}$ Fraction of woody biomass used in year y for fuel type *i* that can be established as non-renewable biomass (NRB) $B_{b,y,i}$ Fuel consumption for fuel type *i* used in baseline b in year y in tonnes, from baseline KPTs $NCV_{b,i}$ Net calorific value of the fuel type *i* used in baseline b (TJ/tonnes) $EF_{b,i,CO2}$ CO_2 emission factor of the fuel type *i* used in the baseline *i* Fuel Type $ER_{b,p,y,nonCO2} = \sum_i \{ B_{b,y,i} * NCV_{b,i} * EF_{b,i,nonCO2}\} - \sum_i \{ B_{p,y,i} * NCV_{p,i} * EF_{p,i,nonCO2}\}$ Where: $EF_{b,i,nonCO2}$ non-CO_2 emission factor of the fuel type *i* used in the baseline = (34.27 (CH_4) + 2.98 (N_2O) tCO_2/TJ) * 0.015 TJ/t The derivation of $ER_{b,p,y,CO_2} = \sum_i \{fNRB_{b,i,y} \cdot B_{b,y,i} \cdot NCV_{b,i} \cdot EF_{b,i,CO_2}\}$, and the calculation of non-CO_2 terms $ER_{b,p,y,nonCO_2}$ as described in the Monitoring Report /01/. Carbon Check verified that the key input parameters used in these calculations (e.g. $B_{b,y,i}$, $B_{p,y,i}$, NCV, EF_{CO_2}, EF_{nonCO_2}, $fNRB$, $N_{p,y}$, and $U_{p,y}$) are the same as those reported in the Monitoring Report and the VPA-DDs (/01/, /B04/) and that the applied units and conversions are consistent with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and the methodology guidance /B02/. The Verification Team confirms that: • the CO_2 and non-CO_2 emission factor applications, NCV value usage and fNRB application follow the methodology; • the project-scenario fuel use terms $B_{p,y,i}$ were derived from documented KPT results and sampling as reported in the MR /01/; • the usage rate $U_{p,y}$ and the credited technology counts $N_{p,y}$ match the Monitoring Database entries; and • aggregate leakage $LE_{p,y}$ has been applied as reported. On this basis Carbon Check confirms the baseline emissions for the monitoring period as reported in the Monitoring Report: • BE_b,y (VPA 2) = 862,167 tCO_2e • BE_b,y (VPA 7) = 345,872 tCO_2e These values were recalculated by the Verification Team from the submitted input parameters and ER spreadsheets and were found to be arithmetically consistent

	with the methodology and the submitted monitoring data. No material discrepancies were identified that would affect the baseline emission totals above.

D.8.2. Calculation of project GHG emissions or actual net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	Document Review, Interview
Findings	No finding raised.
Conclusion	The Verification Team reviewed the CME's Emissions Reduction (ER) calculation worksheets and supporting evidence MR /01/, ER calculation sheet /02/, and verified the application of the governing equations in the registered VPA-DDs /03/ and the applied methodology TPDDTEC v3.1 /B02/. Unit consistency, factor application, sample-derived parameters, and arithmetic in the ER spreadsheets were independently checked. $ER_y = \sum BE_{b,y} - \sum PE_{p,y} - \sum LE_{p,y}$ Where: ER_y Emission reduction for total project activity in year y (tCO_2e/yr) $BE_{b,y}$ Baseline emissions for baseline scenario b in year y (tCO_2e/yr) $PE_{p,y}$ Project emissions for project scenario p in year y (tCO_2e/yr) $LE_{p,y}$ Leakage for project scenario p in year y (tCO_2e/yr) As per the methodology the governing equation for the emission reduction calculations is as follows with ($\sum BE_{b,y} - \sum PE_{p,y}$) is directly merged in to the following equation: $ER_y = \sum_{b,p} N_{p,y} * U_{p,y} * (ER_{b,p,y,CO2} + ER_{b,p,y,nonCO2})) - \sum LE_{p,y}$ Where: $\sum_{b,p}$ Sum over all relevant (baseline b/project p) couples $N_{p,y}$ Cumulative number of project technology-days included in the sales/distribution database for project scenario p against baseline scenario b in year y $U_{p,y}$ Cumulative usage rate for technologies in project scenario p in year y, based on cumulative adoption rate and drop off rate revealed by usage surveys (fraction) $ER_{b,p,y,CO2}$ Specific CO_2 emission savings for an individual technology of Project against an individual technology of Baseline b in year y, in tCO_2/day as derived from the statistical analysis of the data collected from the field tests $ER_{b,p,y,nonCO2}$ Specific non-CO_2 emission savings for an individual technology of Project against an individual technology of Baseline b in year y, in tCO_2/day as derived from the statistical analysis of the data collected from the field tests $LE_{p,y}$ Leakage for project scenario p in year y (See Section E.3) $ER_{b,p,y,CO2} = \sum_i \{f_{NRB,b,i,y} * B_{b,y,i} * NCV_{b,i} * EF_{b,i,CO2}\} - \sum_i \{ f_{NRB,b,i,y} * B_{p,y,i} * NCV_{p,i} * EF_{p,i,CO2}\}$ Where: $f_{NRB,b,i,y}$ Fraction of woody biomass used in year y for fuel type *i* that can be established as non-renewable biomass (NRB) $B_{b,y,i}$ Fuel consumption for fuel type *i* used in baseline b in year y in tonnes, from baseline KPTs

	$B_{p,y,i}$ Fuel consumption for fuel type *i* used in project p in year y in tonnes, as derived from the statistical analysis of the data collected from the field tests
	$NCV_{b,i}$ Net calorific value of the fuel type *i* used in baseline b (TJ/tonnes)
	$EF_{b,i,CO2}$ CO_2 emission factor of the fuel type *i* used in the baseline
	i Fuel Type
	
	$ER_{b,p,y,nonCO2} = \sum_i \{ B_{b,y,i} * NCV_{b,i} * EF_{b,i,nonCO2} \} - \sum_i \{ B_{p,y,i} * NCV_{p,i} * EF_{p,i,nonCO2} \}$
	
	Where:
	$EF_{b,i,nonCO2}$ non-CO_2 emission factor of the fuel type *i* used in the baseline
	LEy Leakage for project scenario p in year y
	
	Key input parameters used (as applied by the CME and verified by VT):
	• Number of ICS (Np,y): VPA02 = 79,000; VPA07 = 39,672 /01/, Monitoring Database).
	• Total technology-days (used to derive $N_{p,y}$days): VPA02 = 35,945,000 days; VPA07 = 13,964,544 days (as per ER sheet /02/).
	• Usage rate (Up,y): 90% for both VPA02 and VPA07 (habit surveys /06/; verified).
	• Baseline fuel consumption (Bb,y,i): 5.4880 t/household-yr (baseline KPTs; VPA-DD /B04/).
	• Project fuel consumption (Bp,y,i): VPA02 = 0.8129 t/household-yr; VPA07 = 0.8788 t/household-yr (project KPTs /02/).
	• fNRB (fraction non-renewable biomass): 0.79 (Promethium Carbon fNRB assessment, 14 Jun 2024).
	• NCV (fuelwood): 0.015 TJ/tonne (IPCC default).
	• EF $_{CO2}$ (fuelwood): 112 tCO_2/TJ × 0.015 = 1.68 tCO_2/tonne.
	• EF $_{nonCO2}$ (fuelwood): (34.27 + 2.98) tCO_2/TJ × 0.015 = 0.5588 tCO_2/tonne.
	
	Per-technology savings applied (verified):
	• Annual CO_2 saving per stove: 7.28371 tCO_2/yr → 0.01996 tCO_2/day.
	• Annual non-CO_2 saving per stove: 2.42269 tCO_2/yr → 0.00664 tCO_2/day. (These per-stove values were reproduced from the ER spreadsheet and unit-checked by the VT.)
	
	Reported / Verified aggregated results (CME ER sheet /02/):
	• Baseline emissions (BE_b,y): VPA02 = 862,167 tCO_2e; VPA07 = 345,872 tCO_2e.
	• Project emissions (PE_p,y): VPA02 = 127,702 tCO_2e; VPA07 = 55,949 tCO_2e.
	• Leakage (LE_p,y): VPA02 = 0 tCO_2e; VPA07 = 0 tCO_2e.
	• Emission reductions (ER_y = BE − PE − LE):
	  ○ VPA02: 734,464 tCO_2e (CME reported; VT recalculation matches).
	  ○ VPA07: 289,923 tCO_2e (CME reported; VT recalculation matches).
	
	Verification findings and conclusion
	1. The VT re-computed the ER calculations from the submitted ER spreadsheet (/02/) using the CME's input parameters and confirmed that the applied formulae, unit conversions (IPCC NCV and EF usage), and arithmetic are consistent with TPDDTEC v3.1 /B02/ and the registered VPA-DDs /03/.

	2. All key parameters (Bb,y, Bp,y,i, fNRB, NCV, EF, Np,y, Up,y) were traced to primary evidence (KPT reports, Monitoring Database, fNRB report) and were found acceptable for use in the ER calculations. 3. The VT identified no material discrepancies that would alter the verified ER totals. The minor 1 tCO_2e rounding difference for VPA02 is immaterial and results from spreadsheet rounding conventions. 4. The VT therefore confirms the ER totals for the monitoring period as: VPA02 = 734,464 tCO_2e and VPA07 = 289,923 tCO_2e, and that these values have been calculated in accordance with the registered VPA-DDs /B04/ and TPDDTEC v3.1 /B02/.

D.8.3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions

Means of verification	Document Review, Interview
Findings	No finding raised.
Conclusion	The verification team (VT) assessed the leakage analysis presented in the Monitoring Report /01/ against the requirements of the applied methodology TPDDTEC v3.1 /B02/ and the registered VPA-DDs /03/. As required by the methodology /B02/, the VT evaluated all five potential leakage risks (a–e), confirmed the evidence provided by the CME, and verified whether any source of leakage required quantitative adjustments to the emission reductions. Methodology Requirement The methodology requires the project proponent to investigate the following leakage risks /B02/: a) Reuse of displaced baseline technologies outside the project boundary. b) Increased fuel use by non-project users due to availability of saved NRB. c) Project impacts on the NRB fraction used by other CDM/VER activities. d) Additional fuel use for space heating or continued use of inefficient technologies. e) Technology substitution that leads to higher emissions where not permitted as an evolving baseline. Leakage must be assessed at least every two years, and the assessment must demonstrate either quantified values or substantiated insignificance. Findings from Document Review and Interviews The VT reviewed the CME's leakage justification (MR Section E.3), supporting baseline and project KPT results (/05/), baseline surveys (/03/), the fNRB study (Promethium Carbon, 2024), and conducted interviews with field staff. The following assessments were verified for both VPA02 and VPA07: (a) Reuse of displaced baseline technologies The replaced baseline appliances consist exclusively of three-stone fires, which are rudimentary, freely constructed, and have no resale or market value. The VT confirms that such traditional devices cannot be transferred outside the project boundary in a manner that increases usage. VT Conclusion: Leakage source not applicable and duly discounted. (b) Non-project users consuming saved NRB or fossil fuels Non-renewable biomass is abundantly available in the project region. There is no mechanism through which fuelwood "saved" by ICS users could increase consumption by non-project households.

	VT Conclusion: Leakage risk negligible; justification is consistent with MR /01/ and methodology expectations. (c) Impact on the NRB fraction of other projects Given the scale of the VPA relative to the larger regional woodfuel supply area, and considering the deforestation dynamics, the VT agrees there is no material impact on regional NRB levels. The fNRB study will be reassessed in the next crediting period as required. VT Conclusion: No demonstrable risk; leakage can be ignored. (d) Compensation for loss of space-heating effects Zimbabwe's climatic conditions do not necessitate significant space heating. KPTs account for all household wood consumption—including cooking, heating, and any other uses—ensuring no unaccounted rebound effect. The VT confirms that no evidence exists of increased heating fuel use triggered by ICS adoption. VT Conclusion: Leakage risk not observed and adequately justified. (e) Substitution of lower-emitting technologies with ICS due to marketing Baseline surveys and VPA-DDs /B04/ confirm that 3-stone open fires are the prevalent technology, and no lower-emitting stoves were being displaced. VT Conclusion: No leakage under this category. Overall VT Assessment and Conclusion Based on methodology requirements (/B02/), CME justification (/01/), field evidence, and interviews, the VT confirms that: • All required leakage sources were assessed. • The CME's justification for insignificance is reasonable, consistent with project conditions, and methodologically sound. • No leakage source requires quantitative adjustment of ERs for either VPA02 or VPA07. Therefore, the VT concludes that Leakage (LEp,y) = 0 tCO_2e for both VPAs is justified and compliant with the applied methodology /B02/.

D.8.4. Summary calculation of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sink

Means of verification	Document Review, Interview
Findings	No Finding raised.
Conclusion	The Verification Team of Carbon Check has reviewed the CME's Emission Reduction (ER) calculations for the respective monitoring periods — VPA 2 (MP5): 01/09/2024 to 30/11/2025 (inclusive) and VPA 7 (MP2): 14/12/2024 to 30/11/2025 (inclusive). The team confirms that the ERs have been calculated in accordance with the governing equation in the registered VPA-DDs and the applied methodology TPDDTEC Version 3.1 (/B02/). $ERy = \sum BEb,y - \sum PEp,y - \sum LEp,y$ ERy = Emission reduction for total project activity in year y (tCO_2e/yr) BEb,y = Baseline emission for baseline scenario b through the year y. PEp,y = Project emission for project scenario b through the year y.

	LEp,y = Leakage for project scenario p in year y (tCO_2e/yr) The Team verified the underlying inputs (baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage) and traced these to the Monitoring Report and ER calculation spreadsheets (/01/, /02/) as summarised in Sections D.8.1–D.8.3 of this report. In particular, the Verification Team confirms the following aggregated inputs for the monitoring period: Baseline emissions (BE_b,y): • VPA02 = 862,167 tCO_2e; • VPA07 = 345,872 tCO_2e. (see D.8.1) Project emissions (PE_p,y): • VPA02 = 127,702 tCO_2e; • VPA07 = 55,949 tCO_2e. (see D.8.2) Leakage (LE_p,y): • VPA02 = 0 tCO_2e; • VPA07 = 0 tCO_2e. (see Section D.8.3) Using these inputs, the Verification Team independently reproduced the ER calculations and confirms the reported results for the monitoring period as follows: Using these inputs, the Verification Team independently reproduced the ER calculations and confirms the reported results for the monitoring periods as follows: Verified Emission Reductions (ER_y): • VPA 2 = 734,464 tCO_2e • VPA 7 = 289,923 tCO_2e All parameter values, equations, and unit conversions were found consistent with the applied methodology and the registered VPA-DDs /03/. No material discrepancies were identified that would affect the verified ER totals. The Verification Team concludes, with reasonable assurance, that the emission reductions for VPA 2 (MP5) and VPA 7 (MP2) have been calculated correctly in accordance with the registered documentation and the applied methodology, and that the verified emission reductions reported above are suitable for certification.

D.8.5. Comparison of actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks with estimates in registered POA-DD/VPA-DDS

Means of verification	Document Review, Interview
Findings	CL 03 and CAR 02 were raised and closed satisfactorily. Please refer Appendix 4 for further details.
Conclusion	The Verification Team compared the actual monitored GHG emission reductions achieved during the monitoring period with the ex-ante estimates provided in the registered PoA-DD/VPA-DDs /03/ for VPA 2 and VPA 7. For VPA 2, the ex-ante emission reductions were estimated at 809,834 tCO_2e, while the actual verified reductions achieved during the monitoring period amounted to 734,464 tCO_2e. For VPA 7, the ex-ante estimate was 279,268 tCO_2e, compared to an actual achievement of 289,923 tCO_2e. The tables below provide

a detailed comparison of these ex-ante and actual values for both VPAs across the relevant SDG indicators.

VPA 2:

SDG	Values estimated in ex ante calculation of approved POA-DD/VPA-DDS	Actual values achieved during this monitoring period
13	809,834 (tCO_2e)	734,464 (tCO_2e)
1	25,500 ICS distributed; 340.10 USD per annum (28.34 USD per month)	79,000 ICS distributed; 165.93 USD per annum (13.83 USD per month)
3	100%	97%
5	100%	96%
7	25,500 ICS distributed	79,000 ICS distributed
8	25 persons hired	24 persons hired (Both VPAs)
12	4.17 tonnes/year	4.6752 tonnes/year

Actual GHG emission reductions (734,464 tCO_2e) were slightly lower than the ex-ante estimate but remain within expected operational performance. Distribution of ICS significantly exceeded ex-ante projections, while small deviations in SDG 3, 5, and 8 indicators reflect normal field-level variations and do not materially affect ER outcomes.

VPA 7:

SDG	Values estimated in ex ante calculation of approved POA-DD/VPA-DDS	Actual values achieved during this monitoring period
13	279,268 (tCO_2e)	289,923 (tCO_2e)
1	50,000 ICS distributed; 340.10 USD per annum (28.34 USD per month)	39,672 ICS distributed; 108.39 USD per annum (or 9.03 USD per month)
3	100%	100%
5	100%	100%
7	50,000 ICS distributed	39,672 ICS distributed
8	25 persons hired	24 persons hired (both VPAs)
12	4.1688 (tonnes/year)	4.6003 (tonnes/year)

Actual emission reductions (289,923 tCO_2e) slightly exceeded the ex-ante forecast, demonstrating strong performance under SDG 13. While ICS distribution numbers and household financial savings were lower than ex-ante expectations, other indicators—such as SDG 3 and 5—fully aligned with the registered assumptions.

	The Verification Team confirms that the emission reduction calculations provided in spreadsheet /02/ were found to be accurate, consistent with the registered PoA-DD/VPA-DDs /03/, and free of any material discrepancies. Both VPAs performed within the expected operational range, with minor deviations appropriately justified by field conditions.

D.8.6. Remarks on difference from estimated value in registered PoA-DD/VPA-DDs

Means of verification	Document Review, Interview
Findings	CAR 03 was raised and closed satisfactorily. Please refer Appendix 4 for further details.
Conclusion	The Verification Team reviewed the variances between ex-ante estimates and actual monitored results for VPA 2 and VPA 7 as presented in the Monitoring Report /02/ and compared them with the registered POA-DD/VPA-DDs /03/. All deviations were found to be supported by reasonable explanations and verified evidence. VPA 2 • SDG 13 (Emission Reductions): The ex-ante emission reduction value was 809,834 tCO_2e, while the actual monitored value was 734,464 tCO_2e. The actual value is lower than estimated; however, this difference is justified by actual usage rates and performance measurements confirmed through KPT results and interviews with the PP. The deviation is acceptable to the Verification Team. • SDG 1: Actual stove distribution (79,000) exceeded ex-ante estimates (25,500) resulting in lower per-household financial savings due to broader distribution across the population. The deviation is consistent with implementation realities and acceptable. • SDG 3 & SDG 5: Actual values (97% and 96%) are slightly lower than the ex-ante assumption of 100%, but deviations are minor and acceptable. • SDG 7: Actual number of stoves distributed (79,000) is significantly higher than ex-ante (25,500). This aligns with the expanded implementation scale and is acceptable. • SDG 8: Personnel hired (24) for both VPAs is slightly below ex-ante estimates (25); deviation is minor and acceptable. • SDG 12 (Wood Savings): Actual SDG 12 values (4.6752 tonnes/year) are slightly higher than ex-ante (4.17 tonnes/year). This difference results from the use of ex-post KPT data, where actual wood savings were calculated by subtracting the project KPT value from the baseline KPT value rather than relying on estimates. Because actual KPT results showed greater reductions in fuel consumption, SDG 12 performance increased. This results in a slightly higher SDG 12 impact, which is acceptable and supported by field data. VPA 7 • SDG 13 (Emission Reductions): The ex-ante estimate (279,268 tCO_2e) was slightly lower than the actual monitored value (289,923 tCO_2e). This increase

	is due to actual wood savings identified during ex-post KPT assessments, which directly influenced the net emissions. Because ex-ante values were based on estimated thermal efficiency and baseline fuel use, while ex-post values were calculated using actual monitored KPT results, the resulting emission reductions are higher. This deviation is reasonable and acceptable. • SDG 1, SDG 7: Actual stove distribution (39,672) is below ex-ante expectations (50,000). This deviation, attributed to implementation timing and distribution capacity, is appropriately justified. • SDG 3 & SDG 5: Actual values match ex-ante estimates (100%). No discrepancies noted. • SDG 8: Personnel hired (24) for both VPAs is slightly lower than ex-ante estimates (25); deviation is minor and acceptable. • SDG 12 (Wood Savings): Actual monitored value (4.6003 tonnes/year) is slightly higher than ex-ante (4.1688 tonnes/year). As with VPA 2, this increase is due to reliance on ex-post KPT measurements rather than estimated values. Actual monitored stove performance resulted in higher wood savings than initially projected, which is acceptable and supported by field data. All differences between ex-ante and actual performance for VPA 2 and VPA 7 are supported by reasonable and verifiable justifications. The deviations reflect actual implementation and monitored performance conditions and do not adversely affect the validity of the reported results or the emission reductions achieved.

D.9. Assessment of Safeguard Reporting

Means of verification	Document Review, Interview			
Findings	No Findings raised.			
Conclusion	**Risk identified in PDD**	**Actions to Mitigate**	**Mitigated? (yes/no)**	**VVB Assessment**
	Principle 6.1 Labour Rights: The Project Developer shall ensure that all employment is in compliance with national labour occupational health and safety laws and with the principles and standards embodied in the ILO fundamental conventions	Legal employment contracts for project staff in Zimbabwe are provided to the VVB as evidence. Stove manufacturers will be required to show suitable, up to date ESG policy.	Yes	As per the employment contracts /12/ reviewed, the contract with the individuals is in as per the ESG policy of the CME /18/
	Principle 6.1 Labour Rights: Working agreements with all individual	Legal employment contracts for	Yes	As per the assessment of the employment contract /12/

	workers shall be documented and implemented and include: a) Working hours (must not exceed 48 hours per week on a regular basis), AND b) Duties and tasks, AND c) Remuneration (must include provision for payment of overtime), AND d) Modalities on health insurance, AND e) Modalities on termination of the contract with provision for voluntary resignation by employee, AND f) Provision for annual leave of not less than 10 days per year, not including sick and casual leave.	project staff in Zimbabwe are provided to the VVB as evidence.		provided by the CME all the information regarding the working agreements with all individuals are provided.

SECTION E. Internal quality control

>>

The verification report has passed an independent technical review prior to submission to Gold Standard. The technical review is conducted by a qualified technical reviewer in accordance with Carbon Check's internal qualification and competence requirements for validation and verification personnel. The reviewer confirmed that the verification activities, evidence assessment, and conclusions presented in this report comply with Carbon Check's quality management procedures and the applicable Gold Standard verification requirements.

SECTION F. Verification/Certification opinion

>

Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. has performed the 5th periodic verification of GS11551 – TASC Clean Cooking PoA – VPA 2 (Zimbabwe) and the 2nd periodic verification of GS12144 – TASC Clean Cooking PoA – VPA 7 (Zimbabwe).

The verification team assigned by the VVB concludes that the project activities, as described in the POA-DD/VPA-DDS /03/ and the respective Monitoring report /01/, meets all relevant requirements of the Gold Standard. The verification for both VPAs has been conducted in accordance with the GS4GG principles, procedures, and quality assurance expectations for project activities.

Verification methodology and process

The Verification team confirms the contractual relationship between the VVB, Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. and the project developer, Cicada Carbon /14/ for the verification of both VPAs. The team assigned to the verification meets the Carbon Check's internal procedures including the UNFCCC/GS requirements for the team composition and competence. The verification team has conducted a thorough contract review as per UNFCCC and Carbon Check's procedures and requirements.

The verification has been performed as per the requirements described in the GS4GG and constitutes the review and completion of the following steps:

- Reviewing the PoA-DD/VPA-DDs /03/, including the monitoring plan and the corresponding validation report /03/;
- Desk review of the Monitoring Reports /01/ for both VPAs and supporting documents relevant to emission reduction calculations;
- Review of the applied monitoring methodology Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Energy Consumption (version 3.1) /B02/;
- On-site inspection (03/12/2025 – 06/12/2025)
- Resolution of CARs and CLs raised during verification
- Issuance of Verification Report

The verification confirms that both project activities were implemented correctly in accordance with the registered methodology, the monitoring plan, and the PoA-DD/VPA-DDS. Monitoring systems were found to be properly operated and maintained, and the monitored data were deemed reliable, traceable, and sufficient for verifying achieved GHG emission reductions.

Verification Periods

- VPA 2 (5th periodic verification): 01/09/2024 – 30/11/2025 (inclusive)
- VPA 7 (2nd periodic verification): 14/12/2024 – 30/11/2025 (inclusive)

Verified Emission Reductions

The verified emission reductions for the two VPAs, based on the review of monitoring data and field verification, are as follows:

VPAs	Vintage	VERs (tCO_2e)	Total
VPA 02	01/09/2024 – 31/12/2024	195,319	734,464
	01/01/2025 – 30/11/2025	539,145	
VPA 07	14/12/2024 – 31/12/2024	14,826	289,923
	01/01/2025 – 30/11/2025	275,097	
Total			**1,024,387**

Across both VPAs, the VVB raised three Clarification Requests (CLs) and four Corrective Action Requests (CARs). All findings were satisfactorily resolved, and supporting evidence was provided and verified. No FAR was raised in the current MP.

The VVB determines that reasonable assurance can be provided that the reported GHG emission reductions for VPA 2 and VPA 7 have been calculated correctly, follow the approved methodology (TPDDTEC v3.1), are consistent with the registered PoA-DD/VPA-DDs and monitoring plans, and are supported by a complete and reliable audit trail.

Certification Statement

The VVB hereby certifies that VPA 2 (5th periodic verification) achieved verified emission reductions of 734,464 tCO_2e for the monitoring period 01/09/2024 to 30/11/2025, and VPA 7 (2nd periodic verification) achieved verified emission reductions of 289,923 tCO_2e for the monitoring period 14/12/2024 to 30/11/2025, for their respective monitoring periods. All monitoring requirements have been fully met and substantiated with appropriate evidence.

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
AQL	Unacceptable Quality Level
BE	Baseline Emissions
CA	Corrective Action/ Clarification Action
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mission
CL	Clarification Request
CME	Coordinating And Managing Entitty
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
CO_{2e}	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
EB	CDM Executive Board
EF	Emission Factor
FA	Final Approval
FAR	Forward Action Request
FVR	Final Validation Report
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
GS	Gold Standard
HH	HouseHolds
ICS	Improved cookstoves
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
KPT	Kitchen Performance Test
LE	Leakage Emissions
MP	Monitoring Period
MR	Monitoring Report
PE	Project Emissions
PoA	Programme of Activity
PRC	Post registration change
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
TASC	The African Stove Company
TPDDTEC	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption
QC/QA	Quality Control/ Quality Assurance
TA	Technical Area
TR	Technical Review
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UQL	Unacceptable Quality Level
VPA	Voluntary Project Activity
VT	Verification Team
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard
VVB	Validation & Verification body

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

Carbon CHECK

Carbon Check (India) Private Limited

Certificate of Competency

Mr. Piyush Raj

has been qualified as per CCIPL's internal qualification procedures in accordance with the requirements of CDM AS, A 6.4 AS/ ISO/IEC14065:2020, ISO/IEC 17029:2019 and other applicable GHG programs:

for the following functions and requirements:

☒ Validator	☒ Verifier	☒ Team Leader	☒ Technical Expert
☐ Technical Reviewer	☐ Validator/Verifier (Trainee)	☐ Gender Expert	☐ Plastic Waste Expert
☐ CCB Expert	☐ Legal Expert	☐ Financial Expert	☐ Environmental, Health and Safety financial matters
☐ SDG Expert	☐ Expert Social aspect	☐ Expert Environmental Aspect	☐ Health Expert
☒ Regional Expert for India		☒ FOEN Approved Technical Expert	☐ FOEN Approved Quality officer

in the following Technical Areas:

☒ TA 1.1	☒ TA 1.2	☒ TA 2.1	☒ TA 3.1	☐ TA 4.1
☐ TA 4. n	☐ TA 5.1	☐ TA 5.2	☐ TA 7.1	☐ TA 8.1
☐ TA 9.1	☐ TA 9.2	☐ TA 10.1	☐ TA 13.1	☐ TA 13.2
☐ TA 14.1	☐ TA 15.1	☐ TA 16.1		

Issue Date	Expiry Date
06th February 2025	31st December 2025

Mr. Vikash Kumar Singh
Director - Compliance

Revision History of the document:

Revision Date	Summary of changes
Jan 2025[1]	Revised as per latest organogram
Feb 2025	Revised to include FOEN requirements

CCIPL_FM 7.9 Certificate of Competency_V8.0_05022025

[1] Please refer to previous version of FM 7.9 for the revision history

Carbon Check (India) Private Limited

Certificate of Competency

Mandishona Liberty

has been qualified as per CCIPL's internal qualification procedures in accordance with the requirements of CDM AS, A 6.4 AS/ ISO/IEC14065:2020, ISO/IEC 17029:2019 and other applicable GHG programs:

for the following functions and requirements:

☐ Validator	☐ Verifier	☐ Team Leader	☐ Technical Expert
☐ Technical Reviewer	☐ Validator/Verifier (Trainee)	☐ Gender Expert	☐ Plastic Waste Expert
☐ CCB Expert	☐ Legal Expert	☐ Financial Expert	☐ Environmental, Health and Safety financial matters
☐ SDG Expert	☐ Expert Social aspect	☐ Expert Environmental Aspect	☐ Health Expert
☒ Regional Expert for Zimbabwe		☐ FOEN Approved Technical Expert	☐ FOEN Approved Quality officer

in the following Technical Areas:

☐ TA 1.1	☐ TA 1.2	☐ TA 2.1	☐ TA 3.1	☐ TA 4.1
☐ TA 4. n	☐ TA 5.1	☐ TA 5.2	☐ TA 7.1	☐ TA 8.1
☐ TA 9.1	☐ TA 9.2	☐ TA 10.1	☐ TA 13.1	☐ TA 13.2
☐ TA 14.1	☐ TA 15.1	☐ TA 16.1		

Issue Date

06th February 2025

Expiry Date

31st December 2025

Mr. Vikash Kumar Singh
Director - Compliance

Revision History of the document:

Revision Date	Summary of changes
Jan 2025[1]	Revised as per latest organogram
Feb 2025	Revised to include FOEN requirements

CCIPL_FM 7.9 Certificate of Competency_V8.0_05022025

[1] Please refer to previous version of FM 7.9 for the revision history

Carbon Check (India) Private Limited

Certificate of Competency

Mr. S Ranganathan

has been qualified as per CCIPL's internal qualification procedures in accordance with the requirements of CDM AS, A 6.4 AS/ ISO/IEC14065:2020, ISO/IEC 17029:2019 and other applicable GHG programs:

for the following functions and requirements:

☒ Validator	☒ Verifier	☒ Team Leader	☒ Technical Expert
☒ Technical Reviewer	☐ Validator/Verifier (Trainee)	☐ Gender Expert	☐ Plastic Waste Expert
☐ CCB Expert	☐ Legal Expert	☒ Financial Expert	☐ Environmental, Health and Safety financial matters
☒ SDG Expert	☒ Expert Social aspect	☒ Expert Environmental Aspect	☐ Health Expert
☒ Regional Expert for India		☐ FOEN Approved Technical Expert	☐ FOEN Approved Quality officer

in the following Technical Areas:

☒ TA 1.1	☒ TA 1.2	☐ TA 2.1	☒ TA 3.1	☐ TA 4.1
☐ TA 4. n	☒ TA 5.1	☐ TA 5.2	☐ TA 7.1	☐ TA 8.1
☐ TA 9.1	☐ TA 9.2	☐ TA 10.1	☒ TA 13.1	☒ TA 13.2
☐ TA 14.1	☐ TA 15.1	☐ TA 16.1		

Issue Date

06th February 2025

Expiry Date

31st December 2025

Mr. Vikash Kumar Singh
Director - Compliance

Revision History of the document:

Revision Date	Summary of changes
Jan 2025[1]	Revised as per latest organogram
Feb 2025	Revised to include FOEN requirements

CCIPL_FM 7.9 Certificate of Competency_V8.0_05022025

[1] Please refer to previous version of FM 7.9 for the revision history

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

S. No.	Document	Details
/01/	Monitoring Report TASC_Zim_Joint_VPA_7_MP2_VPA_2_MP5_v7_cc	V7, 30/12/2025
/02/	ER Sheet VPA2_Zimbabwe_MRV5_ER calc sheet_v1.3 VPA7_Zimbabwe_MRV2_ER calc sheet_v1.7	VPA 2: v1.3,15/12/20-25 VPA7: v1.7, 15/12/2025
/03/	Registered PoA-DD & VPA-DD (VPA 2 & VPA 7) & Validation report	
/04/	Monitoring/Habit survey	VPA 2: Monitoring/Habit Survey (21/05/2025 to 24/07/2025) VPA 7: Monitoring/Habit Survey (21/05/2025 to 03/07/2025) Joint VPA 2 & VPA 7: Monitoring/Habit Survey (10/11/2025 to 30/11/2025)
/05/	KPT survey	VPA 2: 17/06/2025 to 02/08/2025 VPA 7: 16/06/2025 to 04/07/2025
/06/	Distribution Records	Till 30/11/2025
/07/	Carbon Waiver	End users and technology provider (BURN)
/08/	Evidence for Start date	VPA 2: 23/09/2021 VPA 7: 20/04/2023
/09/	Grievnace records	VPA 2: 01/09/2024 to 30/11/2025 VPA 7: 14/12/2024 to 30/11/2025
/10/	Traning records Habit Survey and KPT	20/05/2025
/11/	Evidence for random sample selection for Habit & KPT survey	
/12/	Employment records	24 no. of employments both both VPAs
/13/	Last MP records	
/14/	Verifcation contract (PD- Cicada Carbon and VVB-Carbon Check)	26/11/2025
/15/	Onsite Audit records	03/12/2025 to 06/12/2025
/16/	Purchase records of KPT equipments	Moisture meter: 09/06/2025 Weighing scale: 19/05/2025
/17/	Cover letter	VPA 2: 16/09/2025 VPA 7: 31/05/2023
/18/	ESG policy	Cicada carbon TASC
/19/	Follow-up Visits (CME – TASC /PD – Cicada Carbon)	2025
/20/	Technical Specification of the project ICS	Manufacturer - BURN
/21/	SDG Impact tool	VPA 2: 01/09/2024 to 30/11/2025 VPA 7: 14/12/2024 to 30/11/2025
/22/	Declaration for no double counting by CME	20/03/2025
/23/	Stove purchase records and agreement with BURN	17/11/2022

Background Documents

Ref no.	Reference Document
/B01/	1. Gold Standard Principles and Requirements version 2.1, dated 31/01/2025 2. Gold Standard Programme of Activity Requirements version 3.0, dated 12/11/2024 3. GS Validation and Verification Standard version 2.0, dated 12/11/2024 4. Community Services Activity Requirements (version 1.2) under GS4GG
/B02/	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Energy Consumption (version 3.1)
/B03/	REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES: USAGE RATE MONITORING, v2.0, dated: 27/10/2020
/B04/	Sampling and Survey a) CDM Sampling Standard, version 09.0 b) Guidelines for Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project activities and Programme of Activities Ver. 4.0.
/B05/	Site Visit and Remote Audit Requirements and Procedures, version 2.0 dated 30/05/2023
/B06/	Gold Standard Monitoring Report Template Version 1.1

Appendix 4. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests

Table 1. Remaining FARs from validation and/or previous verification

FAR ID	xx	**Section No.**		**Date:** DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR				
No FAR				
CME's response				**Date:** DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by the PD				
VVB assessment				**Date:** DD/MM/YYYY

Table 2. Clarifications Required.

CL ID	**01**	**Section no.**	**D.3**	**Date:** 11/12/2025
Description of CL				
CME is requested to provide following documents: *a) Evidence for carbon waiver from end users and technology provider.* *b) End user training & Awareness campaign for good practice monitoring requirements.* *c) Evidence for start date of the each VPA* *d) Pictures of follow up visit* *e) Cover letter for both VPAs* *f) Purchase/Calibration records of the KPT equipment*				
CME response				**Date:** 15/12/2025
The documents have been provided as described below. a) A waiver letter provided by the technology provider BURN manufacturing has been uploaded. The end user agreement for the first stove distributed under each VPA has been provided as well as example end user agreements from two households in the site visit, one from each VPA. b) Photographs of follow up visits and engagements have been provided. c) Evidence for the start of each VPA has been provided in the form of the first End User Agreements signed for each VPA d) Examples from the first two stoves in the internal monitoring survey (ZM31114 and ZM127159) list have been provided, as well as good-practice monitoring event examples. e) The cover letters for both VPAs have been provided f) The purchase records for the scales and moisture meters used have been provided.				
Documentation provided by CME				
1. BURN Waiver Letter 2. Device_EndUserAgreement_Zimbabwe_ZM32892 3. Device_EndUserAgreement_Zimbabwevpa7_ZM134603 4. Device_EndUserAgreement_Zimbabwe_210858466 5. Device_EndUserAgreement_Zimbabwevpa7_ZM123949 6. Habit Survey Chidamoyo Village, Hurungwe (Nov 25) (FOLDER) 7. Habit Survey Gutu Village (Nov 25) (FOLDER) 8. Siakobvu Hurungwe (5-6 Dec) (FOLDER) 9. ZM31114 stove 10. ZM31114 barcode 11. ZM127159 barcode 12. ZM127159 stove 13. VPA 7 CCL Signed Cover Letter 14. VPA 2 Cover Letter_Amended_Signed 15. Customs WorkSheet250610155147 16. Scales invoice 17. Invoice standard250610155903 18. Invoice_208381522 19. Release Notification250610155407 20. SAD500SAD501250610155159				
VVB assessment				**Date:** 17/12/2025

CME has provided all requested documents which VVB has reviewed and found appropriate. Hence, the CL is closed.

CL ID	02	Section no.	D.6.2	Date: 11/12/2025

Description of CL

1) *CME is requested to provide all employment records for each VPA as per Table 1 of the MR for the current monitoring period. Moreover, the few employment records submitted by CME is of "My Trees Trust" whereas in the table 1 of the MR, the employment records of Cicada Carbon is mentioned. CME is requested to clarify the same.*

2) *CME has provided EHS policy of stove manufacturer "BURN" which is not appropriate as per monitoring parameter "Principle 6.1 Labour Rights", CME is requested to provide OHS/EHS polices of employers.*

3) *In monitoring parameter "QE IG" in section D.2 of the MR, CME has mentioned single value as "24" which is not consistent with table 1 of the MR. CME is requested to rectify the same and maintain consistency for the values of the monitoring parameter across the MR.*

CME response — **Date:** 15/12/2025

1) The employment contracts for all monitors employed by My Trees as well as Cicada staff employed during this monitoring period have been provided.
2) The ESG policy for TASC has been provided. TASC ensures that implementation partners adhere to the same ESG policies and that all partners align with local laws and regulations regarding employment.
3) Section D.2. parameter "QE IG" has been amended to reflect a value of 24 for both VPA and VPA7 combined as is consistent with table 1 and the rest of the MR. The same change has been made in section E2

Documentation provided by CME

1) C.Sirimina 2425 Contract
2) HRE GUTU Stove 2025 contracts
3) Kariba Karoi 2025 Stoves contracts
4) M.Munezi 2425 Contract
5) R.Marumahoko 2425 Contract
6) R.Matekenya 2425 Contract
7) S. Bhiza 2425 Contract
8) W.Enock 2425 Contract
9) Employee contracts (FOLDER)

VVB assessment — **Date:** 17/12/2025

1) *CME has provided employment records for both VPAs for the current monitoring period which VVB reviewed and found appropriate. Hence, the CL point is closed.*
2) *CME has provided ESG policies which project developer and implementer follows which VVB reviewed and confirmed during the onsite visit. Hence, the CL point is closed.*

CL ID	03	Section no.	D.8.5	Date: 11/12/2025

Description of CL

In section E.5.1 of the MR, CME has mentioned "Ex-ante values were based on the total number of days that the monitoring period lasts, assuming that all ICS were distributed on day 1. Whereas, monitored ICS were distributed progressively over the MP, meaning a lower number of technology days per ICS credited in the MP". However, in section D.3 of the MR, it is observed that the no. of ICS distributed are same in the last MP for both VPAs means, no new distribution happened in the current monitoring period. CME is requested to clarify the same and provide appropriate information in the MR.

CME response — **Date:** 15/12/2025

The difference between ex-ante and ex-post values for the SDGs is now more clearly explained for each VPA in section E.5.1. This difference is not due to the ICS being distributed during this MP but rather a few factors which are now explained more clearly in this section including fNRB and fuel savings. Specifically the difference in SDGs 13 (emissions reductions), 1 (number of ICS in use) and 12 (fuel savings) are now explained.

Documentation provided by CME

VVB assessment — **Date:** 17/12/2025

CME has made the required changes in section E.5.1 of the MR which VVB reviewed and found appropriate. Hence, the CL is closed.

Table 2: Corrective action Required.

CAR ID	01	Section no.	D.1	Date: 11/12/2025
Description of CAR				
1) The date and version of the monitoring report is not appropriate. CME is requested to provide appropriate date and version of the MR. *2) The format of date mentioned in table 2 of the MR is not in line with MR template filling guideline v1.2. CME is requested to rectify the format of the date as per template guideline across the MR.* *3) The End date of the MP mentioned in ER sheet for VPA 2 is not consistent with the MR and verification contract (addendum). CME is requested to maintain consistency for the same and provide revised ER sheet.*				
CME response				**Date: 15/12/2025**
1) Version of MR has been updated to version 5 as well as the dates of the monitoring period amended with the MP running from 01/09/2024-30/11/2025 for VPA2 and 14/12/2024-30/11/2025 for VPA7. 2) Format of date in table 2 Product vintages has been updated to match MR template filling guideline v1.2. 3) End date updated on both ER calculation sheets for VPA2 and VPA7, subsequently, the following values were changed in the MR: a. The number of tech days in section E.1. was changed from 38,315,00 to 35,945,00 for VPA2. The same change was made in section E.2. b. The ERs in sections E.2. and E.5. were changed from 782,891 to 734,464 for VPA2 to remain consistent with the rest of the MR (as per table 1 and the ER sheet). Similarly in section E.2., the baseline and project emissions were amended to reflect the ER sheet. Finally in section E.2. c. Also in section E.5. the ex-ante estimated ERs were amended for VPA2 to reflect the ER sheet. **d.** The baseline and project ERs were also amended in the table in section E.4. to reflect the ER sheet.				
Documentation provided by CME				
VVB assessment				**Date:** 17/12/2025
1) CME has made the required changes in the MR. Hence, the CAR point is closed. *2) CME has rectified the format of date in table 2 of the MR which is found to be inline with template filling guideline. Hence, the CAR point is closed.* *3) CME has revised the end date of MP in the ER sheet of the VPA 2 and rectified the value of ER in MR and ER sheet which VVB reviewed and found appropriate. Hence, the CAR point is closed.*				

CAR ID	02	Section no.	D.8.5	Date: 11/12/2025
Description of CAR				
In section E.2 of the MR, CME has not provided values of SDG 8 outcome for both VPAs compared to other SDGs in the same section as well as with table 1 of the MR. CME is requested to provide project contribution in SDG 8, for both VPAs in the MR.				
CME response				**Date:** 15/12/2025
1. Section E.2. SDG has been updated to reflect the number of employees for each VPA to remain consistent with the rest of the MR.				
Documentation provided by CME				
VVB assessment				**Date:** 17/12/2025
CME has revised section E.2 of the MR to reflect SDG 8 contribution for both VPAs which VVB reviewed and found appropriate. Hence, the CAR is closed.				

CAR ID	03	Section no.	D.8.6	Date: 11/12/2025
Description of CAR				

CME has not provided required explanation for the value of the monitored parameters for the current MP compared to the last MP as per template filling guideline v1.2. CME is requested to provide the required information in the MR.
CME response **Date: 15/12/2025**
An explanation of the differences in monitored variables between this MP and the previous MP has been added to section D.3. Essentially, the variation between these MPs mostly comes from the fact that a sampling approach is taken which is inherently variable and can change over time due to seasonal differences and statistical variation.
Documentation provided by CME
VVB assessment **Date:** 17/12/2025
CME has provided comparison in section D.3 of the MR for the outcome of monitored parameters compared to last MP which VVB reviewed and found appropriate. Hence, the CAR point is closed.

CAR ID	04	**Section no.**	**D.6.3**	**Date:** 11/12/2025
Description of CAR				
1) *The joint Habit survey sheet shared by CME doesn't have information on the samples belonging to which VPA. Also, the date of 6th HS and 3rd HS for VPA 2 and VPA 7 respectively is not consistent with survey sheet "Habit_Surveys_Joint MRV - VPA2 MP5_VPA7 MP2_Second_Period_v1.0". CME is requested to rectify the date and provide evidence for random sampling for the joint HS for both VPAs along with interlinking of samples with their respective VPAs.* 2) *In section D.4 of the MR, CME has not provided details of the Joint Habit survey both VPAs conducted for extended i.e., more than 1 year of the monitoring period. CME is requested to provide details of Habit survey in section D.4 of the MR.*				
CME response				**Date: 15/12/2025**
1) Section B.1. and D.4 have been updated with correct date (10/11/2025) for the beginning of the 6th and 3rd round of habit surveys for VPA2 and VPA7 respectively. The final habit survey performed on 01/12/2025 has been removed, thus the last habit survey occurred on 30/11/2025 as per the MR. Evidence of random sampling has been provided by means of the distribution database sampling sheet provided where samples are extracted in age stratified groups and randomized by the RAND() function in Excel. The relevant VPA has been added in a new column to the habit survey sheet indicating to which VPA each stove belonged. 2) An explanation of the second round of habit surveys explaining their applicability to the length of the MP being more than one year has been added to section D.4.				
Documentation provided by CME				
1. Paper_Trail_Random_Samples_VPA2 MP 6_VPA7 MP3				
VVB assessment				**Date:** 17/12/2025
1) ***CME has provided revised joint Habit survey sheet which VVB reviewed and found appropriate. Hence, the CAR point is closed.*** 2) ***CME has made the required changes in the MR. Hence, the CAR point is closed.***				

Table 2. FARs from this verification

FAR ID	xx	**Section No.**		**Date:** DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR				
No FAR				
CME's response				**Date:** DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by the CME				
VVB assessment				**Date:** DD/MM/YYYY

Annex 1: Assessment of data and parameters fixed ex-ante at the time of validation

Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 13, Climate action
Parameter	$B_{b,\,y}$
Data unit	Tonnes per household per annum
Default values used	VPA 2: 5.4880 tonnes VPA 7: 5.4880 tonnes
Purpose of data	Calculation of the baseline scenario
Source of verification of the source	Baseline kitchen performance tests (KPTs) results by KPT Version 4.0

Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 13, Climate action
Parameter	$EF_{b,i,CO2}$
Data unit	$tCO2/t_{fuel}$
Default values used	Fuelwood/ wood chips: 1.68 tCO_2/t_{fuel}
Purpose of data	Calculation of baseline scenario
Source of verification of the source	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Chapter 2: Stationary Combustion, Table 2.5 – Default emission factors for stationary combustion in the residential and agriculture/ forestry/ fishing/ fishing farms categories

Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 13, Climate action
Parameter	$EF_{b,i,nonCO2}$
Data unit	$tCO2/t_{fuel}$
Default values used	Fuelwood/ wood chips: 0.5588 tCO_2/t_{fuel}
Purpose of data	Calculation of baseline scenario
Source of verification of the source	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Chapter 2: Stationary Combustion, Table 2.9 – Residential Source Emission Factors The value has changed from the ex-ante estimates as the revised values for the GWPs have been used for N_2O and CH_4.

Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 13, Climate action
Parameter	$EF_{p,i,CO2}$
Data unit	$tCO2/t_{fuel}$
Default values used	Fuelwood/ wood chips: 1.68 tCO_2/t_{fuel}
Purpose of data	Calculation of Baseline scenario
Source of verification of the source	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Chapter 2: Stationary Combustion, Table 2.5 – Default emission factors for stationary combustion in the residential and agriculture/ forestry/ fishing/ fishing farms categories

Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 13, Climate action
Parameter	$EF_{p,i,nonCO2}$
Data unit	$tCO2/t_{fuel}$
Default values used	Fuelwood/ wood chips: 0.5588 tCO_2/t_{fuel}
Purpose of data	Calculation of the baseline scenario

Source of verification of the source	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Chapter 2: Stationary Combustion, Table 2.9 – Residential Source Emission Factors The value has changed from the ex-ante estimates as the revised values for the GWPs have been used for N_2O and CH_4.

Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 13, Climate Action
Parameter	$NCV_{b,i}$
Data unit	TJ/tonne
Default values used	Fuelwood/ wood chips: 0.015 TJ/ tonnes
Purpose of data	Calculation of the baseline scenario
Source of verification of the source	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Chapter 1: Introduction, Table 1.2- Default net calorific values

Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 13, Climate Action
Parameter	$NCV_{p,i}$
Data unit	TJ/tonne
Default values used	Fuelwood/ wood chips: 0.015 TJ/ tonnes
Purpose of data	Calculation of the baseline scenario
Source of verification of the source	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Chapter 1: Introduction, Table 1.2- Default net calorific values

Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 13
Parameter	$f_{NRB,b,i,y}$
Data unit	Fraction of non- renewable biomass used in the baseline
Default values used	Fuelwood: 0.79
Purpose of data	Calculation of the baseline scenario
Source of verification of the source	PDD (Promethium Carbon report), 14 June 2024

Annex 2: Assessment of data and parameters monitored

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 13 Indicator 13.2.1 “Amount of CO2e emissions reduced by the project per year”
Data / Parameter: **(as in monitoring plan of POA-DD/VPA-DDS):**	$B_{p,y,l}$ - Quantity of fuel consumed in the project scenario p during year y, in tonnes (derived from statistical analysis of Project KPTs)
Unit	Tonnes per household per annum
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Updated every two years
Reported value	VPA 2: 0.8129 t/HH/year VPA 7: 0.8878 t/HH/year
Verified Source of Data	Kitchen Performance Tests (KPTs), conducted in accordance with KPT Version 4.0
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Assessment of details of monitoring equipment, its specification and calibration as per the requirements of registered POA-DD/VPA-DDS:	The moisture meters (Ryobi MM-210 2 in 1 moisture testers (5-50%/±2%)) and scales (ACCUD 75kg x 10g (0.01kg resolution)) are used in the KPT surveys of which the invoices are provided by the CME /16/. The manufacturer specification provided for the products /20/ and the invoices /16/ are reviewed and it confirms that the devices used in the KPT surveys /05/ are newly purchased.
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes. QA/QC procedures include proper handling of KPT data, consistency checks, and adherence to KPT Version 4.0 protocol. Fuel weight and moisture content measurements are reliable for emission reduction calculations.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	Not applicable. Complete and compliant monitoring data were available for both VPAs.

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 13 Indicator 13.2.1 “Amount of CO_2e emissions reduced by the project per year”
Data / Parameter: **(as in monitoring plan of POA-DD/VPA-DDS):**	Up,y – Usage rate in project scenario p during year y, determined on a sampling basis
Unit	Fraction (or %)
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Annual
Reported value	VPA 2: 90% VPA 7: 90%
Verified Source of Data	VPA 2: Habit Survey (21/05/2025 to 24/07/2025) VPA 7: Habit Survey (21/05/2025 to 03/07/2025)

	Joint VPA 2 & VPA 7: Habit Survey (10/11/2025 to 30/11/2025)
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Assessment of details of monitoring equipment, its specification and calibration as per the requirements of registered POA-DD/VPA-DDS:	Not applicable. Data collected through survey instruments and enumerator records.
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes. CME provided guidance and training to enumerators to conduct surveys in line with methodology requirements. Data recorded in ER sheets was verified and consistent.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA, Full survey data available for both VPAs.

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	**Assessment/ Observation by the VVB**
Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 13 Indicator 13.2.1 “Amount of CO_2e emissions reduced by the project per year”
Data / Parameter: **(as in monitoring plan of POA-DD/VPA-DDS):**	Np,y – Technologies in the Monitoring Database for project scenario p through year y
Unit	Number
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Continuous
Reported value	VPA 2: 79,000 units VPA 7: 39,672 units
Verified Source of Data	Monitoring Database
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Assessment of details of monitoring equipment, its specification and calibration as per the requirements of registered POA-DD/VPA-DDS:	Not applicable. Data are digital records maintained in the Monitoring Database.
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes. Transparent data analysis and reporting procedures are applied. The stoves included in the VPA are registered in the database via the data collection app.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption	NA

theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 13 Indicator 13.2.1 “Amount of CO2e emissions reduced by the project per year”
Data / Parameter: **(as in monitoring plan of POA-DD/VPA-DDS):**	$LE_{p,y}$ – Leakage in project scenario p during year y
Unit	Tonnes of CO_2 equivalent per year
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Aggregate leakage can be assessed every two years
Reported value	0 tCO_2e (VPA 2 and VPA 7)
Verified Source of Data	Leakage assessment documented in Monitoring Report /01/ and Section E.3
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Assessment of details of monitoring equipment, its specification and calibration as per the requirements of registered POA-DD/VPA-DDS:	Not applicable; leakage assessment is qualitative/quantitative based on project activity evaluation.
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the leakage assessment is well-documented and justified with evidence in the Monitoring Report.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	Not applicable; full assessment completed and verified.

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 1 Indicator 1.4.1 “Proportion of population living in households with access to basic services”
Data / Parameter: **(as in monitoring plan of POA-DD/VPA-DDS):**	BSA/ HHS - – Proportion of population living in households with access to basic services
Unit	Number
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Annually
Reported value	79,000 ICS in use (VPA 2) 39,672 ICS in use (VPA 7)
Verified Source of Data	1. Monitoring Database ICS distribution records 2. Ex- post Monitoring Survey Records

Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Assessment of details of monitoring equipment, its specification and calibration as per the requirements of registered POA-DD/VPA-DDS:	Not applicable; based on distribution records and survey verification
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the Monitoring Database is consistent and cross-checked with survey records
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	Not applicable; full data available and verified

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	**Assessment/ Observation by the VVB**
Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 3 Indicator 3.9.1 “Mortality rate attributed to household and ambient air pollution”
Data / Parameter: **(as in monitoring plan of POA-DD/VPA-DDS):**	SPM_{HH} – Air quality in project households
Unit	%
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Annually
Reported value	97% (VPA 2) 100% (VPA 7)
Verified Source of Data	Ex- post Monitoring Survey Records
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Assessment of details of monitoring equipment, its specification and calibration as per the requirements of registered POA-DD/VPA-DDS:	Not applicable; data obtained via survey assessment
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes; survey records documented and cross-checked
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	Not applicable; full survey data collected

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 5 Indicator 5.4.1 “Proportion of time spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age and location”
Data / Parameter: **(as in monitoring plan of POA-DD/VPA-DDS):**	HHTS – % of households reporting time savings from reduced cooking time using ICS
Unit	%
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Annual
Reported value	96% (VPA 2) 100% (VPA 7)
Verified Source of Data	Ex- post Monitoring Survey Records
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Assessment of details of monitoring equipment, its specification and calibration as per the requirements of registered POA-DD/VPA-DDS:	Not applicable; data obtained via survey assessment
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes; survey records documented and cross-checked
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	Not applicable; full survey data collected

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 7 Indicator 7.1.2 “Proportion of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technology”
Data / Parameter: **(as in monitoring plan of POA-DD/VPA-DDS):**	$AACS_{HH}$ – Number of households and institutions having access to affordable, reliable, and modern energy services
Unit	Number
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Continuous
Reported value	79,000 (VPA 2) 39,672 (VPA 7)
Verified Source of Data	ICS Monitoring Database
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Assessment of details of monitoring equipment, its specification and calibration as	NA

per the requirements of registered POA-DD/VPA-DDS:	
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes; database records verified against distribution logs
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	**Assessment/ Observation by the VVB**
Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 8 Indicator 8.5.1 “Average hourly earnings of female and male employees, by occupation, age and persons with disabilities”
Data / Parameter: **(as in monitoring plan of POA-DD/VPA-DDS):**	QE IG – Quantitative Employment and Income Generation
Unit	Number
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Annually
Reported value	24 (VPA 2 & VPA 7 Combined)
Verified Source of Data	Employment Records
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Assessment of details of monitoring equipment, its specification and calibration as per the requirements of registered POA-DD/VPA-DDS:	Not applicable; data obtained from employment records /12/
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes; verified with legal employment contracts /12/ and ESG compliance evidence /18/
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	Not applicable; full employment records available

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	**Assessment/ Observation by the VVB**
Relevant SDG Indicator	SDG 12

	Indicator 12.2.2 “Domestic material consumption, domestic material consumption per capita and domestic material consumption per GDP”
Data / Parameter: **(as in monitoring plan of POA-DD/VPA-DDS):**	$B_{y,savings}$
Unit	Tonnes/ year
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Annually/ biennially
Reported value	VPA 2: 4.6752 tonnes/year VPA 7: 4.6003 tonnes/year
Verified Source of Data	KPT survey data
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Assessment of details of monitoring equipment, its specification and calibration as per the requirements of registered POA-DD/VPA-DDS:	Not applicable — By,savings is derived from Bp,y,i; instruments used for underlying measurements during KPTs (scales and moisture meters) met prescribed specifications, and no calibration deviations were identified.
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes — data were consistently recorded, processed, and used in emission reduction calculations following QA/QC procedures.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	Not applicable — complete monitoring data available for both VPAs.

Annex 3: Checklist for evaluating the compliance of project with requirement and guidelines - Usage rate requirement (2.0)

Section	Sub Section	Criteria	VVB response
1. Scope and applicability	N/A	a. VVBs the project/PoA undergoing certification involve any one or more of the following technologies: solid, gaseous fuel based improved cooking technologies for example firewood, charcoal based improved cookstove, household biogas digesters, solar cookers, etc.?	Yes, the project activity involves the distribution of improved cookstoves.
		b. If there is any conflict with the TPOA-DD/VPA-DDSTEC methodology, are all the rules and requirements contained in this Annex given precedent and followed by the project/PoA?	There is no conflict observed with the TPDDTEC methodology.
	2.1 Levels of usage	a. Has the project/PoA clearly specified the usage monitoring requirement level in the POA-DD/VPA-DDS/VPA-DD?	Yes, please refer section B.7.1 of the VPA-DD/03/
		b. Has the project/PoA correctly applied the level of usage and associated monitoring requirements in accordance with the claimable usage rates?	Yes. As per the article 2.3 of the guideline/B03/, Good practice level of usage with maximum 90% usage rate has been applied /10,19/
		c. In case the project/PoA applies a different level of usage as compared to the registered POA-DD/VPA-DDS, have the monitoring requirements from the levels below been followed?	The MR has also followed Good practice usage level which is explained in section D.4 of MR/01/
		a. Has the project/PoA defined project technology “use” and “non-use” (Step 1) and	Use and Non-use has not been defined in the VPA DD/B04/. The use and non use is defined in section D.4 of MR/01/.

2. Requirements and guidelines		documented the criteria applied for defining them in the POA-DD/VPA-DDS(s)?	
		b. Is the project's definition of "use" and "nonuse" correct and their documentation of the criteria applied for defining this done correctly?	The definition for use and non use has been added in the section D.4 of the MR/01/.
	2.2 Mandatory monitoring requirements	c. Has the project/PoA correctly identified criteria to define use and non use considering the representative cooking practices and likely project technology use?	Yes, the use and non use project technology has been identified during the monitoring survey and can be assessed from the habitat survey sheet/04/.
		d. Has the project developer carried out in-person household usage surveys (Step 2) by: i. Determining the minimum sample size for the survey as per the methodology requirements? ii. Performing the following monitoring activities, at minimum, as per the requirements of this Annex: Kitchen observation, interview of the primary cook, taken photos of the cooking areas and recorded the GPS coordinates of the household?	d. i. yes, the detailed sampling procedure is given in section D.4 of MR/01/ ii. yes, the questionaries conducted and the photographs taken during monitoring survey has been verified by VVB
		e. Has the project developer performed the verification checks (Step 3) prior to the verification by the VVB?	Yes, the same has been verified on the basis of the review of call records and verification checks spreadsheet/18/ provided by PP.
		f. Has the project developer kept a record of the verification checks containing the details. of households and their responses?	Yes, the records are also provided to the VVB /19/
		g. VVBs the evidence establish a clear relationship between the usage claimed by the project and observations made during the in-person household surveys?	Yes, the observation provided in the evidence /04/ has been cross checked with the ER sheet/02/ and VVB confirms that the evidence establishes a clear relationship between the usage rate claimed by project and observations made in in-person surveys.
	2.3 Good practice	a. Has the project/PoA successfully met all the	VVB confirms that the project met all the mandatory usage rate requirement

	monitoring requirements for improved cooking devices.	mandatory usage rate requirements?	defined in the section 2,2 of REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES: USAGE RATE MONITORING version 2.0./B03/
		b. Is the project/PoA eligible to apply the good practice monitoring requirements?	Yes, CME has followed all procedure required for the mandatory as well as good practice usage requirements as provided in section D.4 of MR/01/
		c. Has the project developer carried out the following monitoring activities as per the relevant requirements: i. Field team training and supervision ii. End-user training and follow-up visits? Awareness campaign?	Based on the review of the section D.4 of MR/01/ and its supporting documents/10, 19/. VVB confirms that the monitoring activities have been carried out as per the requirement.
		d. Has the project developer provided evidence for trainings, follow up site visits, awareness campaign?	Yes, the evidence/10, 19/ have been provided to VVB and verified.
		e. In VVB's opinion, i. Can the effectiveness of the trainings, follow up site visits and awareness campaigns be confirmed? ii. Should project developer make changes in registered trainings, site visits and awareness campaigns to enhance the effectiveness?	i. Based on the review of the MR/01/, and supporting documents, VVB confirms that the trainings, follow up visits and awareness campaigns are deemed to be effective, and ii. No further changes are required.
	2.4 Best practice monitoring requirements	a. Has the project/VPA successfully met all the mandatory & good practice usage rate requirements?	PoA has not opted for this level of usage, and therefore not applicable for this PoA
		b. Is the project/PoA eligible to apply the best practice monitoring requirements?	
		c. Has the project developer carried out stove use monitoring activities as per the relevant requirements?	
		d. Has the project developer correctly calculated the stove use based on the stove use monitoring?	
3. Determination of usage rate ($U_{p,y}$)		a. Has the project developer applied the applicable cap at individual age-group?	Yes, verified based on review of ER sheet /02/, tab "Upy".

	b. Has the project developer appropriately applied the weighted-average usage rate quantification approach to each monitored project technology age group?	Yes,

Annex 4: Questions from the CME's habit survey for monitoring the SDGs

SDG 13:

- $U_{p,y}$ & $LE_{p,y}$: (how many days since stove is used, if stove warm, is soot present in the stove, if the stove is ashy, frequency of using the stove, why low use of stove, why stove not used, if alternative stove used, type of alternative stove, frequency of using the alternative stove,)
- $N_{p,y}$ (based on the duration on the monitoring period and the number of devices)
- $B_{p,y,l}$ (KPTs/05/ are conducted to determine the amount of fuel used in the project scenario)

SDG 1:

- BSA/HHS: (is money saved due to reduction in wood used, amount of money saved by wood reduction, is money saved in the new stove, amount of money saved from the new stove)

SDG 3:

- SPM_{HH} (Blackening of pots used, smoke from the stove,)

SDG 5:

- HHTS: (is time saved in collecting wood, time saved in wood collection, time saved in cooking, amount of time saved in cooking, cooking time in project ICS compared to baseline scenario)

SDG 7:

- $AACS_{HH}$ (time to get hot, fire start difficulty, fire stability, temperature control, difficulty in cooking, wood consumption, heating performance, stove durability, stove maintenance)

SDG 8: QE IG (employment records/12/ provided by the PP)

SDG 12: $B_{y,savings}$ (KPTs/05/ are conducted to determine the amount of fuel used in the project scenario)