



**Verification and certification report form for
GS programme of activities
(version 02.0)**

Complete this form in accordance with the instructions attached at the end of this form.

BASIC INFORMATION

Title and GS reference number of the programme of activities (PoA)	Utsil Naj – Casa saludable para todos PoA: GS1377 VPA 4: GS2441	
Version number(s) of the PoA-DD(s) to which this report applies	11	
Version number of the verification and certification report	2	
Completion date of the verification and certification report	18/02/2019	
Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period	VPA 4: Monitoring Period No: 2 – from 01/01/2015 until 31/08/2018 (including both days)	
Number and version number of the monitoring report to which this report applies	VPA 4: version 5 from 12/02/2019	
Coordinating/managing entity (CME)	Microsol S.A.S.	
Host Parties	Host Parties of the PoA	Is this a host Party to a VPA covered in this report? (yes/no)
	Mexico	Yes
	El Salvador	No
	Guatemala	No
	Honduras	No
	Peru	No
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption – version 1.0	
Mandatory sectoral scopes linked to the applied methodologies	1	
Conditional sectoral scopes linked to the applied methodologies, if applicable	-	
Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring period in the included VPAs covered in this report	VPA 4: 406,186 tCO ₂ e	

Certified amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring period for the included VPAs covered in this report	VPA 4: 98,842 tCO ₂ e
Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE	Earthood Services Private Limited UNFCCC Ref. Number: E-0066
Name, position and signature of the approver of the verification and certification report	 Dr. Kaviraj Singh Managing Director

SECTION A. Executive summary

Brief summary of the project activity

The Voluntary Project Activity 4 is part of the PoA “Utsil Naj – Casa saludable para todos”.

The project scenario for this project is defined as each ICS Model (ICS stands for improved cook stove). The following scenarios presented for this verification are:

LPP (Local project participant)	ICS Model – Project scenario	ICS quantity	State	Country
AURA	Patsari	5289	SONORA	Mexico
GIRA	Patsari	1297	MICHOACÁN	
FPCV	Plancha	479	STATE OF MEXICO	
	Tierra compactada	601	STATE OF MEXICO	
FPP	Patsari	1329	OAXACA, SAN LUIS POTOSI, VERACRUZ	
	ONIL	618	OAXACA	

This PoA aims to disseminate improved cook stoves that will enable the beneficiaries to reduce significantly their wood consumption and will decrease their exposure to indoor air pollution, as in these communities a large part of the population relies on wood for cooking and inefficient cooking practices are a major cause of deforestation.

In addition, the poorest population of Mexico have a very low access to basic needs and one of the most urgent issues is the health-related issue of cooking combustion habit. The design of the improved cook stoves optimizes the internal combustion, the isolating materials used (such as adobe or clay) in the construction optimize the heat efficient use and the chimney draws the toxic smokes outside the house.

The PoA and its VPAs contribute to the following SDG Goals:

1. Goal 1: No poverty;
2. Goal 3: Good health and well-being;
3. Goal 4: Quality education;
4. Goal 7: Affordable and clean energy;
5. Goal 8: Decent work and economic growth;
6. Goal 13: Climate action; and
7. Goal 15: Life on land.

* Goal 5 – Gender Equality: even though it has been reported in the MR and assessed in this verification report, the PoA is not claiming positive contribution to SDG #5 and consequently will not be certified as positive by GS as can be seen in the Transition Document to GS4GG^{/13/} and assessed in CAR 2.

Scope of verification

This verification is an independent and objective review and ex-post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions by the DOE. The verification addresses the implementation and operation of the GS PoA and tests the data and assertions set out in the monitoring report based on the following:

1. the registered PoA-DD, VPA-DD and GS Passport;
2. the approved methodology mention in the PoA-DD, VPA-DDs and GS Passports;
3. the registered monitoring plan;

4. UNFCCC criteria referred to in the Kyoto Protocol criteria and the CDM modalities and procedures as agreed in the Bonn Agreement and the Marrakech Accords;
5. Gold Standard for the Global Goals;
6. CDM Validation and Verification Standard (VVS);
7. CDM Project Standard (PS) and Project Cycle Procedure (PCP);
8. relevant decisions, guidance and clarifications of the CMP, GS Secretariat and CDM Executive Board and any other information and references relevant to the reported emission reductions of the project activities.

The verification has considered both quantitative and qualitative aspects on stated/reported emission reductions. The monitoring report and corresponding supporting documentation was assessed in accordance with the rules defined by UNFCCC and GS, as appropriate to the PoA and VPAs. The verification is not meant to provide any consulting or recommendations to the CME/others. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the monitoring activities.

Verification process

The verification process is conducted as per internal CDM Quality Manual, which includes the following steps:

1. contract with PP and appointment of verification team and technical review team (refer Section B.1 and B.2 of this report);
2. completeness check of Monitoring Report;
3. sending the Monitoring Report and work plan to GS to become public available;
4. desk review of Monitoring Report and corresponding ER sheet by verification team and planning of onsite audit (including sampling approach to be applied);
5. on site audit (physical implementation and interview with relevant stakeholders) by verification team;
6. follow up activities e.g., interviews;
7. reporting and closure of findings (CARs/CLs/FARs) and preparation of draft verification report;
8. independent technical review of the draft verification report and final/revised documentation (e.g., Monitoring Report, corresponding ER sheet and evidences);
9. reporting and closure of TR comments/findings (CARs/CLs/FARs) and final approval for the decision made (refer Section E and F of this report);
10. issuance of final verification report to contracted PP (or authorized representatives) and submission of request for issuance, as appropriate.

Conclusion

Based on the outcome of the verification process of the registered PoA “Utsil Naj – Casa saludable para todos” for the period from 01/01/2015 to 31/08/2018 (the VPAs have different monitoring periods, but all within this period), we confirm that the implementation of referenced registered PoA and its VPAs is complying with applicable GS rules and regulations as stated in the final Monitoring Report.

Earthood Services Private Limited is able to certify that the emission reductions from the registered GS PoA “Utsil Naj – Casa saludable para todos”, in Mexico¹, during the above mentioned period, correspond to the amount of 98,842 tCO₂e. Therefore, this is being submitted for request for issuance, as per Gold Standard for the Global Goals procedures as applicable.

SECTION B. Verification team, technical reviewer and approver

B.1. Verification team members

No.	Role	Gender	Last name	First name	Involvement in
-----	------	--------	-----------	------------	----------------

¹ This VPA is located in Mexico. However this PoA corresponds to a multi-country PoA.

					Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)	Desk/document review	On-site inspection	Interview(s)	Verification findings
1.	Team Leader	EI	Sebben	Marcelo	Central Office	Y	Y	Y	Y
2.	Methodological Expert	EI	Sebben	Marcelo	Central Office	Y	Y	Y	Y
3.	Technical Expert	EI	Sebben	Marcelo	Central Office	Y	Y	Y	Y
4.	Local Expert	EI	Lopes	Ricardo	Central Office	Y	N	N	Y

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

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)
1.	Technical Reviewer	EI	Cruz	Sergio	Central Office
2.	Technical Expert	EI	Cruz	Sergio	Central Office
3.	Approver	IR	Singh	Kaviraj	Central Office

SECTION C. Application of materiality in conducting the verification

C.1. Consideration of materiality in planning the verification

No.	Risk that could lead to material errors, omissions or misstatements	Assessment of the risk		Response to the risk in the verification plan and/or sampling plan
		Risk level	Justification	
1.	Human error in recording the readings	High	Recording of readings for most of the parameters is subject to human intervention. . Therefore, chances of possible human errors, in recording and archiving, exists and are considered high.	Sampling surveys were carried out to corroborate the sampling performed by the PPs. Based on its results, it is possible to minimize the risks associated to the manual input of data. Sampling techniques were applied in accordance to Guidelines on sampling surveys.
2.	Error in transferring the data to ER sheet	Medium	Transfer of data from source to ER calculation involve human intervention and might lead to inconsistencies.	The values reported in ER sheet to be checked with their respective source data. The first value, last value and the total of the columns for all parameters reported at the interval of were verified from the source data.
3.	Calculation of some parameters	Low	Human errors entering formulas and data.	All formulas are checked and compared to applied methodology and tools. In addition, entry data are crosschecked with raw data.

C.2. Consideration of materiality in conducting the verification

In accordance with CDM VVS for programmes of activities – version 01.0 – para. 307, the prescribed thresholds for materiality for CDM PAs are as under:

Emission Reductions (tCO ₂ e)/year	500,000 or more	300,001 to 499,999	300,000 or less	Small Scale CDM CPAs	Micro Scale CDM CPAs
Materiality Threshold	0.5%	1.0%	2.0%	5.0%	10.0%

The materiality threshold is 1.0%.

Particulars / Monitoring Report	MR Version (Public)	MR Version (Revised/Final)
Emission Reductions Achieved (tCO ₂ e) in this monitoring period	98,842	98,842
Applicable Threshold (%) as per para. 307 of CDM VVS for PoA – version 01.0	2.0%	2.0%

The sampling of the VPAs have been done in accordance with PoA rules, as demonstrated below in Section D.4 of this report.

It can be confirmed that the materiality threshold is not breached for the registered PoA and its VPA, as per CDM and GS requirements.

SECTION D. Means of verification

D.1. Desk/document review

The verification is performed primarily as a desk review of the documents submitted at various stages of assessments. The review is performed by assessment team using dedicated protocols (checklists). The assessment team cross checks the information provided in the documents (MR) and information from sources other than those used, if available, and conducts independent background investigations.

ESPL conducted a desk review, as under:

1. a review of the data and information presented to verify their completeness
2. a review of the monitoring plan (as described in registered PoA-DD; Registered GS PoA Passport; VPA4-DD; VPA4-GS Passport and Monitoring Report VPA 4 version 1 (published), the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures;
3. a review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions;
4. 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 emission reductions.

A complete list of documents/evidences reviewed is included as Appendix 3.

D.2. On-site inspection

Duration of on-site inspection: 10/09/2018 to 12/09/2018				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	Opening Meeting: Introduction, scope and objective of work, roles and responsibilities of audit team, resources required, and timetable of the onsite audit including venue for closing meeting and any concerns from PP.	Morelia	10/09/2018	Marcelo Sebben
2.	Santa Rita community: - visit to implemented ICS; - interviews with beneficiaries	Morelia	10/09/2018	Marcelo Sebben
3.	El Fresno community: - visit to implemented ICS; - interviews with beneficiaries - Interview with GIRA Representative	Toluca	10/09/2018	Marcelo Sebben
4.	Turcio Primera Sección community: - visit to implemented ICS; - interviews with beneficiaries	Toluca	11/09/2018	Marcelo Sebben

	- Interview with FPCV Representatives			
5.	Turcio Segunda Sección/Ejido Laguna Seca communities - visit to implemented ICS; - interviews with beneficiaries	Toluca	11/09/2018	Marcelo Sebben
6.	Review of ER calculations in accordance with applied methodology and relevant tools.	Mexico DF	11/09/2018	Marcelo Sebben
7.	Review of monitored data and relevant document in accordance with registered monitoring plan and applied monitoring methodology.	Mexico DF	12/09/2018	Marcelo Sebben
8.	Closing Meeting: Submission of the audit findings to the auditee and agreement on the issues raised and agreement on timelines. Suggestion for more or less frequent site visits.	Mexico DF	12/09/2018	Marcelo Sebben

D.3. Interviews

D.3.1. Interview with CME and LPPs

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Laurent	Arthur	Microsol	10/09/2018 11/09/2018	Management and operational system General aspects of PoA and VPAs	Marcelo Sebben
2.	Berriota	Victor	GIRA	10/09/2018	Implementation of ICS	Marcelo Sebben
3.	Alejandro	Cusi	Procuenca	11/09/2018	Implementation of ICS	Marcelo Sebben
4.	Villacorta	Anaís	Microsol	12/09/2018	Management and operational system ER calculations General aspects of PoA and VPAs SDG calculations	Marcelo sebben

D.3.2. Type of questions asked by team member

No.	Questions asked by team member to local stakeholders (beneficiaries)	Nature of Responses Received
1.	Is the ICS installed in the household?	Yes (=Positive) No (=Negative)
2.	Is the ICS in operation?	Yes (=Positive) No (=Negative)
3.	Does the ICS have a chimney?	Yes (=Positive) No (=Negative)
4.	Is the chimney working properly?	Yes (=Positive) No (=Negative)
5.	For how long the ICS is installed?	Neither positive nor negative
6.	What was used for cooking before the installation of the ICS?	Neither positive nor negative
7.	Is there any other type of fuel (LGP) used for regular cooking?	Yes (=Negative) No (=Positive)

8.	Does the ICS use more or less wood than the previous equipment?	Less (=Positive) More (=Negative)
9.	How many people live in the household?	Neither positive nor negative
10.	How many meals are cooked per day?	Neither positive nor negative
11.	Did the LPP provide training/explanation on how to use and maintain the ICS?	Yes (=Positive) No (=Negative)
12.	Are you happy with the ICS?	Yes (=Positive) No (=Negative)

D.3.3. Interview with local stakeholders (beneficiaries)

No.	Interviewee			Date	Feedback (Positive / Negative)
	Last name	First name	Affiliation		
1.	Meza Tena	Alba Naborina	El Fresno community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
2.	Garcia Morillo	Raquel	El Fresno community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
3.	Calderón Medrano	Teresa	El Fresno community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
4.	Guzman Rodriguez	Ana Lilia	El Fresno community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
5.	Medina Orozco	Hermelinda	El Fresno community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
6.	Lopes Nuñez	Rosalía	El Fresno community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
7.	Meza Medrano	Irene	El Fresno community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
8.	Garcia Murillo	Maria Lorena	El Fresno community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
9.	Avalos Gonzalez	Amalia	El Fresno community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
10.	Dimas Luna	Amalia	El Fresno community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
11.	Avalos Nuñez	Laura	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
12.	Contreras Gomez	Leticia	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
13.	Lopez Claudio	Martha	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Negative (Q. 7) Positive (all others)
14.	Lopez Cisneros	Maria Carmen	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
15.	Cisneros Vega	Cecilia	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Negative (Q. 7) Positive (all others)
16.	Gonzalez Toledo	Yolanda	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
17.	Ortiz Toledo	Angel	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
18.	Manriquez Guzman	Maritza	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
19.	Avalos Barcenás	Maria Irene	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
20.	Lopez Medina	Pilar	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Negative (Q. 7) Positive (all others)
21.	Barcenás Cortez	Amalia	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
22.	Chavez Corona	Agustina	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
23.	Cisneros Garcia	Erminia	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Negative (Q. 7) Positive (all others)
24.	Nuñez Toledo	Delia	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions

25.	Chavez Barcenas	Josefina	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
26.	Toledo Ortiz	Elena	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
27.	Medina Medina	Fabiola	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Negative (Q. 7) Positive (all others)
28.	Silva Silva	Alberta	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
29.	Cruz Alcantar	Celia	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
30.	Chaves Barcenas	Gloria	Santa Rita community	10/09/2018	Positive for all questions
31.	Estrada Velazquez	Antonia	Turcio 1a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
32.	Ruiz Rivera	Elia	Turcio 1a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
33.	Quintero Iglesias	Macrina	Turcio 1a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
34.	Camaho Ruiz	Leticia	Turcio 1a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
35.	Alvarez Rebollo	Marciana	Turcio 1a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
36.	Carbajal Esquivel	Josefina	Turcio 1a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
37.	Marin Vilchis	Maria Concepción	Turcio 1a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
38.	Millan Cruz	Karina	Turcio 1a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
39.	Quintero Diaz	Martina	Turcio 1a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
40.	Mercado Quintero	Julia	Turcio 1a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
41.	Colin Quintero	Irma	Turcio 1a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
42.	Mercado Carvajal	Veronica	Turcio 1a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
43.	Hernandez Carbajal	Lazaro	Turcio 1a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Negative (Q. 11) Positive (all others)
44.	Mercado Quintero	Adela	Turcio 1a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
45.	Gomez Gomez	Evaristo	Turcio 1a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
46.	Colin Bernal	Roberto	Turcio 2a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions

47.	Mercado Gonzales	Heriberta	Turcio 2a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
48.	Bernal Sanchez	Genaro	Turcio 2a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
49.	Nieto Sanchez	Teodoro	Turcio 2a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
50.	Esquivel Garduño	Graciela	Turcio 2a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Negative (Q. 7) Positive (all others)
51.	Diaz Velazquez	Hermelinda	Turcio 2a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Positive for all questions
52.	Alvarado Gonzalez	Jaqueline	Turcio 2a Seccion community	11/09/2018	Negative (Q. 7) Positive (all others)

D.4. Sampling approach

The proposed sampling process has been defined as follows, in accordance with PoA rules for DOE site visit:

- MICROSOL will define VPAs for which issuance of credits is requested so that not necessarily all VPAs at a given time shall go for request of issuance of credits.
- The DOE will randomly select the VPA(s) to be verified following the rules below for the selection of VPA(s).
 - For 1 to 10 VPAs for which issuance of credits is requested, all the scenarios of 1 VPA selected randomly by the DOE will be verified;
 - For 11 to 20 VPAs for which issuance of credits is requested, all the scenarios of 2 VPAs selected randomly by the DOE will be verified;

As there is only one VPA to be verified during this verification process, VPA 4 is the chosen one.

- Once the VPA(s) to be verified are randomly selected, the DOE randomly selects for a site visit 1 project scenario out of each batch of 3 scenarios.

In this VPA there are six different scenarios, thus, as per requirement above, 2 scenarios were chosen (in the project case, each ICS type corresponds to one project scenario).

The scenarios were chosen by the verification team and the ones chosen were “FPCV - Tierra Compactada” and “GIRA - Patsari”.

In order to determine the amount of ICS to be visited, a simple random sampling calculation was carried out. The verification team considered the whole population of the VPA is 9613 ICS (information given by the CME). Applying the simple random sampling formula below to the whole population we will have an amount of 263 households. As the chosen scenarios corresponds to approx. 20% of the total population (1,898 households), we will have approx. 52 households to be interviewed. Each Household will be selected randomly during the site visit.

$$n \geq \frac{z^2 \times N \times V}{(N - 1) \times \text{precision}^2 + z^2 \times V}$$

$$n \geq \frac{1.96^2 \times 9613 \times 1}{(9613 - 1) \times (0.5^2) + 1.96^2 \times 1}$$

$$n \geq 263 \times 9613 / 1898$$

$$n_{\text{sampled}} \geq 52.0$$

The assessment team will follow the audit plan given in table 5 while conducting the on-site audit.

The chosen districts were El Fresno (10 households - Patsari), Santa Rita (20 households, Patsari), Turcio 1a Sección (15 households – Tierra Compactada) and Turcio 2a Sección (7 households – Tierra Compactada).

D.5. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests raised

Areas of verification findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
General			
Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form	CL 1	-	-
Remaining forward action requests from validation and/or previous verification	-	-	-
VPA(s) considered for verification and covered in this report	-	-	-
Programme of activities			
Compliance of the programme implementation with the registered PoA-DD	-	-	-
Implementation and operation of the management system	-	-	-
Post-registration changes	-	-	-
1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline	CL 3	-	-
2. Corrections	-	-	-
3. Inclusion of a monitoring plan	-	-	-
4. Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodology, standardized baseline or other applied standards or tools	-	-	-
5. Changes to the programme design or project design	-	-	-
6. Change of coordinating/managing entity	-	-	-
7. Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation activities	-	-	-
Voluntary project activities			
Compliance of the VPA implementation with the included VPA design document			-
Post-registration changes			-
1. Temporary deviations from registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline			-
2. Corrections			-
3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period of voluntary project activities			-
4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan			-
5. Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodology, standardized baseline or other applied standards or tools			-
6. Changes to the programme design of project design	-	-	-
7. Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation voluntary project activities	-	-	-
Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with the methodology including applicable tool(s) and standardized baseline	-	-	-
Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan	-	-	-
1. Data and parameters fixed ex ante or at renewal of crediting period	-		-
2. Data and parameters monitored	CL 2	CAR 1	-

		CAR 2 CAR 3 CAR 4 CAR 5	
3. Implementation of sampling plan	-	-	-
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	-	-	-
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals	-	-	-
1. Calculation of baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks	-	-	-
2. Calculation of project GHG emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks	-	-	-
3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions	-	-	-
4. Summary of calculation of GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks	-	-	-
5. Comparison of actual GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks with estimates in included VPA	-	CAR 6	-
6. Remarks on difference from estimated value in included VPA		-	-
Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits		-	-
Global stakeholder consultation		-	-
Others (please specify) – 04 FARs from GS feedback on the new SD monitoring plan as part of transition review of GS4GG for verification and 01 FAR from validation of the renewal of the crediting period of VPA 2		-	-
Total	3	6	0

SECTION E. Verification findings

E.1. General

E.1.1. Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form

Means of verification	The MR was crosschecked with the Gold Standard for the Global Goals Monitoring report template – version 1, available at the GS website and with the instructions for filling it out. However, a CL has been raised
Findings	CL 01 MR 2nd page: - The MR is not in accordance with the GS MR template version 1 (2nd page items) - The estimated ER presented are not in accordance with VPA-DD nor with section E.4 of the MR. Moreover, not only the Red Patsari is requesting ER during this MP as stated by the foot note #1
Conclusion	After the findings resolution, a valid version of the MR template available at the GS website has been used. It has been filled out in accordance with its instructions.

E.1.2. Remaining forward action requests from validation and/or previous verifications

Not applicable.

E.1.3. VPAs considered for verification and covered in this report

Title and UNFCCC reference number of the VPA included in the PoA as of the end of this monitoring period	Is the VPA considered for this verification? (yes/no)	The date when the VPA was included ²	Version of the PoA-DD	Confirmation that a request for issuance including the VPA has been published for the previous monitoring period (Y/N)
VPA 1 – GS2423	no	26/12/2013	11	N (no verification has been conducted for this VPA so far)
VPA 2 – GS2439	no	31/03/2014	11	Y
VPA 3 – GS2440	no	26/12/2013	11	Y
VPA 4 – GS2441	yes	26/12/2013	11	Y

E.2. Programme of activities**E.2.1. Compliance of the programme implementation with the registered programme design document**

Means of verification	During the on-site visit, the verification team checked the implementation status of the voluntary project activities of the PoA. In addition, interviews with CME representatives LPP representatives and beneficiaries were also performed. The PoA aims to disseminate improved cook stoves that will enable the beneficiaries to reduce significantly their wood consumption and will decrease their exposure to indoor air pollution, as in the regions where PoA is being installed a large part of the population relies on wood for cooking and inefficient cooking practices are a major cause of deforestation.
Findings	-
Conclusion	The CME and LPPs have implemented the PoA and VPAs in accordance with PoA-DD, VPA-DDs and GS Passports. No deviations have been observed.

E.2.2. Implementation and operation of the management system

Means of verification	A management system is in place. The CME (Microsol) centralizes all information gathered by the LPPs and is responsible for the compilations. The LPPs are responsible to perform the KS and KT in accordance with registered Monitoring Plan under supervision of Microsol. In addition, the CME provides training to the LPPs and LPPs are responsible for trainings of their staff and orientation and follow up of beneficiaries. There is an implemented quality control system in order to guarantee the accurateness and completeness of all data. In addition, leakage, SD matrix, NRB and eventual DNH mitigation parameters assessments are monitored every two years.
Findings	-
Conclusion	The management system is in place, as roles and responsibilities, either for the CME and for LPPs.

E.2.3. Post-registration changes**E.2.3.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline**

Means of verification	A temporary deviation of the monitoring plan is being requested between 01/01/2015 and 31/08/2018 as not all LPPs comprehended in this VPA 4 were monitored during this monitoring period. The LPPs that were not monitored are
------------------------------	---

² These dates correspond to inclusion date. However, as all these VPAs claimed retroactive credits, the CP starts two years prior the informed date.

	VAD, ESM, CDT and VDQ and their ERs accounted for this period are equal to zero. The VPA was not monitored as per monitoring plan during this period.
Findings	CL 3
Conclusion	Temporary deviation has been requested which no prior approval is required as conservative assumptions were taken into consideration. For further details refer to PRC validation report attached to this report.

E.2.3.2. Corrections

No corrections have been identified prior and/or during the present monitoring period.

E.2.3.3. Inclusion of a monitoring plan

Not applicable as monitoring plan is part of the registered PoA-DD.

E.2.3.4. Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodology, standardized baseline or other applied standards or tools

Not applicable as no permanent deviations from the registered monitoring plan or from monitoring methodology have been submitted prior and/or during the current monitoring period.

E.2.3.5. Changes to the programme design or project design

Not applicable as no changes to the project design of the registered project activity took place prior and/or during the current monitoring period.

E.2.3.6. Change of coordination/managing entity

Not applicable as there was no change of CME.

E.2.3.7. Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation activities

Not applicable as it is not an afforestation or reforestation PoA.

E.3. Voluntary project activities**E.3.1. Compliance of the VPA implementation with the included VPA design document**

Means of verification	During the on-site visit, the verification team checked the implementation status of the project activities of the PoA. In addition, interviews with CME representatives LPP representatives and beneficiaries were also performed. The PoA aims to disseminate technologies with strong social impacts to poor populations of the continent in order to improve their living conditions in a sustainable way. This VPA (VPA 4) is located in Mexico. For the present verification, the operating Local Project Proponents (LPPs) and project scenarios (ICS types) of VPA 4 are given below³: <u>LPP AURA</u> ○ ICS model (project Scenario): Patsari ○ City Hermosillo, State of Sonora ○ Latitude: 29.0892 / Longitude: -110.9613 ○ 5,289 improved cook stoves; <u>LPP GIRA</u> ○ ICS model (project Scenario): Patsari ○ City of Morelia, State of Michoacán ○ Latitude: 19.7059 / Longitude: -101.1949 ○ 1,297 improved cook stoves; <u>LPP FPCV</u> ○ ICS model (project Scenario): Plancha and Tierra compactada ○ Mexico City, State of Mexico
------------------------------	---

³ There are in total 9 LPPs in this VPA, however, for this monitoring period, only 4 are requesting issuance

	- Latitude: 19.4326 / Longitude: -99.1332 479 improved cook stoves (Plancha) and 601 improved cookstoves (Tierra compactada); <u>LPP FPP</u> - ICS model (project Scenario): Patsari and Onil - City of Oaxaca State of Oaxaca, - Latitude: 17.0669/ Longitude: -96.7203 - City of San Luis Potosi, State of San Luis Potosi - Latitude: 22.1565/ Longitude: -100.9855 - City of Veracruz, State of Veracruz - Latitude: 19.1903/ Longitude: -96.1533 1,329 improved cook stoves (Patsari) and 618 improved cookstoves (Onil) The LPPs CDT, VAD, ESM, VDQ and STI are not requesting issuance during this monitoring period. The VPA comprehends the following periods. 1st crediting period: from 27/12/2011 to 26/12/2018 (including both days); 2nd Monitoring period: from 01/01/2015 until 31/08/2018 (including both days). All VPAs contribute to the following SDG Goals: - Goal 1: No poverty; - Goal 3: Good health and well-being; - Goal 4: Quality education; - Goal 7: Affordable and clean energy; - Goal 8: Decent work and economic growth; - Goal 13: Climate action; and - Goal 15: Life on land. * Goal 5 – Gender Equality: even though it has been reported in the MR and assessed in this verification report, the PoA is not claiming positive contribution to SDG #5 and consequently will not be certified as positive by GS as can be seen in the Transition Document to GS4GG^{/13/} and assessed in CAR 2.
Findings	CAR 1 <i>During the site visit, it has been observed that the number of ICS reported does not reflect the actual number of ICSs installed.</i>
Conclusion	The CME and LPPs have implemented the VPAs in accordance with PoA-DD, VPA-DDs and GS Passports. A mechanism is in place receiving any grievances regarding the project, as well as being available to solve stakeholder/beneficiaries problems. The VPA is in accordance with GS4GG guidelines and no deviations have been observed.

E.3.2. Post-registration changes

E.3.2.1. Temporary deviations from registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline

Means of verification	A temporary deviation of the monitoring plan is being requested between 01/01/2015 and 31/08/2018 as not all LPPs comprehended in this VPA 4 were monitored during this monitoring period. The LPPs that were not monitored are VAD, ESM, CDT and VDQ, thus a CL has been raised.
Findings	CL 3 <i>Not all LPPs were monitored during this MP as informed in the VPA-DD</i>
Conclusion	A temporary deviation has been requested and for the period which no monitoring was carried out for the mentioned LPPs, their ERs were accounted as zero. For more details, refer to the Assessment on post registration changes attached to this report.

E.3.2.2. Corrections

No corrections have been identified prior and/or during the present monitoring period for any of the VPAs.

E.3.2.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period of voluntary project activities

Not applicable as there was no change in the start date of the crediting period of any of the VPAs.

E.3.2.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan

Not applicable as the monitoring plan is part of the registered VPA-DDs.

E.3.2.5. Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodology, standardized baseline, or other applied standards or tools

Not applicable as no permanent deviations from the registered monitoring plan or from monitoring methodology have been submitted prior and/or during the current monitoring period for any of the VPAs.

E.3.2.6. Changes to the programme design or project design

It has been observed that in the previous monitoring period, the number of ICSs have been updated taking into consideration the installed and the decommissioned ones. The current ICS amount for each LPP was provided in the Monitoring report.

E.3.2.7. Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation voluntary project activities

Not applicable as the VPAs are not afforestation or reforestation project activities.

E.3.3. Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with the methodology including applicable tool(s) and standardized baseline

Means of verification	The MP of the approved PoA-DD and VPA-DDs was reviewed against the monitoring requirements of the applied methodology and applicable tools.
Findings	-
Conclusion	The MP of the voluntary project activities is totally in accordance with the applied methodology (Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption – version 1.0).

E.3.4. Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan**E.3.4.1. Data and parameters fixed ex ante or at renewal of crediting period**

Means of verification	All ex-ante parameters listed in MR used to calculate baseline, project, and leakage GHG emissions of the PoA and VPA were checked against the registered PoA-DD and VPA-DDs. The ex-ante parameters of the registered PoA-DD and VPA-DDs were verified in order to check its consistency with applied methodology and tools to calculate the ex-ante value and methodological requirements for the baseline, project and leakage emission calculations. The fixed parameters and their values are: - SDG 13 – $EF_{wood,co2}$ (CO₂ emission factor for wood): 112 tCO₂/TJ; - SDG 13 – $EF_{wood,non-co2}$ (Non-CO₂ emission factor for wood): 8.692 tCO₂/TJ; - SDG 13 – NCV_{wood} (Net calorific value of wood): 0.0156 TJ/ton wood
Findings	N/A
Conclusion	The values in the MRs and corresponding emission reduction calculations spreadsheets are consistent with the registered PoA-DD and VPA-DDs. The applied values are correct.

E.3.4.2. Data and parameters monitored

Means of verification	All monitored parameters listed in MR used to calculate baseline, project, and leakage GHG emissions of the VPA were checked against the registered VPA-DDs and GS4GG. The parameters were verified in order to check its consistency with applied methodology and GS4GG directives.
------------------------------	--

1. SDG 1 – Number of poor people benefitting from clean cooking technology: Project population_p

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Every two years in project surveys. The values are: - AURA= 24,826 - GIRA = 6,194 - FPCV _{Plancha} = 2,645 - FPCV _{Tierra Compactada} = 3,209 - FPP _{Onil} = 3,010 - FPP _{Patsari} = 6,346
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The consistency of the values presented in the MR were verified through surveys.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

2. SDG 3 – Proportion of households considering cough occurs less often or not at all: Cough reduction_p

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Every two years in project surveys. The values are: - AURA= 95 % - GIRA= 97% - FPCV _{Plancha} = 96% - FPCV _{Tierra Compactada} = 99% - FPP _{Onil} = 99% - FPP _{Patsari} =100 %
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The consistency of the values presented in the MR were verified through surveys.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

3. SDG 3 – Proportion of households considering respiratory diseases occur less often or not at all: Respiratory diseases reduction_p

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Every two years in project surveys. The values are:

	- AURA = 98% - GIRA= 97% - FPCV, Plancha =97 % - FPCV, Tierra compactada =94 % - FPP, Onil = 100% - FPP, Patsari =100 %
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The consistency of the values presented in the MR were verified through surveys.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

4. SDG 3 – Proportion of households considering burns occur less often or not at all: Burns reduction_p

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Every two years in project surveys. The values are: - AURA =96 % - GIRA=99 % - FPCV, Plancha= 93% - FPCV, Tierra Compactada= 99% - FPP, Onil= 100% - FPP, Patsari= 100%
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The consistency of the values presented in the MR were verified through surveys.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

5. SDG 3 – Proportion of households considering backaches occur less often or not at all: Backaches reduction_p

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Every two years in project surveys. The values are: - AURA= 98%

	- GIRA =84 % - FPCV Plancha= 95% - FPCV Tierra Compactada= 89% - FPP Onil =98 % - FPP Patsari=100 %
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The consistency of the values presented in the MR were verified through surveys.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

6. SDG 4 – Proportion of children having more time to do their homework: Class homework improvement_p

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Every two years in project surveys. The values were not reported in the MR. Thus a CAR has been raised. Refer to CAR 1. After the findings resolution, it has been observed in the transition document^{13/} that these both parameters were adjusted in order to attend to the GS requirements. Taking into account that the surveys are carried out every two years, it is comprehensible that this information might not be used for the surveys at the moment of this monitoring period. It was observed in the MR that no values were reported during this monitoring period.
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Refer to CAR 1
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Refer to CAR 1
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Refer to CAR 1

7. SDG 4 – Proportion of children having more time to attend school: School attendance improvement_p

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Every two years in project surveys. The values were not reported in the MR. Thus a CAR has been raised. Refer to CAR 1.

		After the findings resolution, it has been observed in the transition document ^{13/} that these both parameters were adjusted in order to attend to the GS requirements. Taking into account that the surveys are carried out every two years, it is comprehensible that this information might not be used for the surveys at the moment of this monitoring period. It was observed in the MR that no values were reported during this monitoring period.
	Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Refer to CAR 1
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Refer to CAR 1
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Refer to CAR 1
8. SDG 4 – Proportion of people having received capacity-building on the benefits and adequate use of the ICS: Capacity-building_p		
	Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
	Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Every two years in project surveys. The values are: - AURA = 99 % - GIRA = 97 % - FPCV, Plancha = 100 % - FPCV, Tierra Compactada = 99% - FPP, Onil = 100% - FPP, Patsari = 97%
	Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The consistency of the values presented in the MR were verified through surveys.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.
9. SDG 4 – Proportion of beneficiaries who participated in ICS construction: Participation in construction_p		
	Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
	Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Every two years in project surveys. The values are:

		- AURA=99 % - GIRA =75 % - FPCV_{, Plancha} =100 % - FPCV_{, Tierra Compactada} = 99% - FPP_{, Onil} = 71% - FPP_{, Patsari} = 71%	
	Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.	
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The consistency of the values presented in the MR were verified through surveys.	
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.	
	10. SDG 5 – Amount of time saved by women through cooking		
	Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation	
	Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	This parameter is being assessed in this Verification report as it was described in the MR. However the PoA is not claiming positive contribution to SDG #5 and consequently will not be certified as positive by GS as can be seen in the Transition Document to GS4GG^{/13/} and assessed in CAR 2. The surveys will take place every two years. The values are (hours/month): - AURA = 57.81 - GIRA = 76.07 - FPCV_{, Plancha} = 49.33 - FPCV_{, Tierra Compactada} = 49.61 - FPP_{, Onil} = 78.65 - FPP_{, Patsari} = 78.40	
	Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.	
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The consistency of the values presented in the MR were verified through surveys.	
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.	

11. SDG 5 – Amount of time saved by women through wood collection

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	This parameter is being assessed in this Verification report as it was described in the MR. However the PoA is not claiming positive contribution to SDG #5 and consequently will not be certified as positive by GS as can be seen in the Transition Document to GS4GG^{/13/} and assessed in CAR 2. The surveys will take place every two years. The values are (hours/month): - AURA = 1.24 - GIRA = 1.22 - FPCV, Plancha = 1.96 - FPCV, Tierra Compactada = 3.12 - FPP, Onil = 13.40 - FPP, Patsari = 3.61
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The consistency of the values presented in the MR were verified through surveys.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

12. SDG 5 – Activities carried out by women during saved time

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	This parameter is being assessed in this Verification report as it was described in the MR. However the PoA is not claiming positive contribution to SDG #5 and consequently will not be certified as positive by GS as can be seen in the Transition Document to GS4GG^{/13/} and assessed in CAR 2. The surveys will take place every two years. The parameter corresponds to the proportion of activities carried out by the end users during the time saved thanks to the project implementation The values are (%):

		Household Chores_p - AURA = 64 - GIRA = 60 - FPCV, Plancha = 79 - FPCV, Tierra Compactada = 70 - FPP, Onil = 85 - FPP, Patsari = 86 Agriculture_p - AURA = 3 - GIRA = 4 - FPCV, Plancha = 23 - FPCV, Tierra Compactada = 13 - FPP, Onil = 40 - FPP, Patsari = 38 Livestock Farming_p - AURA = 19 - GIRA = 1 - FPCV, Plancha = 50 - FPCV, Tierra Compactada = 33 - FPP, Onil = 35 - FPP, Patsari = 40 Activity Generating Income_p - AURA = 1 - GIRA = 22 - FPCV, Plancha = 1 - FPCV, Tierra Compactada = 5 - FPP, Onil = 6 - FPP, Patsari = 12 Spending Time with family_p - AURA = 29 - GIRA = 19 - FPCV, Plancha = 31 - FPCV, Tierra Compactada = 34	
--	--	---	--

		- FPP, Onil = 24 - FPP, Patsari = 40
	Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The consistency of the values presented in the MR were verified through surveys.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.
13. SDG 7 – Number of clean cooking technologies implemented and used by the project population: ICS nb_p		
	Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
	Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Before each verification. It has been observed that the values were not correctly reported as per information provide to the verification team. Thus a CAR has been raised. Refer to CAR 3. After correction, the values are: - AURA = 5,289 - GIRA = 1,297 - FPCV, Plancha = 475 - FPCV, Tierra Compactada = 601 - FPP, Onil = 614 - FPP, Patsari = 1,259
	Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Refer to CAR 3.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Refer to CAR 3.
14. SDG 8 – Number of permanent job positions created thanks to the implementation of the project employing local people with a minimum participation rate in the ICS project of 50%: Employment_p		
	Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
	Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Every two years in project surveys. The values are:

	- AURA = 11 - GIRA = 3 - FPCV, Plancha and tierra comp. = 6 - FPP, Onil and Patsari = 14
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values of the MR were verified their consistency with surveys.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

15. SDG 8 – Equal pay for work of equal value for both women and men: Equal pay_p

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Every two years in project surveys. After the findings resolution the values are: - AURA = N/A - GIRA = N/A - FPCV = N/A - FPP = 33%
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values of the MR were verified their consistency with surveys. However, justification on reported values for AURA and GIRA was not given. Thus a CL has been raised. Refer to CL 2
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

16. SDG 13 – N_{p,y}: Technology.days

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Monitored continuously from a list of end users provided by the LPP showing at least the following information: name, surname, location, date of installation of the technology. The values were dully reported in the MR section E.3, tables E.3.4, E.3.5, E.3.6 and E.3.7.

Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values of the MR were verified their consistency with list of end users.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

17. SDG 13 – $U_{p,y}$: Usage rate for technologies from project scenario p in year y

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Annually monitored by qualitative information collected in the usage surveys. A question concerning the current use of the technology is asked to each end user of the sample and is validated by the observation of the interviewer in order to determine the usage rate of each technology age category. The values are as follows: - AURA= 100% - GIRA =100% - FPCV, Plancha =99.23% - FPCV, Tierra Compactada = 100% - FPP, Onil = 99.42% - FPP, Patsari = 94.71%
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values of the MR were verified their consistency with surveys.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

18. SDG 13 – P_b : Average daily wood consumption of a stove in baseline scenario b

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	The parameter will be monitored only once prior to first verification. The values are (tons/day/HH): - AURA = 0.01414 - GIRA = 0.01120

	- FPCV_{traditional} = 0.01598 - FPCV_{non-traditional} = 0.01316 - FPP = 0.01585 As not values reported are as per previous monitoring period, a CAR has been raised. Refer to CAR 4
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Fixed baseline is chosen at VPA level. The data is calculated from the same Baseline Kitchen Tests performed during the last monitoring period. However not all values were correctly reported. Refer to CAR 4
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Refer to CAR 4

19. SDG 13 – P_p: Average daily wood consumption of an ICS in project scenario *p*

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Every two years, the calculation of the parameter is based on real, observed technology performance in the field, measured in the project field tests. The fuel consumption is measured with a representative sample of end users under each defined project scenario and taking into account the age distribution of the project technologies, following the procedure described in the PoA-DD. The values are (ton/day/HH): - AURA = 0.01011 - GIRA = 0.00862 - FPCV_{Plancha} = 0.00828 - FPCV_{Tierra Compactada} = 0.00847 - FPP_{Onil} = 0.00611 - FPP_{Patsari} = 0.01029
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values of the MR were verified their consistency with project field tests.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

20. SDG 13 – $P_{p,b,y}$: Daily wood savings of an ICS of project scenario p against a stove from baseline scenario b

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Every two years, it is calculated from a statistical analysis, which is conducted in combination on baseline and project scenarios wood consumption data. The correct values are (ton/day/HH) - AURA = 0.00416 - GIRA = 0.00270 - FPCV_{Plancha} = 0.00646 - FPCV_{Tierra Compactada} = 0.00673 - FPP_{Onil} = 0.00951 - FPP_{Patsari} = 0.00557 However the values reported are not in accordance with ER calculations spreadsheet. Thus a CAR has been raised. Refer to CAR 5
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values of the MR were verified their consistency with project field tests.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

21. SDG 13 – f_{NRB} : Non-renewability fraction of woody biomass fuel

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Fraction of non-renewable biomass for Peru approved at PoA-DD validation. The value for Mexico (VPA 4) is 87.67%.
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Registered PoA-DD.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

22. SDG 13 – E_p : Eligibility factor of the technologies implemented in project scenario p

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Annually monitored to exclude in a statistical way the part of the end users

	that are not eligible for emission reductions calculation. The values are: - AURA = 100.00% - GIRA = 97.85% - FPCV _{Plancha} = 99.13% - FPCV _{Tierra Compactada} = 98.92% - FPP _{Onil} = 99.00% - FPP _{Patsari} = 99.39%
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values of the MR were verified their consistency with project surveys.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

23. SDG 13 – LE_p : Leakage in project scenario p

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Every two years, L4 – <i>The project population compensates for loss of the space heating effect of inefficient technology by adopting some other form of heating</i> – this potential source of leakage is monitored in the project and monitoring surveys by asking the end users if they use a new heating device since their ICS has been implemented. The leakage is as follows: - AURA = 0.00% - GIRA = 0.00% - FPCV _{Plancha} = 0.00% - FPCV _{Tierra Compactada} = 0.00% - FPP _{Onil} = 0.00% - FPP _{Patsari} = 0.00%
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values of the MR were verified their consistency with surveys.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

24. SDG 13 – O_p : Removal rate of the baseline technology in project scenario p in year y

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
-----------------------	------------------------

Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Annually calculated based on qualitative information collected in the project and monitoring surveys by asking the end user whether the ICS is still being used. The values are as follows: - AURA = 71.43% - GIRA = 77.96% - FPCV_{Plancha} = 52.17% - FPCV_{Tierra Compactada} = 68.28% - FPP_{Onil} = 50.00% - FPP_{Patsari} = 65.76%
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values of the MR were verified their consistency with surveys.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

25. SDG 13 – Number of tCO₂e reduced by the project: Emission reductions_p

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Calculated at each verification. The values are reported after all findings resolution. The correct values can be observed below: - AURA = 48,929 tCO₂e - GIRA = 7,664 tCO₂e - FPCV_{Plancha} = 6,777 tCO₂e - FPCV_{Tierra Compactada} = 7,944 tCO₂e - FPP_{Onil} = 13,119 tCO₂e - FPP_{Patsari} = 14,409 tCO₂e TOTAL = 98,842 tCO₂e
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values of the MR were verified their consistency with ER calculations Excel files.
If applicable, has the reported data been crosschecked with other available data?	All data presented during the verification.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate.

26. SDG 15 – Number of tons of wood saved by the project: Wood savings_{p,y}

Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Calculated at each verification. The values are (t/year): - AURA= 8,040 - GIRA = 1,279 - FPCV Plancha= 1,121 - FPCV Tierra Compactada= 1,477 - FPP Onil= 2,134 - FPP Patsari= 2,558
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values of the MR were verified their consistency with ER calculations Excel files.
If applicable, has the reported data been crosschecked with other available data?	All data presented during the verification.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate
27. Safeguarding Principle 3.6.1: Labour Rights – Age of employees	
Criteria/Requirements	Assessment Observation
Measuring / Reading / Recording frequency	Verified at the list of workers for each employee and presented at Section D.2 of MR and Excel SDG calculation.
Is the measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values of the MR were verified with list of workers.
If applicable, has the reported data been crosschecked with other available data?	All data presented during the verification.
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Data management system was found to be reliable and appropriate
Findings	CL 2 MR section D.2, parameter SDG 8: it is not justified the reasons for the values of parameter being "Not applicable" for AURA and GIRA CAR 1 According to the document "Transition Annex-Microsol Utsil Naj PoA 20180612", the SDG #4 corresponds to the following indicators: - Proportion of children having more time to do their class homework - Proportion of children having more time to attend school.

	- Proportion of people having received capacity-building on the benefits and adequate use of the ICS - Proportion of beneficiaries who participated in ICS construction However, the first two indicators described above were not reported in the MR section D.2 CAR 2 According to the document "Transition Annex-Microsol Utsil Naj PoA 20180612", the SDG #5 have been removed from the monitoring parameters. However it is not reflected in the MR section D.2: CAR 3 During the site visit, it has been observed that the number of ICS reported does not reflect the actual number of ICSs installed. CAR 4 MR section D.2: parameter SDG 13 Pb: values reported for FPCV are not the same as reported in the previous monitoring period. CAR 5 The value of the parameter $P_{p,b,y}$ for all project scenarios reported in the MR is not in accordance with the parameters reported in the ER calculations:
Conclusion	The registered monitoring plans have been properly implemented and followed by the CME and LPPs. The parameters have been monitored in a correct and conservative way. In addition, the parameters have been classified and included as SDG parameters in accordance with the transition to GS4GG approved by GS. Quality assurance and quality control procedures are in place. Therefore, the VT has concluded that the monitoring of the VPAs is in accordance with the registered monitoring plans. As per CL 2, explanation was given in the MR. As per CAR 1, both parameters were not yet approved by the GS requirements, thus, were not included in the current surveys. As per CAR 2, the SDG#5 was included in the MR but its positive score will not be claimed for the current period as the parameter is not being monitored as per GS requirement. It was also not included under the verification report. As per CAR 3, correct value has been reported in the MR. Moreover, it has been clarified that values reported in the parameter SDG7, section D.2 of the MR and section E.3, table E.3.1 are not the same. Thus, small differences can be observed. As per CAR 4, values were corrected in the MR. As per CAR 5, values were corrected in the MR.

E.3.4.3. Implementation of sampling plan

Means of verification	Documents were checked and interviews with PP's representatives and personnel were performed in order check if a sampling plan was used. As per the CME, the PoA-DD sets the general framework and guidelines for sampling methods, but precise operational methodology is evolving since the beginning of the programme. The latest version of the sampling methodology can be summarized as follows: a multistage random sampling for all monitoring surveys has been designed in order to cover all the geographical areas of the project activities and to ensure a random selection of the subjects. Different stages corresponding to the territorial organization of Mexico are taken into consideration while defining the sample. These are the province, the district and the community. Sampling on usage surveys The usage survey provides a single usage parameter that is weighted based on the rate of technology drop off by the end users, this rate being calculated on a sample representative of the age distribution for project technologies in the total sales record. A minimum sample size of $n = 100$, with at least 30 samples for project technologies of each age being credited is applied for the usage surveys.
------------------------------	--

	Questions concerning the current use of the technology will be asked to each end user of the sample and observation will be conducted by the interviewer within the kitchen in question, allowing to determine the drop off rate of each technology age category.
Findings	-
Conclusion	The sampling plans used by CME are in accordance with the PoA-DD and VPA-DDs.

E.3.4.4. Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments

Means of verification	There verification was done through reporting provided by the CME which describe which scales were used during the verification process and their condition.
Findings	N/A
Conclusion	The CME has presented the list of the electronic scales used during the project KPT, stating their conditions, based on their status of new or used (in which case, the results come from calibration certificates).

E.3.5. Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals

E.3.5.1. Calculation of baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	The calculations of baseline emission have been done in accordance with registered monitoring plan and applied methodology. So: $BE_{VPA4} = 294,298 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$;
Findings	Refer to CAR 1, CAR 2, CAR 3, CAR 4 and CAR 5 above
Conclusion	The verification team confirms that: a. the monitored data was available in accordance with the registered monitoring plan; b. the reported data were crosschecked, as prescribed in the revised approved PoA-DD and VPA-DD, with the relevant supporting evidences and were found consistent; c. appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline GHG emissions have been followed; d. the assumptions, emission factors and default values that were applied in the calculations are correct and evidenced; e. the calculations are transparent, consistent, correct and complete.

E.3.5.2. Calculation of project GHG emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	Project emission calculations have been done in accordance with registered monitoring plan and applied methodology. So: $PE_{VPA4} = 195,456 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$;
Findings	Refer to CAR 1, CAR 2, CAR 3, CAR 4 and CAR 5 above
Conclusion	The verification team confirms that: a. the monitored data was available in accordance with the registered monitoring plan; b. the reported data were crosschecked, as prescribed in the revised approved PoA-DD and VPA-DD, with the relevant supporting evidences and were found consistent; c. appropriate methods and formulae for calculating project GHG emissions have been followed; d. the assumptions, emission factors and default values that were applied in the calculations are correct and evidenced; e. the calculations are transparent, consistent, correct and complete.

E.3.5.3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions

Means of verification	The only possibility of leakage considered at the PoA-DD and VPA-DD is L4 – <i>The project population compensates for loss of the space heating effect of inefficient technology by adopting some other form of heating</i> – this potential source of leakage is monitored in the project and monitoring surveys by asking the end users if they use a new heating device since their ICS has been implemented. Then, the removal rate of the baseline stoves in each cluster. In this case, the removal rate is 100%. So, leakage is 0 (zero). Thus: - VPA 4: LE₂₀₁₅, LE₂₀₁₆, LE₂₀₁₇ and LE₂₀₁₈ for all project scenarios is = 0 tCO₂e; Therefore, LE_{Total} = 0.00 tCO₂e.
Findings	-
Conclusion	The verification team confirms that: - the monitored data was available in accordance with the registered monitoring plan; - the reported data were crosschecked, as prescribed in the revised approved PoA-DD and VPA-DD, with the relevant supporting evidences and were found consistent; - appropriate methods and formulae for calculating leakage GHG emissions have been followed; - the assumptions, emission factors and default values that were applied in the calculations are correct and evidenced; - the calculations are transparent, consistent, correct and complete.

E.3.5.4. Summary of calculation of GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	The emission reductions from the project activity are based on baseline and project emissions only. The calculations presented at the final MR and corresponding ER calculation spreadsheet were found to be appropriate and in compliance with the provisions of the registered monitoring plan of the approved VPA-DD and applied methodology. The verification team confirms an audit trail that contains the evidences and records of validated figures. It is calculated as follows: $ER_y = \sum_{b,p} \{ N_{p,y} * P_{p,b,y} * U_{p,y} * NCV_{wood} * (f_{NRB} * EF_{wood,CO2} + EF_{wood,nonCO2}) * E_p \} - \sum LE_p$ Where: $\sum_{b,p}$ Sum over all relevant couples; $N_{p,y}$ Cumulative number of ICS-days included in the project database for project scenario p in year y; $P_{p,b,y}$ Wood savings for an individual ICS of project scenario p against an individual stove of baseline scenario b in year y; $U_{p,y}$ Cumulative usage rate for ICS in project scenario p in year y, based on cumulative adoption rate and drop-off rate revealed by usage surveys; NCV_{wood} Net calorific value of wood; f_{NRB} Fraction of biomass that can be established as non-renewable; $EF_{wood,CO2}$ CO₂ emission factor of wood; $EF_{wood,nonCO2}$ Non-CO₂ emission factor of wood; E_p Eligibility factor of the ICS implemented in project scenario p; LE_p Leakage for project scenario p Thus: VPA 4 (Total): - ER₂₀₁₅ = 27,510 tCO₂e;
------------------------------	--

	- ER₂₀₁₆ = 28,287 tCO₂e; - ER₂₀₁₇ = 24,780 tCO₂e. - ER₂₀₁₇ = 18,265 tCO₂e. Therefore, ER_{Total} = 98,842 tCO₂e.
Findings	Refer to CAR 1, CAR 2, CAR 3 and CAR 4 above
Conclusion	The verification team confirms that appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline GHG emissions reductions have been followed. The summary tables have been correctly presented at the MRs and the figures are correct and justified.

Title and UNFCCC reference number of the VPA	Baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage (tCO ₂ e)	GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks (tCO ₂ e)		
				Amount achieved before 1 January 2013	Amount achieved from 1 January 2013	Amount achieved in the entire monitoring period
VPA 4 – GS2441	294,298	195,456	0	0	0	98,842
Total	294,298	195,456	0	0	0	98,842

E.3.5.5. Comparison of actual GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks with estimates in included VPA

Means of verification	The comparisons were presented at the MR. The ex-ante estimated values included in VPA-DD are higher than the actual GHG emission reductions. However, the comparison did not take into consideration the correct ER calculations achieved. Thus a CAR has been raised.
Findings	CAR 6 <i>The comparison of Estimated x actual ERs presented in the ER calculations from FPP patsari/Onil, from Gira and from FPCV tierra/plancha are not taking into consideration the correct amount of actual ERs for each model.</i>
Conclusion	The comparisons of actual values of the monitoring period with the estimates in the registered VPA-DDs are properly presented at the MR.

Title and UNFCCC reference number of the VPA	Value estimated in ex ante calculation in the included VPA-DD(s)	Actual values achieved by the VPAs during this monitoring period
VPA 4 – GS2441	406,186 t CO ₂ e	98,842 t CO ₂ e
Total	406,186 t CO ₂ e	98,842 t CO ₂ e

E.3.5.6. Remarks on difference from estimated value in included VPA

Means of verification	All comparisons have been made taken into account the LPPs project scenario that effectively are part of the present verification and for the exact period, in order to be consistent and traceable. As the actual ERs are lower than the value estimated at the validation, no justification is necessary.
Findings	N/A
Conclusion	The verification team confirms that the comparison was done and the estimated ERs are higher than the achieved ones. The estimate is demonstrated at the tab "Estimated vs. Actual ERs" at ER calculations excels of each LPP

E.3.6. Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits

Means of verification	Refer to Section E.3.4.2 above.
Findings	-
Conclusion	Refer to Section E.3.4.2, as all monitoring parameters have been classified in SDG Goals categories and are fully assessed.

E.3.7. Global stakeholder consultation

Means of verification	The GS work plan and respective verification documents have been submitted to GS registry before the site visit took place.
Findings	-
Conclusion	The verification documents have been available for global stakeholder consultation in accordance with GS rules. In addition, in order to be in accordance with transition measures for GS4GG, the CME has agreed to perform, for all future activities, the stakeholder consultation planned and organized keeping in mind the Gold Standard for the Global Goals Stakeholder Procedure, Requirements & Guidelines document and the Gender Equality Guidelines & Requirements.

SECTION F. Internal quality control

A draft verification report prepared by assessment team is reviewed by an independent Technical Review team (one or more members) to confirm if the internal procedures established and implemented by ESPL were duly complied with and such opinion/conclusion is reached in an objective manner that complies with the applicable Gold Standard and CDM requirements. The technical review team is collectively required to possess the technical expertise of all the technical area/sectoral scope the project activity relates to. All team members of technical review team are independent of the validation team. The report approved by Quality Manager is endorsed by Managing Director, who is overall responsible to ensure quality, before final release. The further details of applicable procedures and responsibilities about Earthood Quality Management System (QMS) are available on its website (www.earthood.in).

SECTION G. Verification opinion

Earthood Services Private Limited, contracted by Microsol S.A.S., has performed the independent verification of the emission reductions for the GS PoA “Utsil Naj – Casa saludable para todos”, for the monitoring period from 01/01/2015 until 31/08/2018, as reported in the final version of Monitoring Reports (final).

Microsol S.A.S. is responsible for the collection of data in accordance with the monitoring plan and the reporting of GHG emissions reductions from the project activity. ESPL commenced the verification against methodology Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption – version 1.0, the monitoring plan contained in the registered PoA-DD, VPA-DDs, GS Passports and Monitoring Reports.

ESPL confirms that the monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements. This verification report has been prepared using the latest available template specified by UNFCCC and complies with the instructions to follow. The verification activities were conducted in accordance with ESPL’s CDM Quality Manual System as per the steps indicated under Section A of this report.

As a result, it is confirmed that the emission reductions from the VPA 4 (GS2441) belonging to the GS PoA (GS1377) “Utsil Naj – Casa saludable para todos” are correctly reported in the final version of Monitoring Reports and corresponding ER spread sheets for the monitoring period from 01/01/2015 until 31/08/2018 (including both days) amounted as 98,842 tCO₂e. Therefore, this will be submitted as part of request for issuance as per Gold Standard for the Global Goals.

SECTION H. Certification statement

ESPL’s verification approach is based on the understanding of the risks associated with reporting of GHG emission data and the controls in place to mitigate these. ESPL planned and performed the verification by obtaining evidence and other information and explanations that ESPL 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 are fairly stated in the final version of Monitoring Reports. ESPL, based on 01/01/2015 until 31/08/2018 (including both days), the VPA 4 (GS2441) belonging to the registered GS PoA “Utsil Naj – Casa saludable para todos” achieved the verified amount of 98,842 tCO₂e reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that would not have occurred in the absence of the PoA.

The verified amount of emission reductions are stated below as per year:

Specific case VPA	Emission Reductions (Amount) in this monitoring period	
	Duration	Emission reduction
VPA 4 – GS2441	2015 – from 01/01/2015 to 31/12/2015	27,510 tCO ₂ e
	2016 – from 01/01/2016 to 31/12/2016	28,287 tCO ₂ e
	2017 – from 01/01/2017 to 31/12/2017	24,780 tCO ₂ e
	2018 – from 01/01/2017 to 31/08/2018	18,265 tCO ₂ e
Total	from 01/01/2015 to 31/08/2018	98,842 tCO₂e

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
AURA	Asesoría en Arquitectura y Urbanismo Social (ICS Implementer)
BL	Baseline
CA	Corrective Action / Clarification Action
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CDT	Corazón de la Tierra (ICS implementer)
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CL	Clarification Request
CME	Coordinating Managing Entity
CMNC	Non-Certified Improved Cook Stove (“Cocina Mejorada non Certificada”)
CT	Traditional Cook Stove (“Cocina Tradicional”)
CWCP	Cumulated Weighted Crediting Period
DNH	Do Not Harm
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
DVerR	Draft Verification Report
ER	Emission Reduction
ESM	Ecocina Stove Mexico (ICS Implementer)
ESPL	Earthood Services Private Limited
FAR	Forward Action Request
FPCV	Fondo Pro Cuenca Valle de Bravo (ICS implementer)
FPP	Fondo para la Paz (ICS implementer)
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
GIRA	Grupo Interdisciplinario de Tecnología Rural Apropiada (ICS implementer)
GS	Gold Standard
HH	Household
ICS	Improved Cook Stove
KS	Kitchen Survey
KT	Kitchen Test
LPP	Local Project Participant
MAI	Mean Annual Increment
MP	Monitoring Plan
MR	Monitoring Report
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NRB	Non-Renewable Biomass
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PA	Project Activity
PoA	Programme of Activities
PoA-DD	Programme of Activities Design Document
PP	Project Participant
PS	Project Scenario
QA/QC	Quality Assurance / Quality Control
SD	Sustainable Development
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
STI	Stove Team International (Financial and technical support to ICS implementer)
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VAD	Fundación Vamos a Dar (ICS Implementer)
VDQ	Vasco de Quiroga (ICS Implementer)

VER	Verified Emission Reduction
VPA	Voluntary Programme of Activities
VPA-DD	Voluntary Programme of Activities Design Document
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard
XLS	Emission Reduction Calculation Spread Sheet

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

Competence Statement			
Name	Marcelo Sebben		
Country	Brazil		
Education	M.Sc. (Sustainable Energy System) B. Eng. (Chemical Engineering)		
Experience	12.5 Years		
Field	Chemical process industry, CDM, Energy, Climate Change		
Approved Roles			
Team Leader	Yes		
Validator	Yes		
Verifier	Yes		
Methodology Expert	Yes (ACM0001, ACM0002, ACM0006, AM0065, AMS ID)		
Local expert	Brazil, Chile, Honduras		
Financial Expert	No		
Technical Reviewer	Yes		
TA Expert	Yes (TA 1.1, 1.2, 5.1, 13.1)		
Reviewed by	Abhishek Mahawar	Date	01/03/2018
Approved by	Ashok Kumar Gautam	Date	01/03/2018

Competence Statement			
Name	Ricardo Lopes		
Country	Brazil		
Education	Technical Diploma in Data Processing		
Experience	12 years		
Field	CDM, Energy, Environment		
Approved Roles			
Team Leader	Yes		
Validator	Yes		
Verifier	Yes		
Methodology Expert	Yes (ACM0001, ACM0002, AM0026, AMS ID, AMS IIH)		
Local expert	Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Uruguay		
Financial Expert	NO		
Technical Reviewer	Yes		
TA Expert	Yes (1.2, 13.1)		
Reviewed by	Abhishek Mahawar	Date	22/02/2018
Approved by	Ashok Kumar Gautam	Date	22/02/2018

Competence Statement			
Name	Sergio Bonanno Cruz		
Country	Brazil		
Education	Post Graduate Diploma in Environment		
Experience	25 Years		
Field	Environmental Law, CDM, Energy, Climate Change		
Approved Roles			
Team Leader	Yes		
Validator	Yes		
Verifier	Yes		
Methodology Expert	Yes (ACM0001, ACM0002, AM0026, ACM0006, AMS ID)		
Local expert	Brazil, Chile		
Financial Expert	No		
Technical Reviewer	Yes		
TA Expert	Yes (TA 1.2, 13.1)		
Reviewed by	Abhishek Mahawar	Date	01/03/2018
Approved by	Ashok Kumar Gautam	Date	01/03/2018

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1.	UNFCCC	Standard: CDM PS for PoA	version 01.0	Other
2.	UNFCCC	Standard: CDM PCP for PoA	version 01.0	Other
3.	UNFCCC	Standard: CDM VVS for PoA	version 01.0	Other
4.	GS	Methodology: Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption	version 1.0	Other
5.	CME	PoA - PoA design document - PoA Passport	version 11 – 22/05/2015 version 6 – 22/05/2015	Other
6.	CME	VPA 4 - VPA design document - VPA Passport	version 9 – 22/05/2015 version 5 – 22/05/2015	Other
7.	CME	Monitoring Report – VPA 4	version 1 – 27/08/2018 version 2 – 07/11/2018 version 3– 20/11/2018 Version 4 – 17/01/2019 Version 5 – 12/02/2019 (final)	CME
8.	CME	ER calculations spreadsheet – VPA 4 - AURA - FPCV _{Plancha}	version 1; version 2 version 3 version 1;	CME

		- FPCV_{Tierra compactada} - FPP_{Onil} - FPP_{Patsari} - GIRA	version 2 version 3 version 1; version 2 version 3 version 1; version 2 version 3 version 1; version 2 version 3 version 1 version 2 version 3	
9.	CME	SDG calculations spreadsheet – VPA 4 - AURA - FPCV_{Plancha} - FPCV_{Tierra compactada} - FPP_{Onil} - FPP_{Patsari} - GIRA	version 1; version 2 version 3 version 1; version 2 version 3 version 1; version 2 version 3 version 1; version 2 version 3 version 1; version 2 version 3 version 1 version 2 version 3	CME
10.	CME	Surveys spreadsheet – VPA 4 - AURA - FPCV_{Plancha} - FPCV_{Tierra compactada} - FPP_{Onil} - FPP_{Patsari}	version 1; version 2 version 3 version 1; version 2 version 3 version 1; version 2 version 3 version 1; version 2 version 3 version 1; version 2 version 3 version 1;	CME

		- GIRA	version 2 version 3 version 1 version 2 version 3	
11.	LPPs	<u>Delivery Acts</u> – samples	-	CME
12.	LPPs	<u>List of workers:</u> - AURA - FPCV - FPP - GIRA	- - -	CME
13.	CME	<u>Transition Documents:</u> - Transition Review under Gold Standard for the Global Goals - Transition Annex-Microsol Utsil Naj PoA 20180612	29/06/2018 Sept/2017	Other
14.	-	Gold Standard for Global Goals	https://www.goldstandard.org/tags/g4gg	Other
15.	-	UNFCCC	http://cdm.unfccc.int	Other

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

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

FAR ID	0x	Section no.	x	Date : x
Description of FAR/CL				
<i>Not Applicable</i>				
Project participant response				Date : x
Documentation provided by project participant				
-				
DOE assessment				Date: xx

Table 2. CL from this verification

CL ID	01	Section no.	E.1.1	Date : 20/09/2018
Description of CL				
<i>MR 2nd page:</i> - The MR is not in accordance with the GS MR template version 1 (2nd page items) - The estimated ER presented are not in accordance with VPA-DD nor with section E.4 of the MR. Moreover, not only the Red Patsari is requesting ER during this MP as stated by the foot note #1				
Project participant response				Date : 07/11/2018

- Indeed, there were item titles on the second page that were not in line with the GS template version 1. The corrections have been made and a missing line has been added. Please refer to the 2nd page of the revised MR.
- Indeed, the Estimated ERs presented at second page of the MR were not in accordance with VPA4-DD. The estimated annual amount has been corrected from 146,496 tCO₂e to 83,712 tCO₂e. This value has been obtained from table A.10 of VPA4-DD v8 which is the sum of the annual values from the specific LPPs requesting issuance in this verification, as presented below:

Annual average GHG ERs over the CP (CO ₂ e)				
FPCV	FPP	Aura	Red Patsari	Total for VPA4
4,173	15,571	30,382	33,586	83,712

As it can be observed, annual estimated values in the VPA-DD are presented at LPP level without differentiating the stove model for each LPP. Moreover, values in the VPA-DD from GIRA, VDQ and VAD are presented at an aggregated level under a common coordinating structure called "Red Patsari". Since there are no specific data for GIRA, the annual average from the Red Patsari has been used in the MR for estimating the ERs. A specification has been added in Cell B21 at Tab "Estimated vs actual ER" of the ER calculation Excel of GIRA explaining the reference values. In addition to the annual amount, the estimated amount for the monitoring period of 1339 days has been included (406,186 tCO₂e). This value is in accordance with the one presented at section E.4 and corresponds to the sum over all ERs estimated (4 LPPs) for the current MP (01/01/2015 - 31/08/2018) as follows:

ERs estimated for the current MP: 01/01/2015 - 31/08/2018	
AURA	141,842
FPCV Tierra compactada	20,380
FPCV Plancha	
FPP Onil	76,326
FPP Patsari	
GIRA (RED PATSARI values)	167,637
Total	406,186

For further details on the calculation of the "ERs estimated for current MP" value, please refer to the corresponding ER calculations excels of each LPP at tab "Estimated vs. Actual ERs".

Finally, with respect to the comment "*only the Red Patsari is requesting ER during this MP*", there is no such a statement at footnote #1. On the contrary, the footnote #1 states that the estimated values correspond to four LPPs which are FPCV, FPP, AURA and GIRA who are requesting issuance of credits in this monitoring period, meaning that not only the Red Patsari is requesting issuance for the current MP. A specification has been added to clarify the reason why we use aggregated values of the RED PATSARI for GIRA.

Documentation provided by project participant

In the folder "Revised Documents" > "MR"

- Word File "UN VPA4 - MR - MP2 v2"

In the file "Revised Documents" > "ER calculations"

- Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPCV plancha_ERs v2"
- Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPCV tierra compactada_ERs v2"
- Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPP Onil_ERs v2"
- Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPP Patsari_ERs v2"
- Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 GIRA_ERs v2"

Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 AURA_ERs v2"

DOE assessment

Date: 12/11/2018

- The MR template now is in accordance with the template provided by the GS website.
- Explanation was given regarding the estimated ERs. The values presented for annual average and total estimated for the period are now traceable in the excel sheets provided to the verification team.

CL is closed

CL ID	02	Section no.	E.3.4.2	Date : 20/09/2018
Description of CL				
<i>MR section D.2, parameter SDG 8: it is not justified the reasons for the values of parameter being "Not applicable" for AURA and GIRA</i>				
Project participant response				Date : 07/11/2018
The indicator "Equal pay for work of equal value for both women and men" analyses the proportion of job positions in which women and men are equally paid. In both cases, for LPP AURA and LPP GIRA, a comparison cannot be made because within the organization there are no employees with the same job positions and different genders. Footnotes (#10 and #11) have been added to the MR to clarify the situation. In addition, corrections for LPPs FPCV and FPP have been made since the percentages were not well calculated. Please refer to the List of workers included in the revised ER calculation excels of both LPPs, and to section D.2 of the revised MR to follow the changes. Also, please refer to footnotes #12 and #13 of the revised MR.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
In the folder "Revised Documents" > "MR" - Word File "UN VPA4 - MR - MP2 v2" In the file "Revised Documents" > "ER calculations" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPCV plancha_ERs v2" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPCV tierra compactada_ERs v2" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPP Onil_ERs v2" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPP Patsari_ERs v2" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 GIRA_ERs v2" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 AURA_ERs v2"				
DOE assessment				Date: 12/11/2018
Information is now fully given in the MR section D.2. It is clear now that only job positions which have employed different genders can be compared. Moreover, it is well explained in the MR footnote 13 that when difference in wage is observed, it does not refer to any kind of gender discrimination, but years of experience, level of responsibility and performance. The information was clarified in the MR.				
CL is closed				

CL ID	03	Section no.	E.2.3.1	Date : 15/01/2019
Description of CL				
<i>Not all LPPs were monitored during this MP as informed in the VPA-DD</i>				
Project participant response				Date : 17/01/2019
The fall in carbon prices and the subsequent catastrophic market conditions had an impact on the project developers, making their participation difficult in verification activities over the time due to the lack of carbon resources. Nevertheless, the fact that relevant participants such as VAD, ESM, CDT and VDQ are not activated in this verification (MP: 1/01/2015 – 31/08/2018) does not imply their exclusion from the Programme and does not limit the possibility to be reactivated for next verifications. Depending on the negotiation discussions and the current conditions of their ICS, we expect these LPPs participate on the upcoming renewal process, as this way, the beneficiaries (around 90,000 Mexican people living in poverty) have the opportunity to keep being included in the following new crediting period, issue new carbon credits and finally benefit from the Programme's goal: fund sustainability activities to ensure the long-term access and use of clean cooking technologies.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
In the folder "Revised Documents" > "MR" - Word File "UN VPA4 - MR - MP2 v4"				
DOE assessment				Date: 12/11/2018
A temporary deviation of the monitoring plan is being requested between 01/01/2015 and 31/08/2018 as not all LPPs comprehended in this VPA 4 were monitored during this monitoring period. The LPPs that were not monitored are VAD, ESM, CDT and VDQ and their ERs accounted for this period are equal to zero. For further details, please refer to the Assessment on post registration report				
CL is closed				

4 Around 18,000 ICS are included in this VPA. Average size in the projects is 5 people/family.

Table 3. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	01	Section no.	E.3.4.2	Date : 20/09/2018
Description of CAR				
According to the document "Transition Annex-Microsol Utsil Naj PoA 20180612", the SDG #4 corresponds to the following indicators: - Proportion of children having more time to do their class homework - Proportion of children having more time to attend school. - Proportion of people having received capacity-building on the benefits and adequate use of the ICS - Proportion of beneficiaries who participated in ICS construction However, the first two indicators described above were not reported in the MR section D.2				
Project participant response				Date : 07/11/2018
The process of the transition to the Gold Standard for the Global Goals initiated in September 2017 and culminated in July 2018. At the time of programming the survey for the LPPs' monitoring campaigns within the framework of this verification, the inclusion of indicators "Proportion of children having more time to do their class homework" and "Proportion of children having more time to attend school" had not yet been approved by the GS. For this reason, no data referring to these indicators have been collected for the current verification, but they will be gathered in future monitoring campaigns. In order to be consistent with the Transition annex, the specific tables of the two missing parameters have been included at section D.2 of the monitoring report.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
In the folder "Revised Documents" > "MR" - Word File "UN VPA4 - MR - MP2 v2"				
DOE assessment				Date: 12/11/2018
It is recognized by the verification team that due to the amount of ICS installed in the PA, the interviews planning is an issue. It was also checked that the first submission of the transition request was made on 26/09/2017 and the final GS feedback was given on 29/06/2018. It is stated in the transition document "GS1005_GS1377_GS4GG_Transition_Review_Final" that these both parameters were adjusted in order to attend to the GS requirements, thus it is comprehensible that this information might not be used for the surveys at the moment of this monitoring period. It was observed in the MR that these both parameters were not included in this monitoring period.				
CL is closed.				

CAR ID	02	Section no.	E.3.4.2	Date : 20/09/2018
Description of CAR				
According to the document "Transition Annex-Microsol Utsil Naj PoA 20180612", the SDG #5 have been removed from the monitoring parameters. However it is not reflected in the MR section D.2:				
Project participant response				Date : 07/11/2018
Indeed, it was agreed that a positive contribution to SDG 5 would not be claimed until demonstrating compliance with the GS Gender Equality Guidelines & Requirements. Any reference to a positive contribution to the SDG 5 has been removed from the monitoring report (see the front page and section A.1). However, as stated at comment/request 2/4.b of the transition document "GS1005_GS1377_GS4GG_Transition_Review_Final" ("In case PP does not wish to apply the gender guidelines, information/data on SDG # 5 can be reported in project documentation, but will not be certified as "positive" by GS"), the SDG 5 can be reported along the documentation. For this reason, results for indicators "Amount of time saved by women through cooking", "Amount of time saved by women through wood collection" and "Activities carried out by women during saved time" referring to SDG 5 have been kept but clarifications have been added to reflect that the project is not actually claiming contribution for this SDG. Please refer to specific tables of SDG 5 at section D.2 of the revised monitoring report to follow the changes.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
In the folder "Revised Documents" > "MR" Word File "UN VPA4 - MR - MP2 v2"				
DOE assessment				Date: 12/11/2018

It is clear in the transition document that even though SDG#5 will not be claimed as a positive contribution to the project, it can be reported in the MR. This information was given in the MR section D.2. The verification team kept the parameters related to SDG#5 in the verification report. However it was clarified that no positive goals were requested due to this goals as they do not fulfil the GS requirements.

CAR is closed

CAR ID	03	Section no.	E.3.4.2	Date : 20/09/2018
Description of CAR				
<i>During the site visit, it has been observed that the number of ICS reported does not reflect the actual number of ICSs installed.</i>				
Project participant response				Date : 07/11/2018
The number of ICS reported at MR v1 and at MR v2 does reflect the actual number of ICS installed (9,613) and is in accordance with submitted Work plan as clarified by email with the DOE on October 18 th . At early email exchanges, a wrong number of installed stoves for LPP FPP - stove model Onil (601 instead of 618) was provided resulting in a total volume for the whole VPA4 of 9,596 ICS. Nevertheless, in the MR v1, we reported the correct value of ICS installed under the project activity. Also, when the draft version of Work Plan was submitted we noted that the number of stoves was not in accordance with the corresponding MR and asked if an adjustment of the sample size was needed for the site visit (see integrated comment on page 7 of the PDF file attached "GS.F26W. Work Plan for GS4GG Utsil Naj_rMicrosol" sent on August 28 th). We received on August 29 th a new version of the Work Plan with the corrected population value for the VPA. Therefore, the DOE was aware of the correct volume of stoves before the start of the site-visit.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
In the folder "New Documents"> "CAR03": PDF file "GS.F26W. Work Plan for GS4GG Utsil Naj_rMicrosol"				
DOE assessment				Date: 19/11/2018
Correct values of ICSs is being reported in the MR. However it is still not clear why the values reported in the Section D.2 - parameter SDG 7, are not in accordance with table E.3.1 of the MR (pg 38)				
<u>CAR remains open</u>				
Project participant response				Date : 20/11/2018
The parameters "Volume of improved cookstoves implemented per LPP" (table E.3.1) and the parameter "Number of clean cooking technologies implemented and used by the project population" (SDG 7) are different. The calculation for the indicator "Number of clean cooking technologies implemented and used by the project population" considers the usage rate that comes from the Kitchen Surveys, which represent the proportion of ICS that are actually operating. Please refer to cell E16 at tab SDG's calculation of the corresponding ERs calculation excels to verify how the parameter "Number of clean cooking technologies implemented and used by the project population" is obtained.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
UN VPA4 - MR - MP2 v3				
DOE assessment				Date: 21/11/2018
Correct values of ICSs is being reported in the MR. It is now clear that the values reported in SDG 7 and table E.3.1 are not the same.				
<u>CAR is closed</u>				

CAR ID	04	Section no.	E.3.4.2	Date : 20/09/2018
Description of CAR				
<i>MR section D.2: parameter SDG 13 Pb: values reported for FPCV are not the same as reported in the previous monitoring period.</i>				
Project participant response				Date : 07/11/2018
Indeed, the values of P _b were not in accordance with the previous monitoring report, as for this second verification the values were displayed according to the stove model (Plancha and Tierra Compactada) instead of the type of baseline scenario. The values have been corrected, they reflect henceforth the P _b values of each baseline scenario (as presented in cells O5 and R5 at tab "BL & PS emissions" of the ER calculation excel) and are in line with the previous monitoring period's values. This correction has also been applied for LPP FPP where a unique P _b value is now reported instead of one value per stove model (Onil and Patsari) as it was presented in the MR v1. Please refer to section D.2 of the revised monitoring report.				
Documentation provided by project participant				

In the folder "Revised Documents" > "MR"	
Word File "UN VPA4 - MR - MP2 v2"	
DOE assessment	Date: 12/11/2018
Values reported in the MR are now in accordance with baseline data which are demonstrated in the informed cells of the ER calculation spreadsheet.	
CAR is closed	

CAR ID	05	Section no.	E.3.4.2	Date :	20/09/2018																																										
Description of CAR																																															
AURA: The value of the parameter $P_{p,b,y}$ for all project scenarios reported in the MR is not in accordance with the parameters reported in the ER calculations:																																															
Project participant response					Date :																																										
					07/11/2018																																										
The parameter "Daily wood savings of an ICS of project scenario p against a stove from baseline scenario b" is in accordance with the corresponding ER calculation excels (please refer to table C24:K24 at tab "Emission reductions" of each ER calculation excel). The $P_{p,b,y}$ value considers, for each crediting year (2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018), the seasonally weighted wood savings according to their weight in each cookstoves age category. It is important to note that only the average value is reported in the MR as presented below:																																															
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>P(p,b,y) (tons/ICS/day)</th> <th>2015</th> <th>2016</th> <th>2017</th> <th>2018</th> <th>Average</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>$P_{p,b,y}$ AURA</td> <td>0.004140</td> <td>0.004381</td> <td>0.003767</td> <td>0.004372</td> <td>0.00416</td> </tr> <tr> <td>$P_{p,b,y}$ GIRA</td> <td>0.003273</td> <td>0.002831</td> <td>0.002079</td> <td>0.002624</td> <td>0.00270</td> </tr> <tr> <td>$P_{p,b,y}$ FPCV, Plancha</td> <td>0.006335</td> <td>0.006356</td> <td>0.006487</td> <td>0.006675</td> <td>0.00646</td> </tr> <tr> <td>$P_{p,b,y}$ FPCV, Tierra Compactada</td> <td>0.007275</td> <td>0.006909</td> <td>0.006585</td> <td>0.006159</td> <td>0.00673</td> </tr> <tr> <td>$P_{p,b,y}$ FPP, Onil</td> <td>0.010802</td> <td>0.010802</td> <td>0.008469</td> <td>0.007979</td> <td>0.00951</td> </tr> <tr> <td>$P_{p,b,y}$ FPP, Patsari</td> <td>0.006036</td> <td>0.005770</td> <td>0.004929</td> <td>0.005534</td> <td>0.00557</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						P(p,b,y) (tons/ICS/day)	2015	2016	2017	2018	Average	$P_{p,b,y}$ AURA	0.004140	0.004381	0.003767	0.004372	0.00416	$P_{p,b,y}$ GIRA	0.003273	0.002831	0.002079	0.002624	0.00270	$P_{p,b,y}$ FPCV, Plancha	0.006335	0.006356	0.006487	0.006675	0.00646	$P_{p,b,y}$ FPCV, Tierra Compactada	0.007275	0.006909	0.006585	0.006159	0.00673	$P_{p,b,y}$ FPP, Onil	0.010802	0.010802	0.008469	0.007979	0.00951	$P_{p,b,y}$ FPP, Patsari	0.006036	0.005770	0.004929	0.005534	0.00557
P(p,b,y) (tons/ICS/day)	2015	2016	2017	2018	Average																																										
$P_{p,b,y}$ AURA	0.004140	0.004381	0.003767	0.004372	0.00416																																										
$P_{p,b,y}$ GIRA	0.003273	0.002831	0.002079	0.002624	0.00270																																										
$P_{p,b,y}$ FPCV, Plancha	0.006335	0.006356	0.006487	0.006675	0.00646																																										
$P_{p,b,y}$ FPCV, Tierra Compactada	0.007275	0.006909	0.006585	0.006159	0.00673																																										
$P_{p,b,y}$ FPP, Onil	0.010802	0.010802	0.008469	0.007979	0.00951																																										
$P_{p,b,y}$ FPP, Patsari	0.006036	0.005770	0.004929	0.005534	0.00557																																										
In order to clarify the calculation of the parameter $P_{p,b,y}$ the average value has been added in the ER calculation excel at cell L24 of tab "Emission reductions" for each project scenario.																																															
Documentation provided by project participant																																															
In the file "Revised Documents" > "ER calculations" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPCV plancha_ERs v2" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPCV tierra compactada_ERs v2" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPP Onil_ERs v2" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPP Patsari_ERs v2" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 GIRA_ERs v2" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 AURA_ERs v2"																																															
DOE assessment					Date: 12/11/2018																																										
The values are now in accordance with ER calculations spreadsheet. Clarification was included in the section "Calculation method" of the parameter in section D.2 of the MR.																																															
CAR is closed																																															

CAR ID	06	Section no.	E.3.5.5	Date :	20/09/2018
Description of CAR					
The comparison of Estimated x actual ERs presented in the ER calculations from FPP patsari/Onil, from Gira and from FPCV tierra/plancha are not taking into consideration the correct amount of actual ERs for each model.					
Project participant response					Date :
					07/11/2018
The values of actual ERs have been corrected for project scenarios FPP Patsari/Onil, FPCV Tierra/Plancha and GIRA. Please refer to tab "Estimated vs Actual ERs" in the revised ER calculation excels.					
Documentation provided by project participant					

In the file "Revised Documents" > "ER calculations"	
- Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPCV plancha_ERs v2" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPCV tierra compactada_ERs v2" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPP Onil_ERs v2" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 FPP Patsari_ERs v2" - Excel File "UN VPA4 MP2 GIRA_ERs v2"	
DOE assessment	Date: 12/11/2018
Values are now correct in the ER calculation spreadsheet and duly reported in the MR. The comparison from FPP patsari/Onil, from Gira and from FPCV tierra/plancha are now taking into consideration the correct amount of ERs achieved. <u>CL is closed</u>	

Table 4. FAR from this verification

There is no FAR from this verification.

- - - - -

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
02.0	29 December 2017	Revision to align with the requirements of the “CDM validation and verification standard for programme of activities” (version 01.0).
01.0	5 June 2015	Initial publication.

Decision Class: Regulatory
Document Type: Form
Business Function: Issuance
Keywords: programme of activities, verifying and certifying