

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT FOR CREDITING PERIOD (CP) RENEWAL AND DESIGN CHANGE

For: Soneva Foundation

REPORT NO.: GS1729-RCP-DC



SUSTAINCERT
KNOW YOUR IMPACT

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 1 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



Abbreviations used in this Report

CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CL	Clarification request
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
DR	Document Review
EF	Emission Factor
ER	Emission Reductions
FAR	Forward Action Request
GWP	Global Warming Potential
GS	Gold Standard
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IRR	Internal Rate of Return
kWh	Kilo Watt Hour
MW	Mega Watt
NC	Non-Conformity
NCV	Net Calorific Value
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PDD	Project Design Document
PD	Project Developer
tCO ₂ e	Tonnes of CO ₂ equivalents
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
GS4GG	Gold Standard for the Global Goals
ICS	Improved Cookstove
MWh	MegaWattHour
MR	Monitoring Report
POA	Programme of Activity
SGP	Safeguarding Principles
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SC	SustainCERT
TPDDTE C	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralised Thermal Energy Consumption
UN	United Nations
VVB	Validation and Verification Body
VER	Verified Emission Reduction
VPA	Voluntary Project Activity

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 2 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



Table of Contents

1	OBJECTIVE AND CRITERIA	4
1.1	Objective	4
1.2	SCOPE.....	4
2	Team composition	5
3	Project Information	5
3.1	Monitoring Period	5
3.2	Annual projections.....	5
4	VERIFICATION/VALIDATION OPINION	5
5	METHODOLOGY	7
5.1	Desk Review	7
5.2	Example Protocol.....	8
5.3	Example Review Feedback	9
5.4	Site Visit	9
5.5	ASSESSMENT PROTOCOL.....	10
Appendix: 1- CLARIFICATION REQUESTS, CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS.		11
Appendix: 2 - FORWARD ACTION REQUESTS.....		26

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 3 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



1 OBJECTIVE AND CRITERIA

1.1 Objective

Gold Standard projects must undergo independent validation of emission reductions and overall compliance with Gold Standard rules as the basis for issuance of Gold Standard Voluntary Emission Reductions (GS VERs).

The objectives of this validation i.e., crediting Period (CP) Renewal and Design Change are to determine if the projected GHG statements and other reporting information are likely to be achieved by the implementation of the project and in compliance with the criteria defined in Gold Standard rules.

This report details the objectives, scope, criteria, methodology and findings of this process and a final opinion for validation of crediting Period (CP) Renewal and Design Change.

The Gold Standard requires that the final version of this report is published in the public domain. The client to whom this report is addressed therefore acknowledges that the final version of this report will be published unless SustainCERT (SC) are informed in writing within 1 business day following issuance of the final version to the client.

1.2 SCOPE

GHG related activity	Renewal of Crediting period and Design Change Validation
Project Title (s)	Not applicable as this is a POA
Project ID (s) (i.e.: GS-ID)	Not applicable as this is a POA
GS Project Type	Community Service Activity (Improved Cookstove)
PoA Title (if applicable)	Myanmar Stoves Campaign
POA ID (if applicable)	GS1729
Responsible Party	Soneva Foundation

The scope of validation¹ covers the emissions reductions project prepared in accordance with the Project Design Document² and Design Change Memo of the GS ID (s) listed above.

Consistent with Gold Standard requirements, only the following GHGs are considered within the scope of the assessment: CO₂ CH₄ N₂O.

¹ The term validation is used synonymously with the term inclusion (the process of validating if a project is eligible within a programme of activities). The Protocol in this report is specially designed to accommodate these analogous but slightly different assessments.

² Project Design Document may also refer to VPA-DD (the Design document for a VPA).



2 TEAM COMPOSITION

Validation/Verification Team

Name	Qualification	Coverage of sectoral/technical area	Host country experience	Conducted Site visit / Remote Audit
Indrapal Parmar	TL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (All)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Independent Review team and approver

Name	Role	Coverage of technical area
Shivraj Sharma	Independent R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (All)
Shivraj Sharma	Approver	N/A

3 PROJECT INFORMATION

3.1 Monitoring Period

Start of Monitoring Period	N/A
End of Monitoring period	N/A
Total Emission Reductions	N/A
Total SDG x	N/A
Total SDG y	N/A
Date of MR Report	N/A
Version of MR Report	N/A

3.2 Annual projections

Annual Average Emission Reductions (SDG 13)	tCO ₂ e (VERs) saved
Total SDG 7	Number of households served
Total SDG 3	Number (Percentage) of households reporting the improvement in the indoor air quality, and health and safety of the stove users during the annual monitoring surveys
Crediting Period	Second Crediting period – 08/03/2022 to 07/03/2027

4 VALIDATION OPINION

Unmodified Opinion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Modified Opinion (see reasons below)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 5 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



Adverse Opinion (see reasons below)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disclaimer of Opinion	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project representative to whom this report is addressed is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of GHG and other reporting information in accordance with Gold Standard rules.

SustainCERT is responsible for expressing this validation opinion on the GHG and other reporting information based on the evidence gathering procedures documented in this report. The GHG validation was planned and carried out in accordance with ISO 14064-3 (Specification with guidance for the verification and validation of greenhouse gas statements) to provide a reasonable level of assurance that the information is accurate.

Reason for Modified Opinion (if applicable)	N/A
Reason for Adverse Opinion (if applicable)	N/A
Reason for Disclaimer (not issuing) of Opinion (if applicable)	N/A

Conclusion:

Considering the following information and the one provided in this report:

GHG-related activity	Renewal of Crediting period and Design Change Validation
POA Project Title (s)	Myanmar Stoves Campaign
Responsible Party	Soneva Foundation
Start of Monitoring Period	N/A
End of Monitoring period	N/A
Date of PDD	08/11/2022
Version of PDD	6.0

SustainCERT (SC) concludes that:

The review of the project documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided SC with sufficient evidence for concluding that the project fulfils with all stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant requirements for this GHG scheme, the annual projections have been prepared in accordance with the validation criteria and are materially correct and fair representation of likely GHG information and other reporting information. The validated baseline (continuation of inefficient cooking) has been determined in line with the methodology and Gold Standard rules. The emission reductions attributable to the project are confirmed as additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity. It is

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 6 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



important to note that actual GHG emission reduction results may differ from GHG emission reduction projections as the estimate is based on assumptions that may change in the future. Therefore, SC recommends the validation of the project.

Estimated GHG emission reductions and removals:

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)
Total	9,502	0	0	9,502

The conclusion is reached based on the following criteria:

The criteria for this validation are defined in the versions of the following documents stated in the project design document (PDD)

- GS4GG Principles & Requirements, v.1.2
- GS4GG Stakeholder Consultation Requirements & Guidelines, v .2.0
- GS4GG Safeguarding Principles & Requirements, v.1.2
- GS4GG GHG-Emissions-Reduction-Sequestration-Product-Requirements
- GS4GG Design change requirements

Optional Requirements

- 100-GS4GG-Programme-of-Activity-Requirements-version 1.2
- Applied methodology Simplified Methodology for Efficient Cookstoves Version 1.1

Authorised Signatory Name:	Shivraj Sharma – Director, Validation & Verification
Signature	
Date of this report approval	26/04/2023
Version of this report	01
Office Location	Luxembourg

The validation of the GHG statement was conducted in accordance with ISO 14064-3 and corresponding GHG scheme.

5 METHODOLOGY

5.1 Desk Review

An initial validation (crediting Period (CP) Renewal and Design Change) documentary review was conducted by SustainCERT involving:

- An assessment of the data and information presented in the PDD to determine if the GS project activity meets relevant GS requirements
- An assessment of whether the chosen methodology (see Criteria above) has been applied correctly, including the baseline selection and monitoring plan

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 7 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



- An assessment of the additionality argument of the project activity against relevant GS rules

A Protocol was used to assess each requirement during the execution of assessment activities and is explained below. The completed Protocol is available in section 5.5 below.

5.2 Example Protocol

The name/section of the reporting template is indicated in the top row					
Type	Ref	Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Conc.
V or I This indicates the type of assessment. V = validation/verification I = inclusion (a streamlined validation for VPAs)	Details the section and section number in the reporting template (PDD or MR)	Provides a reference to the GS rule	Question used to determine compliance with the rule, or if the rule is applicable	Used to track clarifications or corrective actions raised when the assessment question does not immediately lead to a conclusion.	Conclusion of each assessment question.

Whenever the assessment question does not immediately lead to a conclusion, clarifications (CLs) and corrective action requests (CARs) are issued as Findings/Comments against the relevant Rule and Assessment Question.

If a Findings is closed, it will result in a conclusion of either OK, a Forward Action Request (FAR) or an Observation (OBS). If a Finding cannot be closed and a requirement cannot be shown to be met, an NC (Non-conformity) is issued.

OK, CARs, CLs, FARs, OBS and NC are further explained below:

- OK – issued when a requirement has been met.
- CAR (Corrective Action Request) – issued if one of the following occurs:
 - There is a risk that emission reductions cannot be monitored or calculated
 - Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions that will impact the quantity of emission reductions
 - Gold Standard requirements have not been shown to be met
- Clarification request (CL) – issued if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether a requirement has been met
- Forward Action Requests (FARs) – issued to highlight issues related to implementation that require review at the next verification
- Observations (OBS) – issued where there may be a possible future non-conformity against a requirement.
- Non-Conformity (NC) – issued if a requirement has not been met and cannot be met.

To demonstrate transparency, all Findings (along with the relevant Rule and Assessment Question) are transferred to a separate Review Feedback table (shown below) to provide a

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 8 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



written record of how they are discussed and how the conclusion was reached. A transcript of the Review Feedback is available as Appendix 1, which also includes a list of the Supporting Document (s) provided and Reviewed.

5.3 Example Review Feedback

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
Copied from the Protocol	Copied from the Protocol	Copied from the Protocol, the nature (and number – e.g. CAR 1/CAR 2) of the Finding is included for traceability	The response should include an explanation of what evidence has been provided in response to the Finding

5.4 Site Visit

A site visit is chosen on the basis of risk assessment.

It was determined during our Risk Analysis that a site was not required since this is the crediting Period (CP) Renewal and Design Change and during the validation & inclusion of real case VPA, site visit was already done. Also, a physical site visit is not required in line with the Site visit and remote audit requirements and procedures, v.1.0., para 3.1.1.

However, a remote audit has been conducted on 13/09/2022 with the PD, field team and end users to check the project baseline, project implementation etc.

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 9 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	

5.5 ASSESSMENT PROTOCOL

The Protocol covers the key thematic areas in Gold Standard certification and is tailored to the review type and the mandatory reporting template (MR/PDD). The key thematic areas addressed in the Protocol are:

- GHG emission reductions (known as SDG 13 contributions)
- Other SDG contributions
- Compliance with Safeguarding Principles
- Compliance with Stakeholder Consultation (LSC) requirements

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 10 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	

Appendix: 1- CLARIFICATION REQUESTS, CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS

Review Feedback Round:	V
Supporting Document (s) provided and Reviewed (1 round)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Design Document (Myanmar Stove-POA-Design-Documents-RCP and PRC) • Stakeholder Consultation Report (Greenway Prime Stoves – End User Consultation Report(1)) • Myanmar PoA-Design-Change-Memo-1729 • Greenway Prime Test Report(1) • Envirofit SuperSaver AI (PCS1) Cert • Envirofit SuperSaver GL (M-5000) Test Report • ERCalculation Difference - Envirofit M5000 Vs Greenway Prime Vs Supersaver AI • Validation Report (VR-Myanmar Stove-Microscale-Validation-Appraisal-Report – RCP and PRC)
Supporting Document (s) provided and Reviewed (2 round)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Design Document (Myanmar PoA-Design-Change-Memo-1729 31.08.2022) • Myanmar Stove-POA-Design-Documents-RCP and PRC - 31082022 • Stakeholder Consultation Report • Greenway mail • Myanmar Stoves Campaign - Baseline Survey Report - November 2020
Supporting Document (s) provided and Reviewed (3 round)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Myanmar PoA-Design-Change-Memo-1729 31.08.2022 2) PoA Design Document (Myanmar Stove PoA-Design Document-RCP and PRC 08.11.2022) 3) LSC Meeting Attendance and IMG_20220922_093357.jpg; 20220922_090641.jpg 4) SDG Impact Tool Version 1.0 - GS 1729 5) Sale receipt Scan copies (5 Jan 2022).pdf
Supporting Document (s) provided and Reviewed (4 round)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) GS1729_Internal Validation Finding_RCP_DC_Round-3 (2) 2) Myanmar PoA-Design-Change-Memo-1729 31.08.2022

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 11 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



	3) PoA-DD-08.11.2022 4) T-PreReview_V2.0-Stakeholder-Consultation-Report – Myanmar 5) Scan copies of Sale Receipt_Super Saver AI 6) SupersaverAI - Pictures 7) SuperssaverAI - Pictures
Supporting Document (s) provided and Reviewed (5 round)	1) GS1729_Internal Validation Finding_RCP_DC_Round-4 (1).docx 2) ERCalculation Difference - Supersaver AI 3) Myanmar Stoves Campaign PoA-DD-08.11.2022 4) Myanmar Stoves Campaign PoA-DD-08.11.2022 5) T-PreReview_V2.0-Stakeholder-Consultation-Report - Myanmar(1).docx 6) Myanmar PoA-Design-Change-Memo-1729 31.08.2022(3).docx

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
	Is the report prepared using the most up to date version of GS4GG template at time of submission? (note this checklist is applicable to template versions later than the above version only)	The template of the PoA-DD has been altered at some of the places. For example, the KPI table has been altered. Hence the original PoA-DD template shall be restored.	PP has corrected the PoA-DD template in line with GS template guideline & the same has been revised. Hence Revised PoA DD Version 06
	Round-2	<p><u>Review Round 2:</u></p> <p>The PoA-DD template has still not been corrected as it is altered at most of the places as compared to the original PoA-DD template.</p> <p>Most of the images in the PoA-DD are not displayed, hence appropriate corrections shall be provided in this regard.</p> <p>The PoA-DD template (version 1.1) dated 14/10/2020 has been used. However it is observed that some of the sections in the current PoA-DD has been modified inline with the latest version of the PoA-DD (version 2.1) dated 31/05/2022. Hence the PoA-DD template shall be prepared either in the older template or new template.</p> <p>The “Date of Design Certification” shall be provided in the KPI section of PoA-DD.</p>	Template is corrected. Images also updated. Serial number is now aligned.

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 12 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		<p>No section number against the sections are traceable throughout the PoA-DD.</p> <p>The Serial number under the “General operating and implementing framework of PoA” starts from “9”. Hence it shall be corrected.</p> <p>During the next round of responses, the PD is requested to submit the track change and clean version of the PDF version of the PoA-DD. The Comment/Request is open.</p>	
	Round-3	<p><u>Review Round 3:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
10.5.2	If both Renewable Energy Activity and Renewable Energy Labels requirements are applied and the project is grid connected, have all relevant registries that could hold REACs from the project activity been checked for double counting?	Section B.2: The relevant requirements of the “GS4GG Programme of Activity Requirements”, version 1.2 shall also be followed for the renewal of the crediting period of the PoA.	The Section B.2 has been corrected & revised in line with GS template guidelines. Hence Revised PoA DD Version 6.0.
	Rd 2	<p><u>Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
Inclusion Criteria	Copy Inclusion Criterion/Evidence Requirement here – use as many new lines as needed	<p>The following report has been submitted: https://www.dropbox.com/s/rcalwdr6h3xrd2b/FAO%20State%20of%20Worlds%20Forest%202014.pdf</p> <p>However the report is quite old (year 2014), hence how the same may be considered applicable at the time of renewal of the crediting period. Clarify.</p>	PP hereby submitting the latest baseline survey report 2020 along with this submission to the assessment team.
	Rd 2	<p><u>Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 13 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
P&R 4.1.12	Is the project sufficiently well described so that the way GHGs/impacts contributes to SDGs are understandable? Does the description match the design certified VPA-DD in the KPI?	Section A.3: The examples of various domestic stoves have been provided (including their specifications), however the examples do not consider the additional two stove models (SuperSaver AI, Greenway Prime) considered in the PoA. Hence the manufacturer specifications (with their photographs) may also be provided for the stoves included under the PoA.	Section A.3 is updated and relevant specifications has been added for the SuperSaver AI and Greenway Prime.
	Rd 2	<u>Review Round 2:</u> The supporting evidences for the manufacturer specifications shall also be submitted. This can be in the form of declaration on the specifications from the manufacturer. The Comment/Request is open.	A web-link has been added in the section A.3
	Round-3	<u>Review Round 3:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
P&R 4.1.12	Is the project sufficiently well described so that the way GHGs/impacts contributes to SDGs are understandable? Does the description match the design certified VPA-DD in the KPI?	Section A.3: The Efficiency value provided for the “Envirofit SuperSaver AI (PCS1)” and “SuperSaver GL” is the “Average Thermal Efficiency” as per the submitted Efficiency Certificate. However Efficiency for the “Greenway Prime” is “High Power Thermal Efficiency” as per the Efficiency Certificate. The observed differences in the Efficiency shall be clarified.	Manufacturer has clarified over the email that “High power thermal efficiency” mentioned for the Greenway prime is the actual “Average thermal efficiency”. Same can be ascertain by the mail communication sent by the manufacturer. Screenshot of the email is attached.
	Rd 2	<u>Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 14 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
P&R 4.1.12	Is the project sufficiently well described so that the way GHGs/impacts contributes to SDGs are understandable? Does the description match the design certified VPA-DD in the KPI?	Section A.3: It is mentioned that <i>“Soneva Foundation also engaged with the local population in Myanmar who are the target group for this project to get their feedback on the Greenway Prime Stove, the findings of this study are compiled and presented in a supporting document titled, ‘Greenway Prime Stoves – End User Consultation Report’.</i> Clarify whether any such study has also been conducted for the other stove (SuperSaver AI (PCS-1)). Clarify.	No study has been conducted separately for the Super Saver AI, since it is identical to M-5000 with a higher efficiency. Moreover, Super Saver AI is widely accepted by the beneficiary as per recent interaction between sales agents and the beneficiary.
	Rd 2	<u>Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
P&R 1.2.6	For cookstove projects only, has a transparent declaration of estimated wood savings using equation 2 in Simplified Cookstove Methodology been supplied in the PDD $P_y = B_{b,y} * (1 - \eta_b / \eta_{p,y}) \dots \dots \dots$ Nb = 10% (wood) 20% (charcoal); Np = estimated project stove efficiency (similar stoves may be used if not tested directly)	Section B.2: As per the applied methodology, <i>“The efficiency of project cookstove shall be determined by an independent expert entity in the field or laboratory following the Water Boiling Test (WBT) protocol (available at https://www.cleancookingalliance.org/binary-data/DOCUMENT/file/000/000/399-1.pdf) To determine the project cookstove efficiency, three sample runs shall be carried out on atleast three randomly selected project cookstoves. The average of the nine results shall be taken as the efficiency for the project cookstove (η_p)”.</i> The Efficiency of the three stoves have been provided as SuperSaver GL (29.7%), SuperSaver AI (36.5%), Greenway Prime (29.8%). The PD shall clarify as how the above guideline was followed to determine the efficiency of the project stoves.	Except Greenway Prime, other 2 stoves have followed the methodology requirement and test were conducted in 3 different randomly selected stoves. A letter from the manufacturer can be submitted upon request.
	Rd 2	<u>Review Round 2:</u> Since the methodology requirements for the Greenway Prime stoves are not followed, hence it shall be clarified as how the Efficiency may be considered inline with the methodological requirements and hence appropriate. The Comment/Request is open.	Greenway prime stove has been removed from the consideration since it does not meet the methodology requirement.
	Round-3	<u>Review Round 3:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	



Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
Meth Applicability	Copy Meth applicability Criterion n here – use as many new lines as needed	<p>Section B.3: It has been observed that all the Eligibility criteria are same as available in the PoA-DD of the 1st Crediting period. However the Eligibility criteria shall be revised in the PoA-DD corresponding to the 2nd Crediting period due to various reasons. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eligibility criteria 1 mentions that “<i>Envirofit M-5000 (SuperSaver GL) has been tested in various villages in the target location and was voted by the community as the preferred technology</i>”, however two more stove models have been distributed in the 2nd Crediting period of the PoA. Hence the details shall be updated. - Eligibility criteria 2 mentions “<i>minimum expected durability of 1 year</i>”, however the lifespan of the technologies is more than 1 year as per the Section A.3 of the PoA-DD. - Eligibility criteria 9 refers to the “Baseline survey report”, and hence the Baseline survey report conducted corresponding to the 2nd Crediting period shall be provided and updated in the PoA-DD accordingly. <p>Similarly, please also check the other Eligibility criteria in the PoA-DD and hence all the Eligibility criteria corresponding to the 2nd crediting period shall be updated in the PoA-DD covering all the design changes as well. While doing so PD shall refer to latest GS Rule update and methodology published on GS4GG webpage.</p>	Relevant changes are done in the section B.3 of the revised PoA-DD
	Rd 2	<p><u>Review Round 2:</u> It is not clarified as how the other two stoves (Super Saver AI and Greenway Prime) fit for the local conditions and preferences. Hence the relevant details shall be provided in the PoA-DD. The Comment/Request is open.</p>	PP has conducted the LSC in the September month and taken the feedback for the new stoves from the end users. No negative comment received. LSC details are furnished to the SC.
	Round-3	<p><u>Review Round 3:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 16 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
GS <u>RU</u>	Validation and Design Reviews submitted after 01/01/2021 must use AR5 Global Warming Potentials to demonstrate additionality, determine contributions to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and calculate ex-ante emission reductions and removals.	How the project target the SDG 3 has not been discussed in the Section A.1 of the PoA-DD. The description as how the project targets the SDG7 in Section A.1 shall be broadly consistent with the SDG target description as per the Section A.4 of the PoA-DD. Check.	SDG 3 is added in the section A.1. Also, description for the SDG 7 has been made consistent with the section A.4
	Rd 2	<u>Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
P&R 4.1.39	Is the start date defined as the earliest date on which the Project Developer has committed to expenditures related to the implementation of the Project? (For example signed contracts for equipment or construction/operation)	Section D.1: The “PoA start date” has been mentioned as “ <i>The PoA start date is the date of first project activity (02/01/2014) or 2 years prior to PoA registration (whichever is later)</i> ”. The actual start date may be indicated in the Section D.1 as the 1 st crediting period is now already completed.	Actual start date of the PoA has been updated in the section D.1
	Rd 2	<u>Review Round 2:</u> The “Start date of PoA” is “02/01/2014” as per the KPI section, however the “PoA start date” is 08/03/2015 as per the page-17 of the PoA-DD. Check on the differences observed. The Comment/Request is open.	Start date is corrected
	Round-3	<u>Review Round 3:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
SC <u>Reqs</u> 9.1.1 (a)	Do the agreed mitigation measures (if present) in the SCR match the PDD/VPA-DD?	Section F: The renewal of crediting period also includes the design change. Hence in view of the Design change, it shall be clearly justified as why the stakeholder consultation at the PoA level has been considered as sufficient. More details shall be provided in the Section F accordingly.	PP has provided more details regarding stakeholder consultation in section F of the revised PoA DD. Hence Revised PoA DD Version 6.0.

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 17 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
	Rd 2	<p><u>Review Round 2:</u> The statement “<i>The Stakeholder Feedback Round (SFR) was organized between 30/05/2019</i>” provided in the PoA-DD is incomplete. Check.</p> <p>It is mentioned that “<i>To further strengthen the stakeholder engagement during project implementation, additional state-level physical consultations for local stakeholders were also organized by the CME</i>”. However no further details on the state-level physical consultation is provided in the PoA-DD. Check. The Comment/Request is open.</p>	PP has conducted the physical LSC in September-2022, details are submitted with the responses.
	Round-3	<p><u>Review Round 3:</u> The statement “<i>The Stakeholder Feedback Round (SFR) was organized between 30/05/2019</i>” provided in the PoA-DD is still incomplete. Check and complete the above sentence. The updated Stakeholder Consultation Report shall also be submitted in clean and track change mode. The Comment/Request is open.</p>	Statement is corrected. Updated SCR submitted along with the responses.
	Round-4	Comment/Request is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
SC <u>Reqs</u> 9.1.1 (a)	Do the agreed mitigation measures (if present) in the SCR match the PDD/VPA-DD?	As new type of stoves have been introduced in this Design Change and further new users will be part of this PoA. So as per the Principles & Requirements section 4.1.9 (<i>Annex A – Design Change Approval Procedure, Section 4</i>), in case of a design change, relevant stakeholders from these locations shall be invited for comments as per Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement requirement. PD shall clarify how the above condition was met. How were the stakeholders invited, how many stakeholders were invited, how many categories of stakeholders were invited, mode of invitation, proof of invitation etc. shall be shared along with attendance list, photos of stakeholder consultation.	Only new type of stoves have been introduced but users and stakeholders are going to remain same, hence a stakeholder meeting has not been conducted at this stage. However, a stakeholder meeting was conducted with the users on 30/05/2019. Details of the same has been updated in the PoA-DD
	Rd 2	<p><u>Review Round 2:</u> It shall be clarified whether the new stoves were discussed in the stakeholder meeting conducted on 30/05/2019.</p>	PP has conducted the LSC in the September month and taken the feedback for the new stoves from the end users. No negative comment received. LSC details are furnished to the SC.

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 18 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		Further the relevant supporting evidences (categories of stakeholders were invited, mode of invitation, proof of invitation etc.) shall be submitted. The Comment/Request is open.	
	Round-3	<u>Review Round 3:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
SGP <u>Reqs</u> 2.1.4	Have the qualifying questions all been addressed in a credible manner and adequately justified wherever a project developer wishes to deem a principle non-relevant?	1. Section E.1: It shall be clearly indicated whether the “ <i>Safeguarding Principles Assessment</i> ” has been taken up at the PoA level or VPA level or at both the levels. The appropriate justification shall be included on the appropriate of choosing at PoA/VPA level.	The section E.1 of the project activity has been elaborated by PP & revised in line with GS template guidelines. Hence Revised PoA DD Version 6.0
	Rd 2	<u>Review Round 2:</u> It is mentioned on page-17 that “ <i>The manufacturing of the cookstoves is done in Myanmar at CME’s manufacturing plant which involves following activities</i> ”. However the website of Greenway Prime stove (https://www.greenwayappliances.com/greenway-jumbo-stove), which is provided in the PoA-DD has been checked and found that manufacturing happens in India. Check and Clarify. The Comment/Request is open.	Greenway prime is removed from the consideration.
	Round-3	<u>Review Round 3:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
SGP <u>Reqs</u> 2.1.4	Have the qualifying questions all been addressed in a credible manner and adequately justified wherever a project developer wishes to deem a principle non-relevant?	The following Safeguarding Principle is missing in the Principe 8.2 (Erosion and/or Water Body Instability): <i>Is the Project’s area of influence susceptible to excessive erosion and/or water body instability?</i> Hence the above Principle may be included in the PoA-DD.	The section E.2 of the project activity has been elaborated by PP & revised in line with GS template guidelines. Hence Revised PoA DD Version 6.0
	Rd 2	<u>Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 19 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
SGP <u>Reqs</u> 2.1.4	Have the qualifying questions all been addressed in a credible manner and adequately justified wherever a project developer wishes to deem a principle non-relevant?	Section E.2: It has been observed that some of the Safeguarding Principles have not been discussed completely in three columns available in the Table under Section E.2. Hence complete discussions on the Safeguarding Principles shall be provided in Section E.2 of the PoA-DD.	The section E.2 of the project activity has been elaborated by PP & revised in line with GS template guidelines. Hence Revised PoA DD Version 6.0
	Rd 2	<u>Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
SC <u>Reqs</u> 9.1.1 (a)	Do the agreed mitigation measures (if present) in the SCR match the PDD/VPA-DD?	The SDG monitoring plan shall be updated to accommodate any changes and/or comments from the local stakeholders.	The SDG monitoring plan has been updated in the revised PoA DD. Hence Revised PoA DD Version 6.0.
	Rd 2	<u>Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
-	Suggestions	Design Memo: As per the KPI section, “ <i>start date of any new measures/technologies</i> ” shall be provided as per the Design Change	

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 20 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		memo requirements. The “ <i>date of memo submission</i> ” shall also be filled along-with.	PP has updated the KPI section of the Design Memo inline Design memo template guidelines. Hence Revised Design Change Memo.
	Rd 2	<u>Review Round 2:</u> The relevant evidences for the “ <i>start date of any new measures/technologies</i> ” as “05/01/2022” shall also be submitted. The Comment/Request is open.	Sales receipt of stoves are submitted along with the responses.
	Round-3	<u>Review Round 3:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
-	Suggestions	It has been observed that the Design Change was also requested earlier prior to this renewal of the crediting period, however the same was rejected on 09/03/2022. Hence it shall be clarified as how this Design Change is different from the earlier proposed Design Change and hence why it may be considered for review along-with this renewal of the crediting period. Clarify.	Earlier design change was proposed but PP has not proceeded with it and withdrawn. There was no rejection earlier.
	Rd 2	<u>Review Round 2:</u> What was the reason due to which the Design Change was withdrawn earlier. Further how those reasons are not applicable now shall also be clarified. The Comment/Request is open.	Earlier, PP has applied for the design change because manufacturer was unable to supply the required quantity of the stoves. However, later stage manufacturer has assured the supply from their other manufacturing unit hence PP has withdrawn the design change.
	Round-3	<u>Review Round 3:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
-	Suggestions	Section B.1 (PDD): During this renewal of the crediting period, the design change has been carried out to include two additional stove models in the PoA. Hence the following requirements as per the applied latest version of the methodology shall be applicable:	PP has included the two additional stove models in the PoA here with the design change request & PP has also accounted/calculated the emission reduction calculation for the project activity in line with GS guidelines. Hence Revised PoA-DD /Design change memo.

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 21 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		<p><i>"The project database is derived from the total sales record with project cookstoves differentiated by different project scenarios. The differentiation of the project database into sections is based on the results of the applicable monitoring studies for each project scenario, in order that emission reduction calculations can be conducted appropriately section by section".</i></p> <p>Clarify as how the above requirements have been met.</p>	
	Round-2	<p><u>Review Round 2:</u> The appropriate reply has not been provided in view of the above raised comment. Please refer to the above comment again and provide appropriate reply along with evidences (project database). The Comment/Request is open.</p>	
	Round-3	<p><u>Review Round 3:</u> The PD has not provided any reply during the last round of review (Review Round 2). Hence the reply shall be provided during this current round. The PD shall also update the Design Change Memo accordingly. The Comment/Request is open.</p>	Updated design change memo along with photographs of new cook stove and its sales receipt has been submitted.
	Round-4	<p>1) Firstly, PD shall add clear and transparent response under developer section for the finding comment raised during round-1 (see above highlighted in yellow). PD shall clearly state if two or one new stove is being added as part of design change. As per design change memo it seems one stove however, in ER sheet there are two new stove. In this respect information on new project scenario is not clear and consistent in POA-DD, design change memo and ER sheet. 2) Updated design change memo document includes <i>"The new stove is going to be SuperSaver AI, which is identical to the M-5000, in terms of efficiency and usability"</i>. However, efficiency of existing stove is 29.7% while of new stove is 36.5% which is not identical. Also, in ER sheet ER calculation is included for <i>"(New) Greenway Prime"</i> which is not part of the project. PD shall clarify the inconsistency in statements. PD shall correct the ER sheet. Comment/Request is open.</p>	<p>1) PP hereby confirm that only one stove (e.g. SuperSaver AI) has been added in the design change. ER sheet, PoA-DD and design change memo has updated and made consistent to avoid any confusion. 2) ER sheet has been updated and made consistent with the PoA-DD and design change memo. Only M-5000 (old stove) and SuperSaver AI (New stove) has been taken to compare the ER generated by both.</p>
	Round-5	<p><u>Review Round 5:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	3)

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 22 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
-	Design Memo shall be submitted and updated inline with revision done in POA-DD.	Based on the revisions in the PoA-DD, the Design Memo shall also be updated accordingly.	PP has also updated the design memo accordingly. Hence Revised
	Round-2	<u>Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
GS4GG P&R on Design Change	Para 4.1.49 (c): The prior consideration rule is also applicable to a Project that undergoes a design change. A project with a Certified Design requesting to include a new technology/measures shall submit the request for approval of design change to Gold Standard within one year of the start date of the proposed technology/measures (design change component). If the developer fails to submit the request for approval within one year, the design change component shall not be eligible for Gold Standard Certification.	As project developer is going for Design Change therefore, as per para 4.1.19 (c) of the GS4GG P&R on Design Change requirement PD shall demonstrate the compliance of the same.	As such, there is no such changes in the technology part of the project activity it remains the same only. There is a new type of stove has been included in the project activity (no new technology added) & the existing one will remain the same only. The same request also has been updated/revised in the Design change memo request. So as per GS requirement, PP has not applied for new technology to be added to the Design change request. So, the GS guideline fulfils the criteria for the project activity.
	Round-2	<u>Review Round 2:</u> OK. Regular VPAs are exempt from any kind of prior consideration of carbon revenue checks. However, as the Efficiency is different in the case of three stoves, and also the technical specifications are different in the case of three stoves, hence how this may not be considered as different technologies in the case of three stoves. Clarify. The Comment/Request is open.	Assessment of the safeguarding principal is updated as per para 4.1.19 (c) of the GS4GG P&R
	Round-3	<u>Review Round 3:</u> As the Efficiency is different in the case of three stoves, and also the technical specifications are different in the case of three stoves, hence how this may not be considered as different technologies in the case of three stoves.	PP has submitted the design change document within one year of the it's start date. Sales receipt has been submitted as a proof of the start date for the distribution of the new stove model.

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 23 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		Hence a project with a Certified Design requesting to include a new technology/measures shall submit the request for approval of design change to Gold Standard within one year of the start date of the proposed technology/measures (design change component). If the developer fails to submit the request for approval within one year, the design change component shall not be eligible for Gold Standard Certification. The PD may further seek separate Deviation approval from Gold Standard on the same. The Comment/Request is open.	
	Round-4	OK. Sales receipt is checked for the date "Sale receipt Scan copies (5 Jan 2022)" Comment/Request is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
GS4GG P&R on Design Change:	Section (d) STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK ON DESIGN CHANGE a) 4.1.8 The Project Developer shall discuss if there is a need to conduct a stakeholder consultation on changes that are to occur or have occurred in the Project design. b) 4.1.10 The Project Developer can choose to invite comments electronically or through a physical meeting and shall justify the selected method. To the extent possible, the Project Developer shall conduct the complementary stakeholder consultation on design change component prior to the start of implementation of change in the project design.	Project developer shall address how stakeholder feedback on design change is addressed for the changes done the project technology equipment. Refer. Para 4.1.8 and 4.1.10 of the GS4GG P&R on Design Change.	PP has not applied for the new technology inclusion or any technology changes in the existing technology in the PoA. So, there are no such requirements for the stakeholder conduction for the design change documents. 1) PP has only applied for the inclusion of new company stoves in the PoA & existing stoves also remain the same. The same has been updated in the revised PoA/Design change Memo. 2) PP like to clarify that there is no such need for stakeholder conduction because PP has already organized the stakeholder in the year 2020. There are no changes in the technology & project type of the PoA. The Design changes are not impacting the project type/PoA requirements as per GS guidelines. So the stakeholder does not need for the design change in the PoA.
	Rd 2	<u>Review Round 2:</u> It shall be clarified whether the new stoves were discussed in the stakeholder meeting conducted on 30/05/2019.	PP has conducted the LSC in the September month and taken the feedback for the new stoves from the end users. No negative comment received. LSC details are furnished to the SC.

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 24 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	



Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		Further the relevant supporting evidences (categories of stakeholders were invited, mode of invitation, proof of invitation etc.) shall be submitted. The Comment/Request is open.	
	Round-3	<u>Review Round 3:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 25 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADBB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	

Appendix: 2 - FORWARD ACTION REQUESTS

N/A

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 26 of 26
File name: \$9bb17b5e08e8\$66839D3B3FFB4ADB7F150CC0764C141.docx	Version / Date: 02 / 12/05/2022	