

GOLD STANDARD VERIFICATION REPORT

For: CO2 Balance UK Limited

REPORT NO.: GS7456-60 VER02



Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 1 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Abbreviations used in this Report

CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CL	Clarification request
CO2	Carbon dioxide
CO2e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
DNA	Designated National Authority
DR	Document Review
EF	Emission Factor
ERPA	Emission Reduction Purchase Agreement
ER	Emission Reductions
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
FAR	Forward Action Request
GWP	Global Warming Potential
GS	Gold Standard
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IRR	Internal Rate of Return
kWh	Kilo Watt Hour
MW	Mega Watt
NC	Non-Conformity
NCV	Net Calorific Value
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PDD	Project Design Document
PD	Project Developer
tCO2e	Tonnes of CO2 equivalents
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
BH	Borehole
GS4GG	Gold Standard for the Global Goals
ICS	Improved Cookstove
MWh	MegaWattHour
CH4	Methane
MR	Monitoring Report
N2O	Nitrous Oxide
POA	Programme of Activity
SGP	Safeguarding Principles
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 2 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



SC	SustainCERT
TPDDTE C	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralised Thermal Energy Consumption
UN	United Nations
VVB	Validation and Verification Body
VER	Verified Emission Reduction
VPA	Voluntary Project Activity

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 3 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/2022	



Table of Contents

1	OBJECTIVE AND CRITERIA.....	5
1.1	Objective	5
1.2	SCOPE.....	5
1.3	Criteria	6
2	Team composition.....	6
3	Project Information.....	6
3.1	Monitoring Period	6
3.2	Annual projections.....	7
4	VERIFICATION OPINION	8
5	METHODOLOGY.....	9
5.1	Desk Review	9
5.2	Site Visit	10

Appendix: 1- CLARIFICATION REQUESTS, CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS	11
Appendix: 2 - FORWARD ACTION REQUESTS	33

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 4 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



1 OBJECTIVE AND CRITERIA

1.1 Objective

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

The objective of this verification is to determine if the GHG statement and other reporting information is accurate and conforms with the criteria defined in Gold Standard rules.

This report details the objectives, scope, criteria, methodology and findings of this process and a final opinion.

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

1.2 SCOPE

GHG related activity	Verification
Project Title (s)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GS1247 VPA 190 Zambia Eastern Province Safe Water Project (GS7456) 2. GS1247 VPA 191 Zambia Eastern Province Safe Water Project (GS7457) 3. GS1247 VPA 192 Zambia Eastern Province Safe Water Project (GS7458) 4. GS1247 VPA 193 Zambia Eastern Province Safe Water Project (GS7459) 5. GS1247 VPA 194 Zambia Eastern Province Safe Water Project (GS7460)
GS ID (s)	GS 7456-60
GS Project Type	SWS
PoA Title (if applicable)	Improved Kitchen Regimes Multi-Country PoA
POA ID (if applicable)	GS 1247

The scope of verification covers the emissions reductions project in that is prepared in accordance with the Monitoring Report of GS 7456-60 listed above.

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

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 5 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



1.3 Criteria

The criteria for this verification are defined in the following documents stated in the Monitoring Report (MR)

- GS4GG Principles & Requirements
- GS4GG Stakeholder Consultation Requirements & Guidelines
- GS4GG Safeguarding Principles & Requirements
- GS4GG GHG-Emissions-Reduction-Sequestration-Product-Requirements
- *Design Certified PDD*

Optional Requirements

- 100-GS4GG-Programme-of-Activity-Requirements-
- Applied methodology *TPDDTEC, Ver. 01*

2 TEAM COMPOSITION

Verification Team

Name	Qualification	Coverage of sectoral/technical area	Host country experience	Conducted Site visit / Remote Audit
ANURAG JUYAL	TL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Energy)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ROHIT BADAYA	Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Energy)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-

Independent Review team and approver

Name	Role	Coverage of technical area
SHIVRAJ SHARMA	Independent R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (All)
JAVIER CASTRO	Approver	NA

3 PROJECT INFORMATION

3.1 Monitoring Period

Start of Monitoring Period	16/08/2020 (ALL VPAs)
End of Monitoring period	15/08/2021 (ALL VPAs)
Total Emission Reductions	VPA 190/GS7456 – 2,985 VPA 191/GS7457 – 2,674 VPA 192/GS7458 – 3,454 VPA 193/GS7459 – 3,221 VPA 194/GS7460 – 3,426
Total SDG 3	Additional people consuming safe water:

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 6 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



	VPA 190/GS7456 – 2,035 VPA 191/GS7457 – 1,966 VPA 192/GS7458 – 2,083 VPA 193/GS7459 – 2,067 VPA 194/GS7460 – 2,101
Total SDG 5	Time saved collecting water and firewood per trip: 0.71 hours (All VPAs)
Total SDG 6	Additional people with access to safe water: VPA 190/GS7456 – 2,025 VPA 191/GS7457 – 1,957 VPA 192/GS7458 – 2,073 VPA 193/GS7459 – 2,058 VPA 194/GS7460 – 2,091
Total SDG 13	VPA 190/GS7456 – 2,985 VPA 191/GS7457 – 2,674 VPA 192/GS7458 – 3,454 VPA 193/GS7459 – 3,221 VPA 194/GS7460 – 3,426
Date of MR Report	02/03/2022
Version of MR Report	4

3.2 Annual projections

Annual Average Emission Reductions (SDG 13)	10,000 tCO2e (for all VPAs as per the registered VPA-DD)
Total SDG 3	Additional people consuming safe water: VPA 190/GS7456 – 2,035 VPA 191/GS7457 – 1,966 VPA 192/GS7458 – 2,083 VPA 193/GS7459 – 2,067 VPA 194/GS7460 – 2,101
Total SDG 5	Time saved collecting water and firewood per trip: 0.71 hours (All VPAs)
Total SDG 6	Additional people with access to safe water: VPA 190/GS7456 – 2,025 VPA 191/GS7457 – 1,957

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 7 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



VPA 192/GS7458 – 2,073
 VPA 193/GS7459 – 2,058
 VPA 194/GS7460 – 2,091

4 VERIFICATION OPINION

Unmodified Opinion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Modified Opinion (see reasons below)	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Adverse Opinion (see reasons below)	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Disclaimer of Opinion	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

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

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

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

Conclusion:

SustainCERT (SC) concludes that:

The GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements for the monitoring period and has been prepared in accordance with the verification criteria and is a materially correct and fair representation of GHG other reporting information.

Our opinion refers to reported project's information on GHG emissions and resulting reductions, which were determined using the valid and certified baseline, monitoring plan and other relevant documents.

Based on the information we have assessed; we can confirm that the implementation of the project resulted in the emission reductions during the corresponding monitoring period.

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 8 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Authorised Signatory Name:	Javier Castro – Head of Certification
Signature	<p>DocuSigned by:</p>  <p>6412AD16AA1143B...</p>
Date of this report approval	13/05/2022
Version of this report	01
Office Location	Luxembourg

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

The responsible party is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of the GHG statement in accordance with the criteria.

5 METHODOLOGY

5.1 Desk Review

An initial verification documentary review was conducted by SustainCERT involving

- A review of the data and information presented in the MR to verify their completeness.
- A review of the approved monitoring plan and monitoring methodology
- An evaluation of data management and quality control system used in the generation and reporting of data and information

A Protocol was used to assess each requirement during the execution of assessment activities and is explained below.

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

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

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

- OK - issued when a requirement has been met.
- CAR (Corrective Action Request) - issued if one of the following occurs:
 - There is a risk that emission reductions cannot be monitored or calculated

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 9 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



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

To demonstrate transparency, all Findings are transferred to a separate Review Feedback table (shown below) to provide a written record of how they are discussed and how the conclusion was reached. A transcript of the Review Feedback is available as Appendix 1, which also includes a list of the Supporting Document (s) provided and reviewed.

5.2 Site Visit

A site visit is chosen based on risk assessment.

It was determined during our Risk Analysis that a site was not required for this verification because a *microscale VPA must be subjected to an Objective Observer appraisal and site visit at least once within three years of date of VPA inclusion or start of crediting period, whichever is later.*

The same is in accordance with PoA rules

9.1.1 In view of the inclusion and verification of VPAs to a mPoA, a target- random approach is applied to the VPAs appraisal, making use of an Objective Observer at inclusion and/or verification stage.

9.1.2 A microscale VPA must be subjected to an Objective Observer appraisal and site visit at least once within three years of date of VPA inclusion or start of crediting period, whichever is later.

The project was design certified on 14/04/2020 and the CP start date is in August 2019 and the OO visit was carried out on 12/10/2020.

No physical site visit was therefore undertaken during the current verification.

A remote site visit was conducted via remote document & data review during this verification.

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 10 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	

Appendix: 1- CLARIFICATION REQUESTS, CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS

GS1247 VPA 190-194 Zambia Eastern Province Safe Water Project (GS 7456-60) – 2nd MP**Internal Verification Form for GS Micro Scale Projects and Micro VPAs under Gold Standard for the Global Goals**

Project summary	
Project Type:	Energy Efficiency-Domestic/Safe Water Project
Micro Scale Limit:	10,000
Project Location:	Zambia
Impact Methodology Applied:	TPDDTEC, version 01
Date of Project Design Certification:	14/04/2020
Start Date of Crediting Period:	16/08/2019
Date of Last OO visit	12/10/2020 - 15/10/2020
PoA Title and GS ID (for Micro VPA):	PoA Title & ID: GS1247 Improved Kitchen Regimes Multi-Country PoA
<p>Project details: The Micro-Scale VPA Zambia Eastern Province Community Safe Water project is eligible under the Gold Standard methodology Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption Version 1.0. By providing safe water, the project will ensure that households consume less firewood during the process of water purification and as a result there shall be a reduction of carbon dioxide emissions from the combustion process.</p> <p>Lundazi District in Eastern Province, Zambia is a largely rural district in which local people typically use wood fuel on inefficient three stone fires to boil their drinking water for purification. This process results in the release of greenhouse gas emissions from the combustion of wood - this can be avoided if a technology that does not require fuel (wood or fossil) supplies clean water desired by households. The Micro-Scale VPA Zambia Eastern Province Safe Water project is eligible under the Gold Standard methodology Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption Version 1.0. By providing safe water, the project will ensure that households consume less firewood during the process of water purification and as a result there shall be a reduction of carbon dioxide emissions from the combustion process.</p>	

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 11 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Many existing safe water sources in Lundazi District have fallen into disrepair because maintenance programmes have been poorly managed or proven too expensive. In this project local NGO, Reformed Open Community Schools (ROCS), will work with British company CO2balance to rehabilitate and maintain water points so that they deliver clean, safe water. The project will ensure that the quality of the water delivered by the safe water sources is fit for human consumption for the entire length of the project, which will be a minimum of five years. The number of water points per VPA will be limited by the amount of pure water supplied by each unit. Based on ex-ante calculations, the maximum number of water points that can be rehabilitated in one VPA will be limited by 10,000 tCO2e.

<u>Monitoring Period Information</u>	
Duration of this monitoring period:	16/08/2020 to 15/08/2021
Crediting Period Sequence Number:	1 st Crediting period
Monitoring Period Sequence Number:	2 nd Monitoring period
SDG Impacts (min 3):	
SDG 03. Good Health and Well-being	<p>Additional people consuming safe water:</p> <p>VPA 190/GS7456 – 2,035 VPA 191/GS7457 – 1,966 VPA 192/GS7458 – 2,083 VPA 193/GS7459 – 2,067 VPA 194/GS7460 – 2,101</p>
SDG 05. Gender Equality	Time saved collecting water and firewood per trip: 0.71 hours (All VPAs)
SDG 06. Clean Water and Sanitation	<p>Additional people with access to safe water:</p> <p>VPA 190/GS7456 – 2,025 VPA 191/GS7457 – 1,957 VPA 192/GS7458 – 2,073 VPA 193/GS7459 – 2,058 VPA 194/GS7460 – 2,091</p>
SDG 13. Climate Action	Emission Reductions: tCO2e

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 12 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



	VPA 190/GS7456 – 2,985 VPA 191/GS7457 – 2,674 VPA 192/GS7458 – 3,454 VPA 193/GS7459 – 3,221 VPA 194/GS7460 – 3,426
Product Totals:	VPA 190/GS7456 – 2,985 VPA 191/GS7457 – 2,674 VPA 192/GS7458 – 3,454 VPA 193/GS7459 – 3,221 VPA 194/GS7460 – 3,426
Vintage Break	
16/08/2020 to 31/12/2020	GS7456 – 1,065 GS7457 – 931 GS7458 – 1,300 GS7459 – 1,173 GS7460 – 1,267
01/01/2021 to 15/08/2021	GS7456 – 1,920 GS7457 – 1,743 GS7458 – 2,154 GS7459 – 2,048 GS7460 – 2,159

OO Assigned	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------------	------------------------------	--

Review Feedback Round:	iii
------------------------	-----

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 13 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Version number of the PDD	4
Completion date of version (MR)	23/11/2021
Supporting Document (s) provided and Reviewed (round 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gold Standard Monitoring Report (GS7456-60 Monitoring Report v1.pdf) • Emission Reduction Calculation Excel File (GS7456 ER Calcs MP2 v1.xlsx)
Supporting Document (s) provided and Reviewed (round 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gold Standard Monitoring Report (GS7456-60 Monitoring Report v2 CLEAN) • Gold Standard Monitoring Report (GS7456-60 Monitoring Report v2 TRACKED) • Emission Reduction Calculation Excel File (GS7457 ER Calcs MP2 v2) • MP2 Project Survey Data & Results • MP2 Usage Survey Data & Results • WASH & Minor Maintenance Agendas 2021 • Q1 WQT Random Sample • WASH and Minor Maintenance Agendas 2021(1)
Supporting Document (s) provided and Reviewed (round 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gold Standard Monitoring Report (GS7456-60 Monitoring Report v3 CLEAN) • Gold Standard Monitoring Report (GS7456-60 Monitoring Report v3 TRACKED) • MP2 Project Survey Data Results • MP2 Usage Survey Data and Results • WQ testing dates (1)
Supporting Document (s) provided and Reviewed (round 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GS7456-60 ER Calcs MP2 v3 • GS7456-60 Monitoring Report v5 TRACKED • Retest Results • Water Quality Testing v.2

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 14 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Decision:

Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/>
Request for clarifications and /or corrective action	<input type="checkbox"/>
To be submitted for external verification	<input type="checkbox"/>
Verified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Review Results: Please respond to the following comments and/or requests for additional information and update your project documentation where needed.

Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
Cover Page	The “blue text box” in the KPI section of the MR shall be deleted in line with the MR filling guidelines.	PP has deleted.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	
General	As the project is a microscale project, it shall be clarified whether an Objective Observer has been selected for this assignment. If an Objective Observer has been selected, the VAR must be finalised and any observed risks reviewed during and prior to the completion of verification shall be reported.	An OO has not been selected.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	
PoA KPI	It is observed that version 11 and version 14 of the PoA-DD is available on the SustainCERT website (both corresponding to the 2 nd CP). The PD shall confirm that the version 11 of the PoA-DD is	PP confirms that version 11 of the PoA-DD is applicable to this MP.

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 15 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
	applicable to the monitoring period under Verification as indicated in the MR.	
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> However it shall also be clarified as why the version 14 of the PoA-DD is not applicable to this VPA. Clarify. The Comment/Request is open.</p>	<p><u>PD Response:</u> PP has corrected and updated MR with version number 14 of the PoA-DD, which is the most updated version available.</p>
	<p><u>GS Review Round 3:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	<p><u>PD Response:</u></p>
KPI	<p>The “<i>date of last annual report</i>” has been mentioned as “15/08/2020”, however the Annual report is not traceable on the SustainCERT website. Hence the relevant evidence for the submission of the Annual report shall be provided.</p>	 <p>PP has attached a screenshot of the final Monitoring Report uploaded to Sustain Cert at Performance Review.</p>
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The PD shall note that the “Annual Report” is different from the “Monitoring report”. In case the “Annual Report” has not been submitted, the same may be indicated accordingly (may be indicated as N/A). The Comment/Request is open.</p>	<p><u>PD Response:</u> This project does not require an Annual Report since the Monitoring Report is completed annually. Therefore, PP has corrected the “date of annual report” to N/A.</p>
	<p><u>GS Review Round 3:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	<p><u>PD Response:</u></p>

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 16 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
KPI	The duration of the monitoring period shall be provided in the format “DD/MM/YYYY” inline with the MR filling guidelines.	PP has corrected.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	
Table 1	The Net Benefit corresponding to the SDG 5 is “0.55 hours” as per the Table 1, while the same is “0.53 hours” as per the Section E.4 of the MR. The observed differences shall be clarified.	PP has corrected and made consistent with the figure calculated in the Emission Reductions.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	
Table 1	The Net Benefit corresponding to the SDG6 is “2,025 people” as per the Table 1, while the same is “2,035 people” as per the Section E.4 of the MR. The observed differences shall be clarified.	PP has corrected and made consistent.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	
Table 2	The start of the monitoring period has been considered from “15/08/2020” corresponding to the 1 st vintage. However the start date of the monitoring period is “16/08/20” (Cell B2) as per the “Summary” spreadsheet of the “ERs Excelsheet”. Check.	PP has corrected. The correct date is 16/08/2020.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	
Section A.3	The reference of the relevant tools/mandatory GS guidelines etc. shall also be provided. As the project applies the TPDDTEC methodology, the GS Usage Rate guidelines shall also be referenced.	The only relevant tool used has already been quoted in Section A.3. The only GS Usage Rate guideline available is https://globalgoals.goldstandard.org/standards/407G_V1.0_EE_ICS_TPDDTEC_Usage-

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 17 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
		guidelines.pdf ” however this is only for improved cookstove projects. Is this the correct guideline to be included?
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	
Section B.1.1	<p><u>FARs from the previous Verification</u> FAR#1: As per the FAR#1, a copy of the “<i>Usage survey format</i>” shall be submitted for the SustainCERT approval prior to conducting the study. Hence it shall be confirmed in the reply as when the approval from SustainCERT was granted on the Usage survey format. Hence the required and relevant details shall be provided in the Section B.1.1 of MR. Further the updated “<i>Usage survey format</i>” shall be submitted.</p> <p>FAR#2: The “<i>maintenance programme document</i>” shall be submitted as reference by the PD in the MR. Further brief information on the “<i>maintenance programme roles and responsibilities</i>” shall also be included in the MR.</p> <p>FAR#3: With reference to the raised FAR, more clarity shall be provided on the parameters as what cap has been applied during the monitoring period.</p>	<p>FAR#1: PP has included information regarding the approval of the Usage survey in Section B.1.1.</p> <p>PP has uploaded the updated Usage survey.</p> <p>FAR#2: PP has uploaded the Maintenance Programme Document.</p> <p>FAR#3: PP has included additional information in Section B.1.1.</p>
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> FAR#1: It is mentioned in the Section A.1 of MR that “<i>By providing safe water, the project will ensure that households consume less firewood during the</i></p>	<p>PD Response: Column CC is part of the Usage Survey spreadsheet and not the ER spreadsheet.</p>

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 18 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
	<p><i>process of water purification and as a result there shall be a reduction of carbon dioxide emissions from the combustion process".</i></p> <p><i>"The project will ensure that the quality of the water delivered by the safe water sources is fit for human consumption for the entire length of the project, which will be a minimum of five years".</i></p> <p>However it is traceable from the Column "CC" of the "Results & Analysis" spreadsheet of the "ERs Excelsheet" that purpose of the water is for <i>"personal hygiene, food preparation, water for animals, washing clothes, washing utensils, water for crops"</i>. The PD shall confirm whether the above mentioned activities are part of the objective (water consumption) of the project activity. Hence more details shall be provided in this regard.</p> <p>The Comment/Request is open.</p>	<p>We only claim emissions reductions from drinking, basic personal hygiene, and food preparation. Other water uses are not claimed for.</p>
	<p><u>GS Review Round 3:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	<p><u>PD Response:</u></p>
Section D.1	<p>The fNRB (Fractional non-renewability) has been considered as <i>"ex-ante parameter"</i> in Section D.1, however the same is a monitored parameter as per the registered PDD. Hence the parameter (fNRB) shall be considered as a monitoring parameter inline with the registered PDD.</p>	<p>PP has corrected.</p>
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 19 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
Section D.2	Parameter (Np,y: Project Technology Days): The Borehole downtime (days) shall also be included in the monitoring parameter table.	PP has included.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	
Section D.2	The source of data used for the fNRB value of 0.81 are old, hence it shall be clarified as how the fNRB value (0.81) is applicable to the current monitoring period.	PP has updated fNRB to a new value calculated in a March 2021 report by C4EcoSolutions using CDM Tool 30 EB 108 Annex 11 v3.0 2020. PP has uploaded the report and the MR and ex-antes have been updated accordingly.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	
Section D.2	<p>The following parameters have not been monitored during the current monitoring period inline with the registered PDD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reported cases of corruption arising from project activity - Community maintenance trainings - WASH trainings <p>Clarify.</p>	<p>PP has uploaded WASH and community maintenance training evidence.</p> <p>Regarding cases of corruption, as explained in the PDD at the Validation stage, corruption cases are monitored through a continuous input mechanism. Project beneficiaries are able to contact the project developer and implementer through the continuous grievance mechanism to report any form of corruption. No cases of corruption have been identified, so no reports or evidence can be shared.</p>
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> <p>The PD shall monitor the above parameters (<i>reported cases of corruption arising from project activity, community maintenance trainings, WASH trainings</i>) in the monitoring parameter table format as per the requirements of the parameter table in the registered VPA-DD. Hence more details shall be included in the VPA-DD.</p>	<p><u>PD Response:</u> PP has updated the monitoring parameter table accordingly.</p>

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 20 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
	The Comment/Request is open.	
	<p>GS Review Round 3:</p> <p>For the parameter (<i>Reported cases of corruption arising from project activity</i>), no details have been provided in the row “Values applied” in the monitoring parameter table. The futuristic statement (<i>the communities will be able to communicate any cases of corruption through the continuous input mechanism. The continuous input mechanism will be monitored, and any reports of corruption will be acted on</i>) shall be corrected and the actual scenario related to the current monitoring period shall be reported.</p> <p>For the parameter (<i>Community maintenance training</i>), no details have been provided in the row “Values applied” in the monitoring parameter table. The futuristic statement (<i>training will be conducted at the beginning of the project on conducting minor maintenance</i>) shall be corrected and the actual scenario related to the current monitoring period shall be reported.</p> <p>For the parameter (WASH training), the futuristic statement (<i>for each borehole rehabilitated within this project a WASH programme will be carried out</i></p>	<p>PD Response:</p> <p>PP has corrected.</p> <p>Round 4</p> <p>Request/comment is closed.</p>

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 21 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
	<p><i>by the project including WASH training at the beginning of the project, as well as subsequent WASH follow-up trainings. Each training will follow an agenda and have a participation list collected. The trainings will involve introducing the concept of WASH, duties of village WASH and provide hands-on demonstrations with the community group) shall be corrected and the actual scenario related to the current monitoring period shall be reported.</i></p> <p>Hence the appropriate additional details shall be provided in the MR.</p> <p>The Comment/Request is open.</p>	
Section D.2	Parameter (<i>Quality of treated water</i>): The Test Reports shall be submitted for review purpose.	PP has submitted WQT reports.
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The “WQT Reports” are not traceable on the SustainCERT website. Please check. The Comment/Request is open.</p>	<p><u>PD Response:</u> PP has resubmitted the WQT reports.</p>
	<p><u>GS Review Round 3:</u> It shall be clearly indicated in the MR as which were the “9 Boreholes which failed to meet all requirements with the national standard and underwent professional treatment and retesting to improve and verify the good water quality”.</p>	<p><u>PD Response:</u> As per the water quality test, only 7 boreholes failed the water quality test in Q1 2021. These included: LUNO15, 18, 19, 23, 25, 34 – for E.Coli and LUNO 10, 34 for turbidity. Please note, LUN039 was also treated and retested despite it not failing the previous test as its turbidity was also high.</p> <p>PP has corrected the number of failed boreholes in the updated MR.</p>

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 22 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
	<p>The PD shall further submit the relevant evidence (i.e., retesting reports) for the verification purpose.</p> <p>The dates of WQT testing in the excel document and the WQT report submitted do not match. PD is requested to clearly explain the testing and re-testing dates in the excel document.</p> <p>PD shall also note that for boreholes that fail testing shall not claim ERs from date of last test to the date of failed test. All of the above shall be clearly explained in the MR and ER sheet.</p> <p>The Comment/Request is open.</p>	<p>Retests for the 7 boreholes which failed in Q1 were conducted between 13/05/21 - 26/05/21 – PP has uploaded the retest certificate, where results can be found on page 5.</p> <p>PP has uploaded a new version of the Water Testing Dates document as the dates in the initial document were incorrect.</p> <p>PP has corrected the failure dates in the ER Calcs and updated the relevant figures throughout the MR. PP has included explanations in the MR on page 29 & 30 and in the ERs on the 'Downdays Summary' tab.</p> <p>Round 4</p> <p>Request/comment is closed.</p>
Section D.2	<p>The parameter "Py" has been defined as "<i>Number of persons consuming safe water</i>" in the MR. However the parameter is defined as "<i>Number of persons having access to safe water in the project activity</i>" as per the Cell C15 of the "SDG Calcs" spreadsheet of the ERs Excelsheet and registered PDD.</p> <p>The observed differences shall be clarified.</p>	<p>Py is defined as the "Number of persons having access to safe water in the project activity". PP has corrected the MR.</p>
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> Further the uncapped value of this parameter does not match between the MR and ERs Excelsheet. Hence consistent value shall be provided in all the documents.</p> <p>The Comment/Request is open.</p>	<p><u>PD Response:</u> PP has corrected in the MR.</p>
	<p><u>GS Review Round 3:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	<p><u>PD Response:</u></p>

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 23 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
Section D.2	<p>The parameter “Tp,y” has been defined as “<i>Project time spent collecting water per household per trip</i>” in the MR. However the parameter is defined as “<i>Project time spent collecting water and firewood per household per day</i>” as per the registered PDD. The observed differences shall be clarified.</p>	PP has corrected.
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	
Section D.2	<p>The PD shall note that all the <u>vintages</u> post 01/01/2021* must use AR5 Global Warming Potentials to calculate emission reductions and removals.</p> <p>AR4 to AR5 GWP summary:</p> <p>CH4 - 25 to 28</p> <p>N2O - 298 to 265</p> <p>All vintages pre 31/12/2020 must use AR4.</p> <p>As the project monitoring period includes the year 2021, hence AR5 shall be applied for the vintage year 2021 and AR4 for the vintage year 2020.</p> <p>Appropriate revisions shall be provided in this regard.</p>	PP has corrected. AR4 values have been applied for 2020 and AR5 values for 2021 figures of this Monitoring Period.
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	
Section D.2	<p>The following supporting documents shall be submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water point project database - Project survey and Usage survey 	<p>PP has submitted.</p> <p>For the Project Survey and Usage Survey, the mobile monitoring app Kobo was used, so downloaded data now substitutes paper scans. The raw data can be found in separate tabs of the spreadsheets.</p>

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 24 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Usage Survey forms used during the surveys (on sample basis) 	
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	
Section D.2	<p>The PD shall note that if the values are measured and capped by a methodology, then both the measured and capped values used for calculations shall be reported. Measured values must be reported in brackets.</p>	<p>The capped and uncapped Py values have been included. We don't use uncapped values for any other calculations and therefore they do not need to be reported.</p>
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	
Section D.2 & ERs Excelsheet	<p>Please refer to the "<i>Downdays Summary</i>" spreadsheet of the "<i>ERs Excelsheet</i>". For the Borehole ID (LUN023), the non-functioning days for Q4 2020 is "1" (15-11-2020), Q1 2021 is "65" (23-03-2021 to 26-05-2021), Q3 2021 is "1" (18-07-2021). Hence the total non-functioning days arrives as "1+65+1" = "67".</p> <p>However the non-functioning days has been provided as "66" (Cell V7).</p> <p>Similar corrections shall also be provided for other Borehole IDs.</p> <p>Further the PD shall note that for the calculation of the "<i>Total Non-functioning Days MP2</i>", the various Cells in the Excelsheet shall be linked to arrive at the total value.</p>	<p>PP has corrected.</p>
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 25 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative								
Section D.2 & ERs Excelsheet	Please refer to the "PTDs" spreadsheet of the "ERs Excelsheet". The Cell J18 mentions " <i>Net Crediting Days per VPA with 95% cap</i> ", however it is observed that cap of 94% has been applied for the year 2021 crediting days. Hence appropriate corrections shall be provided in the Excelsheet.	A conservative cap of 95% for functionality is applied when total functionality is between 95% and 100%. However, VPA GS7456 shows a 94% functionality because it has more non-functioning days and was only functional for 94% of the time. Using the 95% figure would mean overcounting in this case.								
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>									
Section D.2	<p>It has been observed that the following household ids are repeated in the "<i>Borehole HH List</i>" spreadsheet of the ERs Excelsheet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CHAU 010 - CHAU 011 <p>The reasons for the same shall be clarified.</p>	This was a formatting error made when creating the excel document, PP has corrected.								
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The PD shall confirm that similar error does not appear at any other places in the Excelsheet. The Comment/Request is open.</p>	<p><u>PD Response:</u> PP confirms.</p>								
	<p><u>GS Review Round 3:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	<p><u>PD Response:</u></p>								
Section D.2	<p>For the following households, the distance of the Borehole is more than 1 km walking/pedalling distance from the household.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="388 1064 905 1136"> <tr> <td>LUN 024</td> <td>NYA 018</td> <td>NYALUBANGA</td> <td>LUCAS BANDA</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="388 1168 905 1239"> <tr> <td>LUN 032</td> <td>ZOK 038</td> <td>ZOKWE</td> <td>TEDSON ZULU</td> </tr> </table>	LUN 024	NYA 018	NYALUBANGA	LUCAS BANDA	LUN 032	ZOK 038	ZOKWE	TEDSON ZULU	As this project is under GS methodology TPDDTEC v.1 this requirement does not apply.
LUN 024	NYA 018	NYALUBANGA	LUCAS BANDA							
LUN 032	ZOK 038	ZOKWE	TEDSON ZULU							

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 26 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
	Hence it is not clear as how the above households have been included in the calculation of emission reductions as the methodology allows the distance to be within 1 km.	
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	
Section D.2	The page-15 mentions “ <i>Annual Monitoring: Usage and Project Surveys and WCFT</i> ”. As the annual monitoring has been indicated, hence it shall be clarified as when the WCFT corresponding to the current monitoring period has been carried out. Clarify.	The WCFT is a survey conducted bi-annually. As it was conducted in 2020 it will next be conducted in 2022.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> Even if it was conducted in year 2020, the dates of WCFT shall be included in the Monitoring report. The Comment/Request is open.	<u>PD Response:</u> PP has updated the MR accordingly.
	<u>GS Review Round 3:</u> The year has been indicated; however, the date has still not been provided in the MR. Hence more details shall be provided in the MR. The Comment/Request is open.	<u>PD Response:</u> The WCFT was last conducted between 23/06/2020 - 26/06/2020. PP has uploaded an updated MR which states this on pages 16 and 17. Round 4 Request/comment is closed.
Section D.2	Water Quality tests - The PD shall clarify as how it was ensured that the tests were conducted during the season of highest risk of contamination. How the conservative estimation has been used in the calculations shall be clarified.	The rainy season is known to negatively affect groundwater quality due to increased surface runoff etc. The rainy season runs from November to April. As the tests were conducted in Q1 and Q2 they were conducted at the time when water was at the highest risk of contamination.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u>	

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 27 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
	The Comment/Request is closed.	
Section D.3	The Usage Rate (Up,y) during the last monitoring period was 90%, however the same has been indicated as 100% in the comparison table under Section D.3 of the MR. Correct information shall be provided.	PP has corrected. The usage rate was 90% for the last Monitoring Period (MP1) and 95% in this Monitoring Period (MP2).
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	
Section D.3	The usage rate during the last monitoring period was 90%, while the cap of 95% has been applied during the current monitoring period. Clarify on the reasons for the increase in the Usage rate during the current monitoring period as compared to the previous monitoring period.	The 90% cap used in MP1 was used temporarily due to a lack of information to prove a higher value required by the BAMG changes. For this MP updated Usage Surveys, approved by Sustain Cert, were conducted with additional questions allowing for a higher usage rate to be reached. The new 95% cap has been voluntarily used by CO2balance to ensure that our emission reduction calculations are conservative.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	
Section D.3	The value of “ Tp,y ” between the previous monitoring period and current monitoring period has been interchanged in the comparison table under Section D.3 of the MR. Correct information shall be provided.	PP has corrected.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	
Section D.3	The value of the “ TRy ” and “ $Tusage$ ” has been wrongly provided in the comparison table under Section D.3 of the MR. Correct information shall be provided.	PP has corrected both values and made consistent across the MR.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 28 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
Section D.4	<p>For any parameters that were sampled, the following shall be demonstrated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Description of implemented sampling design; (b) Collected data; (c) Analysis of the collected data; (d) Demonstration that the required confidence/precision level has been met; (e) Demonstration that the samples were randomly selected and are representative of the population 	<p>PP has included the relevant information in section D.4. PP has also uploaded documentation displaying the random sample process for Annual Monitoring and Water Quality Testing and Q1 & Q2 Water Quality Testing results.</p>
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The PD has mentioned in the MR that "<i>In Q2, the remaining 21 boreholes were tested, meeting the methodological requirement that each borehole should be tested once per year</i>". The PD shall confirm with the help of dates (<i>based on the testing conducted during previous monitoring period and current monitoring period</i>) that each borehole have been tested once per year. The summary of the dates shall be provided in this regard. The Comment/Request is open.</p>	<p><u>PD Response:</u> PP has attached document with testing dates.</p>
	<u>GS Review Round 3:</u>	<u>PD Response:</u>

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 29 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
	<p>As per the submitted summary of the Water Quality Testing, the Water Quality Test during the MP1 was conducted on 20/04/2021, however as per the 1st page of the "Water Quality Testing Results Report", "<i>the water quality monitoring was conducted from 13th to 26th May 2021</i>". Hence it is not clear as how the water quality testing during the current monitoring period is within 1 year of the last water quality testing (during MP1). Clarify.</p> <p>The Comment/Request is open.</p>	<p>PP has uploaded a new version of the Water Quality Testing document as the dates in the initial document were incorrect.</p> <p>As all boreholes were tested within 2020 and again in 2021, PP has met the required sampling frequency outlined in our PDD of "At least one test each year conducted by accredited laboratory."</p> <p>Round 4 Request/comment is closed.</p>
Section E.1	<p>The baseline value corresponding to each of the SDGs shall be provided in Section E.1 of the MR. The values shall be put in the equations to calculate the value of the baseline estimate.</p>	<p>PP has included.</p>
	<p>GS Review Round 2: For the SDG13, the baseline value for GS7456 is "3,567 tCO₂" as per the MR, however the same is "3,337 tCO₂" as per the ERs Excelsheet. Please check and provide appropriate corrections. The Comment/Request is open.</p>	<p>PD Response: The figure 3,337 tCO₂ refers to the total Emission Reductions throughout the Monitoring Period. The correct baseline values in the MR have been updated.</p>
	<p>GS Review Round 3: The baseline emissions as per the page-40 is "3566 tCO₂", while the same is "3,337 tCO₂" as per the page-45 of MR. Check on the differences observed. The Comment/Request is open.</p>	<p>PD Response: The correct figure is 3,187 tCO₂, as calculated in the ER calculations (figures were reduced due to changing water quality testing failure dates). This figure refers to the emissions per year prior to applying the suppressed demand assessment and usage rate cap. PP has corrected the baseline emission figures for all VPAs on page 47 of the MR.</p> <p>Round 4 Request/comment is closed.</p>

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 30 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
Section E.1	Baseline Estimate: The PD shall note that some methodology equations or other equations (derived to calculate other SDGs) calculate a net benefit without elaborating a separate baseline and project situation, this should be marked clearly where this is the case.	PP has provided details regarding where each of the figures from the relevant calculations are sourced.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	
Section E.1	The value of "Cj" has been used as "0.182" in the MR, while the same has been indicated as "0.0182" in the "ER Calcs" spreadsheet of the ERs Excelsheet. The observed differences shall be clarified.	PP has corrected and made consistent across MR. 0.0182 is the correct value.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	
Section E.2	The project values corresponding to each of the SDGs shall be provided in Section E.2 of the MR. The values shall be put in the equations to calculate the value of the project estimate.	PP has included.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	
Section E.2	Project Estimate: The PD shall note that some methodology equations or other equations (derived to calculate other SDGs) calculate a net benefit without elaborating a separate baseline and project situation, this should be marked clearly where this is the case.	PP has corrected.
	<u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.	

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 31 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/2022	



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
Section E.4	<p>The SDG impact corresponding to the SDG3 in Section E.4 (<i>additional people consuming safe water</i>) does not matches with the SDG impact of SDG3 in the Table 1 of MR (<i>reduced incidence of stomach related diseases/illness</i>).</p> <p>Similar corrections shall also be provided corresponding to the SDG5, as the time saved collecting water is “per trip”. The same shall be clearly indicated in Section E.4 of the MR.</p>	<p>For SDG 3, we quantify the additional number of people consuming safe water as that is directly related to the reduction of the occurrence of water borne stomach related diseases. This was explained in the PDD document at the Validation stage.</p> <p>Similarly, as explained in the PDD, women are widely recognised as being responsible for collection of natural resources such as firewood and water. This was confirmed with the baseline survey and annual monitoring surveys. By calculating the reduction of time spent collecting wood/water, we can assume it is mostly women who obtain more free time to be allocated in different activities, and thus improving Gender Equality which SDG 5 refers to.</p>
	<p>GS Review Round 2:</p> <p>However the PD shall note that both the ‘Table’ (“Table 1” and “Section E.4”) has common column “SDG Impact” and hence the details on the “SDG Impact” shall be the same at both the places in the MR.</p> <p>Further the description on the “Net Benefit” shall be the same in the table at both the places (“Table 1” and “Section E.4”) of the MR.</p> <p>The Comment/Request is open.</p>	<p>PD Response:</p> <p>PP has updated and aligned both sections. Net benefit and Amount Achieved already represent the same figures, and PP is not allowed to change the wording of the template.</p>
	<p>GS Review Round 3:</p> <p>In the column “Amount Achieved”, the corresponding “indicator/parameter” shall also be indicated for which the value has been provided in this column. Hence more details may be provided in the column “Amount Achieved” in the Table 1 of MR.</p>	<p>PD Response:</p> <p>PP has corrected.</p> <p>Round 4</p> <p>Request/comment is closed.</p>

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	Page 32 of 34



Sections	Clarifications and/or corrective action needed	Response by Project Representative
	<p>For example, the indicator/parameter corresponding to the SDG13 is “Emission Reductions”, the indicator/parameter corresponding to the SDG3 is “additional people consuming safe water” etc. The Comment/Request is open.</p>	
Section E.4	<p>The “<i>Baseline Estimate</i>” and “<i>Project Estimate</i>” corresponding to the SDG13 is “3512” and “0” respectively in the Section E.4 of MR. The “Net Benefit” is the difference of the “Baseline estimate” and “Project estimate”, hence it is not clear as how the “Net benefit” arrives as “3,148”, which is mentioned in the table under Section E.4 of the MR. Clarify.</p>	PP has corrected.
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	
Section E.5	<p>The net benefit for the SDG13 is “3,148 tCO₂” as per the Table 1, while the same is “2035 tCO₂” as per the Section E.5 of the MR. Check. Similarly the SDG impacts of other SDGs (like SDG5) shall also be corrected.</p>	PP has corrected.
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	
Section F	<p>The details on the general training and WASH trainings shall be provided.</p>	PP has provided the general agendas used to conduct each of the WASH and minor maintenance trainings.
	<p><u>GS Review Round 2:</u> The Comment/Request is closed.</p>	

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 33 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/02/2022	



Appendix: 2 - FORWARD ACTION REQUESTS

N/A

Prepared/changed by: Eric Tolcach	Approved by: Javier Castro	Page 34 of 34
File name: GS7456-60_VPA190-194_Verification REPORT 2nd MP_FINAL_13052022	Version / Date: 01 / 22/2022	