VERIFICATION REPORT FOR INSTALLATION OF HIGH EFFICIENCY WOOD BURNING COOKSTOVES IN KENYA

Report ID	VCS VerR 2349 MP01012023-31032025
Project title	Installation of high efficiency wood burning cookstoves in Kenya
Project ID	VCS 2349
Verification period	01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025(inclusive both days)
Original date of issue	15-September-2025
Most recent date of issue	02-February-2026
Version	03

VCS Standard Version	Version 4.7
Client	Bridge Carbon Africa Stoves Development Private Limited
Prepared by	SustainCERT S.A.
Approved by	Shivraj Sharma Director, Validation and Verification Services
Work carried out by	Team Leader: Dr. Atul Takarkhede (TA 3.1) Auditor: Dr. Atul Takarkhede (TA 3.1) Technical Area Expert: Dr. Atul Takarkhede (TA 3.1) Country Expert/Auditor: Ms. Caroline Kimani (TA 3.1) Independent Reviewer: Mr. Shivraj Sharma (TA 3.1)

Summary:

A description of the verification of the project

The Verification of the project titled 'Installation of high efficiency wood burning cookstoves in Kenya' VCS ID – 2349, have been undertaken by SustainCERT, with accordance to the relevant VCS standard/1/, VCS Program Guide/2/. Relevant requirements of ISO 14064-2 and ISO 14064-3, as well as applicable criteria for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting have been applied for verification.

The project VCS 2349 involves distribution of cookstoves in Kenya. The project activity by the PP is a voluntary initiative as host country laws do not mandate the distribution of ICS to the households. The project proponent is Bridge Carbon Africa Stoves Development Private Limited who uses the carbon finance to support local partners engaged in different activities like production, distribution, and maintenance of various product technologies. The two ICSs distributed by the PP under this project activity are Total Land Care Rocket Stoves (TLC-RS). The ICS is designed to improve fuel combustion and heat transfer which improves combustion efficiency of wood fuel.

The Purpose and scope of verification

Purpose:

Verification service provided by SustainCERT is to perform independent periodic verification for the monitoring period 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025 (both days included). The verification of the project is an independent review and ex-post determination by SustainCERT of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions that have occurred, against the VCS standard/1/, VCS Program Guide/2/, the Project baseline and host country criteria.

Scope of verification:

The scope of verification is to establish/verify that:

- Methodology changes from VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1. to VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0.
    - The project activity has been implemented and operated as per the changed methodology.
    - All the physical features (project technology) of the project are in place in accordance with registered VCS PD, revised PD and VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0.
    - The monitoring report and other supporting documents provided are complete in accordance with the latest applicable version of VCS standard.
    - The actual monitoring systems and procedures comply with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan, any registered monitoring plan, the changed methodology including applicable tool(s) and/or, where applicable, the reassessed baseline.
    - The data recorded and stored as per the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the reassessed baseline

  The Monitoring Period:

  The project activity VCS 2349 is undergoing 5th verification from 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025(both days included), under its first crediting period from 06-October-2020 to 05-October-2030 (inclusive both days).

  The Method and Criteria used for Verification:

  Desk Review:

  Review of project information, monitoring plan specifically monitoring frequency, quality assurance and quality control system against the registered PD& revised PD and applicable VCS standard and applied methodology VCS Methodology from Sectoral Scope 3 – VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0

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

  The number of findings raised during verification:

  A risk-based approach has been followed for the verification of the project. During verification, 04 CARs, 07 CL and 00 FAR were raised during verification.

  All the issues raised were resolved successfully, details for which can be found in appendix 4 of the report.

Any uncertainties associated with the verification:

The assessment team thoroughly reviewed monitoring report and the emission reduction calculation sheet against the relevant evidence and applicable VCS requirements, VCS standard V4.7/1/ and VCS guideline V4.4. It has been concluded that there are no more uncertainties associated with the project.

Summary of the verification conclusion:

The review of revised VCS PD, monitoring report/8/, emission reduction calculation sheet along with relevant supporting evidence and the interview with relevant personnel during on site audit have provided the assessment team with sufficient evidence to confirm to the applicable criteria. The SustainCERT confirms the project activity has been successfully implemented in accordance with the registered PD & revised PD and updated methodology VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0 meeting all the relevant VCS requirements. SustainCERT confirms that the monitoring period 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025 (both days included) in its implementation is calculated to generate 16,591 tCO_2e of emission reductions from reducing the amount of wood fuel combustion.

The management of Bridge Carbon Africa Stoves Development Private Limited (Project Proponent) is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emission reductions on the basis set out within the project's Monitoring Plan indicated in the registered Project Design and the updated methodology.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The Verification of the project titled "Installation of high efficiency wood burning cookstoves in Kenya" VCS 2349, have been undertaken by SustainCERT, as requested by Bridge Carbon Africa Stoves Development Private Limited project proponent for the monitoring period 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025(both days included). The verification of project activity is the 5th periodic verification for the crediting period 06-October-2020 to 05-October-2030 (inclusive both days). The purpose of the verification is to conduct an independent review of the project information and confirm:

- The project activity is implemented in accordance with registered project description document/5/, revised PD /33/ and updated methodology.
- All physical features (project technology) are in place.
- The actual monitoring systems and procedures comply with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan, the updated methodology including applicable tool(s) and/or, where applicable, the reassessed baseline.
- The data collection procedures and records are as per the monitoring methodology VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0/7/.

The verification followed the requirements mentioned in the VCS standard/1/ and VCS Guidelines/2/ ensuring the quality and consistency of the report.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of verification for this project activity involves assessing the claims made by the project proponent in the monitoring report/8/, emission reduction calculation sheet/9/ and other supporting evidence (as mentioned in appendix 2) made available to the verifier for this monitoring period from 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025 (both days included), in accordance to:

- VCS standard, version 4.7/1/
- VCS program guideline, version 4.4/2/
- VCS Methodology from Sectoral Scope 3 – VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0/7/.
- Other relevant rules and requirements, including host party requirements/30/.

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

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

1.3 Level of Assurance

The verification of the project activity is conducted by doing a thorough assessment of Monitoring report/8/, Registered PD/5/, revised PD/33/ emission reduction calculation sheet/9/ and all the relevant documents mentioned Kitchen Performance Test, and Distribution Database' (as mentioned in appendix 2) of the report.

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

Enough evidences were gathered by the assessment team to reduce the risk associated with audit process. This means that there is some uncertainty arising from the use of sampling since it is possible that a material mis-statement is missed.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

This is the 5th monitoring report for the "Installation of high efficiency wood burning cookstoves in Kenya" (VCS ID 2349), by Bridge Carbon Africa Stoves Development Private Limited which is aimed at distributing fuel-efficient improved cookstoves (ICS) to local communities in Kenya.

The ICS distribution of this project activity replaces the baseline practice of using wood in traditional cookstoves or three-stone fire stoves. The project activity involves the distribution of two Total Land Care Rocket Stoves (TLC-RS) to *eligible households throughout rural Kenya*. The project activity achieves the emission reductions through biomass burning using improved combustion efficiency of wood fuel and decreased wood fuel consumption.

The project activity has been implemented in phased manner, with each household receiving two stoves. At the end of this 5th monitoring period, a total of 119,938 ICS were distributed in 59,969 households under the grouped project/11/.

Technical specification of the stove technology is verified in accordance with registered PD section 1.11, manufacturer's specifications/25/.

An onsite audit for the project activity was conducted from 09-July-2025 to 19 July 2025. Furthermore, it was confirmed that the project involves dissemination of improved cookstoves for period 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025 (both days included), leading to 16,591 tCO_2e/9/ emission reductions.

The start date of the project activity is 06-October-2020/6/. This was verified from the opening meeting, verification against distribution database/11/ and by cross verifying against previous monitoring period reports and verification reports. The crediting period for the project activity is 06-October-2020 to 05-October-2030 (inclusive both days), as verified using PD/5//33/, validation report/6/ and onsite visit/10/.

Based on this, the assessment team confirms that the project activity is implemented and operational in accordance with applied methodology VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0/7/, registered & revised Project Description Document/5//33/, VCS standard, version 4.7/1/ and VCS program guide, version 4.4/2/. It has also been assessed and verified that emission reduction calculation for this monitoring period from 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025 (both days included) has been done conservatively and found to be appropriate.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

The Registered Project activity has been undergoing 5th Verification under its crediting period (fixed 10 years), the approach adapted to ensure the quality and credibility of emission reduction is described in the following sections.

2.1 Method and Criteria

The method and criteria used for verification consist of the following phases. A risk-based approach has been applied for the process.

Desk review:

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

- Project activity sources contributing to the leakage as well as project emissions are assessed.
- The frequency of measurements, QA/QC procedures and other relevant documents are verified.
- An onsite audit for the project was conducted from 09-July-2025 to 19 July 2025. Further details regarding the process have been mentioned in sections 2.3 and 2.4 of the report.

- Interviews of the project representatives were conducted to discuss the implementation and operational status of the project with respect to the registered monitoring plan/5/ and updated methodology.
- Discussion of QA/QC procedure, data collection, storage and transfer.
- Interview and visual observation on the condition of the project technology stove, baseline stoves, perceived opinion on SDG claims of the projects, grievances if any
- Monitoring period claimed (01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025) was verified from the ER calculation/9/, as well as from the previous monitoring period/4/ and its verification report/4/ to ensure that the period claimed is continuing from the last monitoring period and no double claim made.

  During verification, 04 CARs, 07 CL and 00 FAR were raised during verification. Resolution of all the issues and findings raised was done, and the final verification statement was issued.

2.2 Document Review

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

The completeness of the information with reference to the register PD/5/, revised PD/33/ and updated methodology/7/.

Review of project information, monitoring plan specifically monitoring frequency, quality assurance and quality control system against the registered PD/5/ and applicable VCS standard and updated methodology/7/.

A review of the QA/QC procedures were conducted to make sure the implementation is as per the revised PD/33/ and updated methodology VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0/7/.

Project specific assessment against applicable national framework and legislation requirement[1].

All the other evidence reviewed is mentioned in Appendix 2 of this report. The cross checks between information provided in the Monitoring report/08/, VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0/7/ and information from sources other than those used, if available, the team's sectoral or local expertise and, if necessary, independent background investigations.

[1] https://laoofficialgazette.gov.la/index.php?r=site/index

2.3 Interviews

An on-site inspection/10/ was performed by the assessment team member Ms. Caroline Kimani (TA 3.1) from 09-July-2025 to 19-July-2025 for the project and baseline reassessment in accordance with updated methodology.

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

S/n	Name of household user	Location (Village, District/Province/state, Country	Stove Id Number	Date of Onsite Interviews
1.	Matilda Maingi	Kithi, kangundo central, Machakos	CQCVKE 0411895	09-July-2025
2.	Looise Katua	Kyanzesye, kalama, Machakos	CQCVKE 0358153	09-July-2025
3.	Agnes Mukuria	Makongeni, Gatanga, Murang'a	CQCVKE 0056115 0056116	10-July-2025
4.	Cecilia Wavinya	Makongeni-gatanga Murang'a	CQCVKE 0057514 0057513	10-July-2025
5.	Joseph Nzuki	Wendo, Ithanga-Gatanga Murang'a	CQCVKE 0078482	10-July-2025
6.	Esther Ndunge	Mbusyani, Ithanga-Gatanga Murang'a	CQCVKE 0180510 CQC0180509	10-July-2025
7.	Patrick Muendo Mulwa	Mouukune, Masinga Central, Machakos	CQCVKE 0404245 0404246	16-July-2025
8.	Catherine Kathini Muindi	Mikayauni, Kivaa Masinga Machakos	CQCVKE 0351935 0351936	16-July-2025

Table 2: KPT stove users interviewed on site for household visit

S/n	Name of household user	Location (Village, District/Province/state, Country	Stove Id Number	Date of Onsite Interviews
1.	Mary Wamby	Makongo, Gatanga Murang'a	CQCVKE 0056766 0056765	10-July-2025
2.	Mariam Muthoni	Makongo, Gatanga Murang'a	CQCVKE 0057273 0057274	10-July-2025
3.	John Njuguna	Gicabi, Elementaita Gilgil, Nakuru	CQCVKE 0276862 0276863	14-July-2025
4.	Wango Mwania	Kyondoni, Machakos	CQCVKE 0099252 0099251	17-July-2025
5.	Elen Ndambuki	Mtomoo, Kitui	CQC 0432742 0432741	19-July-2025
6.	Jennifer Nganda	Kabutho,	CQCVKE0389075 CQCVKE0389074	19-July-2025
7.	Wanza Mawia	Kaumoni, Makueni	CQCVKE0437363 CQCVKE0437390	19-July-2025
8.	Angela Ndinda	Kaumoni, Makueni	CQCVKE 0437392 0437391	19-July-2025

Table 3: Baseline stove users interviewed on site for household visit

S/n	Name of household user	Location (Village, District/Province/state, Country	Stove Id Number	Date of Onsite Interviews
1.	Jackline Kanini	Kavilinguni, Kangundo East, Machakos	BCKBS 0030	09-July-2025
2.	Bendetta Wayua	Kavilinguni ward Kithatani village, Kangundo East Machakos	BCKBS 0029	09-July-2025
3.	Grace Mbenge	Kalama ward, kiitini, Ngulwa, Kamutonga Kalama	BCKBS 0048	09-July-2025
4.	Alice Mukami Thiogo	Gicabi, Elementaita Gilgil, Nakuru	BCKB S0069	14-July-2025
5.	Josephine Wangari Wakuria	Rigogo, Kabazi Subukia Nakuru	BCKBS 0060	15-July-2025
6.	Ngwio Nzumbi	Ituka, Nguutani Mwingi West, Kitui	BCKBS 0087	17-July-2025
7.	Vundi Ngombalu	Masaa, Nguutani Mwingi West Kitui	BS114	17-July-2025
8.	Irene Ngata	Masaa, Nguutani Mwingi West Kitui	BS 113	17-July-2025

Table 4: Project implementation field team, PP representative and Local Stakeholders interviewed from 09-July-2025 to 19-July-2025.

S/N	Name of the person Interviewed	Designation	Topic Discussed	Date of onsite Interviews	Audit Team
1.	Kingwaa Shadrack	Retired Chief	Introduction of the project & consultation purpose, benefits of the project Stakeholder participation, opinion about the project, grievance/ feedback	19-July-2025	Caroline Kimani Technical (country) Expert
2.	Beatrice Muia	Area Chief	Introduction of the project & consultation purpose, benefits of the project Stakeholder participation, opinion about the project, grievance/ feedback	19-July-2025	
3.	Phillp Kilee	Beneficiary	Introduction of the project & consultation purpose, benefits of the project	19-July-2025	

S/N	Name of the person Interviewed	Designation	Topic Discussed	Date of onsite Interviews	Audit Team
			Stakeholder participation, opinion about the project, grievance/ feedback		
4.	Anant Ladukar	Manager, Bridge Carbon	ER calculations, VCS PD, Project description, eligibility, baseline etc.	19-July-2025	
5.	Dr. Vijaybhai Patel	Sr. Manager, Bridge Carbon	Project Technology, O&M activities, Project monitoring, project distribution mechanism, data collection (distribution database), grievances mechanism, LSC etc.	19-July-2025	
6.	Narendra Koganti	Manager, Bridge Carbon	ER calculations, VCS PD, Project description, eligibility, baseline etc.	19-July-2025	
7.	Wimbiso Simbi	Project Manager, Bridge Carbon, Kenya	Project monitoring survey execution, project distribution mechanism, data collection (distribution database), grievances mechanism	19-July-2025	
8.	Michael Mutinda	Stove Champion, Bridge Carbon, Kenya	ICS distribution, monitoring and maintenance, grievances	09-Juy-2025	
9.	Joshua Maingi	Stove Champion, Bridge Carbon, Kenya	ICS distribution, monitoring and maintenance, grievances	15-Juy-2025	
10.	Faith Wayua	Stove Champion, Bridge Carbon, Kenya	ICS distribution, monitoring and maintenance, grievances	19-Juy-2025	

Tables 1, 2, 3 & 4 provide a comprehensive overview of the onsite interview process conducted during the verification.

The tables outline the personnel involved in the interviews, along with their respective roles. The interviews specifically targeted individuals responsible for monitoring the project activity, data collection and management, as well as those involved in the quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) procedures. Assessment team also interviewed some of the local stakeholders during onsite visit. The tables serve to identify the individuals interviewed and provide relevant information regarding their roles within the project.

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

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

- Project technology usage
- Project technology model and overall condition (repairs/maintenance)
- Project unique identification barcode
- Baseline stove and baseline fuel
- Confirmation regarding the end user agreements and carbon transfer rights
- Perception on smoke level & time savings of project technology vs baseline stove

During the site visit, assessment team has interviewed with PP's representative and implementation partners employed monitoring teams. Interviews were conducted as part of the verification process for data collection and storage for data sets of distribution database/11/and monitoring survey/12/.

2.4 Site Visits

The VVB carried out an on-site visit from 09-July-2025 to 19-July-2025 and physically inspected the baseline scenarios in line with VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0/7/ and project technical design and implementation as specified in the VCS PD/5/ & MR /8/.

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

The sampling plan adopted by the VVB for carrying out the verification assessment is as follows.

The Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities (Version 9.0)/17/ states under paragraph 28 that "When the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have applied a sampling approach, the VVB may apply acceptance sampling as described in the steps indicated in paragraphs 29–38 below as part of validation/verification activities".

Since the PP has monitored parameters ($n_{j,k,y}$and $BC_{p,j,k,y}$) through surveys, verification team conducted acceptance sampling in line with paragraph 30 and 31 of the sampling standard version 9.0/17/.

The verification team selected random sample of PP's monitoring survey to check the acceptability (or otherwise) of the data for each such record with PP's sample records and determined if the PP's sample records meet the requirements. The sample size is calculated in conformance with paragraph 39 "A DOE may select a different sample size than the one indicated in paragraph 32 above, either by choosing a different value for the consumer risk and producer risk (e.g. 20 per cent for the consumer risk) when applying acceptance sampling or by using another approach, if any of the following conditions apply:

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

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

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

The grouped project is located in Kenya, which is a lower-middle-income nation /19/ and ERs achieved for the project activity less than 100,000 t CO_2 eq. Thus, the verification team can choose a different sample size than one indicated in para 32 of the sampling standard/17/.

During site visit, 8+8 (total 16) household was planned for monitoring survey and project KPT survey. VVB also selected 8 samples for the baseline KPT survey done by the PP. VVB used acceptance sampling during verification for checking the PP's sample size. In accordance with the para 31-32 of the sampling standard, version 09, a sample size of 8 will required based on an AQL of 0.5 % and UQL of 20 %, producer risk 5 % and consumer risk 20 %. The AQL and UQL selected is based on the Table 2 of the sampling standard, version and complies with the sampling standard.

VVB has also selected oversampling in case on non-availability of any sample and thus selected 11 samples each from PP's monitoring & project KPT surveys.

The verification team selected random sample of PP's monitoring survey records ($n_{j,k,y}$, $\eta_{new,avg,y}$, $BC_{b,i,y}$ and $BC_{p,j,k,y}$) to check the acceptability (or otherwise) of the data for each such record with PP's sample records and determined if the PP's sample records meet the requirements.

Therefore, it is concluded by the VVB team to affirms that the project sampling design and field verification reflects a methodologically robust and conservatively designed plan and is fully compliant with VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0 (Section 9.3) and the CDM Sampling Standard v9.0. Also, it accounts for Kenya field realities through application of local expertise, provincial representation, and risk-based sampling.

Sample Size:

AQL	UQL	Producer Risk	Consumer Risk	Sample Size; Min	Acceptance No.
0.5%	20%	5%	20%	8	0

Baseline households confirmed usage of three stove stoves for cooking. All the project households interviewed were found to have the project operational. The verification team would like to conclude that based on acceptance sampling approach the project participant's sample record meets the requirement.

The list of interviewed users, project implementer and PP's representatives that were part of the site visit process is detailed in section 2.3 of the report.

2.5 Resolution of Findings

As discussed above, a risk-based approach has been applied for the verification of the project activity. During the verification, the assessment team identified the issues which could impact the accuracy and the credibility of the emission reduction claimed by the project. The detailed analysis of the issues raised the approach used to resolve these issues can be found in Appendix 4 of this report.

The Corrective Action Request (CAR) was raised if:

- Modifications to the implementation, operation, and monitoring of the registered project activity have not been sufficiently documented by the project participants.
- Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data, or calculations of emission reductions that will impact the number of emission reductions.
- The Clarification Request (CL) was raised if:
- information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable requirements have been met.
- The Forward Action Request (FAR) was raised if:
- if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.

During verification a total of 04 CARs, 07 CLs and 0 FARs were raised. The details of all the issues communicated to the PD can be found in the Appendix 4. The issues raised were closed successfully.

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

The project activity is undergoing 5th Verification, monitoring period from 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025(both days included). There are 0 FARs that have been raised during the current verification period and also there is no FAR from previous verification period or VERRA review.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

This section is not applicable for present verification, as Sustain-Cert holds the necessary accreditation for the validation and verification for projects under Scope 3 / Technical Area 3.1.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

Change of methodology is performed from VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1 to VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0. In accordance with VCS Methodology Change Project Deviation Procedure v4.0, project description deviations are assessed by VVB under section 3.2 of the report.

3.1 Methodology Deviations

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

3.2 Project Description Deviations

Already Approved Deviations:

Deviation 1: (Deviation Approved during monitoring period 06-October-2020 to 31-August-2021)

The PP has taken a deviation during 1st MP verification (06-October-2020 to 31-August-2021) as in certain villages of Kenya, Implementing Partner has charged a nominal amount for the readymade bricks used for building the stove (for around 2000 ICS). This happened due to the shortage of raw materials like clay and cow dung in that village/ HH vicinity. These raw materials had to be arranged from other locations by implementing partners at additional cost. Other than these 2000 stoves, the Project Implementer/Project Proponent installed all the stoves at zero cost, and PP does not plan on charging the end users any amount. PP has replaced the IP that charged the amount with another IP, ensuring that distribution/installation will remain free of cost. In section 3.5 of registered VCS-PD, other than the regulatory surplus and positive list, another step called project method has been added. NPV analysis steps are being added in the revised VCS-PD to confirm the additionality of each project activity instance, where the PP has other sources of revenue except carbon credit sales. PP calculated the NPV of the project and provided a detailed investment analysis spreadsheet to VVB during the first verification. Also, the implementation cost and project revenue are mentioned in detail in section 3.5 of the VCS PD.

The proposed changes do not have any impact on applicability of methodology, appropriateness of the baseline scenario, or estimation of emission reductions. No such instances were observed during current monitoring period.

Deviation 2: (Deviation taken during monitoring period 01-March-2022 to 15-September-2022)

The PP has approved deviation during the 3rd MP verification (01-March-2022 to 15-September-2022). Since 11-January-2023, project ownership rights transferred to C-Quest Capital SGS Stoves Private Limited. The relevant document (Deed of accession and Deed of Partial Release in respect of VCS registration deed of representation, both dated 11-January-2023 and communications agreement dated 24-September-2022 for transferring the ownership to VCS has been provided. Verra has approved this deviation, and it has been published on the project page[2]. The details of the deviation found correct and already approved by VERRA.

<u>Deviation applied during this verification perioid</u>:

Deviation 3: (Deviation applied during current monitoring period 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025)

In line with the Procedure to change Methodology through a Project Description deviation V4.0, section 2.3, point 2.3.2, the assessment team has conducted the assessment of the project description document with methodology, VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0. A detailed assessment of the relevant sections can be found below.

[2] https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/2349

Assessment reviewed and verified that PP has all data to apply the new methodology as per Procedure to Change Methodology through a Project Description Deviation, v 4.0 dated 16-October-2024. Detailed assessment is provided as below:

Project Eligibility:

Exclusion under table 2.1 of VCS standard: The group project activity is distribution of improved cookstoves in Kenya. The ICS distributed are energy efficient, reducing GHG emission. The project does not involve any activity that is explicitly excluded under Table 2.1 of the VCS Standard, such as grid-connected electricity generation, waste heat recovery, fossil fuel switching, or hydrofluorocarbon (HFC-23) emission reduction etc. Thus, meets the scope requirement of VCS standard v4.7 and is not excluded under Table 2.1/1/.

The project meets the requirements of pipeline listing: the project activity was open for public comment from 28-October-2020 to 27-November-2020, ensuring compliance with standardized additionality requirements/1/.

Methodology eligibility capacity limits & double counting: The project applies VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0, an approved methodology under the Verra Standard. The methodology is applicable to the project activity; the applicability criteria of the methodology have been verified below. The methodology does not introduce any scale or capacity limits. Additionally, double counting prevention measures have been implemented through the assignment of a Unique Serial Number (USN) for each ICS, recorded in an electronic database/11/ in addition to this PP has submitted no double counting declaration/35/. This system ensures that emission reductions are not claimed multiple times. CAR 02 was raised and closed after reviewing the PP response & sufficient evidence. The details related to the unique Number have been verified and assessed in detail and also the implementation of the process has been checked on site. Thus, the criteria have been met. Each stove distributed under the project bears:

- A physical serial number permanently marked on the body,
- The VVB cross-verified the physical identifiers during on-site household visits and reviewed the backend tracking system through sampled database entries.

The use of permanent, verifiable, and project-specific stove markings, coupled with digital traceability, ensures that each ICS is uniquely tagged to this project and cannot be reused or reassigned elsewhere, thereby eliminating the risk of stove-level double counting.

Therefore, it is concluded by the VVB team that the Project Proponent has implemented comprehensive and verifiable safeguards against double counting of ICS units and associated emission reductions. These include a contractual waiver of carbon rights by the manufacturer, stove-specific identification protocols, and a formal no double counting declaration aligned with VCS Standard v4.7, Section 3.23. All relevant documents were reviewed and validated, and the associated clarification was duly resolved during the verification process.

Stove overlaps, and the possibility of double claiming

Based on review of the objective evidence during the verification process, the VVB conducted a comprehensive assessment of the stove distribution process, focusing on the eligibility criteria, field protocols, and documentary safeguards implemented to avoid double claiming. The following multi-layered controls were verified:

1. Eligibility Screening Prior to Distribution

- The PP implements a strict eligibility protocol.
- Only households using traditional cooking technologies (e.g., 3-stone fires or rudimentary wood stoves) as their primary baseline stove are considered eligible.
- Households with any type of improved stove (ICS from other carbon projects), fossil fuel-based technologies (LPG, kerosene, ethanol), or electric stoves are explicitly excluded from receiving a project ICS.
- During the household mobilization and pre-distribution screening, PP verify each household's baseline technology.

The VVB confirms that the PP has in place a field-level screening protocol to prevent overlaps with households that already use efficient or improved stoves, thereby addressing the risk of including households participating in other carbon projects.

2. Community-Level Orientation and Signed Informed Consent

- On distribution day, all eligible participants are gathered for a project introduction session. Here, the project's purpose, stove eligibility criteria, and carbon-related commitments are explained to beneficiaries.
- Each household signs the agreement, confirming:
  - Their use of traditional wood-based stoves prior to receiving the ICS,
  - Their understanding of the stove's carbon credit association,
  - Their consent to participate under the conditions of the ICS distribution program by PP.

The VVB reviewed samples of end user agreements submitted by the PP. The VVB concludes that the use of informed consent agreements, presented in a public setting with explanation of the project's carbon implications, adds a strong behavioral safeguard and formal acknowledgment by beneficiaries, supporting stove-use traceability and program exclusivity.

3. Record Keeping and Documentation: All signed household agreements are systematically collected, scanned, and archived. Further, these records are linked to the household's unique barcode ID in the stove distribution database. The VVB team cross-checked these records during the audit, validating the consistency between signed declarations, household data, and stove assignments. Therefore, through proper documentation and system-level tracking of agreements, the project maintains audit-ready evidence of eligibility screening and distribution integrity.

Finally, the VVB confirms that the PP has established and implemented a comprehensive protocol for stove distribution that mitigates the risk of double claiming and stove overlaps within households. This includes:

- A clearly defined eligibility framework,
- Informed consent through signed declarations,

- A contractual clause preventing future stove acquisitions from other carbon projects,
- And proper recordkeeping with traceability through barcode-linked databases.

All submitted documents and field practices were reviewed and verified in accordance with VCS Standard v4.7, Section 3.23 and MR Template Section 1.11. The VVB is satisfied that the measures in place are robust and effective in maintaining the integrity of emission reductions claimed under this project.

Eligibility of the project activity in accordance with VCS Standard v4.7

Sr. No.	Applicability condition	VVB Assessment and conclusion
1	Projects shall meet all applicable rules and requirements set out under the VCS Program, including this document. Projects shall be guided by the principles set out in Section 2.2.1.	VVB has reviewed the project documents and confirms that the project complies with VCS standard v4.7 requirements guided by the ISO 14064-2:2019. Therefore, the criteria are found to be met.
2	Projects shall apply methodologies eligible under the VCS Program. Methodologies shall be applied in full, including the full application of any tools or modules referred to by a methodology, noting the exception set out in Section 3.14.1.	VVB has reviewed the project in accordance with VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0/7/, Correction and Clarifications to VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0 and confirms that methodology is applied in full along with applicable tools and modules to ensure complete compliance. Therefore, the criteria are found to be met.
3	Projects shall apply the latest version of the applicable methodology in all cases unless a grace period applies to the project as set out in 3.22. Projects shall update to the latest version of the methodology when reassessing the baseline or renewing a crediting period.	VVB has reviewed the project documents in accordance with VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0, Correction and Clarifications To VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0 and confirms that grouped project applies the latest version of VCS approved methodology. Thus, the criteria is found to be met.

Sr. No.	Applicability condition	VVB Assessment and conclusion
4	Projects and the implementation of project activities shall not lead to the violation of any applicable law, regardless of whether or not the law is enforced.	Project activity is completely in compliance with applicable laws of the host country. VVB has reviewed agreement between PP and end users, national rules and found it satisfactory. Also, assessment team reviewed both the act/rule and noted that the Climate Change Act (2016) and the Climate Change (Carbon Markets) Regulations (2024) of host country does not have any impact on the project eligibility and issuance of VERs. The project activity is in compliance to the rules. Therefore, the criteria is found to be met.
5	Where projects apply methodologies that permit the project proponent its own choice of model, such model shall meet with the requirements set out in the VCS Program document VCS Methodology Requirements and it shall be demonstrated at validation that the model is appropriate to the project circumstances (i.e., use of the model will lead to an appropriate quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals).	Not applicable
6	Where projects apply methodologies that permit the project proponent to choose a third-party default factor or standard to ascertain GHG emission data and any supporting data for establishing baseline scenarios and demonstrating additionality, such default factor or standard shall meet with the requirements set out in the VCS Program document VCS Methodology Requirements.	Not applicable
7	Where the rules and requirements under an approved GHG program conflict with the rules and requirements of the VCS Program, the rules and requirements of the VCS Program shall take precedence.	Not applicable

Sr. No.	Applicability condition	VVB Assessment and conclusion
8	Where projects apply methodologies from approved GHG programs, they shall conform with any specified capacity limits and any other relevant requirements set out with respect to the application of the methodology and/or tools referenced by the methodology under those programs.	The project activity is in accordance with VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, VERSION 1.0 methodology which doesn't define any capacity limit.
9	Where Verra issues new VCS Program rules, the effective dates of these requirements are set out in Appendix 3 of VCS standard ver 4.7 and Effective Dates or equivalent for other program documents and are listed in a companion Summary of Effective Dates document which corresponds with each update.	VVB has reviewed the project documents and confirms that the project activity adheres to latest VCS program rules.

The applicability of the methodology VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0:

Sr. No	Applicability condition	VVB Assessment and conclusion
1	The project activity corresponds to: a) Replacement of non-renewable biomass (e.g., firewood, charcoal)-fired cookstoves with any of the following: i) More efficient project devices that use the same fuel as in the baseline; ii) Efficient project devices fired by renewable biomass or bioethanol; iii) Efficient project devices fired by liquefied petroleum gas (LPG); or iv) Electric-powered project devices. b) Replacement of solid or liquid fossil fuel (e.g., coal, kerosene)-fired cookstoves with any of the following: i) Efficient project devices fired by renewable biomass or bioethanol; ii) Efficient project devices fired by LPG; or iii) Electric-powered project devices.	The assessment team has crosschecked the registered PD, Previous verification report, Baseline & Project KPT report/13/ conducted in current monitoring period submitted by PP. VVB confirms that project is using an efficient stove that uses same fuel i.e. firewood as baseline three stone stove. Therefore, the criteria is found to be met.

Sr. No	Applicability condition	VVB Assessment and conclusion
2	Project devices are used in households, communities, institutions, or small or medium enterprises (SMEs), collectively referred to in this methodology as the "target population."	Assessment team has crosschecked registered PD/revised PD/33/, previous verification report/4/, Project database/11/ and confirmed during onsite visit/10/ that households are the target population for the project activity. Therefore, the criteria is found to be met.
3	Where renewable biomass is used, it is exclusively renewable and qualifies as one of the following: a) A by-product, residue, or waste stream from agriculture, forestry, and related industries; or b) Originating from dedicated plantations that comply with all relevant applicability conditions in the most recent version of CDM TOOL16.	As per monitoring survey, baseline survey and interview conducted with households during onsite visit, firewood is the fuel used for cooking is collected from local area/12/ Therefore, the criteria is not applicable.
4	Where biomass residues are used, they would have been left to decay or burned without energy recovery before implementation of the project activity, and their use does not involve a decrease in carbon pools – in particular of dead wood, litter, or soil organic carbon – on the land areas from which the biomass residues originate.	As per monitoring survey, baseline survey interview conducted with households during onsite visit/10/, firewood is the fuel used for cooking in the project scenario. Therefore, the criteria is found to be not applicable.
5	Where biomass residues from a production process are used, project implementation does not result in an increase in the processing capacity of raw input or any other substantial changes (e.g., product change) in this process.	As per baseline survey, monitoring survey, KPT survey/12/ interview conducted with households during onsite visit/10/, firewood is the fuel used for cooking in the project scenario. Therefore, the criteria is found not applicable.
6	Where more than one type of renewable biomass is used, each of the biomass types used complies with the applicability conditions	As per baseline survey, monitoring survey, KPT survey/12/ interview conducted with households during onsite visit/10/, firewood is the fuel used for cooking in the project scenario. Therefore, the criteria is found not applicable.

Sr. No	Applicability condition	VVB Assessment and conclusion
7	Where project activities introduce renewable biomass as charcoal, it is renewable charcoal produced by efficient charcoal production processes (e.g., retort sedentary kilns, improved sedentary kilns, Casamance kilns). Methane produced during the charcoaling process is captured and destroyed or combusted for energy purposes.	This condition is not applicable as firewood is the fuel used for cooking in the project scenario. This is confirmed by VVB by monitoring survey, baseline survey conducted with households during onsite visit/12/,/10/.
8	Project devices using renewable biomass (fuel-switch) or non-renewable biomass (improved efficiency) are single-pot, multi-pot portable, or in-situ cookstoves with an initial thermal efficiency of at least 25%.	The assessment team has crosschecked the registered PD/5/, Previous verification report/4/, WBT test report/36/ conducted in current monitoring period, reassessed baseline survey/12/ submitted by PP. VVB confirms that the efficiency of project stove is more than 25%/36/. Therefore, the criteria is found to be met.
9	Project devices using LPG or bioethanol are single-pot, multi-pot portable, or in-situ cookstoves with an initial thermal efficiency of at least 30%.	This condition is not applicable as firewood is the fuel used for cooking in the project scenario. This is confirmed by VVB by monitoring survey, KPT survey interview conducted with households during onsite visit/10/.
10	Electric project devices10 meet the maximum risk factor score of 15 on the Cookstove Durability Protocol11 and have the following minimum thermal efficiency: a) Hot plates and electric hobs: 40% b) Induction stoves and other electric stoves: 70%	This condition is not applicable as firewood is the fuel used for cooking in the project scenario. This is confirmed by VVB by monitoring survey, KPT survey interview conducted with households during onsite visit/10/.
11	Project devices using LPG comply with all of the following conditions: a) The baseline fuel either includes non-renewable biomass or is a more carbon intensive fossil fuel (demonstrated by the baseline survey, see Section 6.2);	This condition is not applicable as firewood is the fuel used for cooking in the project scenario. This is confirmed by VVB by monitoring survey, KPT survey interview conducted with households during onsite visit/10/.

Sr. No	Applicability condition	VVB Assessment and conclusion
	b) The project has a provision for metering LPG supplied to each consumer at the LPG filling station, in order to determine household LPG consumption; and c) The project does not seek to issue any carbon credits for periods after 31 December 2045.	
12	Electric project devices use the following electricity sources: a) Decentralized renewable energy systems: Decentralized energy systems using fossil fuels are not eligible, except for backup generators that supply less than 1% of the annual electricity of the decentralized renewable energy system. b) Self-generated renewable electricity (with a maximum of 20% electricity from non-renewable sources for backup); c) National or regional electricity grid.	This condition is not applicable as firewood is the fuel used for cooking in the project scenario. This is confirmed by VVB by monitoring survey, KPT survey interview conducted with households during onsite visit/10/.
13	The project proponent designs incentive mechanisms to reduce the use of inefficient baseline devices and practices that can be replaced by the project devices and describes these mechanisms in the project description.	PP distributes ICS free of cost to household with financial barriers. In addition to this PP provides an awareness program to educate beneficiaries on proper use of stove. VVB verified the same during interview with households during site visit and cross checked the training records/29/ submitted by PP for current monitoring period. Therefore, the criteria is found to be met.

Sr. No	Applicability condition	VVB Assessment and conclusion
14	Where a project device has ended its technical life, the project proponent either replaces it with a comparable or better project device or retrofits its essential components to continue meeting the minimum service level requirements (i.e., thermal energy generation), otherwise no further emission reductions may be claimed for the project device	As per the registered PD/5/, previous verification reports the technical lifespan of the project stove is 10 years/4/. VVB has also verified 'Product Fact Sheet'/25/ from project stove manufacturer. The project was started in 06-October-2020 and current MP is from 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025 where the age of stove is approx. 5 years based on the date of distribution which is well below the technical end life of the project stove/5/. During the onsite visit interviews with project implementers, it was confirmed that PP would either go for project stove replacement with same or comparable project stove, or have its essential components retrofitted to continuously meet the minimum service level requirements (i.e., thermal energy generation)/10/. Otherwise, the project stove in question will not be accounted for project ER calculation. Therefore, the criteria is found to be met.
15	Project proponents implement a method for the distribution and identification of project devices that avoids double counting of emission reductions by other mitigation actions and includes unique product identification on the stove itself at the time of distribution/sale (e.g., program logo, alpha/numeric ID, and end-user location, such as geographic coordinates, complete address information)	PP has assigned unique barcode IDs to the project stoves which can be scanned to display end user information associated with that project stove/10/. PP has maintained app-based system for data recording of end user credentials, stove ID, location, date of distribution. VVB has accessed this information during the onsite visit/10/. Therefore, the criteria is found to be met.
16	The project complies with any national, sub-national, or local regulations or guidance for the installation, commercialization, distribution, and use of improved cookstoves and/or fuel supply and use for the target population. National, regional, and local regulatory frameworks for the provision of the type of thermal energy services provided by the project activity must be documented.	VVB has crosschecked the national rules/guidelines however no guidelines found which prevent PP to run the free ICS distribution program. Thus, project complies with national, sub-national, and local regulations and guidance for the installation, commercialization, distribution, and use of improved cookstoves and fuel supply for the target population/10/. Therefore, the criteria is found to be met.

Sr. No	Applicability condition	VVB Assessment and conclusion
17	Where project activities reduce emissions from non-renewable biomass, including firewood and charcoal, the risk of double counting is assessed on a national basis by evaluating at validation and crediting period renewal whether there are REDD+ projects or jurisdictional REDD+ programs whose project boundary overlaps with the expected fuel source area of the project. The project proponent must report on the findings of this assessment for informational purposes in the project description	Assessment team has evaluated the risk of double accounting as REDD+ projects/programs across various registries namely Gold standard, GCC, CAR, Verra, CDM. VVB has crosschecked the period verification reports for the same. There are no REDD+ project in the host country. Therefore, the criteria is found to be met.

Therefore, it has been concluded that the project activity is eligible under the VCS program.

Project start date and crediting period:

The assessment team has start date from registered PD, previous verification reports and also verified with PP during the onsite visit for the project, the start date mentioned for the project activity is inline with VCS standard V4.7, section 3.8. The crediting period for the project is 06-October-2020 to 05-October-2030 (inclusive both days) Thus, the start date and crediting period of the project is accepted.

Project scale and estimate emission reductions:

The project is calculating emission reductions based on VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0, and is categorizing the “project” as s inline with VCS standard, section 3.10, “projects: less than 300,000 tonnes of CO_2e per year”.

Based on the assumption values taken by the project to calculate the estimated emission reduction it can be concluded that the project is inline with the methodology and will be able to achieve the emission reductions mentioned.

Conditions prior to project initiation:

The conditions prior to the project initiation are same as described in the baseline scenario for the project, continued use of non-renewable wood fuel using unimproved open fire three stone firewood and the already validated statement remain valid during the methodology change as well. More details related to the crosscheck of baseline scenario can be found in section 2.3 of the report.

CL 05 was raised and closed successfully during audit process.

Title and reference of methodology:

During the current Monitoring the project undergoing a methodology change from VMR0006 Methodology for installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1 to VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0 inline with the guidelines release by VERRA on 09-October-2024 (*https://verra.org/verra-releases-new-cookstoves-methodology*).

Along with the methodology project applies the latest version of tool CDM Tool 33 Default values for common parameters, Version 03.0 and CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, v4.0 and CDM sampling standard, V9.0, all the applicable tools and methodology applies the latest version therefore acceptable.

Project boundary:

Project determines the boundary inline, VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0, In line with methodology section 5, project boundary includes the project devices, the geographical site where they are located, and the locations from which baseline and project fuels are sourced.

The assessment team was able to ensure that the approved methodology addresses all the identified emission sources that are impacted by the project activity as mentioned in section 3.3 of revised PD. CAR 03 was raised and closed successfully during audit process.

Baseline Scenario/Re-assessment:

As per section 2.1.3 (2) of "Procedure to Change Methodology through a Project Description Deviation" v4.0 dated 16-October-2024, PP has applied the steps of new methodology (VM0050, v1.0) to determine the most plausible baseline scenario and to calculate baseline emissions for the remaining crediting period.

KPTs from 07-April-2025 to 10-May-2025

Further, in compliance with VM0050 v1.0 Corrections and Clarifications Clarification 1, the PP has re-conducted baseline survey from 07-April-2025 to 10-May-2025. According to the results of the baseline survey, households most frequently utilize non-renewable biomass-based cooking technology, mainly rudimentary cookstoves or three-stone fires.

Comparison of fuel consumption with Other Projects:

Project ID	Baseline fuel consumption per annum (tonnes)	Remarks
VCS 4223[3]	3.30 tonnes/device/year	Baseline fuel consumption value derived from the project fuel
VCS 1918[4]	3.47 tonnes/device/year	

[3] https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/4223

[44] https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/1918

GS 12037[5]	3.53 tonnes/device/year	consumption and savings.
Project activity (VCS 2349)	2.6188 tonnes/HH/year	

PP has provided detailed baseline assessment under Sections 3.4 of VCS PD inline with section 6.1 of VM0050, v1.0. Same have been found correct and acceptable.

Additionality:

Regulatory surplus Requirements:

Kenya is non-Annex 1 country and host country doesn't mandate implementation of the project activity by any law, statute or other regulatory framework. Assessment team reviewed the both act/rule and noted that the Climate Change Act (2016) and the Climate Change (Carbon Markets) Regulations (2024) of host country does not have any impact on the project eligibility and issuance of VERs. The project activity is in compliance to the rules.

In accordance with the positive list requirements:

The project activity introduces:

a) Efficient biomass-fired cookstoves that replace inefficient biomass-fired cookstoves;

b) Efficient, solely renewable biomass-fired cookstoves that replace fossil fuel-fired cookstoves; or

c) Electric cookstoves that replace inefficient biomass-fired or fossil fuel-fired cookstoves.

The project activity installs or distributes improved cookstoves at zero cost to the end user and has no revenue source other than from the sale of verified carbon units (VCUs).

During the onsite visit by assessment time interviews were held with project households and it was confirmed that households are provided with project stoves free of cost.

Assessment of applicability conditions and eligibility criteria for free-of-cost distribution of ICS

Field Verification–Household Interviews: During the on-site audit, the verification team visited eight households form PP monitoring survey, 8 from Project KPT survey and 8 from the Baseline KPT Survey (see Tables 1–2 in the FVR). Each interviewed beneficiary independently confirmed the following:

- They received the improved cookstove without payment or charges.
- They did not provide money or services in exchange for the stove.
- Distribution was coordinated through stove champions & village administration.

[5] https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects/details/3998

Field Verification–Staff Interviews: The VVB also interviewed field-level implementers, including stove champions and village heads (Table-3 in the FVR), who confirmed that:

- Households were not charged at any stage of the distribution process.
- The no-cost distribution approach is aligned with internal training and implementation guidelines.
- No transaction records (receipts, invoices, etc.) are generated because no payments are involved.

Documentation and System Review:
The distribution database and user agreement templates were reviewed. These do not include any pricing, sales, or financial fields that would suggest a commercial transaction occurred. The absence of financial data fields is consistent with a zero-cost distribution model.

Therefore, it is concluded by the VVB verification team that the Project Proponent has fully demonstrated, through documentary evidence and field-level validation, that the improved cookstoves (ICS) were distributed free of cost to all beneficiary households during the monitoring period (01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025). The verification team confirms that the project is in full compliance with the requirements of VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0.

VVB has crosschecked baseline, monitoring surveys and KPTs with onsite interviews with households and can confirm firewood is used as fuel to cook on ICS and baseline stoves. Moreover, VVB has reviewed and accepted WBT, fact sheet documents submitted by PP which mention about the efficiency of the stove more than the baseline ones.

Hence the project activity is deemed additional.

The appropriateness of the baseline scenario:

In accordance with the requirement of VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, VERSION 1.0, Correction and Clarifications to this applied meth baseline was reassessed/7/.

In accordance with clarification 1 of Correction and Clarifications to VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0 project KPTs/36/ performed in the current monitoring period. It can be concluded that KPT performed to reassess wood consumption in the baseline scenario to be 2.6188 tons/HH/year. Further, the project activity has not been completed 5 years from the start date and hence the baseline survey for the controlled households is not applicable. However, the users/households selected for baseline KPT has similar characteristics as baseline households defined in the VCS PD/5/. These KPT households continue to utilize baseline technology for cooking. The PP has engaged a third-party entity for KPT and MRV training, which aligns with the requirement for Methodology.

VVB has reviewed the project documents, registered PD, pervious verification report and confirms project boundaries are unchanged. In addition to this, the project adheres to the monitoring plan in line with VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0.

Quantification of GHG emission reductions and carbon dioxide removals

The project activity is quantifying the emission reductions based on methodology VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0, the assessment team has assessed the details it has been observed that it conservatively estimated. Further details related to the calculation can be found in section 4.4 of this report.

Leakage assessment: The PD has assessed the additionality on the basis of methodology VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0, In line with section 8.3, based on the based with association with reduced or avoiding the use of non-renewable biomass, the leakage has been correctly applied as 0.95/5/,/9/. There it is acceptable.

Methodology deviations

Methodology deviations are described in section 3.1 of the report. There is no methodology deviation applied in the project.

Monitoring plan

The assessment team reviewed the monitoring plan described in the Project Design Document and confirms that it clearly identifies all relevant parameters to be monitored as per the applied methodology VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0/7/.

Key monitored parameters include (more details related the parameter can be found in section 4.3 and 4.4 of the project report):

- Number of stoves distributed and operational
- Thermal efficiency of project devices
- Fraction of non-renewable biomass (fNRB)
- Usage rate of the improved cookstoves
- Baseline and project scenario fuel consumption Leakage emissions (via applied adjustment factor)

It has been verified by the assessment team that monitoring procedures outlined in the PD ensure traceability, consistency, and conservativeness based on the onsite visit and the evidence submitted. The project utilizes a digital data management system for stove registration, tracking each stove by a Unique Serial Number (USN)/11/. The procedures for data collection, entry, validation, and storage are robust and compliant with the methodology requirements.

Monitoring equipment and methods, including household surveys, field verification, and sampling protocols, are designed in accordance with the methodological guidance. Internal quality assurance protocols and field team training further enhance data credibility.

Based on document review and site audit findings, the assessment team concludes that the monitoring plan has been effectively implemented and is fully in adherence with the requirements of the applied methodology and the referenced tools. No deviations were noted, and the system is capable of ensuring accurate and consistent monitoring throughout the crediting period. Hence, project deviation is valid.

CAR 01, CAR 02, CAR 04 & CL 01, CL 03, CL 05, CL 06 & CL 07 was raised by assessment team on the section and closed successfully.

3.3 New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects

Till date of 31-March-2025which is also last date for this MP total 119,938 ICS are distributed in 59,969 households/11/. The last stove distributed on 30-September-2023 during current monitoring period/11/.
With new distributed units disseminated in existing project the assessment of eligibility of the new units are as followed as per set criteria in the Project Description/5//33/ :

Eligibility criteria following section 3.6.10 to 3.6.16 of the VCS Standard v 4.7/1/:

No	Criterion	Compliance Requirement	Method of Evaluation
1.	Meets the applicability conditions set out in the methodology applied to the project.	The project activity instance shall use VCS approved methodology – VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0 and shall comply with its requirements.	Assessment team checked section 3.2 of VCS PD and found that new users added meets the applicability conditions of VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0/7/.
2.	Use the technologies or measures specified in the project description.	Project activity deploy improved cookstoves (ICS) in the households by replacing traditional cookstove with an initial thermal efficiency of at least 25%.	Manufacturer's specification & WBT test are verified for establishing minimum efficiency criteria in the first year of stove installation and found meeting the criteria where project ICS achieved 34.50% thermal efficiency/*25//36/*.
3.	Apply the technologies or measures in the same manner as specified in the project description.	The ICSs will substitute the inefficient cooking techniques that are still adopted by the local communities. During the ICS	Manufacturer's specification & WBT test are verified for establishing minimum efficiency criteria in the first

No	Criterion	Compliance Requirement	Method of Evaluation
		delivery, information regarding biomass use as fuel and cooking baseline appliances will be collected and stored in a data management system in order to facilitate the following validation and verification processes.	year of stove installation and found meeting the criteria/*25//36/*.
4.	Are subject to the baseline scenario determined in the project description for the specified project activity and geographic area.	Each project activity instance shall be located within the geographic boundary of Kenya as described in section 1.13; therefore, baseline scenario is the same described in section 3.4.	The project has the same baseline scenario defined in section 3.4 of this document and distribution is spread over different regions of Kenya which is crosschecked from distribution database/11/.
5.	Have characteristics with respect to additionality that are consistent with the initial instances for the specified project activity and geographic area. For example, the new project activity instances have financial, technical and/or other parameters (such as the size/scale of the instances) consistent with the initial instances, or face the same investment, technological and/or other barriers as the initial instances.	All new project activity instances will use the activity method to demonstrate additionality Step 1: Regulatory Surplus There is no mandated government programme or policy in the host country of this project ensuring the distribution of new project activity instances. Step 2: Positive List – The project activity must meet both of the following conditions to qualify for the positive list: 1) The project activity introduces: a) Efficient biomass-fired cookstoves that replace inefficient biomass-fired cookstoves; b) Efficient, solely renewable biomass-fired cookstoves that replace fossil fuel-fired cookstoves; or c) Electric cookstoves that replace inefficient biomass-fired or fossil fuel-fired cookstoves. 2) The project activity installs or distributes improved cookstoves at zero cost to the end user and has no revenue source other than from the sale of verified carbon units (VCUs).	There is no mandated government programme or policy in host country of this project ensuring the distribution of domestic fuel efficient cookstoves. Further, project activity satisfies the both the criteria of positive list of technologies. The project ICS are distributed free of cost which was verified during onsite visit/10/.

Overall, verification team confirms that new project technology units distributed in under this monitoring period comply with the eligibility criteria of VCS Standard v 4.7/1/.

3.4 Baseline Reassessment

Did the project undergo baseline reassessment during the monitoring period?

☒ Yes ☐ No

In reference to the Baseline reassessment and KPT, the following assessment is provided by the verification team based on a review of project documentation, field team interviews, and evidence gathered during the site visit.

Assessment team confirmed and validated that the PP has all the data and parameters for the baseline reassessment to apply the new methodology VM0050/34/.

Assessment for Baseline reassessment and KPT:

Assessment of Sample Design and Representativeness: The VVB confirms that the sampling strategy employed by the Project Proponent (PP) aligns with the requirements of:

- CDM Standard: *"Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and PoAs" Version 9.0* Meth_Stan05,
- Appendix 5 of *VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0*,
- and Section 6.2 of VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0, which mandates stratified or simple random sampling over homogenous or heterogenous target populations VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0.

The PP employed cluster random sampling across Kenya. PP has provided detailed sampling approach and outcome under Section 4.3 of the monitoring report and found appropriate.

Site Visit Confirmation

During site visit, 8+8 (total 16) household was visited for monitoring survey and project KPT survey. VVB also randomly selected 8 samples of baseline KPT from the form PP samples. VVB has used acceptance sampling during verification for checking the PP's sample size. In accordance with the para 31-32 of the sampling standard, version 09, a sample size of 8 was required based on an AQL of 0.5 % and UQL of 20 %, producer risk 5 % and consumer risk 20 %. The AQL and UQL selected is based on the Table 2 of the sampling standard, version and complies with the sampling standard.

However, VVB has selected oversampling in case on non-availability of any sample and thus selected 11 samples each from PP's baseline KPT, monitoring & project KPT surveys.

Therefore, it is concluded by VVB team that the baseline survey was designed and implemented in alignment with CDM and VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, VERSION 1.0 requirements. The use of random sampling, adequate geographic coverage, oversampling, and validation through site visits and national data ensures the results are statistically robust and representative of Kenya's rural population.

Baseline survey and controlled households

1. Review of Supporting Documents: The VVB confirms that the PP submitted the complete set of baseline KPT datasheets, raw survey records, and analysis sheets as required under VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, VERSION 1.0..

2. Methodological Conformance:
   - As this was the first monitoring period following transition to VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0, the establishment of control households prior to verification is a mandatory requirement per VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0, Appendix 5.
   - The project correctly selected 100 Baseline KPT & same as control households and 100 Project KPT samples & 190 Monitoring Survey samples using a cluster random sampling technique compliant with CDM Sampling Guidelines. The outcome of the sampling numbers are provided in Section 4.3 of the monitoring report and found correct inline with survey results provided by PP/12/.

3. Verification via Site Visits and Interviews:
   - The VVB conducted on-site audits at a monitoring survey and Baseline & project KPT survey households.
   - Physical observations, stove inspections, interviews with baseline/project stove users, and confirmation of recorded data entries were carried out to validate fuel use patterns, household size, and stove types.

5. Quality Assurance and Transparency:
   - The project KPTs were executed following KPT v4.0 protocols with trained enumerators and achieved the required 90/10 confidence/precision level. The calculated average baseline consumption was:
     - 2.1967 kg/person/day
     - 2.6188 tons/household/year (based on 3.2663 average household size), confirming conservative estimates.

6. VVB Judgment on Sufficiency and Compliance:
   - The documentation provided was complete, consistent, and validated via both desk review and field verification.
   - The identification of control households was robust, and the baseline fuel use data is aligned with both national trends and methodology expectations.

Therefore, it is concluded by the verification team that the Project Proponent has fully complied with the requirements of VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0 and the CDM Sampling and Survey Standard v9.0 in conducting the monitoring survey and Kitchen Performance Tests (KPTs) among the identified (which is also controlled households) households. This conclusion is based on an in-depth review of the submitted KPT and survey datasets, on-site field verification and interviews with selected baseline households, confirmation of the statistical representativeness of the sample, and alignment with methodological guidance under Appendix 5 of VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, VERSION 1.0. All necessary documentation was made available, reviewed, and validated by the verification team.

In accordance with clarification 1 of Correction and Clarifications to VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0, project KPTs/12/ performed in the current monitoring period submitted by PP. It can be concluded that KPT performed to reassess wood consumption in the baseline scenario which is appropriate.

PP has reevaluated fNRB value in accordance with VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0. PP changed the registered value that was calculated in accordance with CDM Tool 30, version 3.0 and used CDM Tool 33 Default values for common parameters, Version 03.0. VVB confirms data is considered for fNRB calculation is still the latest available and correct/9/.

Kenya which is a non-Annex 1 country do not mandate distribution of cookstoves by any law, statute or other regulatory framework. Assessment team reviewed both act/rule and noted that the Climate Change Act (2016) and the Climate Change (Carbon Markets) Regulations (2024) of host country does not have any impact on the project eligibility and issuance of VERs. The project activity is in compliance to the rules and voluntary initiative by PP.

During Onsite visit VVB visited 8 MRV and 8 baseline KPT (which are also designated as controlled households) & 08 Project KPT households and confirmed the use of firewood for cooking in the baseline based on interviews conducted. Please refer to section 2.3 For details. During the audit process, CL 07 was raised and closed successfully.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Details

The project “Installation of high efficiency wood burning cookstoves in Kenya” (VCS ID 2349) Grouped Project (“GP”) by be Bridge Carbon Africa Stoves Development Private Limited falls into sectoral scope 03 and is appropriately selected in the VCS PD and is implemented in Kenya. The project category and type are correctly indicated in the VCS PD/5//33/ & MR/08/. It has been indicated as well as accepted that it is a grouped project activity.

The project entity Bridge Carbon Africa Stoves Development Private Limited which is revised from the original PP (see CAR 02). No other project proponent or project partners are identified involved in the project implementation. This is verified against previous verification report as well as confirmation from the field team during interviews in the site visit/10/.

The start date of the grouped project activity is 06-October-2020 which is verified from the validation report & previous verification report/4/. The 5th monitoring period claimed, encompasses period of 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025 with verified ER claimed of 16,591 tCO_2e with total distributed units of 119,938 till end of monitoring period.

The project crediting period is correctly filled in VCS PD/5//33/, which is ten years (fixed). The selected crediting period is consistent with the project start date and the first crediting period spans from 06-October-2020 to 05-October-2030 (inclusive both days).

The project is correctly classified as "project" as per VCS Standard/1/ as the average annual emission reductions are less than 300,000 tCO_2e. The estimated emission reductions are consistent with the corresponding ER spreadsheet/9/.

Project design, including eligibility criteria for grouped projects:

The project activity involves distribution of improved cookstoves in households of Kenya. The project is a voluntary initiative as host country laws do not mandate the distribution of ICS to the local communities. The project proponent is verified to be Bridge Carbon Africa Stoves Development Private Limited who is using carbon finance to support local partners engaged in different activities like production, distribution, and maintenance of various product technologies. Revision of project proponent from the original PP as verified from Verra Registry to current PP Bridge Carbon Africa Stoves Development Private Limited was raised and resolved in detail in CAR 02. This project includes technologies designed to reduce GHG emission by supplying high efficiency ICS to end-users and promoting public health to tackle several health challenges caused due to using less efficient stoves. The description of the ICS models is given in PD/5/ & MR/8/ and was confirmed from manufacturer's specification (verified from previous monitoring period and verification report4/).

The grouped project activity envisages distribution of the two "*Total Land Care Rocket Stoves (TLC-RS)*" have been installed in eligible households throughout rural Kenya which was verified during the site visit/10/.

Eligibility assessment on the newly distributed unit of stoves in the monitoring period can be found in section 3.3 of the verification report.

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

Audit history	The project activity is undergoing 5th Verification under its fixed crediting period. The assessment team has verified that audit history using the Project webpage/4/, all the previous verification has been published under Verra. It has been concluded that the information present in section 1.2 of MR is appropriate.
Double counting and participation under other GHG programs	The project activity is not registered under any other GHG and non-GHG program or registry. This has been confirmed by means of research on relevant applicable registries and available information in public domain and through declaration from the Project Owner. The assessment team has searched for similar projects of the same nature, project technology, location and project proponent as well as legal owner. The name of the owners mentioned in the regulatory licenses are also matched and checked. Thus, it was concluded that no evidence that the project is double claiming the same ER in various carbon schemes like CDM, GCC, and Gold Standard.
No double claiming with emissions trading programs or binding emission limits	The project activity has been thoroughly search on the various websites of various emission trading programs and or ETS programs running in various counties, using nature, project technology, location and project proponent as well as legal owner as the search option.
No double claiming with other forms of environmental credit	As discussed above the, the project has been thoroughly search in the currently active environment schemes and found that the project is not registered with any other environmental credits. PP will reframe from the double counting inline with Section 1.10 & 1.11 of the monitoring report (see CL#3). Therefore, it can be concluded that the project is not claiming any credits from other programs/schemes.
Supply chain (scope 3) emissions double claiming	The grouped project activity which aims at distribution of ICS to households does not result in any Scope 3 emissions in its supply chain.
Sustainable development contributions	As claimed in section 1.12 of the monitoring report, the project is claiming positive impact for the following: - SDG 7.1.2: the project activity has increased access to clean cooking technology with ICS installations 119,938 during current monitoring period in 59,969 households since first ICS distribution since 06-October-2020. - SDG 15: impact is claimed through the emission reduction calculated by the project implementation which the detailed assessment can be found in section 5.3 of this report.
Additional information relevant to the project	No commercially sensitive information has been excluded by the PP.

4.2 Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement

4.2.1 Stakeholder Identification

As confirmed with Project Proponent, the makeup of the stakeholders of the group project activities has not changed. The assessment is performed using project database distribution location as well as assessment of whether new project units distributed in the monitoring report are detected no detected with material discrepancies compared to previous monitoring reports.

Within the grouped project activities implementation in the monitoring report, no change is detected in terms of project location, type of technology, monitoring activities as well as changes detected in socio-economic condition within the project area.

The finding is consistent with the claim made by project proponent with the information reflected in section 2.1.1 of the monitoring report/8/.

CAR 02 was raised and closed successfully during audit process.

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Stakeholder identification	N/A as stakeholder is identified to be the same as initial identification process as verified in project description document/5//33/.
Legal or customary tenure/access rights	The project activity does not involve land use, land access, or biomass harvesting rights. Cookstoves are distributed for voluntary use within individual households. No changes to legal or customary tenure or access rights were observed or reported. The verification team concludes that this requirement is not applicable to this project.
Stakeholder diversity and changes over time	Section 2.1.1 of the MR and verification interviews confirm that the project continues to engage a diverse range of stakeholders, including women, youth, and vulnerable households/8//10/. The demographic composition of stakeholders remains consistent with that identified during validation. No significant shifts or exclusions were noted during this monitoring period.
Expected changes in well-being	Evidence was drawn from the Monitoring Report and stakeholder interviews during the site visit. Reported co-benefits include reduced indoor air pollution and time savings in fuel collection. These impacts were consistently reported by ICS users and are in line with project expectations. The verification team finds the expected improvements to be credible and supported.
Location of stakeholders	It has been observed and verified during on-site audit that the project activity is in line with the monitoring plan/5//33/ and there is no change in the location of stakeholders.

Location of resources	The project does not involve access to or use of shared or contested natural resources. The ICS units operate independently within households and do not require external resource extraction. This criterion is not applicable to the project and was confirmed through field observations and MR review.

4.2.2 Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Ongoing consultation	No additional stakeholder consultation was carried out in this monitoring period as the initial stakeholder has the same stakeholder composition as from the start of crediting period, only additional ICS were distributed during this monitoring period. PP has a continuous grievance mechanism/28/ in place for the local stakeholders. The beneficiaries of the project ICS have been provided with the following means to contact the PP: • Directly registering complaints at the nearest village chief office. • A toll-free helpline number on which the end users can seek assistance which is mentioned on the cookstove. • complaint or grievances through stove champions. It is confirmed by PP that there has been no major grievances/complaints/34/ received in the monitoring period by the means of interview with stakeholder and implementation partner. However, some of grievances regarding stove usage & maintenance are recorded in the Section 2.1.4 of the monitoring report and found resolved inline with the grievance records submitted by PP. **Assessment on stakeholder grievance, ongoing communication and Grievance Redress Mechanism:** Periodic Household Visits Assessment: Based on review of the objective evidence and interviews with the project proponent & users, the VVB confirms the ongoing grievance mechanism & redressal process is well established through the multiple channels as mentioned above. Also, annual visit is done by stove champion once every year. The VVB concludes that the PP has implemented a robust, wide-scale household engagement process as part of its ongoing communication strategy. Also, PP has well established grievance redressal procedure which is defined in the VCS PD & also monitoring report. The documentation and on-site confirmations verify that these visits were conducted as stated, and also redressal happened as per laid down procedures fulfilling the requirements of Section 2.1.2 and 2.1.4 of the MR. Therefore, VVB confirms that a functional and accessible grievance redress system is in place and has been used during the monitoring period. Documentation reviewed demonstrates resolution of all logged concerns, aligning with best practice requirements under the VCS Monitoring Report Template.

Date(s) of stakeholder consultation	No additional stakeholder consultation was executed during this MP.
Communication of monitored results	No major grievances/34/ received in this MP. From the site visit carried out by verifier team, it is confirmed that there is no inputs/complaints from users except some of grievances records as provided under section 2.1.4 of the monitoring report.
Consultation records	PP claimed that there are no major inputs/grievances that is recorded that is relevant to project implementation process. The same is concluded from the data collected from users and stakeholder interviewed during site visit/10/.
Stakeholder input	PP claimed that there are no major inputs/grievances that is recorded that is relevant to project implementation process. The same is concluded from the data collected from users and stakeholder interviewed during site visit/10/.

4.2.3 Free, Prior, and Informed Consent

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Consent	From the communication channel established and communicated to project technology user through: • Directly registering complaints at the nearest village chief office. • A toll-free helpline number on which the end users can seek assistance which is mentioned on the cookstove. • complaint or grievances through stove champions. From the information collected from site visit interviews with project technology users and project implementer partners' field team, no inputs/grievances/34/ that are identified that is evaluated to be material to project design and implementation. VCS standard, version 4.7/1/ para 3.18.8 is applicable in case the project is affecting property rights. The grouped project is an improved cookstove dissemination which is evaluated to have no risk on affecting any property right, Indigenous Peoples (IPs), local communities, nor customary rights
Outcome of FPIC discussion	No concerns or objections regarding participation were reported. The verification team concludes that FPIC was appropriately obtained and documented in line with the VCS Program and project safeguards.

4.2.4 Grievance Redress Procedure

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Grievance received and steps taken to resolve the grievance including the outcomes of the resolution	The verification team conducted on-site assessments and interacted with local stakeholders, as detailed in section 2.3 of the report. Notably, no negative comments or feedback were received from the local stakeholders during these interactions, according to the verification team's records. The PP has a continuous grievance mechanism/28/ in place for the local stakeholders. The beneficiaries of the project ICS have been provided with the following means to contact the PP: • Directly registering complaints at the nearest village chief office. • A toll-free helpline number on which the end users can seek assistance which is mentioned on the cookstove. • complaint or grievances through stove champions. VVB has conducted interviews with the PP representatives and the end users and found that there was the constant on-going communication directly with the beneficiary households. The project proponent has disclosed its feedback and grievance redressal mechanism under section 2.1.2 - 2.1.4 of the MR/8/. Any grievances that arise during the operation of the grouped project activity will be conveyed to the project proponent for resolution. To facilitate ongoing communication with stakeholders, an established grievance mechanism is in place. Based on interviews and observations, the assessment team evaluated that the grievance redressal procedure adequately addresses issues that may arise during project planning and implementation. Beneficiaries and stakeholders are provided with the project proponent's contact information and are encouraged to reach out with any problems, questions, or grievances. During the current monitoring period, no major grievance/34/ are received. However, some of grievances received regarding stove repairs & maintenance received and are resolved by PP. The same is concluded from the site visit (interviews with users) and grievance record submitted by PP/34/. As part of the verification process for the current monitoring period, the verification team confirms that no major grievances were received from project stakeholders or end-users except stove repairs & maintenance received and same are resolved by PP. The grievance received toward ICS operation & maintenance was resolved by PP as per the grievance redressal procedures. This conclusion is based on a review of the grievance records, interviews conducted with field staff, stove champions & local stakeholders, as well as direct engagement with sampled beneficiary households during the site visit conducted by VVB team.

	The grievance redress mechanism was assessed in accordance with the requirements of VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0 and the VCS Standard v4.7. The mechanism includes multiple accessible channels such as a toll-free helpline, in-person reporting to local stove champion or village head, and a grievance register maintained at PP offices. The functionality and awareness of these channels were confirmed through stakeholder interviews and household visits. The grievance register was made available to the VVB during the verification/34/. No unresolved or significant issues were identified that could impact the eligibility or implementation of the project activity.
Grievance redress procedure	PP has a continuous grievance mechanism in place for the local stakeholders. The beneficiaries of the project ICS have been provided with the following means to contact the PP: • Directly registering complaints at the nearest village chief office. • A toll-free helpline number on which the end users can seek assistance which is mentioned on the cookstove. • complaint or grievances through stove champions. Assessment team during site visit found that the Grievance redressal mechanism is established as per the company policy. Management of the Bridge Carbon regularly review the grievance records and resolve the issue of users, local stakeholder and employee as well same has been conformed during site visit.

4.2.5 Public Comments

Comments received	Actions taken by the project proponent	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
The public comments received during the validation stage GSC process was already addressed and closed.	N/A	N/A

4.2.6 Risks to Local Stakeholders and the Environment

4.2.6.1 Management Experience

It was confirmed during the onsite visit that the Bridge Carbon Africa Stoves Development Private Limited staff are well-trained, with prior experience in distribution and monitoring. They received training on the questionnaire before conducting the surveys. The Training records and personnel competency have been verified by the assessment team during the onsite visit/10/.

4.2.6.2 Risk Assessment

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Natural and human induced risks to stakeholders' wellbeing	Based on the review of project documentation and stakeholder consultations, there are no identified natural or human-induced risks associated with the project that could negatively impact users or stakeholders' wellbeing. PP ensured that the end users received adequate training in handling the ICS. All necessary precautions are taken, and necessary trainings are provided to all staff involved in the project. The company instead, is required to fully comply with the national legislation of the Kenya.
Risks to stakeholder participation	The assessment team verified that the project activity is community project with ICS distribution. The stakeholder consultation documents and the local stakeholder gathering also makes this prominently apparent & confirms that there are no exclusions, communication gaps, or barriers within the project activity that could hinder stakeholder engagement or participation. The ongoing grievance mechanism is well established. Same was confirmed during site visit interviews with PP & local stakeholders.
Working conditions	No risk identified. The ICS are the safer cooking alternative compared to traditional cook stoves. PP has provided the comprehensive training sessions on ICS usage to the users and field staff to minimize potential risks. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/10/.
Safety of women and girls	No risk identified. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/10/. The nature of the project is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which based on technology performance claimed from manufacturer and perceived stove performance from user from monitoring survey/12/ and cross checked through verifier's site visit/10/, the project implementation benefits women and girls through reduction of smoke during meal preparation and shorter cooking time.
Safety of minority and marginalized groups, including children	No risk identified as PP has code of conduct and policy in place in relevant to hiring workers under legal age as per host country regulations. No evidence is detected from the site visit and interaction between verifier team and monitoring field team.
Pollutants (air, noise, discharges to water, generation and release of hazardous materials and chemical pesticides and fertilizers	No risk identified. Project technology which is provided with manufacturer's technology specification which is verified through stove specifications with higher thermal efficiency which in effect reduces wood fuel usage. The project technology utilize wood fuel and operates as cookstove which does not generate more waste than baseline stove.

4.2.7 Respect for Human Rights and Equity

4.2.7.1 Labor and Work

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Discrimination	No risk identified. Kenya has Labor Law[6] in effect/22/ in place that cover employee's right. PP their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers both discrimination and sexual harassment issues/16/. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/10/.
Sexual harassment	No risk identified. Kenya has Labor Law in effect/22/ in place that cover employee's right. PP their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers both discrimination and sexual harassment issues/17/. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/10/.
Gender equity in labor and work	No risk identified. Kenya has Labor Law in effect/22/ in place that cover employee's right. PP their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers both discrimination and sexual harassment issues/16/. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/10/.
Forced labor	No risk identified. Kenya has Labor Law in effect/22/ in place that cover employee's right. PP their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which forced labor/16/. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/10/.
Child labor	No risk identified. Kenya has Labor Law in effect/22/ in place that cover employee's right. PP their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which child labor/16/. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/10/.
Human trafficking	No risk identified. Kenya has Labor Law in effect/22/ in place that cover employee's right. PP their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers human trafficking/16/. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit/10/.

4.2.7.2 Human Rights

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion

[6] https://www.kenyalaw.org/kl/fileadmin/pdfdownloads/Acts/EmploymentAct_Cap226-No11of2007_01.pdf

Human Rights	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which presents no risk to Human Rights. The employed worker's rights are assessed in section 4.2.7.1. Kenya has been a member of ILO since 1969 which summary of the ratifications over the years by the country[7].

4.2.7.3 Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Preservation and protection of cultural heritage	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which present no risk to Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage

4.2.7.4 Property Rights

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Disputes over rights to territories and resources	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which present no risk to property rights. Through signed user agreements it is clearly communicated that the stove is distributed free of charge and in return the credit for claiming carbon emission reduction is with PP. Assessment of the project based on the project technology and activities was executed against applicable Financial rules and regulations and international human rights laws and standards.
Respect for property rights	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which presents no risk to property rights.

4.2.7.5 Benefit Sharing

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Summary of the benefit sharing plan	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which present no risk to property rights. Through signed user agreements it is clearly communicated that the stove is distributed free of charge and in return the credit for claiming carbon emission reduction is with PP.

[7] https://normlex.ilo.org/dyn/nrmlx_en/f?p=1000:11200:0::NO:11200:P11200_COUNTRY_ID:103315

Benefit sharing during the monitoring period	N/A. The nature of the project implementation does not have benefit sharing arrangement through all parties involved.

4.2.8 Ecosystem Health

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems	N/A. The nature of the project is implementation through the dissemination of improved cookstove to replace the traditional baseline stove. The project implementation has no effect on biodiversity and ecosystem. Through use of improved cookstove, reduction in wood fuel consumption can serve a positive impact on the surrounding ecosystem.
Soil degradation and soil erosion	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove to replace the traditional baseline stove. The project implementation has no effect on biodiversity and ecosystem. Through use of improved cookstove, wood fuel consumption reduction can serve a positive impact on surrounding ecosystem.
Water consumption and stress	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove to replace the traditional baseline stove. The use of project technology has no impact on water consumption since it is simply aimed to replace the use of baseline stove.

4.2.8.1 Rare, Threatened, and Endangered species

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Species or habitat	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove to replace the traditional baseline stove which does not present risk for local species or habitat.
Areas needed for habitat connectivity	N/A.

4.2.8.2 Introduction of Species

Species introduced	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
N/A	

Existing invasive species	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion

N/A	

	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Invasive species	N/A

4.2.8.3 Ecosystem conversion

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

4.3 Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations

The monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the provision of monitoring plan; the

verification team reviewed if:

- The monitoring of reductions in GHG emissions resulting from the VCS project activity is verified against the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS PD/5//33/ and the updated methodology/7/.
- All parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied/updated methodologies and relevant
- standards and requirements have been sufficiently monitored and updated.
- The responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting were in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the monitoring plan.

The monitoring system and all applied procedures are in compliance with the monitoring plan contained in the revised VCS-PD/33/ and the updated methodology VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0 /7/, based on the information included in the final monitoring report, there are several procedures for data collecting depending on the methodology applicable for each step of the project.

PP conducted sampling surveys to gather information needed for the monitoring of $n_{j,k,y}$, $BC_{b,i,y}$, and $BC_{p,j,k,y}$ parameters.

Where,

$n_{j,k,y}$: Visual inspection of the premises to see if ICS is operational and in use. Interview with end user if required to verify that ICS is still in use (Yes/No)

$\eta_{new,avg,y}$: a linear decrease approach.

$BC_{p,j,k,y}$: Project KPTs were conducted in the sampled households

$BC_{b,i,y}$: Baseline KPTs were conducted in the sampled households

Monitoring surveys were conducted in April-May 2025. Minimum sample size is calculated and verified for each parameter and project activity instances in reference to CDM Guideline Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and PoA/26/ using total distributed units as target population. Using random sampling approach, PP has identified sample sets for parameters. PP has meet minimum sample requirements, and achieved desired precision level. Same was verified from survey sheets & precision calculations.

Description	Estimated Sample Size	Actual Samples Selected	Survey Period
Baseline KPT Survey	100	81	07-April-2025 to 10-May-2025
Project KPT Survey	100	81	07-April-2025 to 17-April-2025
Project Monitoring Survey	190	190	25-April-2025 to 01-May-2025

For survey PP has chosen 100 samples but in actual less samples were surveyed the required level of confidence/precision has been reached.

1) Review and Validation of the End-User Database

- In accordance with Section 9.3 of VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0, the VVB confirms that the complete ICS distribution database containing individual-level household data such as names, addresses, contact details, and stove serial numbers, was shared directly with the VVB and thoroughly reviewed.
- The VVB accessed the full database during a during audit process:
    a) The PP demonstrated secure access to the ICS distribution server.
    b) The VVB downloaded the full database and conducted random sampling checks.
    c) Fields including household name, address, GPS coordinates, stove ID, distribution date, and user agreements were verified.
    d) The database structure and completeness were cross validated with the ER spreadsheet summaries (ICS Distribution Summary tab) and other monitoring records.

Therefore, it is concluded by VVB team that the complete end-user database was securely shared and reviewed during verification, in compliance with VM0050 Section 9.3. Due to personal data protection laws in Kenya and internationally, end-user details were not included in the public ERR spreadsheet. However, the VVB accessed the full database, performed random checks, and verified data accuracy. The exclusion from the ERR does not affect transparency or compliance.

2) Assessment of Sampling Date and Representativeness: VVB team would like to confirm here that:

a) The final stove distribution under the project took place on 30-September-2023, as

verified from the "ICS Distribution Sheet" in the ER sheet and the database itself.

b) No distributions occurred in 2024/2025, a fact cross-confirmed via interviews with the field team and database inspection/9/.
c) The sampling for the usage and performance survey was conducted on March-May 2025.
d) This timeline ensures that:
    - The entire ICS distribution database was finalized before sampling.
    - No additional stoves were distributed after the sample frame was generated, thus eliminating risk of under-coverage or post-sampling bias.
e) This approach aligns with VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0, Section 9.3, which requires sampling to be representative of the full monitored population and to reflect conditions during the monitoring period.

Verification Methodology for Representativeness

- During the site audit, the VVB verified:
    - Sample representativeness by randomly selecting and auditing households across country.
    - Both project stove users and KPT households were visited and interviewed, confirming accurate inclusion in the master database.
    - The survey population's geographic and temporal spread matched the distribution activity recorded in the database.
- The sampling methodology applied by the PP, including stratified random sampling, is consistent with CDM's "Sampling and Survey Guidelines" and was verified the approach as permitted under the Sampling Standard Version 9.0.

Therefore, as stated above it is concluded by VVB team that the sampling was conducted, after the final ICS distribution. No distributions occurred after this date, ensuring the sampling frame was complete and representative of the entire monitoring period. This information has been included in Section 4.3 of the Monitoring Report. The sampling process fully aligns with VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, VERSION 1.0 Section 9.3 and is therefore considered valid and compliant

Sampling captured information on monitoring variables with required confidence/precision
90/10 confidence/precision basis in corresponding to the scale of the Group Project which is "project" in accordance to VCS Standard/1/ and CDM Guideline Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and PoA/26/.

Accuracy and data traceability from the presented survey data is requested to be demonstrated by PP from the internal data management system to the extracted spreadsheet. Data presented and used for ER calculation is concluded to be complete and accurate. PP further provided justification and rationale behind data interpretation from the survey data during the opening meeting.

Calculation for relative precision from survey data is calculated at for both monitored parameters $n_{j,k,y}$, $BC_{b,i,y}$ and $BC_{p,j,k,y}$ is presented in the ER calculation/9/ and Project Device KPT Analysis spreadsheet/12/.

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

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

Parameter $n_{j,k,y}$ and $BC_{p,j,k,y}$ are verified to be matching the monitoring data survey.

Parameter	Description of Parameter	Assessment approach
$n_{j,k,y}$	Number of project devices of type i	-Visual inspection of the premises to see if the project stove is operational and in use. -Interview with end user to verify that project stove is still in use
$BC_{p,j,k,y}$	Average quantity of fuel used by project device type j from batch k during year y	-Onsite interview with households and reviewed KPTs submitted by PP
$BC_{b,i,y}$	Fuel used per baseline device type i during year y	Onsite interview with households and reviewed KPTs submitted by PP

Verification team carried out the site visit concluded that from 8 sampled households for project stove and 8 sampled households for KPT stoves (Baseline and project separately) reassessed in accordance with VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, VERSION 1.0, no discrepancy sighted between the data collected from site visit/10/ with monitoring data reported by PP. This satisfied para 33 of CDM Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities/17/, thus the coordinating/managing entities' set of records is accepted.

Emission reduction (ER)

The methodology calculates baseline and project emissions separately. The steps taken and the equations and parameters applied in the VCS PD/05/ & revised PD and VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, VERSION 1.0 to calculate the project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions comply with the requirements of the selected methodology including applicable tool(s).

$$BE_y = \Sigma EC_{i,y} \times N_{j,k,y} \times n_{j,k,y} \times (EF_{b,i,CO2} \times f_{NRB,y} + EF_{b,i,nonCO2}) \quad \text{Equation (1)}$$

Where:

BE_y	Baseline emissions during year y (t CO_2e)
$EC_{i,y}$	Average energy consumption of baseline device type i in year y (TJ)
$N_{j,k,y}$	Number of commissioned project devices of type j from batch k in year y

$n_{j,k,y}$	Proportion of commissioned project devices of type j from batch k that remain operating in year y (fraction)
$EF_{b,i,CO2}$	CO_2 emission factor for fuel used by baseline device type i in the baseline scenario (t CO_2/TJ)
$f_{NRB,y}$	Fraction of woody biomass that is established to be non-renewable used by baseline device in year y (fraction)
$EF_{b,i,nonCO2}$	Non-CO_2 emission factor for fuel used by baseline device type i in the baseline scenario (t CO_2e/TJ)
i	Baseline device type and its respective fuel type
j	Project device type and its respective fuel type

The average energy consumption of baseline device type i is calculated as follows:

$$EC_{i,y} = BC_{b,i,y} \times NCV_{b,i} \quad \text{Equation (2)}$$

Where:

$BC_{b,i,y}$	Fuel used per baseline device type i during year y (tonnes)
$NCV_{b,i}$	Net calorific value of baseline fuel for baseline device type i (TJ/tonne)

Cross-check of $EC_{i,y}$ to address stove stacking:

Baseline consumption from the back calculation is calculated as follows:

$$EC_{est,y} = EC_{p,y} \times \eta_{new,avg,y} / \eta_{old,avg} \quad \text{Equation (3)}$$

Where:

$EC_{est,y}$	Back-calculated energy consumption of the potential mix of devices and fuels in the baseline in year y (TJ)
$EC_{p,y}$	Energy used in project scenario by project devices during year y (TJ)
$\eta_{new,avg,,y}$	Weighted average efficiency of project devices in year y (fraction)
$n_{old,avg}$	Weighted average efficiency of baseline devices that are replaced by project devices (fraction)

Quantification of leakage emissions:

In accordance with the section 8.3 of the applied methodology, VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0/7/, a default factor of 0.95 to account for leakage has been applied.

Verification team confirms that all relevant assumptions and data are listed in the project description, including their references and sources and that all data and parameter values used in the project description are considered reasonable in the context of the project and all estimates of the baseline emissions can be replicated using the data and parameter values provided in the project description. No uncertainties associated with the calculations of emissions have been observed by the verification team.

Quantification of project emissions:

As per the applied methodology VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0, project emissions are calculated as follows:

$$PE^{y} = PE_{energy,y} + PE_{others,y} \quad \text{Equation (6)}$$

Where:

PE^{y}	Project emissions during year y (t CO_2e)
$PE_{energy,y}$	Project emissions from energy consumption of project devices in year y (t CO_2e)
$PE_{others,y}$	Project emissions from other sources in year y (t CO_2e)

$$PE_{energy,y} = \sum_j \sum_k BCp,j,k,y \times Nj,k,y \times NCVp,j \times nj,k,y \times (EFp,j,CO2 \times fNRB,y + EFp,j,nonCO2) \quad \text{Equation (7)}$$

Where:

$EF_{p,j,CO2}$	CO_2 emission factor for fuel used by project device type j in the project scenario (t CO_2/TJ) = 112 tCO_2e/TJ (Meth Default Value)
$EF_{p,j,nonCO2}$	Non-CO_2 emission factor for fuel used by project device type j in the project scenario (t CO_2e/TJ) = 9.46 tCO_2e/TJ (Meth Default Value)
$BC_{p,j,k,y}$	average quantity of fuel used by project device type j from batch k during year y = 2.2224 tonnes/HH /year
$N_{j,k,y}$	Number of commissioned project devices of type j from batch k in year y = 1 Nos
$n_{j,k,j}$	Proportion of commissioned project devices of type j from batch k that remain operating in year y = 0.594 fraction
f_{NRB}	Fraction of woody biomass that is established to be non-renewable used by baseline device type i in year y in the baseline scenario (fraction); this variable is not considered for fossil fuels = 0.29 fraction (default or host country)

$NCV_{p,j}$ Net calorific value of project fuel for project device type i (Wood) =0.0156 TJ/tonne

Given that the grouped project involves the distribution of non-renewable biomass-based improved cookstoves exclusively to the target users, Equation (8) and Equation (10) of the methodology applies to electric stoves and are therefore not applicable. Further, the ICS distributed under the project is designed for wood fuel, and beneficiaries procure the wood fuel either from nearby fields or the market. Therefore, Equation (9) is not applicable.

Verifier team has reviewed the project KPTs and confirms there are no uncertainties in calculating $BC_{p,j,k,y}$ for project emission calculations.

The grouped project employs methodology namely VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0. Following Project Description Document /5/ section 5.1 and 5.2, the parameters determined ex-ante and monitored ex-post as per methodology requirements are as followed:

The data and parameters fixed (ex-ante):

S.No	Parameter	Value	Means of verification
1	$EF_{p,j,CO2}$: CO^2 emission factor for fuel used by project device type j in the project scenario	112 tCO_2e/TJ	Verification against methodology default value and IPCC Guidelines/24/
2	$EF_{p,j,non\text{-}CO2}$: Non-CO_2 emission factor for fuel used by project device type j	9.46 tCO2e/TJ	Verification against methodology default value and IPCC Guidelines/24/
3	$NCV_{p,j}$: Net calorific value of project fuel for project device type i (Wood)	Wood: 0.0156 TJ/tonne	Verification against methodology default value and IPCC Guidelines/24/
4	$BC_{ex\text{-}ante,b,i}$: Ex-ante annual average quantity of fuel used per baseline device type i	2.6188 tonnes/HH/Yr	Assessment team has reviewed baseline KPTs as per VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0 requirements and cross check firewood consumption during onsite

S.No	Parameter	Value	Means of verification
5	$\eta_{old,avg}$ Weighted average efficiency of baseline devices that are replaced by project devices	15%	Verification against methodology default value and IPCC Guidelines/24/
6	Hhi Hhj,k	Average household size of the target population using device type i is 3.2663 Equivalent standard male adults Average household size of the target population using device type j from batch k 3.2436 Equivalent standard male adults	Assessment team has reviewed baseline survey and KPTs as per VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0 requirements and cross check firewood consumption during onsite

The data and parameters monitored (ex-post):

1. Parameter: $N_{y,k,y}$ (Number of commissioned project devices of type j from batch k in year y)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Assessment team has reviewed total ICS distribution database following methodology/7/ requirement. As per methodology/7/ requirement and PD/5//33/, the monitoring frequency is every time that new project devices are distributed. Frequency monitoring for this parameter is evident meeting the methodology requirement.

	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	N/A.
	Monitoring equipment	N/A.
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	N/A
	Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Assessment team has reviewed the total distribution database which has date of distribution. VVB has also verified CTF for the selected households. Value of $N_{j,k,y}$ is verified as 119,938 units
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	N/A
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Assessment team has reviewed number of ICS devices recorded in database, sales record. Value of $N_{j,k,y}$ is verified as 119,938 units
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	Monitoring is verified to be carried out as per VCS PD/33/ and methodology/7/ requirement with no deviation.
Findings	NA	
Conclusion	The monitoring & recording of the parameter found inline with applied methodology	

2. Parameter: $n_{j,k,y}$ (Proportion of commissioned project devices of type j from batch k that are still being used regularly in year y)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology/7/ requirement, the parameter is measured directly or based on a representative sample. Project Proponent carried out habit survey/12/ with questionnaire determining whether project technology is used (user vs non-user) for each project instances sample sets. Calculation is carried out for the project instance using total units distributed with usage rate % from monitoring survey. As per methodology/7/ requirement and PD/5//33/, the monitoring frequency is annually. The parameter is calculated using usage rate obtained from monitoring survey carried out in April-May 2025 for 5th monitoring period. As per methodology/7/ requirement and PD/5/, the monitoring frequency is annual. The parameter is calculated using usage rate obtained from monitoring survey carried out in April-May 2025 for 5th monitoring period. Sampling requirement for the survey to obtain the data parameter is assessed with presented data that Project Proponent sampling plan is adjusted to satisfy sample size to achieve 90/10 confidence precision relevant to the size of the project. Sampling approach adopted by Project proponent is in line with Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programmes of Activities requirement/17/.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	As per methodology/7/ requirement and PD/5/, the monitoring frequency is annually. The parameter is calculated using usage rate obtained from monitoring survey carried out in April-May 2025 for 5th monitoring period. Sampling requirement for the survey to obtain the data parameter is assessed with presented data that Project Proponent sampling plan is adjusted to satisfy sample size to achieve 90/10 confidence precision relevant to the size of the project. Sampling approach adopted by Project proponent in accordance with Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programmes of Activities requirement/17/
	Monitoring equipment	N/A.

Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	N/A
Calibration frequency /interval:	N/A
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A
Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A
Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Stove Operating Fraction for determination of $N_{y,i,j}$ values are verified through data analysis of data presented as survey habit/12/ for each project instances for usage rate of project technology is at 59.4%.
If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	NA
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The value of usage survey is based on the monitoring survey analysis which is captured and recorded electronically. Traceability of the data from the presented excel data file/12/ was performed from the data source using sampled data set during opening meeting with no discrepancy sighted. Similar feedback from households is obtained during onsite visits. Calculation of the value is verified as well as the value claimed in both ER/9/ and monitoring report/8/.

	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	Monitoring is verified to be carried out as per Project Description Document/5//33/ and methodology/7/ requirement with no deviation.
Findings	No	
Conclusion	The monitoring & recording of the parameter found inline with applied methodology	

3. Parameter $f_{NRB,b,y}$ (Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass.)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	In accordance with VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, VERSION 1.0 requirement, fNRB value revised in PD is taken from Tool 33: Default value for common parameters. Version 03.0. Value of the Parmeter is verified through revised PD and the tool 33. The calculation of this parameter is found to be in accordance with the updated methodology.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Calculation of this parameter is as per updated methodology. This parameter is calculated once per crediting period. The frequency of calculation of f_{NRB} for the host country is in line with VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0.
	Monitoring equipment	N/A. The parameter is sourced from tool 33.
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	N/A
	Calibration frequency /interval:	N/A

	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Calculation of this parameter is as per updated methodology. This parameter is calculated once per crediting period.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	N/A Calculation of this parameter is as per updated methodology. The frequency of calculation of fNRB for the host country is in line with VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	N/A. The parameter is as per revised PD. f_{NRB} is updated in accordance with section 9.2 of the updated methodology.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	N/A. The parameter is as per revised PD. f_{NRB} is updated in accordance with section 9.2 of the updated methodology.
Findings	CAR#06	
Conclusion	The raised CAR were resolved satisfactorily. The value of this parameter is verified and accepted as: 0.29	

4. Parameter $BC_{b,i,y}$ (Fuel used per baseline device type i during year y)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology/7/ requirement, the parameter is to be obtained from survey at five years. The parameter is to be monitored using 2 options with option 1 being used. This option requires measurement campaign followed by KPTs that are not the part of the project activity. Similar sampling procedures to the project scenario were followed and 100 samples were chosen by PP. However, PP achieved required level of confidence/precision with 81 actual samples. The fuel consumption was confirmed by interviews of baseline households during onsite visit. The monitoring frequency is in line with updated methodology.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Following methodology/7/ requirement, under option 1 the parameter is to be obtained from survey designed to capture the cooking habits and baseline firewood consumption of households in project boundary. Assessment team has reviewed the sampling approach and the baseline followup survey data. The estimate wood consumption in the baseline was confirmed by baseline/project households during onsite visit. The approach PP has implemented based on the questionnaire format of the survey, data interpretation and analysis for precision level, it is concluded to satisfy methodology requirement/7/.
	Monitoring equipment	NA, as the survey data is obtained by verbal confirmation and is followed by KPT.

	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	NA, as the survey data is obtained by verbal confirmation on the frequency on the consumption of firewood in the baseline and is then followed by KPT.
	Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	VVB has reviewed the baseline surveys and KPTs. Data analysis on survey data concluded that the value is calculated accordingly. Data Traceability for the survey data presented was carried out during opening meeting.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	N/A.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The approach PP has implemented based on the questionnaire format of the survey, data interpretation and analysis for precision level, it is concluded to satisfy methodology requirement/7/. The approach resulted in simplified questionaries that is easily conveyed by survey team and understood by survey participants. The calculation of the value of itself is also simple fraction based on the frequency.

	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	N/A.
Findings	No finding raised	
Conclusion	The value of this parameter is verified and accepted as:	

Period	$BC_{b,i,y}$ *(Fuel used per baseline device)*
Age 1	2.6188 *tonnes/HH/Yr*
Age 2	2. 6188 *tonnes/HH/Yr*
Age 3	2. 6188 *tonnes/HH/Yr*
Age 4	2. 6188 *tonnes/HH/Yr*
Age 5	2. 6188 *tonnes/HH/Yr*

5. Parameter $BC_{p,j,k,y}$ (Average quantity of fuel used by project device type j from batch k during year y)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology/7/ requirement, the parameter is to be obtained from survey biennial or annually. The parameter is to be monitored using 3 options with option 1 being used. This option requires measurement campaign followed by KPTs that are not the part of the project activity. CDM CDM Standard for Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programmes of Activities sampling procedures were followed for project scenario achieved confidence and precision of at 90/10 for the target parameter of average daily fuel consumption per adult equivalent. The fuel consumption was confirmed by interviews of households during onsite visit. The monitoring frequency is in line with updated methodology.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Following methodology/7/ requirement, under option 1 the parameter is to be obtained from survey designed to capture the cooking habits and project activity firewood consumption of households. Assessment team has reviewed the sampling approach and the project survey data. The estimate wood

		consumption in the project was confirmed by project households during onsite visit. The approach PP has implemented based on the questionnaire format of the survey, data interpretation and analysis for precision level, it is concluded to satisfy methodology requirement/7/.
	Monitoring equipment	NA.
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	NA.
	Calibration frequency /interval:	NA.
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	VVB has reviewed the project KPTs. Data analysis on survey data concluded that the value is calculated accordingly. Data Traceability for the survey data presented was carried out during opening meeting.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	N/A.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The approach PP has implemented based on the questionnaire format of the survey, data interpretation and analysis for precision level, it is

		concluded to satisfy methodology requirement/7/. The approach resulted in simplified questionaries that is easily conveyed by survey team and understood by survey participants. The calculation of the value of itself is also simple fraction based on the frequency.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	N/A.
Findings	N/A	
Conclusion	VVB reviewed monitoring survey and Project KPTs. VVB analysed sampling calculation The value of this parameter is verified and accepted as:	

Period	$BC_{p,j,k,y}$ *(Average quantity of fuel used by project device)*
Age 1	2.2224 *tonnes/HH/Yr*
Age 2	2. 2224 *tonnes/HH/Yr*
Age 3	2. 22243 *tonnes/HH/Yr*
Age 4	2. 2224 *tonnes/HH/Yr*
Age 5	2. 2224 *tonnes/HH/Yr*

5. Parameter $\eta_{new,avg,y}$ (Weighted average efficiency of project devices in year y)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology/7/ requirement, the parameter is established by A linear decrease approach, applying a default schedule of linearly decreasing efficiency up to the terminal efficiency (assumed to be 25%) through the lifespan of the project device PP Has chosen the sub option (b) above i.e., linear decrease approach to determine the project stove efficiency.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Following methodology/7/ requirement, the parameter is established by A linear decrease approach, applying a default schedule of linearly decreasing efficiency up to the terminal efficiency (assumed to be 25%) through the lifespan of the project device

	PP Has chosen the sub option (b) above i.e., linear decrease approach to determine the project stove efficiency.
Monitoring equipment	NA
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval:	N/A as the parameter is calculated.
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A.
Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A.
Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Yes
If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	N/A
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	PP Has chosen the sub option (b) above i.e., linear decrease approach to determine the project stove efficiency.
In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	N/A

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Findings</td><td>No finding</td></tr>
<tr><td>Conclusion</td><td>The weighted average efficiencies are calculated as per meth and found correct/9/.
<table>
<tr><td>Period</td><td>$\eta_{new,avg,y}$ (Weighted average efficiency of project devices)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Age 1</td><td>0.3450</td></tr>
<tr><td>Age 2</td><td>0.3355</td></tr>
<tr><td>Age 3</td><td>0.3260</td></tr>
<tr><td>Age 4</td><td>0.3165</td></tr>
<tr><td>Age 5</td><td>0.3070</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
</table>

Full assessment of value and data used in ER calculation is verified as detailed above/9/. Clarifications and inconsistencies raised as CLs and CARs have been resolved as provided in each specific parameter.

The assessment team has thoroughly verified the calculation done for the quantification of the emissions reduction for the project activity, under this monitoring period from 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025 /9/.

4.4 Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals

Verification team was able to confirm that the data presented is able to be traced to initial raw source of record/data. The spreadsheets used to calculate the VCUs calculations, and all figures were tracked, checked and found to be consistent.

The transfer of carbon rights and other supporting documents related to quality and maintenance were checked by the verification team during the remote audit assessment to confirm the authenticity of the documents and to check the correctness of the calculation.

The verification team can confirm that sufficient evidence is available for the whole monitoring period and the same is verifiable. Based on the distribution database, 119,938 were distributed. Verifier team evaluated the approach chosen by PP to be acceptable from the conservativeness principle as well while still meeting the requirement of the applied methodology.

In accordance with the above details the verification team confirms that:

A complete set of data for the monitoring period was available for the monitoring period and the verification of each monitoring parameter is elaborated under this of this report.

The complete monitoring data is also presented in the corresponding ER sheet and the final monitoring report.

The information provided in the monitoring report was cross checked with other sources, wherever appropriate and available, and such information is also included under this of this report.

The calculations of baseline emissions as presented in the corresponding ER sheet of final Monitoring Report were checked and found to be consistent with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan/05/ and the applied methodology.

All assumptions used in the emission calculations were found appropriate and therefore justified.

Appropriate emission factors and other reference values have been correctly applied.

The assessment team has verified all the primary supporting related to operations, quality, and generation of data during the monitoring period such as cross verification against initial/raw data source (users' signed agreements/14/, internal database record for distribution database for user's information, baseline stove and fuel type/11/; monitoring survey/12/ and; technical specification of ICS model/25/, training sessions for competence evaluation of monitoring personals and survey execution guidance/21/, data quality check for plausibility and accuracy, VVB verified the 4.3 and 4.3 section of the MR in relation to QA/QC measures and training in relation to the competence of the field team. Evidence provided in form of internal audit reports, training records, project stove training material used for households visit/training/21/.

ER calculation with formulations and units conversion as well as data transfer from data sources into reports. The photographs were only used as means of secondary cross check of the information verified from Primary sources. As this is the 5th monitoring period of the project's first crediting period, information regarding project capacity commission and monitoring system are already verified in previous monitoring report which are also cross checked with previous report. Thus, a reasonable level of assurance is achieved.

4.5 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

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

5 VERIFICATION OPINION

5.1 Verification Summary

The project activity VCS – 2349, "Installation of high efficiency wood burning cookstoves in Kenya" has undergone 5th verification with monitoring period from 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025 (including both days). Bridge Carbon Africa Stoves Development Private Limited is responsible for the collection, analysis, aggregation, preparation (conversion factors, assumptions, methodology, calculations) and presentation of activities and related GHG data in its public disclosures (including but not limited to monitoring report, emission reduction calculation sheet, submitted documents/ emails/ communications). Our responsibility of performing this work is to the management of Bridge Carbon Africa Stoves Development Private Limited and in accordance with terms of reference agreed with the Bridge Carbon Africa Stoves Development Private Limited in the master service agreement. The verification engagement is based on the assumption that the GHG data provided to us is complete, sufficient, true and free from material misstatements. SustainCERT disclaims any liability or co-responsibility for any decision a person or an entity would make based on this verification statement towards the issuance and utilization of VCUs hereby verified and certified. The verification was carried out during June-September 2025 by a team of qualified GHG auditors.

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

We have complied with the VCS standard/1/ and other requirements mentioned, during the verification engagement and maintained independence. SustainCERT was not involved in the preparation of any statements or reports or data except for this Verification Statement and Report. SustainCERT maintains complete impartiality toward stakeholders interviewed during the verification process. SustainCERT did not provide any services to Bridge Carbon Africa Stoves Development Private Limited (current Project Proponent) and its subsidiaries in the scope of verification that could compromise the independence or impartiality of our work.

International Accreditation Forum accreditation body approved validation/verification body opinions must include a declaration that the validation and/or verification of the GHG statement was conducted in accordance with ISO 14064-3. The applicable ISO version must be included (e.g., ISO 14064-3: 2019).

5.2 Verification Conclusion

The Verification of the project titled 'Installation of high efficiency wood burning cookstoves in Kenya' VCS ID – 2349, have been undertaken by SustainCERT, as requested by Bridge Carbon Africa Stoves Development Private Limited , project proponent for the monitoring period 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025(including both the days) as reported in monitoring report/8/. The project activity is implemented in accordance with the registered monitored plan in PD/5//33/ and the emission reduction from the project activity. It is our responsibility to express an independent verification statement on the reported GHG emission reductions from the project activity.

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

In our opinion, the GHG emissions reductions reported for the project activity for the period 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025 (inclusive both days) are fairly stated in the project monitoring report/8/The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly based on the approved baseline and monitoring methodology VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0 and the monitoring plan contained in the PD/5/ and updated methodology.

Verification period: From 01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025 (inclusive both days)

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

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO_2e)	Project emissions (tCO_2e)	Leakage emissions (tCO_2e)	Reduction VCUs (tCO_2e)	Removal VCUs (tCO_2e)	Total VCUs (tCO_2e)
1-April-2023 to 31-December-2023	39,293	33,345	0	5,650	0	5,650
1-January-2024 to 31-December-2024	61,034	51,795	0	8,777	0	8,777
1-January-2025 to 31-March-2025	15,050	12,771	0	2,164	0	2,164
Total	**115,377**	**97,911**	**0**	**16,591**	**0**	**16,591**

5.3 Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison

Vintage period	Ex-ante estimated reductions/ removals	Achieved reductions/ removals	Percent difference	Explanation for the difference
1-April-2023 to 31-December-2023	25,875	5,650	-78%	There is a -76 % less in the ex-ante estimates and the actual emission reductions obtained for this monitoring period. The lower ER achieved is conservative f_{NRB} used inline with Tool 33 for country default value. Therefore, lead to a difference in the estimates and actuals for the ERs/VCUs which is acceptable.
1-January-2024 to 31-December-2024	34,437	8,777	-75%	
1-January-2025 to 31-March-2025	8,468	2,164	-74%	
Total	**68,780**	**16,591**	**-76%**	

APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION

Section	*Information*	*Justification*	*Assessment method and conclusion*
N/A			

APPENDIX 2: TABLE OF REFERENCE

S. No	Document Title	Version	Date
1.	VCS standard https://verra.org/documents/vcs-standard-v4-7/	4.7	16-April-2024
2.	VCS guidelines https://verra.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/VCS-Program-Guide-v4.4.pdf	4.4	29-August-2023
3.	Validation and Verification Manual https://verra.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/VCS_Validation_Verification_Manual_v3.2.pdf	3.2	19-October-2016
4.	VCS Project Webpage, VCS ID - 2521 (https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/2349)	-	-
5.	Registered Project Description	Version 4.0	21-October-2022
6.	Validation report	Version 04	22-October-2022
7.	Updated Methodology: VM0050: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND FUEL-SWITCH MEASURES IN COOKSTOVES, Version 1.0	1.0	-
8.	Monitoring report 5th MP (01-April-2023 to 31-March-2025(both days included))	02.2	29-January-2026
9.	Emission reduction calculation sheet (Ex-ante and ex-post ERs)	02.1	13-August-2025
10.	Onsite audit report	-	-
11.	Project distribution database ICS Distribution Database' (Confidential)	-	-
12.	Baseline KPT Survey, Project KPT Survey and Monitoring Survey MP5 (Confidential)	-	-
13.	Survey data collection platform	-	-
14.	User's signed agreements (Samples)	-	-
15.	KML files for project activity	-	-
16.	Bridge carbon internal policy for employment	-	-
17.	Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities	9	
18.	No Double counting declaration Agreement with users and PP		
19.	UN List of Least Developed Country (https://unfccc.int/topics/resilience/workstreams/national-adaptation-programmes-of-action/ldc-country-information).		Accessed on 15/09/2025
20.	Field team activity log records		
21.	Attendance list for training sessions field team		
22.	Kenya Labor Law (*https://www.kenyalaw.org/kl/fileadmin/pdfdownloads/Acts/EmploymentAct_Cap226-No11of2007_01.pdf*)		
23.	Stove Purchase/supply order		
24.	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories; Chapter 2 Stationary Combustion	2006	
25.	Stove Technical specifications		-
26.	CDM Guideline Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and PoA	4	16-October-2015
27.	VCS Methodology Requirements	4.4	29-August-2023

S. No	Document Title	Version	Date
28.	Local Stakeholder Consultation records: • District collaboration agreements • LSC report in district level • Sampled invitation	-	-
29.	Training evidences for monitoring team		
30.	Kenya environmental laws and regulations: https://new.kenyalaw.org/akn/ke/act/1999/8/eng@2022-12-31		Accessed 15-September-2025
31.	Baseline survey and Baseline KPTs raw data and analysis sheet.		
32.	Project stove KPT raw data and analysis sheet.		
33.	Revised PD for meth update	Version 5.3	29-January-2026
34.	Grievance records		-
35.	No Double counting Declaration from PP (Docusign Envelope ID: 085C6B96-C0A5-47A9-B4CA-0DCE26788EF8)	-	-
36.	WBT lab test report for project stoves from Aprovecho Research Centre laboratory	-	-

APPENDIX 3: ABBREVIATIONS

MR	Monitoring report
PD	Project description
MP	Monitoring Period
PP	Project Proponent
PAI	Project Instances
ICS	Improved Cook Stove
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
VCU	Verified Carbon Unit
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
AQI	Acceptable Quality Level
UQL	Unacceptable Quality Level
GP	Grouped Project

APPENDIX 4: PROJECT FINDINGS

PD for methodology change

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CAR01	Developer Response
VCS Standard, V4.7	Is the PD completed VCS PD as per the instruction described in the project description template (font, font size, dates etc.)?	Following discrepancies were observed during review of the VCS PD: 1. Original date of VCS PD as scope of validation & updation of VCS PD is limited to meth revision. 2. VCS PD is not clear about the inclusion of first and last dates of the crediting period and monitoring periods mentioned under audit history. 3. PP requested to submit name change certificate or evidences for ownership of project activity if other entity. 4. PP requested to submit Revised KML file and upload same on the project VERRA webpage. Corrective action raised for the same.	1. Original date of VCS PD has been updated. 2. First and last dates of the crediting period and monitoring periods has been updated under audit history. 3. PP has submitted the evidence for the ownership rights/name change. 4. Revised KML file has been submitted and uploaded on the project VERRA webpage.
	Rd 2	1. Original date of VCS PD is now revised appropriately. CAR is closed. 2. VCS PD & MR is now updated and clear for inclusion of first and last dates of the crediting period and monitoring periods mentioned under audit history. CAR is closed. 3. PP has submitted name change certificate and information in VCS PD & VERRA webpage is matching with certificate. CAR is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CAR01	Developer Response
		4. PP submitted Revised KML file and to be upload same on the project VERRA webpage. CAR is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL01	Developer Response
VCS Standard, V4.7	Does the PD provide a description of the technologies/measures to be implemented by the project? It should include a description of the activities that will be implemented.	PD requested to provide justification/rationale for revised project description as scope of the revalidation is change in the methodology applied. Kindly clarify.	The project description has been updated to provide more clarity on the baseline scenario, technology deployed and updation of language. This change in description does not affect the project design, applicability condition and project technology of project activity.
	Rd 2	The revised description in the VCS PD and MR does not affect on the registered design & technical specification and thus accepted by assessment team. CL is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL02	Developer Response
VCS Standard, V4.7	Does the PP provide assurance that the project is complying with the laws and regulations and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved? The PP need to list all	VCS PD/MR lacking the reference and compliance with the host country regulations; Climate Change Act (2016) and the Climate Change (Carbon Markets) Regulations (2024). Kindly demonstrate application and compliance.	PP has provided the reference and compliance with the host country regulations; Climate Change Act (2016) and the Climate Change (Carbon Markets) Regulations (2024) in the VCS PD/MR.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL02	Developer Response
	applicable regulations in this section of the PD?		
	Rd 2	Assessment team reviewed the both act/rule and noted that the Climate Change Act (2016) and the Climate Change (Carbon Markets) Regulations (2024) of host country does not have any impact on the project eligibility and issuance of VERs. The project activity is in compliance to the rules. CL closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CAR 02	Developer Response
VCS Standard, V4.7	Does the PP provide evidence of project ownership (that is, the legal right to control and operate project or program activities), in accordance with VCS specifications on project ownership? (See Section 3.6.1). How did the VVB validated the project ownership? Does the PD describe who owns the GHG benefits? Requires a PP to show that it has an explicit right to ERRs (typically set out in a law or regulation), a	The change in the ownership has been observed during this joint validation and verification which was also evident from the VERRA project webpage. However, to verify the same, PP requested to submit evidences for the ownership rights/name change and revised communication agreement with VERRA. Also, any revised agreements between new PP and end users for ownership of emission reductions achieved. Kindly clarify and submit evidence.	PP has submitted the evidence for the ownership rights/name change and Accession Registration Representation, v4.2 with VERRA. Also, agreement between PP and end user has been provided.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CAR 02	Developer Response
	contractual right to ERRs (typically in the form of a concession), or an implicit right to ERRs (a fact-specific assessment based on who has the right to receive benefits from the land and whether this right extends to commercial benefits, rather than just subsistence/consuming purposes, by way of a reasonably accessible process).		
	Rd 2	PP has submitted the Name change certificate indicating the revised name of the PP. PP has also submitted the End user sample agreements confirming VERs ownership with PP. Assessment team also reviewed the declaration from the PP stating communication with stove manufacturers confirming VER ownership with PP. CAR thus closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL03	Developer Response
VCS Standard, V4.7	Does the PD demonstrate and justify how the project activity(s) meets each of the applicability conditions of the	Following discrepancies are observed during onsite visit to the users: 1. During onsite visit observations and discussions with users, it was noted that users	1. PP have captured all this information during the survey results and KPT calculations are based on actual fuel wood consumption when these stoves were present in the HH. PP has addressed the

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL03	Developer Response
	methodology(s), and tools (where applicable) applied by the project. Address each applicability condition separately. Revise the methodology and tools. Does the PD define the project boundary and identify the relevant GHG sources, sinks and reservoirs for the project and baseline scenarios (including leakage if applicable)? Does the PD identify and justify the baseline scenario, in accordance with the procedure set out in the applied methodology and any relevant tools? Does the PD include information explaining and justifying key assumptions, rationale and methodological choices?	are using Baseline stoves (3 stone jiko and unimproved charcoal stoves). PP requested to clarify the discount factors for this in the ER calculations. 2. There is a seasonal increase in the use of charcoal during the wet season. PP requested to clarify the accountability of the same in the ERs. 3. Stove stacking (LPG, bioethanol, improved charcoal stoves) have been observed during the onsite visits. Thus, PP requested to clarify how is the project accounting and discounting for stove stacking and double counting prevented. For PP's reference of such HHs, see example IDs below: Stove ID: CQCVKE 0099252, 0099251 Project ID: 2349 ICS Type: Improved charcoal jiko got from a VSLA. Stove ID: BCKBS 0048 Project ID: Baseline ICS Type: Improved Charcoal jiko Stove ID: BCKBS 0029 Project ID: Baseline ICS Type: LPG 4. Due to delay in maintenance of the stove, some users experience non-functional period. PP requested to clarify how same accounted for the emission reduction calculations. 5. It was observed that some users repair their stoves themselves. How PP ensures the QA/QC & integrity of the stoves.	stove staking (non- frequent baseline stove user in project households) in the ER calculation by applying minimum value from $EC_{i,y}$ (equation 2) and $EC_{est,y}$ (equation 3) in equation 1 of VM0050, v1.0. 2. PP have captured all this information during the survey results and KPT calculations are based on actual fuel wood consumption when these stoves were present in the HH. 3. PP have captured all this information during the survey results and KPT calculations are based on actual fuel wood consumption when these stoves were present in the HH. 4. PP have captured all this information during the survey results and KPT calculations are based on actual fuel wood consumption when these stoves were present in the HH. 5. At the time of installation of stove PP has provide comprehensive training on proper stove usage, maintenance, and minor repair to the end users. Also, provide detailed, easy-to-understand manuals and repair guides. During stove champion visit, SC will do the inspection to assess the quality of repairs and identify areas for improvement in the repair process.
	Rd 2	1. Charcoal usage is monitored during KPT survey and accounted during calculation of average wood consumption. Assessment	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL03	Developer Response
		team conforms that the PP has applied minimum for average energy consumption of baseline device through measurement campaigns/default values and back calculations from project scenario. Thus, PP has considered stove staking and baseline stove usage. CL is closed. 2. PP to clarify how shifting from wood to LPG/other improved ICS accounted for baseline shifting and eligibility of the user under project activity. CL is open. 3. PP has distributed two stoves and during VVB onsite interviews it was noted that users opted for second stove if one damaged. However, PP to clarify any non-operational days considered for both stoves during this monitoring period. CL is open. 4. Based on the samples visited by VVB team, no alteration in design of the stoves observed. Thus, finding is closed.	1. Though the stove stacking observed, PPs baseline reassessment KPT studies for fuel consumption showed that the household were currently using traditional biomass three-stone fired cook stoves. Hence, user are eligible under project activity. The project leads to reduction in carbon emissions due to burning of firewood in inefficient three stone fired cookstoves used in the baseline. Also, PP has addressed the stove staking (non- frequent baseline stove user in project households) in the ER calculation by applying minimum value from $EC_{i,y}$ (equation 2) and $EC_{est,y}$ (equation 3) in equation 1 of VM0050, v1.0. 3. As per MRV survey household is considered as user/active, if any one project stove being used regularly in the project household. PP has conducted surveys at household level (not stove level) to collect the data for baseline, project and MRV purposes. Thereby any non-user households are not considered in ER calculation during monitoring period. Hence, ER calculation becomes more accurate and reflects the actual impact of the project on reducing emissions.
	Rd 3	2. Assessment team conforms that the PP has applied minimum for average energy consumption of baseline device through measurement campaigns values and back calculations from project scenario. Thus, PP has considered stove staking in ER calculations.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL03	Developer Response
		3. As the user considered active only if at least one project ICS was in continues use. Only these users are considered for the ER calculations sheet has been checked and found that usage rate of 59.4% considered by PP as per monitoring surveys. CL is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 04	Developer Response
VCS Standard, V4.7	Does the safeguarding principles are adequately justified in the VCS PD/MR.	1. How PP ensures a safe and fair environment for the Stove champions who work across sparsely spaced HHs in rural areas with potential safety risks with some working late. Provide evidence of fair compensation. Also provide safety safeguards as gender aggregated. 2. There have been cases of Stove champions and installers charging money to customers, against policy and it seems BC has taken action by firing the said staff. What mechanisms have been put in place to let customers know they should not be expected to pay and can report such cases to BC, even anonymously. 3. How do PP communicate with users if an SC has changed, so that they know who to reach out to incase of issues. 4. Some of the households report that project stove is spoiling the pots by the stove ring. PP to clarify same and record grievance.	1. To guarantee a safe and equitable working environment for Stove Champions (SC) employed in rural regions, Project Participant (PP) has engaged SC from local communities. Additionally, PP has provided training on safe practices, established transparent communication channels, offered assistance with transportation and personal safety, ensured equitable compensation, and ensured satisfactory working conditions. PP has meticulously developed and implemented gender-sensitive policies and procedures that effectively address potential risks associated with violence, harassment, and discrimination. 2. The action was not carried out by SC, but rather by implementing partner (IP) in the past. When this matter was brought to the attention of Bridge Carbon (BC), the appropriate action was taken for such cases. The relevant documentation has been provided to VVB for review. The PP has informed end users that the stoves are free and inform us if anyone is asking money. PP has established a grievance mechanism to address such issues. Stakeholders and end users are free to connect with the respective Bridge Carbon team at any time via email or the contact number provided by PP.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 04	Developer Response
			3. The PP communicates the SC change to the community leader, village chief. This is because it is not feasible to reach every end user and inform them about the change in the individual responsible for working in this community. 4. This happened because of incorrect placement of the pot on the stove ring, using inappropriate cookware, or prolonged cooking on high heat which all contribute to pot damage. PP ensure that they provide the training to end users regarding- • **Pot Placement:** Ensure the pot is centered on the stove ring and that there is adequate space between the pot and the stove ring for proper airflow. • **Heat Management:** Avoid prolonged cooking on high heat. • **Cookware Choice:** Use pots with thicker bases.
	Rd 2	1. During onsite interviews with PP and stove champions it was noted that stove champions were imparted proper training and also to abide SOP for working & interacting with community. CL is closed. 2. The issue was addressed inline with company policies appropriately. No such events observed during this monitoring period. CL is closed. 3. Village chiefs were actively involved in the project activity for communication between PP and end users. Thus, there is no direct impact on the communication and grievance mechanism due to stove champion's change. CL is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 04	Developer Response
		4. During site visit no design faults were observed in the stoves installed. Moreover, the problem mostly related to usage habits. CL is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CAR 03	Developer Response
VCS Standard, V4.7	1. Does the PD describe the mechanism for on-going communication with local stakeholders?	Ongoing stakeholders communication mechanism for all category of stakeholders found missing whereas existing mechanism is user oriented. Corrective action sought.	Ongoing stakeholders' communication mechanism for all categories of stakeholders has been provided in section 2.1.2 of VCS PD.
	Rd 2	PP has revised VCS PD and MR appropriately for ongoing stakeholder communication mechanism and found acceptable. CAR is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 05	Developer Response
VCS Standard, V4.7	Does the PD demonstrate and justify how the project activity(s) meets each of the applicability conditions of the methodology(s), and tools (where applicable) applied by the project. Address each applicability condition	1. PP requested to clarify the baseline survey for the controlled households that does not participated in the project activity inline with applied methodology and clarification issued by VERRA on 03-February-2025. Kindly clarify. 2. Use of default values provided in the applied methodology or tools for ex-ante/ex-poste parameters and	This project activity has not been completed 5 years from the start date and hence this condition is not applicable. However, the HH selected for baseline KPT has similar characteristics as baseline HH defined in the PD. These KPT HH continue to utilize baseline technology for cooking. The PP has engaged a third-party entity for KPT and MRV training, which aligns with the requirement for Methodology clarification.

<table>
<tr><th>Rule</th><th>Assessment Question</th><th>Findings/Comments# CL 05</th><th>Developer Response</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>separately. Revise the methodology and tools.</td><td>comparison, appropriateness of monitored values against default figures.</td><td>PP has used following values for ex-ante/ex-post parameters which is defined in VM0050 methodology.

<table>
<tr><th>Parameter</th><th>Value Monitored</th><th>Remark</th></tr>
<tr><td>$NCV_{b,i}$
$NCV_{p,j}$</td><td>Ex-ante</td><td>Default Value as per methodology</td></tr>
<tr><td>$BC_{ex\text{-}ante,b,i}$</td><td>Ex-ante</td><td>as per option 1</td></tr>
<tr><td>$EF_{b,i,CO2}$
$EF_{p,j,CO2}$</td><td>Ex-ante</td><td>Default Value as per methodology</td></tr>
<tr><td>$EF_{b,i,non\ CO2}$
$EF_{p,j,non\ CO2}$</td><td>Ex-ante</td><td>Default Value as per methodology</td></tr>
<tr><td>$\eta_{old,avg}$</td><td>Ex-ante</td><td>Default Value as per methodology</td></tr>
<tr><td>Hh_i</td><td>Ex-ante</td><td>As per KPT survey</td></tr>
<tr><td>$Hh_{j,k}$</td><td>Ex-ante</td><td>As per KPT survey</td></tr>
<tr><td>$N_{j,k,y}$</td><td>Ex-post</td><td>Actual monitoring</td></tr>
<tr><td>$n_{j,k,y}$</td><td>Ex-post</td><td>As per option 2: Survey</td></tr>
<tr><td>$f_{NRB,y}$</td><td>Ex-post</td><td>use host country default value as per tool 33</td></tr>
<tr><td>$BC_{b,i,y}$</td><td>Ex-post</td><td>as per option 1: KPT</td></tr>
<tr><td>$\eta_{new,avg,y}$</td><td>Ex-post</td><td>A linear decrease approach, applying a default schedule of linearly decreasing efficiency up to the terminal efficiency (assumed to be 25%) through the lifespan of the project device as per option b of applied methodology VM0050 V1.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>$BC_{p,i,k,y}$</td><td>Ex-post</td><td>as per option 1: KPT</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Rd 2</td><td>1. As the project activity yet to achieve 5 years from the start date, additional baseline survey of controlled household not required. Further, the selected for baseline KPT has similar characteristics as baseline HH defined in the PD. Moreover, PP can not bar population from access of clean cooking and thus, to deviate from same, PP need to approach government for approval so that</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 05	Developer Response
		controlled household can not be established separately those will not have access to clean energy. Thus, accepted by VVB. 2. Default values are sourced from the meth or tool and thus acceptable. Also, survey values are found appropriate. CL thus closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CAR 04	Developer Response
VCS Standard, V4.7	Do the boundaries included match those required by the methodology and used the table provided to describe the project boundaries?	The project boundary justification table found not inline with the applied methodology. Corrective action requested for same.	The project boundary justification table has now made inline with the applied methodology in section 3.3 of VCS PD.
	Rd 2	PP has updated the Section 3.3 of the VCS PD and found inline with the meth applied. CAR is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 06	Developer Response
VCS Standard, V4.7	Does the project demonstrate regulatory surplus?	PP requested to clarify the impact on the regulatory surplus due to recent host country regulations; Climate Change (Carbon Markets) Regulations (2024) of Kenya.	There are no mandatory government policies or regulations in the host country requiring the distribution of improved cookstoves. The project operates on a purely voluntary basis, with households

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 06	Developer Response
			choosing to participate without any legal obligation. Since there is no enforced law or statute mandating the use of efficient cookstoves. It is hereby confirmed that the proposed project is a voluntary coordinated action by PP. Hence, there is no impact on the regulatory surplus due to the recent host country regulations; Climate change (Carbon Market) Regulations (2024) of Kenya. The same has been updated in section 1.15 "1.15 Compliance with Laws, Statutes and Other Regulatory Frameworks" of VCS PD.
	Rd 2	Assessment team reviewed the Climate Change (Carbon Markets) Regulations (2024) of Kenya & interviewed PP and noted that there are no obligatory rules or policies in the host country for regulations or trading of VERs. The project implemented by PP is totally voluntary without any mandate from host country government. CL thus closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CL 07	Developer Response
VCS Standard, V4.7	Are all applicable parameters required in the methodology included in the monitoring plan?	PP requested to clarify and submit evidences for the KPT results for the baseline and project inline with revised methodology. Corrective action requested for same.	PP has submitted the evidences of KPT results for the baseline and project inline with the revised methodology.
	Rd 2	PP has submitted the baseline & KPT surveys carried out during validation. As project yet to attend five years from implementation start, additional baseline survey requirement is not required. Further, PP has also submitted project KPT survey carried out for this verification period inline with applied methodology. Results are incorporated in the ER sheet appropriately. CL is closed.	

Verification Findings:

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments# CAR 04	Developer Response
VCS Standard, V4.7	Is the PD completed VCS MR as per the instruction described in the monitoring report template (font, font size, dates etc.)?	PP requested to calibrate and revise monitoring report for the comments/findings raised for the VCS PD which are applicable to monitoring sections. Corrective action raised for the same.	PP has updated the monitoring report as per the comments/findings raised for the VCS PD.
	Rd 2	PP has updated monitoring report inline with findings raised and found correct. CAR closed.	

APPENDIX 5: BRIEF CVS OF THE TEAM MEMBERS

Dr. Atul Takarkhede	Dr. Atul Takarkhede holds a Ph.D. in Environmental Sciences from the Institute of Science, RTM Nagpur University, Nagpur. With over 18 years of experience in environmental auditing, consulting, and accreditation, he has established himself as a leading expert in the field. His academic contributions include several technical publications focused on environmental sciences. Dr. Takarkhede specializes in ISO 9001 and ISO 14001 standards, CO_2/GHG reporting, carbon footprint analysis, and comprehensive environmental performance assessments. His professional portfolio encompasses: • Conducting GHG audits • Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) • Performing QA/QC reviews of EIA reports • Leading environmental and water audits • Ensuring compliance with NABET requirements • Serving as a Functional Area Expert in Water Pollution and Solid & Hazardous Waste Management He brings robust expertise in carbon auditing frameworks such as CDM, VCS, GS, GCC, and ICR. With 12 years of experience working with Designated Operational Entities (DOEs) and Validation/Verification Bodies (VVBs), Dr. Takarkhede has contributed to projects across renewable energy, cement, biomass, community development, and waste management sectors under the UNFCCC CDM and other global carbon schemes. Currently, Dr. Takarkhede serves as a Senior GHG Auditing Specialist at Sustain-Cert, where he leads GHG audits across various international standards. His previous roles include positions with True Quality Certifications Pvt. Ltd. (Applus+ Certification's outsourced entity), Earthood Services Pvt. Ltd., Enviance, VKU Certifications and Gold Standard (as a Roster Expert). Based in Nagpur, India, Dr. Takarkhede is participating in this audit as a Lead Auditor and Technical Expert.
Caroline Kimani	Caroline Kimani holds an M.Sc. in Range Management (Socio-Ecology) from the University of Nairobi and brings over 8 years of experience in carbon development, carbon auditing, validation, and verification across Africa and Asia. She has developed a strong track record in assessing compliance of projects under leading global standards, including the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS), Gold Standard, CDM and Puro.earth as well as organizational GHG accounting and value chain initiatives. Caroline specializes in GHG auditing and carbon project validation/verification across diverse sectors, including waste management, clean cooking, renewable energy, afforestation/reforestation, REDD, and biochar. Her professional portfolio encompasses:

	• Conducting GHG audits under VCS and Gold Standard: validation and verification of clean cooking, solar projects, waste management projects across Africa • Carbon development, management and accounting for carbon offsetting and corporate value chain insetting initiatives across NbS, energy efficiency projects and biochar projects in Africa and Asia • Supporting QA/QC processes for carbon project documentation and MRV systems as well due diligence for carbon investors and buyers • Advisory on carbon strategy, policy, benefit sharing mechanisms, FPIC, and safeguarding requirements She brings robust expertise in carbon auditing frameworks with ISO 14064 certification and is a Technical Expert Reviewer for LULUCF and Article 6 under the UNFCCC as well as an Approved Auditor with Gold Standard with SustainCert. Her experience spans more than 15 countries, including Kenya, Nigeria, Zambia, Mozambique, India, and South Africa, covering both validation/verification assignments and carbon development roles. Currently, Caroline serves as a Carbon Auditor (Africa Regional Expert) at SustainCert, where she supports GHG audits across projects such as waste disposal, energy efficiency, renewable energy projects among others. Based in Nairobi, Kenya, Caroline is participating in this audit as a Auditor & country expert.
Shivraj Sharma	Shivraj Sharma brings over two decades of distinguished experience in environmental sustainability, climate action, and disaster resilience. His career spans both the corporate and social development sectors, offering a rare blend of strategic insight and grassroots engagement. He has collaborated extensively with government departments, multinational corporations, international organizations, and community-based entities, contributing to initiatives in accreditation, evidence-based policy advocacy, risk-informed governance, and program management. Currently serving as Senior Director – Quality & Compliance at SustainCERT, Mr. Sharma possesses deep expertise in international standards and frameworks, including: ISO Standards: ISO 14001, 14064, 14065, 14066, 17029 PAS Protocols: PAS 2050, PAS 2060 Reporting & Assurance: GRI, ISAE 3000 Global Initiatives: UNGC, IFC His 18-year tenure across leading organizations such as DNV, UNICEF, RedR India, TÜV SÜD, TÜV Rheinland, RINA, and SustainCERT has solidified his reputation in climate and disaster resilience. Mr. Sharma is also a expert in carbon auditing frameworks, including CDM (Clean Development Mechanism) VCS (Verified Carbon Standard), GS (Gold Standard) & GCC (Global Carbon Council). Based in Amsterdam, Netherlands, Mr. Sharma is currently contributing to this audit as an Independent Technical Reviewer, bringing rigorous quality assurance and compliance oversight to the process.

-----X-----