



Gold Standard
for the Global Goals

TEMPLATE

VALIDATION REPORT FOR PROGRAM OF ACTIVITIES (POA)

Publication Date **dd/mm/yyyy**

Version **1.0**

Next Planned Update **12/12/2025**

Contact Details

The Gold Standard Foundation
International Environment House 2
Chemin de Balexert 7-9
1219 Châtelaine
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 788 70 80
Email: standards@goldstandard.org

SUMMARY

This document contains the following sections:

Key PoA Information

PART I – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PART II – VALIDATION TEAM, TECHNICAL REVIEW team AND APPROVER

2.1- Validation Team Member(s)

2.2- Technical Reviewer(s) and Approver(s) of the Validation Report

PART III – MEANS OF VALIDATION

3.1- Desk Review/Planning

3.2- Onsite Inspection/ and List of Interviewees

3.3- Remote Audit (IF APPLICABLE)

3.4- Sampling Approach

PART IV - VALIDATION ASSESSMENT

General description of proposed PoA

Management System and inclusion criteria

4.6- Validation of Design Change(s) -IF APPLICABLE

4.7-Validation of Design and Certification Renewal

PART IV - VALIDATION ASSESSMENTopinion

Appendix 2: Competence of team members and technical reviewers

Appendix 3: Documents/evidence reviewed or referenced.

Appendix 4: Findings

KEY POA INFORMATION

GS ID	GS 1247	
Title of Programme	Improved Kitchen Regimes Multi-Country PoA	
Type of PoA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non – Forestry and Non -AGR PoA (An activity that cannot be categorized as either a FORESTRY Project activity or AGRICULTURE (AGR) activity (e.g., a Renewable Energy project activity)) <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry and/or AGR PoA	
Version number of the Validation Report	V2.0	
Completion Date of Validation Report	19/02/2025	
Version number and completion date of the PoA-DD to which this report applies	16.2 18/02/2025	
Date of listing	N/A	
VPA scale included in the PoA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Microscale <input type="checkbox"/> Small scale <input type="checkbox"/> Large scale	
Project Developer / Coordinating and Managing Entity	CO2balance UK Ltd	
Project Participant	CO2balance UK Ltd	
Host country (ies)	Various partner organizations in target countries to be mentioned at the VPA level Host Country (ies) Burkina Faso Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia Guatemala Haiti, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Sierra Leone Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe	
Applied methodology (ies)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gold Standard approved methodology including any specific Gold Standard applicability criteria. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A project-specific methodology (Applicable to Microscale Project only)	
	<i>Title(s) of methodology (ies)</i>	VERs, , Gender Certification Methodology (ies) applied and version number GS TPDDTEC v4.0GS Simplified Methodology for Efficient Cookstoves v1.1 GS Methodology for Emission Reductions from Safe Drinking Water Supply v1.0

	<i>The version number of the methodology (ies)</i>	VERs, , Gender Certification Methodology (ies) applied and version number GS TPDDTEC v4.0GS Simplified Methodology for Efficient Cookstoves v1.1 GS Methodology for Emission Reductions from Safe Drinking Water Supply v1.0
Activity Requirements applied	<input type="checkbox"/> Renewable Energy Activity Requirements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Services Activity Requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Land-Use & Forests Activity Requirements <input type="checkbox"/> New PoA types <input type="checkbox"/> Others (<i>rules and requirements available in Principles and Requirements apply</i>)	
Product Requirements applied	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration <input type="checkbox"/> Renewable Energy Label <input type="checkbox"/> Others <i>For all other Certification Statements, Certified SDG Impact Statements or Products.</i> Please specify: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Deviation applicable to the PoA (accepted and rejected both)	Deviation ID:	NA
	Applicable section of validation report:	NA

VVB information

Name of the VVB	<i>KBS Certification Service LTD</i>
GS accreditation expiry date	<i>19/07/2027</i>
Is the VVB accredited for the applicable sectoral scope?	<i>Yes</i>
Name, position of the approver of the validation report	<i>Mr. Praveen N Urs. Director climate change</i>
Signature (Final version only)	

PART I – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CO2 Balance UK Ltd has contracted KBS Certification Services Ltd. to perform the design change of the project activity "Improved Kitchen Regimes Multi-Country PoA" having GS4GG Ref no. 1247.

The scope of the design change is defined as an independent and objective review of the GS PDD, the project’s revisions, and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against the following documents:

- GS4GG Principles & Requirements (version 1.2) /1/
- GS4GG Design Change Requirements (version 1.1) /4/
- GS4GG Validation and verification body Requirements version 3.0 /8/
- GS4GG Validation and verification standard version 2.0 /5/
- GS4GG REDUCED EMISSIONS FROM COOKING AND HEATING: Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption (TPDDTEC) version 4.0 /9/

The design change report is based on an assessment of the proposed GS PDD executed through stakeholder consultations, the implementation of standard auditing techniques such as desk review, follow-up actions (e.g., on-site assessment), and an assessment of the applicable approved methodology “”, “GS Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption”, version 4.0 /9/ and relevant tools, guidance, and GS decisions.

The design change process was conducted using KBS's internal procedures. The design change consisted of the following three phases:

- i) A desk review of the project design, baseline, and monitoring plan.
- ii) Follow-up interviews with project implementers.
- iii) The resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final validation report and opinion.

In summary, it is KBS’s opinion that the project activity “Improved Kitchen Regimes Multi-Country PoA ”, as described in the proposed PoA DD v16.1dt 05/12/2024 meets the relevant GS4GG requirements for the design change of project activity and applied methodology, “GS Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption”, version 4.0”. /9/. Thus, KBS recommends GS4GG for design change of the proposed project activity “Improved Kitchen Regimes Multi-Country PoA” GS 1247/10

PART II – VALIDATION TEAM, TECHNICAL REVIEW TEAM AND APPROVER

2.1| Validation team member(s)

S.NO.	FULL NAME	ROLE(S)	TYPE OF RESOURCE	TYPE OF ACTIVITY(IES) CARRIED OUT
-------	-----------	---------	------------------	-----------------------------------

1	Mr. M.P Prasanna	Team leader/technical reviewer	internal	Audit review, PoA Change, Applicability of methodology	Plan, Design	Desk
2	Mr. Tom J Varghese	Validator	internal	Audit review, PoA Change, Applicability of methodology	Plan, Design	Desk

2.2| Technical Reviewer(s) and approver(s) of the validation report

S.NO.	FULL NAME	ROLE(S)	TYPE OF RESOURCE	TYPE OF ACTIVITY(IES) CARRIED OUT
1	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Krishnan Kutty	Technical reviewer	External	Technical Review of Documents
2	Ms. Margaret Francis	Manager Technical & Certification	IR	Technical Certification
3	Mr. Praveen N Urs.	Approver	IR	Approver

PART III – MEANS OF VALIDATION

>>

3.1| Desk review/Planning

>>The report is based on the assessment of the Registered PoA-DD, application of standard auditing techniques including but not limited to desk review, follow-up actions (e.g., electronic (telephone or e-mail, video) interviews), and also the review of the applicable approved methodology the reduced emission from cooking and heating V4.0 replaces V3.1.

All the documents used for arriving inclusion are listed in Appendix 3 and referenced accordingly in the design change report.

3.2| On-site inspection and list of interviewees

>> In accordance with Section 3.2.1 of the Site Visit and Remote Audit Requirements and Procedures, Version 2.0/18/, the physical site visit for the proposed VPA was not requisite. Consequently, a remote evaluation has been undertaken in lieu of an on-site inspection.

~~DURATION OF ON-SITE INSPECTION: DD/MM/YYYY TO DD/MM/YYYY~~

NAME	ROLE	LOCATION OF VISIT	ACTIVITY PERFORMED ON-SITE

S.NO	INTERVIEWEE		DATE	SUBJECT	TEAM MEMBER INVOLVED
	Name	Affiliation			

3.3| Remote audit (if applicable)

As outlined in Section 3.2 above, a remote assessment was carried out utilizing ICT tools and remote auditing techniques in accordance with Annex 2, which specifies the technology/electronic means for remote assessment/audit.

The validation team has ensured that appropriate alternative methods of information were employed to formulate the validation opinion. A remote assessment was conducted in collaboration with the CME representatives, who also serve as the PoA Implementers, to gain a comprehensive understanding of the technology to be deployed within the VPA, its implementation status, required design modifications.

DURATION OF REMOTE INSPECTION: 25/09/2024

NAME	ROLE	REMOTE AUDITING MEANS/METHODS	TOPICS COVERED
Megan Jones	Senior Project Manager CO2balance UK Ltd.	Remote Audit/Google Meet	Check the Applicability of the methodology and other methodological regulatory documents with which the project activity has been certified. Compliance with monitoring procedures followed by updated methodology requirements. Review of Sustainable development criteria relevant to document SDG Impact tool in accordance with the requirements established by the responsible party.

Chiara Martin	Senior Project Manager CO2balance UK Ltd.	Remote Audit/Google Meet	Review of Supporting documents in accordance with applied methodology and relevant tools. Calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data
---------------	----------------------------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

3.4| Sampling approach

>>As this pertains to a design change of a registered PoA, the validation team did not apply a sampling approach.

PART IV - VALIDATION ASSESSMENT

For design change, head directly to the section 4.6 and for design certification renewal, go directly to section 4.7.

4.1| General description of proposed PoA

4.1.1| Purpose and general description of the proposed PoA

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is the description provided in the PoA-DD accurate, complete and provides understanding of the proposed PoA?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
2. Is the PoA eligible under Gold Standard's Programme of Activity Requirements and all applicable regulatory documents?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
3. Are any FARs from the preliminary review stage addressed by CME?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
4. Does the PoA involve the alteration of an existing installation or process? If yes, does the PoA description state the differences resulting from the PoA compared to the pre-PoA situation?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
5. Is the general description of the PoA in accordance with the description and instructions of the template corresponding to the PoA-DD?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
6. Is a framework for the implementation of the PoA and inclusion of VPAs in the POA provided?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
7. Is there confirmation that the PoA is a voluntary action by the CME?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
8. Does the signed cover letter provide clarification on the ownership of the carbon credits and the relationship between project developer and any communities involved?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
Any other question (to be added by the VVB)		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
Findings		
<input type="checkbox"/> CL	(findings ID....)	
<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	(findings ID....)	
<input type="checkbox"/> FAR	(findings ID....)	
Assertion Statement		
<p>«Directions: The assertion statement is a confirmation of requirements fulfilment by the PoA that includes the summary of the VVB opinion on the aspect being validated. For assessment and reporting requirements, please refer to relevant section in Validation and Verification Standard. »</p>		

4.1.2| Physical/Geographical boundary of the PoA

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Are the PoA's geographic and physical implementation locations accurately described?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
2. Is the geographical/physical boundary consistent with the applicable methodology and tools?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
3. Does it provide details of the geographical area e.g., municipality, region within a country, country, or several countries within which all VPAs included in the PoA will be implemented?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
4. Is the PoA following applicable Host Country's legal, environmental, ecological, and social regulations?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
5. Are there any multi-country requirements to be followed by the PoA? If yes, is compliance with it demonstrated?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
Findings		
<input type="checkbox"/> CL	(findings ID...)	

<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	(findings ID...)
<input type="checkbox"/> FAR	(findings ID...)
Assertion Statement	
<p>«Directions: The assertion statement is a confirmation of requirements fulfilment by the PoA that includes the summary of the VVB opinion on the aspect being validated. For assessment and reporting requirements, please refer to relevant section in Validation and Verification Standard. »</p>	

4.1.3| Technologies and/or measures and eligibility under Gold Standard

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Does the developer of the PoA provide all the necessary documents with manufacturing details, technical specifications, contracts of acquisition, operational capacity, serials among others, of all the facilities/technologies/systems/devices that will be installed?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
2. Is the useful life provided according to the manufacturer's specifications or industry standards?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
3. Is it described how the technologies/measures and know-how for their use is transferred to all the parties to ensure a correct implementation of the PoA?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
4. Has the CME demonstrated the compliance of the eligibility criteria under Gold Standard?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
Findings		
<input type="checkbox"/> CL	(findings ID...)	
<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	(findings ID...)	
<input type="checkbox"/> FAR	(findings ID...)	
Assertion Statement		
<p>«Directions: The assertion statement is a confirmation of requirements fulfilment by the PoA that includes the summary of the VVB opinion on the aspect being validated. For assessment and reporting requirements, please refer to relevant section in Validation and Verification Standard. »</p>		

4.1.4| Target/Indicator for each of the minimum three SDGs targeted by the PoA

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Are at least three SDG identified and addressed, specifying the relevant SDG Target, and SDG indicator or, if required a Proposed Indicator? SDG13 is mandatory		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
2. Is the tool provided by the Gold Standard: SDG Impact Tool , used correctly for filling in the SDGs for the implementation of the PoA?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
Findings		
<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<i>(findings ID...)</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<i>(findings ID...)</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> FAR	<i>(findings ID...)</i>	
Assertion Statement		
<p>«Directions: The assertion statement is a confirmation of requirements fulfilment by the PoA that includes the summary of the VVB opinion on the aspect being validated. For assessment and reporting requirements, please refer to relevant section in Validation and Verification Standard. »</p>		

4.1.5| Coordinating/managing entity

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is the information provided of the coordinating/managing entity of the PoA complete?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
Findings	
<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<i>(findings ID....)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<i>(findings ID....)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> FAR	<i>(findings ID....)</i>
Assertion Statement	
<p>«Directions: The assertion statement is a confirmation of requirements fulfilment by the PoA that includes the summary of the VVB opinion on the aspect being validated. For assessment and reporting requirements, please refer to relevant section in Validation and Verification Standard. »</p>	

4.1.6| Founding sources of PoA

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is the PoA receiving public funding or subvention from Developed Countries?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
2. Is the host country part of the list of ODA countries recipients? Is a signed Official Development Assistance (ODA) Declaration supplied?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
Findings	
<input type="checkbox"/> CL	(findings ID...)
<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	(findings ID...)
<input type="checkbox"/> FAR	(findings ID...)
Assertion Statement	
<p>«Directions: The assertion statement is a confirmation of requirements fulfilment by the PoA that includes the summary of the VVB opinion on the aspect being validated. For assessment and reporting requirements please refer to relevant section in Validation and Verification Standard. »</p>	

4.2| Management System and inclusion criteria

4.2.1| Management System

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Are roles and responsibilities of personnel involved in the process of inclusion of VPA described?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
2. Are the competencies of the personnel related to the management system reviewed?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
3. Are the records or arrangements for training and capacity development of the personnel available?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
4. Is there a procedure to perform a technical review of the inclusion of VPAs?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
5. Is there a procedure to avoid including a new VPA that has already been registered as a project activity or included as a VPA in another registered PoA in any voluntary standard?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
6. Is it described how records are kept and documentation control process for each VPA under the PoA is performed?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
7. Are the measures for continuous improvements of the POA management system mentioned?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
Findings	
<input type="checkbox"/> CL	(findings ID...)
<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	(findings ID...)
<input type="checkbox"/> FAR	(findings ID...)
Assertion Statement	
<p>«Directions: The assertion statement is a confirmation of requirements fulfilment by the PoA that includes the summary of the VVB opinion on the aspect being validated. For assessment and reporting requirements, please refer to relevant section in Validation and Verification Standard. »</p>	

4.2.2| Application of methodologies

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Did the CME select the GHG baseline and monitoring methodologies, with applicable tools and mandatory GS Guidelines?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
2. Are the latest version of methodologies and tools to the project activity consistent with the time of submission of the PoA to Gold Standard?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
3. In the case of multiple technologies/measures, is it demonstrated that no GHG/SDG cross effects exist between the technologies and measures?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
4. When cross effects exist, is it demonstrated how these are considered in the calculation of GHG emission reductions/SDG impacts?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
Findings		
<input type="checkbox"/> CL	(findings ID...)	
<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	(findings ID...)	
<input type="checkbox"/> FAR	(findings ID...)	
Assertion Statement		
<p>«Directions: The assertion statement is a confirmation of requirements fulfilment by the PoA that includes the summary of the VVB opinion on the aspect being validated. For assessment and reporting requirements, please refer to relevant section in Validation and Verification Standard. »</p>		

4.2.3| Eligibility criteria for inclusion of a VPA in the PoA

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Are the eligibility criteria for inclusion of real case and its regular VPAs in the PoA defined in the proposed table for each real case VPA type?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
2. Is the confirmation of the consistency of the geographical boundaries of the VPA with that of the PoA included?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
3. Are the conditions to avoid double counting of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals specified?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
4. Are the conditions to check the start dates of VPA through documentary evidence included?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
5. Are the conditions to ensure compliance with the applicability of the applied methodologies, standardized baselines and other methodological regulatory documents included?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
6. Are the conditions to ensure that VPA meet the requirements for demonstration of additionality included?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
7. Is the condition to ensure that the real case VPA and its regular VPAs meet the applicability criteria of selected methodology of combination of methodologies included?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
8. Are the conditions to ensure that real case and its regular VPAs systematically demonstrate additionality in accordance with Principles & Requirements included?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
Findings	
<input type="checkbox"/> CL	(findings ID...)
<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	(findings ID...)
<input type="checkbox"/> FAR	(findings ID...)
Assertion Statement	
<p>«Directions: The assertion statement is a confirmation of requirements fulfilment by the PoA that includes the summary of the VVB opinion on the aspect being validated. For assessment and reporting requirements, please refer to relevant section in Validation and Verification Standard. »</p>	

4.3| Demonstration of additionality

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is the additionality demonstrated in accordance with the " Programme of Activity Requirements and Procedures "		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
2. Has the CME correctly used the additional tools to demonstrate additionality and all additional requirements that concern the type of PoA?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
Findings		
<input type="checkbox"/> CL	(findings ID...)	
<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	(findings ID...)	
<input type="checkbox"/> FAR	(findings ID...)	
Assertion Statement		
<p>«Directions: The assertion statement is a confirmation of requirements fulfilment by the PoA that includes the summary of the VVB opinion on the aspect being validated. For assessment and reporting requirements, please refer to relevant section in Validation and Verification Standard. »</p>		

4.4| Duration of PoA

4.4.1| Date of first submission and duration.

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is the date of first submission of PoA to Gold Standard for Preliminary Review specified in the adequate format?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
2. Is the PoA crediting cycle start date and the total duration of the proposed PoA (in years and months) stated?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
3. Is the duration of PoA defined as specified in Programme of Activity requirements and procedures ?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
4. In case of a CDM Gold Standard POA, is the start date established according to the definition of start date of a CDM PoA (CDM Glossary)?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
5. When the PoA is designed under an earlier version of Gold Standard, is the maximum crediting period maintained as envisaged at time of registration?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
Findings		
<input type="checkbox"/> CL	(findings ID...)	
<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	(findings ID...)	

FAR

(findings
ID....)

Assertion Statement

«Directions: The assertion statement is a confirmation of requirements fulfilment by the PoA that includes the summary of the VVB opinion on the aspect being validated.

For assessment and reporting requirements please refer to relevant section in [Validation and Verification Standard](#). »

4.5| Stakeholder Consultation

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is the local Stakeholder Consultation and Stakeholder Feedback Round at the both level (PoA Design Consultation and VPA) conducted in accordance with Gold Standard Stakeholder Consultation & Engagement Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
2. Is the PoA design consultation report and the real case VPA stakeholder consultation report submitted at the same time to Gold Standard at the time of first submission?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
3. Does the stakeholder consultation comprise input from a minimum of two rounds of consultation, including a mandatory physical meeting and one round of stakeholder comment?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
4. Are all the concerns raised by stakeholders during the stakeholder consultation at PoA level summarized together with the respective proposed mitigation measures and its monitoring when agreed?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
5. Are all the comments received during the PoA design consultation documented with minimum interpretation and without tempering the spirit or intent of the comment?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
6. Is the detailed management of the stakeholder comments included in the PoA Design Consultation Report ?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
7. Is it justified when comments have not been incorporated or addressed?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
8. Are the methods for continuous input and grievance mechanism declared?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
Findings	
<input type="checkbox"/> CL	(findings ID...)
<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	(findings ID...)
<input type="checkbox"/> FAR	(findings ID...)
Assertion Statement	
<p>«Directions: The assertion statement is a confirmation of requirements fulfilment by the PoA that includes the summary of the VVB opinion on the aspect being validated. For assessment and reporting requirements, please refer to relevant section in Validation and Verification Standard. »</p>	

4.6| Validation of Design change(s) - IF APPLICABLE

Type of design change applicable

Corrections

Changes to the start date of the registered crediting period

Update and/or make permanent changes to registered monitoring plan

Changes to the PoA design

Change of Coordinating/managing entity

4.6.1 | Corrections, Changes to the start date of the credit period, Update and/or permanent changes to registered monitoring plan or changes to PoA design.

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

<p>1. Are the corrections made to the PoA information or parameters fixed at validation in compliance with the relevant requirements stated in Section 4 of Design Change Requirements?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
<p>Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i></p>	<p>The review of the Document/12/13/, interviews with CME/17/, and with reference to the registered PoA-DD CP2 version 16.1 dt 05/12/2024 /10/, the validation team confirms that the description of the PoA is complete, accurate and provides an understanding of design change parameters fixed at validation of Improved Kitchen Regimes Multi-Country PoA in compliance with the relevant requirements stated in Section 4 of Design Change Requirements of PoA version 1.6 /7/</p> <p>The proposed project is design change of registered GS PoA (GS-1247).</p>
<p>Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i></p>	<p>As per Section 4. 3.3 of the Design change requirement v.1.1/4, review of registered PoA-DD and remote assessment, the validation team confirms that the description of the validation is in compliance with the relevant requirements is accurate and consistent with the registered PoA and As per Section 3.2.1 of the Design Change Requirement v1.1, no major changes have been made. However, in accordance with Section 3.6, flow meters have been incorporated to correct the flow measurement process within the project design. The validation team has verified that the project complies with the GS4GG requirements, and as such, it is deemed acceptable</p>
<p>2. Is the corrected information an accurate reflection of actual PoA information; and/or the corrected parameters are in accordance with applicable standard documents i.e., methodology(ies) or applicable requirements?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

<p>Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i></p>	<p>Yes, the corrected information accurately reflects the actual PoA (Program of Activities) details, and the corrected parameters align with the applicable Design Change standard documents, including the relevant methodology(ies) and requirements. This is because the changes made are in full compliance with the guidelines set out in the Design Change standard, ensuring that the updates are consistent with the approved methodologies and flow meter (Section B, point 3 of the PoA, which pertains to flow meters and sensors, has been updated to align with the methodology requirements for the parameter SDWS23.) which reflect the actual project conditions ie SDG Impact tool (SDGs 1 and 7 in the PoA), Updated methodology TPDDTEC v4.0.</p>
<p>Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i></p>	<p>The corrected information is an accurate reflection of the actual PoA details because it ensures the data and parameters are aligned with the most up-to-date project information, and the adjustments are made in full compliance with the applicable design change standards and methodologies. By following the prescribed guidelines and incorporating necessary adjustments, the project maintains its adherence to the approved methodologies and reflects the true operational status of the PoA.</p>
<p>3. Is the proposed change in start date of crediting period in compliance with the relevant requirements stated in paragraph 3.1.3 of Design Change Requirements?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>
<p>Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>4. Are the permanent changes or deviation to the monitoring plan in compliance with the relevant GS4GG requirements?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>

<p>Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i></p>	<p>As per Section B.1, the flow meter has been determined to be more suitable for the project's monitoring requirements compared to the digital sensor. This change has been thoroughly justified and is in compliance with the GS4GG requirements. The flow meter is considered an accurate, reliable, and acceptable method for monitoring the relevant parameters in accordance with the Gold Standard guidelines. Additionally, during the remote assessment, the validation team received a satisfactory justification confirming that the flow meter is accurate for measuring flow rates</p>
<p>Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i></p>	<p>In conclusion, the permanent changes to the monitoring plan, particularly the integration of the flow meter, are not only in compliance with PoA-DD section B1 and also as per the GS4GG requirements and strengthen the system's ability to track and report environmental metrics effectively. This adjustment supports the overall integrity and credibility of the monitoring process, ensuring that the project meets its sustainability goals and adheres to the highest standards set forth by the GS4GG framework.</p>
<p>5. Are the permanent changes or deviation to the monitoring plan in compliance with the applied methodology (ies) and do not reduce the level of accuracy of the monitoring compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>

<p>Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i></p>	<p>As per the design change section 4.3/4 which is in line with PoA DD section B2/10</p> <p>1. Compliance with the Applied Methodology(ies): The changes or deviations made to the monitoring plan align with the methodology or methodologies approved for the PoA. These methodologies typically outline the requirements for data collection, monitoring frequency, calculation of emissions reductions, and other relevant procedures. Any modification to the monitoring plan would still need to follow the core principles and rules of the applied methodology(ies).</p> <p>2. No Reduction in Monitoring Accuracy: The changes made to the monitoring plan do not compromise the level of accuracy required in the original plan. This means that the revised monitoring approach is still capable of accurately tracking and reporting emissions reductions or other relevant data, without introducing significant errors or biases. The monitoring system, even after any changes, is still capable of meeting the original objectives, such as ensuring the correct quantification of emissions reductions and maintaining the integrity of the data.</p> <p>3. Consistency with Registered Monitoring Plan: The modifications do not fundamentally alter the goals or parameters set in the registered monitoring plan. They are either minor adjustments or clarifications that still adhere to the overarching framework of the PoA.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i></p>	<p>The permanent changes or deviations to the monitoring plan comply with the approved methodology(ies) and retain the level of accuracy required by the registered monitoring plan. The changes do not diminish the quality or reliability of monitoring, thereby ensuring that the objectives of accurate data collection and emissions reduction calculations are still met effectively. With the introduction of the SDG Impact Tool (As per section 3.1.4 of SDG impact manual v1.1 SDG Tool application is optional and not mandatory) , CME has decided to include SDGs 1 and 7 in the Po. This modification is essential to align the SDG contributions with the requirements of the SDG Impact Tool , specifically for the safe water project involving the implementation of water filters, other treatment methods, and safe water sources, as outlined in Section A.3 of the PoA-DD. Additionally, Section B, point 3 of the PoA, which pertains to flow meters and sensors, has been updated to align with the methodology requirements for the parameter SDWS23. The validation team has verified that the project complies with the GS4GG requirements, and as such, it is deemed acceptable</p>
<p>6. Are the permanent changes or deviation to the monitoring plan likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions and SDG Impacts?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>
<p>Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i></p>	<p>Permanent changes or deviations to the monitoring plan are not likely to reduce the accuracy of emission reduction calculations or SDG impact assessments/12. The integrity and reliability of the monitoring process are maintained, and the changes introduced do not compromise the objectives of accurately quantifying both emissions reductions and the broader SDG impacts/12.</p>
<p>7. Are there conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions will not be over-estimated because of the permanent change or the permanent deviation?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>

Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	<p>The permanent changes or deviations to the monitoring plan have not introduced any new risk of over-estimating emissions reductions. The existing assumptions, methodologies, and calculations already ensure that the emission reductions are accurately quantified, without the need for additional conservative assumptions or discount factors. The overall approach is robust enough to prevent overestimation on its own, rendering extra adjustments unnecessary.</p>	
8. Are the proposed or actual changes to the PoA design in compliance with the relevant requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	

Means of validation (MOV)

Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information

1. PoA design adhere to the approved methodologies, rules, and standards that govern the PoA framework. This means the modifications are consistent with the overall objectives, requirements, and criteria set forth for the PoA under the applicable standards, such as those for carbon crediting, emission reductions, or sustainable development goals (SDGs).
2. The proposed or actual changes do not violate key principles or objectives of the PoA, such as ensuring additionality, maintaining environmental integrity, or meeting the emissions reduction targets set out in the original design document.
3. As per Section 3.4.1 of the Design Change Requirements document, the proposed changes are fully aligned with the requirements of the applied methodology TPDDTEC v4.0. These changes are feasible and can be effectively implemented within the project design, including the established data management, quality assurance, and quality control procedures. Furthermore, PoA-DD Section A.2.2, Subsection C, has been updated to ensure alignment with the principles and requirements of the GS framework.

<p>Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i></p>	<p>The proposed or actual changes to the PoA design have been made in full compliance with the relevant requirements. The changes align with the applicable methodologies and standards, maintain the integrity of the PoA's objectives, and have been properly documented and approved. These modifications do not negatively affect the PoA's ability to generate verifiable emission reductions or contribute to sustainable development goals (SDGs), and they adhere to the established procedures for ensuring compliance with regulatory requirements. The validation team has verified that the project complies with the GS4GG requirements, and as such, it is deemed acceptable.</p> <p>As per Section 3.4.1 of the Design Change Requirements, the proposed changes align with the TPDDTEC v4.0 methodology and are feasible within the project design, including data management and quality control procedures. Additionally, in PoA-DD Section A.2.2, Subsection C, has been updated to comply with GS principles and requirements.</p>
<p>9. Do the description of changes in revised PoA-DD accurately reflect the implementation, operation, and monitoring of the modified PoA?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>

Means of validation (MOV)

Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information

1.The revised PoA-DD provides a clear and precise description of the changes made to the PoA, including how these changes will affect its implementation, operation, and monitoring. All modifications are accurately documented,

2.The changes made are well-integrated into the revised PoA-DD/10, and the document explains how these adjustments are consistent with the overall goals and operations of the PoA.

3.The revisions to the PoA-DD include detailed information on how the monitoring of the PoA will continue under the modified design, ensuring that the monitoring plan remains compliant with relevant methodologies and regulatory standards.

4. Design changes related to the implementation, operation, and monitoring of a project can occur at any stage of the project lifecycle, from the initial stages through ongoing operations. Such changes must be carefully managed and justified to ensure they align with the project's overall goals, regulatory requirements, and certification standards. Proper documentation, impact assessments, and adjustments to monitoring and operational plans are essential to ensure that these changes do not compromise the project's success or compliance.

5. The description of changes in the revised PoA-DD must accurately reflect the implementation, operation, and monitoring of the modified project (Flow meter and Sensor. The requirements for implementing the Safe Water project, including water filters, other treatment methods, and safe water sources.) to ensure the project complies with the Gold Standard for the Global Goals (GS4GG) requirements. Accurate documentation is essential for transparency, verifying compliance with the standard's principles, and ensuring the integrity of the project's environmental and social impacts. The on-site or remote inspection

	<p>ensures that the revised PoA-DD is implemented correctly and that the project maintains its eligibility for certification, continuing to deliver the anticipated carbon credits and sustainable development benefits.</p>
<p>Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i></p>	<p>The description of changes in the revised PoA-DD/10 accurately reflects the implementation, operation, and monitoring of the modified PoA. The document provides a clear and consistent account of how the PoA has been modified, detailing the adjustments made in a transparent and comprehensive manner. This ensures that all changes are properly documented and align with the objectives and standards of the PoA, while maintaining the integrity of emissions reduction calculations and SDG impact assessments/12. The validation team has verified that the project complies with the GS4GG requirements, and as such, it is deemed acceptable</p>
<p>10. Would the actual changes of the PoA design adversely affect the conclusions of the Validation Report of the registered PoA-DD regarding additionality, applicability of the methodology (ies), compliance with the monitoring plan, scale of the PoA, stakeholder consultation, SDG, safeguarding assessment, or applicable legislation/host country regulations?</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A </p>

Means of validation (MOV)

Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information

1. The changes made to the PoA design do not affect the applicability of the originally approved methodology/09(ies). The revised design remains consistent with the core principles and requirements of the applied methodology(ies), ensuring that the PoA continues to meet the necessary criteria for emissions reductions or SDG impacts/12.
2. The modifications to the PoA design do not result in non-compliance with the original monitoring plan. Any changes made to the monitoring approach are fully aligned with the requirements outlined in the Final validation report,v1.0 and the integrity of the monitoring system is maintained.
3. The changes made to the PoA design do not adversely affect its contribution to SDGs. The PoA continues to meet the objectives and targets originally set for SDG impacts/12, and the modifications do not reduce or negate the intended benefits.

<p>Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i></p>	<p>1.The changes made to the PoA design enhance its contribution to the SDGs. The PoA continues to effectively meet the objectives and targets initially set for SDG impacts/12, and the modifications further strengthen the intended benefits without diminishing their impact.</p> <p>2.The modifications to the PoA design fully comply with the original monitoring plan. The changes made to the monitoring approach are in complete alignment with the requirements outlined in the Final Validation Report, v1.0, ensuring the integrity of the monitoring system is preserved and strengthened.</p> <p>3.The changes made to the PoA design do not impact the applicability of the originally approved methodology(ies). The revised design remains fully aligned with the core principles and requirements of the applied methodology(ies), ensuring that the PoA continues to effectively meet the necessary criteria for emissions reductions and SDG impacts.</p>
<p>11. In case that the actual changes affect the additionality of the certified PoA, if investment analysis is used to demonstrated additionality, are key parameters only modified in the original spreadsheet calculations affected by the proposed or actual changes to the PoA?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>
<p>Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i></p>	<p>"Not applicable" is that the investment analysis used to demonstrate additionality is not affected by the proposed or actual changes to the PoA. The changes do not modify key financial parameters used in the analysis, and the additionality demonstration remains valid as initially assessed.</p>
<p>12. In case that the actual changes affect the additionality of the certified PoA, if barrier analysis is claimed to demonstrated additionality, are the still valid under the new circumstances?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>
<p>Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i></p>	<p>"Not applicable" is that the barrier analysis used to demonstrate the additionality of the certified PoA is not affected by the actual changes to the PoA. Since the changes do not alter the financial, technical, or other barriers that were previously identified, the existing barrier analysis remains valid and there is no need to reassess it under the new circumstances. Therefore, there is no requirement to modify or update the barrier analysis, making this question not applicable.</p>
<p>13. In case that the actual changes affect the additionality of the certified PoA, if positive list or standardised additionality is used, does the PoA complies with the positive list of the applied standardised baseline in the registered PoA-DD?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>
<p>Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i></p>	<p>"Not applicable" is that the actual changes to the PoA do not affect its compliance with the positive list or standardized additionality of the applied standardized baseline/11. Since the PoA already met these criteria during registration and the changes do not alter the fundamental compliance requirements, there is no need to reassess the PoA's adherence to the positive list or standardized baseline/11. Therefore, the question is deemed not applicable in this context.</p>
<p>14. Is the revised PoA-DD in compliance with all the requirements of the applied or updated methodologies, and all applicable regulatory documents?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>

<p>Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PoA has been reviewed and updated in a manner that ensures consistency with the latest methodology requirements, and all relevant revisions have been incorporated into the updated PoA-DD. 2. The updated PoA-DD provides an accurate and clear reflection of the requirements of the applied methodology(ies). All necessary changes have been incorporated in a transparent and methodical manner, ensuring that the PoA is fully compliant with the methodologies and regulations that apply to it.
<p>Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i></p>	<p>The revised PoA-DD is in full compliance with both the requirements of the applied or updated methodologies and all relevant regulatory documents. The changes made to the PoA have been carefully reviewed and adjusted to ensure that they align with the applicable standards, rules, and regulations. Therefore, the revised PoA remains compliant with the methodology(ies) and regulatory framework under which it is registered. The validation team has verified that the project complies with the GS4GG requirements, and as such, it is deemed acceptable.</p>
<p>Findings</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL</p>	<p>CLs 02,03 and CL 04 were raised & closed. Refer to Appendix 4 for further details</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR</p>	<p>CARs 01& 03 were raised & closed. Refer to Appendix 4 for further details</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> FAR</p>	<p>NIL</p>
<p>Assertion Statement</p>	

The CME has provided information in line with Section 8.1.1 and 8.4.1 of the validation verification standard, addressing the following:

a. Identification of any proposed or actual changes to the project design and ensuring compliance with relevant requirements.

b. A review of the revised PDD, submitted by Co2 Balance, to confirm that the changes accurately reflect the implementation, operation, and monitoring of the modified project. Additionally, the impacts of these changes on the monitoring plan, accuracy of monitoring activities, applied methodologies, and other requirements, including stakeholder consultation and the use of the GS4GG SDG Impact Tool, have been thoroughly described in the Registered PoA-DD.

c. As per Section 8.4.1(b) of VVS Version 2.0, the actual impacts of the changes on the monitoring plan, the accuracy of the monitoring activities, the applied methodology(ies), and other relevant requirements were verified during the remote visit.

4.6.2| Change of Coordinating/managing entity

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Has the new Coordinating/Managing Entity obtained a new letter from both old and new CME stating the change and confirming the authorisation of its coordination of the PoA?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
2. Has the new Coordinating/Managing Entity provided a confirmation that the PoA will be developed and implemented with the same framework as described in the design certified POA-DD?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
3. Has the new Coordinating/Managing Entity demonstrated compliance with requirements related to the operational and management arrangement?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A
Findings	
<input type="checkbox"/> CL	(findings ID...)
<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	(findings ID...)
<input type="checkbox"/> FAR	(findings ID...)
Assertion Statement	
<p>«Directions: The assertion statement is a confirmation of requirements fulfilment by the PoA that includes the summary of the VVB opinion on the aspect being validated. For assessment and reporting requirements, please refer to relevant section in Validation and Verification Standard. »</p>	

4.7| Validation for design certification renewal

Start date and end date of the previous crediting period	01/05/2013 – 30/04/2020
Start date and end date of the renewed crediting period	N/A DD/MM/YYYY – DD/MM/YYYY
Is there a delay in the renewal of crediting period?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Was it determined whether the information transferred to the updated version of the template is substantially the same as the design?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
2. Is the validity of the original baseline(s) or its update assessed through an evaluation?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
3. Has the PD provided reliable and credible evidence to demonstrate the validity of the original baseline or its update?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
4. If the CME selected another methodology, is it evaluated if it meets all the requirements of the selected methodology, the methodological tool and/or the standardized baseline?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
5. Is the information provided assessed for accuracy and adequacy as to whether the finances derived from Gold Standard Certification are important to the ongoing sustainability of the registered PoA?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Means of validation (MOV) <i>Mention the means of validation (MoV) used to validate this information</i>	N/A	
Justification of the MOV <i>Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.</i>	N/A	
Findings		
<input type="checkbox"/> CL	(findings ID...)	
<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	(findings ID...)	
<input type="checkbox"/> FAR	(findings ID...)	

Assertion Statement

«Directions: The assertion statement is a confirmation of requirements fulfilment by the PoA that includes the summary of the VVB opinion on the aspect being validated. For assessment and reporting requirements, please refer to relevant section in [Validation and Verification Standard](#). »»

PART VI – VALIDATION OPINION AND REPORT

Final opinion

- Positive
 Negative

KBS Certification Services Ltd. has been contracted by CO2 Balance UK Ltd." to perform the design change of the GS project activity "Improved Kitchen Regimes Multi-Country PoA" having GS reference no. 1247".

The design change was performed in accordance with the GS4GG Validation and verification standard, version 2.0/05/, GS4GG Design Change Requirements, version 1.1, GS4GG Principles and Requirements, Version 1.2/01/, GS4GG Activity Requirements:

The GS program of activity will result in real, measurable reductions of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and long-term benefits for mitigating climate change. In our opinion, the project activity meets all relevant GS, CDM, and host country criteria.

The review of the PDD and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided the validation team with sufficient evidence to determine.

- compliance with the monitoring plan of applied methodology(ies),
- level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan,
- Stakeholder Consultation,
- sustainable development impact assessment, including the application of the GS4GG SDG Impact Tool/12/,

The PDD correctly applies the methodology "GS TPDDTEC v4.0", "GS Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption", version 4.0"/09/

The management system provided in the proposed PDD is consistent with the design change requirement, version 1.1. It adequately includes all the roles and responsibilities of individuals involved in the implementation of the proposed project activity.

In conclusion, the validation team believes that the proposed project activity " CO2 Balance UK Ltd" having GS reference no 1247 meets all design change requirements and relevant GS requirements for submission of project activity to GS4GG for design change.

GHG emissions reductions and removals validated according to the design document (PoA-DD)/10/:

APPENDIX 1: ABBREVIATIONS

S.NO	ABBREVIATIONS	FULL TEXTS
1	BE	Baseline Emissions
2	CAR	Corrective Action Request
3	CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
4	CL	Clarification request

5	CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
6	DOE	Designated Operational Entity
7	EF	Emission Factor
8	EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
9	ER	Emission Reduction
10	FAR	Forward Action Request
11	GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
12	GWP	Global Warming Potential
13	GS4GG	Gold Standard for Global Goals
14	IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
15	KBS	KBS Certification Services Ltd.
16	LSC	Local stakeholder consultation
17	PE	Project Emissions
18	PDD	Project Design Document
19	QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
20	tCO ₂ e	Tons of CO ₂ equivalents
21	T&C	Technical & Certification
22	UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
23	VVS	Validation & Verification Standard
24	VVB	Gold Standard Validation and Verification Body
25	PD	Project Developer

APPENDIX 2: COMPETENCE OF TEAM MEMBERS AND TECHNICAL REVIEWERS

Personnel Name		Mr. M.P. Prasanna			
Schemes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CDM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GCC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other GHG Schemes (VCS CCB)
				VCS	
Qualified to work as					
Team Leader			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Technical Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Validator/Verifier			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial Expert	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Reviewer			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Expert (India)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Area(s) of Technical Expertise					
Sectoral Scope			Technical Area		
SS 1 – Energy Industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)			T 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energy sources		
SS 3 – Energy Demand			TA 3.1 – Energy Demand		
SS 7 - Transport			TA 7.1 - Transport		
Approved by (Manager Competence and Training)			Mr. Dushyant Parashar		
Approval date			21/03/2024		

Personnel Name		Mr. Tom.J. Varghese			
Schemes	<input type="checkbox"/> CDM	<input type="checkbox"/> GCC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Other GHG Schemes (VCS CCB)
				VCS	
Qualified to work as					
Team Leader			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Technical Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Validator/Verifier			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial Expert	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Reviewer			<input type="checkbox"/>	Local Expert (India)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Area(s) of Technical Expertise					
Sectoral Scope			Technical Area		
SS 1 – Energy Industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)			T 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energy sources		
SS 3 – Energy Demand			TA 3.1 – Energy Demand		
Approved by (Manager Competence and Training)			Dr.Ritu Arora Sehgal		
Approval date			14/06/2023		

Personnel Name		Mr. Sanjay Kumar Krishnan Kutty			
Schemes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CDM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GCC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VCS	<input type="checkbox"/> Other GHG Schemes (VCS CCB)
Qualified to work as					
Team Leader			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Technical Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Validator/Verifier			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial Expert	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Reviewer			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Expert (India)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Area(s) of Technical Expertise					
Sectoral Scope			Technical Area		
SS 1 – Energy Industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)			T 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energy sources		
SS 3 – Energy Demand			TA 3.1 – Energy Demand		
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal			TA 13.1. Solid waste and wastewater		
Approved by (Manager Competence and Training)			Dr.Rajesh Monga.		
Approval date			14/08/2023		

APPENDIX 3: DOCUMENTS/EVIDENCE REVIEWED OR REFERENCED

S.NO	AUTHOR	TITLE	REFERENCE TO THE DOCUMENT	PROVIDER
1.	Gold Standard	Principles and Requirements	Version 1.2 of 23/10/2019	Publicly available
2.	Gold Standard	Stakeholder consultation and engagement requirements	Version 2.1 of 14/06/2022	Publicly available
3.	Gold Standard	Safeguarding principles & requirements	Version 2.1 of 29/06/2023	Publicly available
4.	Gold Standard	Design change requirements	Version 1.1 of 14/04/2023	Publicly available
5.	Gold Standard	Validation and verification standard	Version 2.0 of 14/01/2021	Publicly available
6.	Gold Standard	Site visit and remote audit requirements and procedures	Version 2.0 of 30/05/2023	Publicly available

7.	Gold Standard	Programme of activity requirements and procedures	Version3.0 of 12/11/2024	Publicly available
8.	Gold Standard	Validation & verification body requirements	Version3.0 of 12/11/2024	Publicly available
9.	Gold Standard	REDUCED EMISSIONS FROM COOKING AND HEATING: Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption (TPDDTEC)	Version-4.0 of 07/10/2021	Publicly available
10.	CME	GS1247 IKR Micro PoA-DD CP2	Version16.1of 05/12/2024	CME
11.	CME	Baseline Survey	N/A	CME
12.	CME	SDG Impact tool	Version 2.0	CME
13.	CME	PoA Level SCR	N/A	CME
14.	CME	Technical Specification Cookstove/Safe Water	N/A	CME
15.	CME	Sensor information PoA level	N/A	CME
16.	CME	Third-party certificate	N/A	CME
17.	VVB	Attendance Sheet	N/A	VVB

APPENDIX 4: FINDINGS

Section 1: CLs from the validation

CL ID	01
Section no.	A.3
Date	04/10/2024
Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Open <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Turned to a FAR
Description of CL	The Project Developer shall clarify the models used for cookstoves and safe water in the project activity and provide objective evidence.
CME response	<p>First response dated 10/10/2024 Specification of the cookstove and safe water technology models are described at VPA level and vary between different projects, depending on the local context. Information on the general technology to be used is included on pages 7 & 10 of the PoA-DD. PP has submitted examples of cookstove and safe water technologies included in the project activity, including Chispa Plancha Cookstove Models and India Mark II handpumps (see 'Technical Specifications – Cookstove Example.pdf' & 'Technical Specifications – Safe Water Example.pdf').</p> <p>Second response dated 06/11/2024 PP has now included additional details of safe water and cookstove technologies, mentioned in accompanying documentation, to pages 8 and 10 of the PoA-DD.</p>
Documentation provided by CME	GS1247 IKR Micro PoA-DD CP2 v16.1
VVB assessment	<p>First response dated 10/10/2024 Acknowledge that the Project Developer (PD) has provided appropriate examples of cookstoves, and safe water technologies included in the project activity, such as the Chispa Plancha cookstoves and the India Mark handpump. However, these examples are not mentioned anywhere in the PoA Design Document (DD). Since they have already been implemented in different Voluntary Project Activities (VPAs), the Project developer needs to add a few models of cookstoves and water technologies used in the project activity to be incorporated into PoA-DD. Hence, it remains open</p> <p>Second response dated 08/11/2024 Noted that the Project Developer (PD) has provided appropriate examples of cookstoves, and safe water technologies included in the project activity as per section A.3 of -PoA-DD, such as the Chispa Plancha cookstoves and the India Mark handpump. Hence, it remains Closed.</p>
<i>Add rows further as required</i>	

CL ID	02
Section no.	B.2
Date	04/10/2024
Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Open <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Turned to a FAR
Description of CL	As per the PDD Section B.2, table 2.2.1.d.(Conditions in Section 2.0 'Source and Applicability' of TPDDTEC V4.0) 'The project developer must design incentive mechanism(s), which should be effective as fast as possible, for the elimination of inefficient baseline stoves that are replaced by the project cooking devices and describe the incentive mechanism(s) in the PoA-DD at the time of validation". Project developer shall provide the incentive mechanism for the same.
CME response	<p>First response dated 10/10/2024</p> <p>PP notes that Section B.2, table 2.2.1.d. (Conditions in Section 2.0 'Source and Applicability' of TPDDTEC V4.0) actually states "The project developer must design incentive mechanism(s), which should be effective as fast as possible, for the elimination of inefficient baseline stoves that are replaced by the project cooking devices and describe the incentive mechanism(s) in the PDD/VPA-DD at the time of validation".</p> <p>As stated in the PoA-DD, these incentives will be developed at VPA level. Incentives will be dependent on specific project situations and cultural differences in different project areas, therefore it is not suitable to create one approach at PoA level which will be applied across all projects.</p> <p>Second response dated 06/11/2024</p> <p>PD has included this explanation in Section B.2, Table 2.2.1.d of the PoA-DD.</p>
Documentation provided by CME	GS1247 IKR Micro PoA-DD CP2 v16.1
VVB assessment	<p>First response dated 24/10/2024</p> <p>It has been observed that the Project Developer (PD) has provided appropriate justification that the incentive mechanism will be developed at the VPA level,. However, this explanation is not mentioned in Section B.2, Table 2.2.1.d of the PoA-DD. The PD needs to address this information in the document. Hence, it remains open.</p> <p>Second response dated 08/11/2024</p> <p>It has been observed that the Project Developer (PD) has provided appropriate justification that the incentive mechanism will be developed at the VPA level,. Moreover, this explanation is mentioned in Section B.2, Table 2.2.1.d of the PoA-DD and found satisfactory. Hence, it is closed.</p>
<i>Add rows further as required</i>	

CL ID	03
Section no.	Supporting Documents
Date	04/04/2024
Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Open <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Turned to a FAR
Description of CL	<p><i>The project developer shall submit the following documents, along with objective evidence, as per the design change requirements for the project activity.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Local Stakeholder Report. (PoA Level, It includes Attendance sheet Feedback Sheet Mode of invitation (Email communication for direct & Indirect Stakeholders) Photographic Evidence)</i> <i>2. Baseline Survey Report</i> <i>3. Details of Clay water filter</i> <i>4. Calibration report for the temperature-based sensors / Flow meter.</i> <i>5. Third-party thermal efficiency certificate.</i> <i>6. Replacement mechanisms for Project technologies both ICS & Water</i>

<p>CME response</p>	<p>First response dated 10/10/2024</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PD has submitted an example SCR Report (see 'Stakeholder Consultation Report Example – Confidential.pdf') 2. PD has submitted an example baseline survey report (see 'Baseline Survey Questionnaire and Report.xlsx') 3. Details relating to the clay water filter can be found on page 9 of the PoA-DD. This model was used as a water filter example but has not been used in a project under this PoA yet, so no further information is available or required as part of this review. 4. We do not currently have any calibration reports available as these sensors are only being trialed in the project. Calibration reports are not required by the methodology, so PP does not consider this evidence necessary. 5. PD has submitted example thermal efficiency certificate (see 'Third-Party Certificate of Cookstove Example'.pdf) <p>As stated in CL02, replacement mechanisms will be determined at VPA level as they will be dependent on specific project situations and cultural differences in different project areas.</p> <p>Second response dated 06/11/2024</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In accordance with GS Design Change Requirements v1.1, Section 4.5, a stakeholder consultation was not required for this design change due to the nature of the changes made – “The project developer shall determine whether a stakeholder consultation is necessary for changes to the project design. This process involves assessing the potential impact of changes on stakeholders and determining whether their input is necessary to ensure that the project design remains aligned with their needs and expectations... For example, changes to wind power projects, such as increasing capacities in new locations or modifying the microsite plan of wind turbines to different locations than those originally planned during design certification, may require a physical meeting”. PD has submitted the most recent PoA level SCR (required as the project boundary was extended) as an example, however this is not necessary for this review (see 'PoA-level SCR – Example.pdf'). 2. PD has submitted an example baseline survey which has been completed (see 'Baseline Survey Example.xlsx'). However, PD highlights that baseline surveys are conducted at VPA level so this is not representative of the PoA. 6. <i>PD has included this explanation in Section B.2, Table 2.2.1.d of the PoA-DD</i>
<p>Documentation provided by CME</p>	<p>PoA-level SCR – Example.pdf Baseline Survey Example.xlsx GS1247 IKR Micro PoA-DD CP2 v16.1</p>

<p>VVB assessment</p>	<p>First response dated 24/10/2024</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. During the remote assessment, it was discussed that the Project Developer (PD) stated that the local stakeholder meeting conducted at the PoA level and the provided LSC document were identified as being at the VPA level, dated 22/12/2022. The PD is required to provide the latest LSC report at the PoA level; therefore, this comment remains open 2. The document provided by the project developer was found to be inappropriate. It has been noticed that the analysis and report tabs in the baseline report are not filled with information. The project developer shall provide the basic necessary questionnaire results along with a completed baseline report 3. The explanation provided by the project developer was found to be appropriate and satisfactory; hence, the comment is closed. 4. It has been observed that the Project Developer (PD) stated in the PoA section, Appendix 2, Design Change sub-section A2.2, that "the design change does not impact the level of accuracy and completeness of monitoring of project activity." This statement has been found satisfactory; hence, it remains closed. 5. The project developer has submitted the appropriate document, which is the thermal efficiency certificate for the cookstoves. Therefore, the comment remains closed. 6. It has been noted that the project developer provided the justification that replacement mechanisms will be determined at the VPA level based on specific project situations and cultural differences in various project areas. However, that information is missing in the PoA DD Section B.2. The project developer should add this information to the document; therefore, it is still open <p>Second response dated 08/11/2024</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. During the remote assessment, it was noted that the Project Developer (PD) confirmed that the local stakeholder meeting held at the PoA level, along with the provided SCR document, were the same event, dated 11/03/2021. As a result, this comment is considered closed. 2. The document submitted by the project developer has been reviewed and deemed appropriate and satisfactory. It was observed that the analysis and report sections of the baseline report contain the required information, including the completed questionnaire results and the finalized baseline report. Therefore, this issue is considered closed. 3. It has been duly noted that the project developer has furnished a justification indicating that the determination of replacement mechanisms will occur at the VPA level, tailored to the distinct project conditions and cultural diversities across various geographical areas. Furthermore, the information provided in PoA-DD Section B.2, Table 2.2.2.d, is in congruence with the source of applicability of the most recent methodology. Consequently, this matter is considered resolved and is hereby closed.
------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Add rows further as
required*

CL ID	04
Section no.	Appendix-2
Date	04/10/2024
Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Open <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Turned to a FAR
Description of CL	The project developer shall clarify/explain the advantages of TPDDTEC Version 3.1 over Version 4.0 with respect to the impact on the Design change of the project activity.
CME response	<p>First response dated 10/10/2024</p> <p>PP confirms that TPDDTEC v4.0 is being included under this PoA as it is the newest version of this methodology, meaning that new projects are no longer able to use TPDDTEC v3.1 as an applied methodology. TPDDTEC v3.1 remains an applied methodology in the PoA for all VPAs which are still using this methodology under their current crediting period.</p> <p>There are various differences between the two methodologies, these include:</p> <p>Distribution List:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPDDTEC v.4.0: Name, telephone number and address and/or GPS coordinates must be provided in the distribution list for all end users. - TPDDTEC v3.1: Cookstove user name, telephone number and address are not required to be provided if "it is justified as not feasible". <p>CTF collection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPDDTEC v4.0: CTFs are collected at every stage of distribution (e.g. CTFs collected at the factory producing the stoves, and from each individual end-user). - TPDDTEC v3.1: CTFs are only required from the end-user or bulk purchasers. <p>Cookstove efficiency stipulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPDDTEC v4.0: Cookstoves must have a thermal efficiency of at least 20%. - TPDDTEC v3.1: No minimum efficiency included. <p>Elimination of Baseline Stoves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPDDTEC v4.0: PD is required to design an incentive mechanism detailed in the PDD, that ensures the elimination of baseline stoves as quickly as possible. - TPDDTEC v3.1: Shifts in technology may occur in a gradual manner and adoption can increase over the project period. <p>Second response dated 28/10/2024</p> <p>Applicability, selection and justification of baseline scenarios, and emission reduction calculation requirements for TPDDTEC v4.0 and how they are applied to the PoA have been detailed in section B.2 of the PoA-DD.</p>

Documentation provided by CME	GS1247 IKR Micro PoA-DD CP2 v16.1
VVB assessment	<p>First response dated 24/10/2024</p> <p>Acknowledge the explanation provided by the project developer regarding the newest version of the methodology TPDDTEC v4.0. However, the source of applicability of the methodologies in terms of cookstoves and safe water has been found to be missing. Please note the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applicability - Selection and justification of baseline scenarios - Emission reduction calculation <p>The project developer shall explain the key updates and relevant changes according to the new methodologies and make changes in alignment with GS PoA-DD. Hence, CL 04 is open</p> <p>Second response dated 29/10/2024</p> <p>The explanation provided by the project developer regarding the latest version of the methodology TPDDTEC v4.0 is acknowledged. Additionally, the update to the source of applicability of the methodologies concerning cookstoves and safe water, as outlined in Section B.2 of the PoA-DD with respect to Applicability, Selection of Baseline Scenarios, and Emission Reduction Calculation, has been found satisfactory. Therefore, CL04 is closed.</p>
<i>Add rows further as required</i>	

Section 2: CARs from the validation

CAR ID	01
Section no.	A.3
Date	04/10/2024
Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Open <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Turned to a FAR
Description of CAR	<i>The project developer shall submit the updated SDG Impact tool with objective evidence of SDG 1 & SDG 7.</i>
CME response	<p>First response dated 10/10/2024 PD has submitted updated SDG tool including SG1 and SDG 7 (430_V1.3_IQ_SDG-Impact-tool – Example.xlsx).</p> <p>Second response dated 29/10/2024 PD has submitted an updated version of the SDG impact tool. The version provided is to be considered as example only and PD would like to clarify that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SDG calculations are project/VPA specific that means each SDG can be claimed in different ways across the projects/VPA. • Each project does not necessarily claim all the SDG listed in the PoA, but only some of them (3 is the minimum GS requirement). <p>In addition, as per section 3.1.4 of the “The SDG Impact Tool Manual”: The SDG Tool application is optional and not mandatory for the following projects. Such projects may apply the SDG tool on a voluntary basis by making applicable changes in the monitoring plan by submitting a design change request at the time of the next issuance.</p> <p>a. design certified projects and VPAs/CPAs until the end of the ongoing Crediting Period (after which application is mandatory) and b. new VPAs/CPAs that will be included in design-certified PoAs until the end of the ongoing Crediting Period of the PoA.</p>
Documentation provided by CME	430_V1.3_IQ_SDG-Impact-tool - Example V2
VVB assessment	<p>First response dated 24/10/2024 It has been noted that the submitted SDG impact tool includes only SDG 1 and SDG 7. The project developer should add all the SDGs as mentioned in the PoA-DD. Therefore, CAR 01 is open.</p> <p>Second response dated 29/10/2024</p> <p>The Validation team has thoroughly assessed the revised SDG Impact Tool and has determined it to be both appropriate and satisfactory, in full compliance with the design change requirements. Moreover, as specified in Section 3.1.4 of the SDG Impact Tool Manual V1.1, the validation team has formally accepted and concluded that the tool fulfills all requisite criteria. As a result, CAR 01 is hereby deemed closed.</p>

CAR ID	02
Section no.	B.1
Date	04/04/2024
Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Open <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Turned to a FAR
Description of CAR	The project developer shall submit the details of the editing of the surrounding sensors used in the project activity with objective evidence. (Like where it is used, function, lifetime and maintenance, etc.)
CME response	First response dated 10/10/2024 PD has submitted the requested information for 2 sensor examples: Charity Water and Magenta (see doc `Sensor Information_PoA review).
Documentation provided by CME	N/A
VVB assessment	First response dated 24/10/2024 The project developer has submitted the appropriate documents, which have been found satisfactory, including those from Charity: Water and Sensors. Since these documents address function, lifetime, and maintenance, CAR02 remains closed.

CAR ID	03
Section no.	B.1
Date	04/10/2024
Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Open <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Turned to a FAR
Description of CAR	The project developer must demonstrate compliance with the monitoring procedure followed by an updated methodology Requirements.
CME response	<p>First response dated 10/10/2024</p> <p>The monitoring procedure will be adapted at VPA level and will be described in the project specific VPA-DD. These will be aligned with the methodology requirements outlined in TPDDTEC v.4.</p> <p>Second response dated 06/11/2024</p> <p>PP confirms that permanent changes or deviations to the monitoring plan will comply with the applied methodologies and will not reduce the level of accuracy of the monitoring compared to the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan.</p> <p>PP also confirms that the revised PoA-DD complies with all the requirements of the applied or updated methodologies and all applicable regulatory documents</p>
Documentation provided by CME	N/A
VVB assessment	<p>First response dated 24/10/2024</p> <p>The project developer shall explain in detail the following points mentioned below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Permanent changes or deviations to the monitoring plan must be in compliance with the applied methodologies and should not reduce the level of accuracy of the monitoring compared to the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan. 2. Is the revised PoA DD in compliance with all the requirements of the applied or updated methodologies and all applicable regulatory documents <p>Hence, the CAR 03 is open.</p> <p>Second Response Dated 08/11/2024</p> <p>Acknowledge that the project developer has provided appropriate justification as per section 4.3 of design change 'Applicability of methodology and compliance with the monitoring plan "has met the criteria. Moreover, the permanent changes or deviations to the monitoring plan will comply with the applied methodologies and will not reduce the level of accuracy of the monitoring compared to the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan. Hence CAR 03 is Closed.</p>

Section 3: FARs from the validation

FAR ID	01
Section no.	
Date	14-02-2025
Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open <input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Turned to a FAR
Description of FAR	<p>The applicability of SDG indicators cannot be definitively determined solely during the design change assessment at the PoA level. Furthermore, it is necessary to evaluate and confirm that the SDG indicators claimed by each actual and corresponding regular VPA align with the eligibility criteria established at the PoA level, as well as with the SDG impact tool. Therefore, this concern should be addressed in the next assessment.</p>
CME response	>>
Documentation provided by CME	>>
VVB assessment	>>

FAR ID	02
Section no.	B.1
Date	14-02-2025
Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open <input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Turned to a FAR
Description of FAR	<p>The evaluation of VPA-level documentation and evidence supporting the claimed SDG indicators, in alignment with the SDG impact tool, is essential. Although monitoring options can be outlined in Section B.1 of the PoA-DD, their relevance and compliance with the methodology must be substantiated at the actual VPA level. This necessitates detailed justifications tailored to the project technology, specific VPA conditions, and the methodology requirements in use. Hence, this issue should be addressed in the upcoming assessment.</p>
CME response	>>
Documentation provided by CME	>>
VVB assessment	>>

FAR ID	03
Section no.	
Date	14-02-2025
Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open <input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Turned to a FAR
Description of FAR	The project developer is required to provide information on the SDG indicators claimed by each actual VPA and its corresponding regular VPA, along with an assessment of their alignment with the eligibility criteria established at the PoA level and the SDG impact tool. Hence, this issue should be addressed in the upcoming assessment.
CME response	>>
Documentation provided by CME	>>
VVB assessment	>>

FAR ID	04
Section no.	
Date	14-02-2025
Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open <input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Turned to a FAR
Description of FAR	The project developer is required to submit the fNRB report at the VPA level, detailing the methodology and approach used. Additionally, it should outline how the fNRB will be assessed at the PoA level. Consequently, the assessment team will address this matter in the next evaluation to ensure proper compliance and consistency.
CME response	>>
Documentation provided by CME	>>
VVB assessment	>>

FAR ID	05
Section no.	
Date	14-02-2025
Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open <input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Turned to a FAR
Description of FAR	The monitoring options presented in Section B.1 of the PoA-DD, along with their applicability and compliance with the methodology, will be demonstrated at the actual VPA level. However, it is essential that specific justifications, considering the project technology, VPA circumstances, and the applicable methodology requirements, are clearly outlined in the PoA-DD.
CME response	>>
Documentation provided by CME	>>
VVB assessment	>>

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Version	Date	Description
1.0	DD/MM/YYYY	Initial adoption