



**Verified Carbon
Standard**

VERIFICATION REPORT FOR “DELAGUA CLEAN COOKING GROUPED PROJECT IN RWANDA”



SUSTAINCERT

Report ID	1003
Project title	DelAgua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in Rwanda
Project ID	4150
Verification period	01-Mar-2024 to 30-Sep-2024
Original date of issue	20-Dec-2024
Most recent date of issue	04-March-2025
Version	3.0
VCS Standard Version	4.7 ^{/1/}
Client	DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited
Prepared by	SustainCERT S.A.

Approved by	Indrapal Parmar
Work carried out by	Team Leader: Manika Mongia Technical Area Expert :Manika Mongia (TA 1.1) Auditor/Local Expert: Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira (TA 1.1) Auditor: Randulph Paulo Rernabe Morales Independent Reviewer: Muskan Chawla (TA 1.1)

Summary:

A description of the verification of the project

The Verification of the project titled ‘DelAgua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in Rwanda’ VCS ID – 4150, have been undertaken by SustainCERT, with accordance to the relevant VCS standard, V4.7^{/1/}, VCS Program Guide, V4.4^{/2/}. Relevant requirements of the ISO 14064-2 and ISO 14064-3, as well as applicable criteria for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting have been applied for verification.

The project 4150 involves dissemination of cookstoves in Rwanda under six project instances (PA11-6). The project proponents are DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited and DelAgua Project Pte. Ltd. who are using carbon finance to support local partners engaged in different activities like distribution, and maintenance of various product technologies. The ICSs disseminated under the grouped project are based on a “rocket stove” and designed to improve fuel combustion and heat transfer which by rocket stove design principles reduces the use of biomass fuel through improved combustion efficiency of wood fuel.

The Purpose and scope of verification

Purpose:

The verification service provided by SustainCERT for the project activity 4150 is to perform independent periodic verification for the monitoring period 01/03/2024 to 30/09/2024. The verification of the project is an independent review and ex-post determination by SustainCERT of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions that have occurred, against the VCS standard, V4.7^{/1/}, VCS Program Guide, V4.4^{/2/}, the Project baseline and host party criteria.

Scope of verification

The scope of verification is to establish/verify that:

- The project activity has been implemented and operated as per the approved registered PDMR^{/5/}.

- All the physical features (project technology) of the project are in place in accordance with registered PDMR^{/5/}.
- The monitoring report^{/8/} and other supporting documents provided are complete in accordance with the latest applicable version of VCS standard.
- The actual monitoring systems and procedures comply with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan, any registered monitoring plan^{/5/}, the approved methodology^{/7/} including applicable tool(s) and/or, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline.
- The data recorded and stored as per the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the standardized baseline

The Monitoring Period:

The project activity 4150 is undergoing 3rd verification from 01/03/2024 to 30/09/2024 (both days included), under its first crediting period (7 years) from 11/10/2021 to 10/10/2028^{/6/}.

The Method and Criteria used for Verification.

Desk Review:

Review of project information, monitoring plan specifically monitoring frequency, quality assurance and quality control system against the registered PD^{/5/} and applicable VCS standard and applied methodology VCS Methodology from Sectoral Scope 3 –VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1.

Onsite audit Interview with the relevant personnel to confirm the implementation of the project with paying particular attention to the operational and data collection procedures, in accordance with the registered PD^{/5/} and methodology.

- A detailed cross check of the information provided in the monitoring report against the relevant evidence such as data sources and technical specification of measuring equipment.
- A detailed cross check of the calculations made for the estimation of greenhouse gas emissions.
- An evaluation of data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emissions reduction.

The number of findings raised during verification:

A risk-based approach has been followed for the verification of the project. During verification, 02 CARs, 11 CL and 00 FAR were raised during verification.

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

Any uncertainties associated with the verification:

The assessment team thoroughly reviewed the monitoring report^{/8/} and the emission reduction calculation sheet^{/9/} against the relevant evidence and applicable VCS requirements, VCS standard V4.7^{/1/} and VCS guideline V4.4. It has been concluded that there are no more uncertainties associated with the project.

Summary of the verification conclusion:

The review of monitoring report^{/8/}, emission reduction calculation sheet^{/9/} along with relevant supporting evidence and the interview with relevant personnel during on site audit have provided the assessment team with sufficient evidence to confirm to the applicable criteria. The SustainCERT confirms the project activity VCS 4150 have been successfully implemented in accordance with the registered PD^{/5/} and applied methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves V1.1 meeting all the relevant VCS requirements^{/1/}. SustainCERT confirms that the monitoring period 01/03/2024 to 30/09/2024 (including both the days) in its implementation is calculated to generate 1,400,322 tCO₂e of emission reductions from reducing the amount of wood fuel combustion.

The management of DelAgua (=Project Proponent) is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emission reductions on the basis set out within the project's Monitoring Plan indicated in the registered Project Design and the applied methodology.

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION	7
1.1 Objective	7
1.2 Scope and Criteria	7
1.3 Level of Assurance	8
1.4 Summary Description of the Project	8
2 VERIFICATION PROCESS.....	9
2.1 Method and Criteria	9
2.2 Document Review.....	10
2.3 Interviews.....	11
2.4 Site Visits.....	14
2.5 Resolution of Findings	17
2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities	18
3 VALIDATION FINDINGS	18
3.1 Methodology Deviations.....	18
3.2 Project Description Deviations.....	18
3.3 New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects	18
3.4 Baseline Reassessment	18
4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS.....	19
4.1 Project Details	19
4.2 Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement	22
4.3 Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations	31
4.4 Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals.....	59
4.5 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis.....	60
5 VERIFICATION OPINION.....	61
5.1 Verification Summary	61
5.2 Verification Conclusion	62
5.3 Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison	63
APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALY SENSITIVE INFORMATION	64
APPENDIX 2: TABLE OF REFERENCE.....	65

APPENDIX 3: ABBREVIATIONS	69
APPENDIX 4: PROJECT FINDINGS.....	70
APPENDIX 5: COMPETENCE OF TEAM MEMBERS AND TECHNICAL REVIEWER	84

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The Verification of the project titled “DelAgua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in Rwanda” VCS ID – 4150, have been undertaken by SustainCERT, as requested by DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited (DHRV) & DelAgua Projects Pte. Ltd. project proponent for the monitoring period 01/03/2024 to 30/09/2024 (including both the days). The verification of project activity is the 3rd periodic verification for the crediting period 11/10/2021 to 10/10/2028^{/6/}. The purpose of the verification is to conduct the independent review of the project information and confirm:

- The project activity is implemented in accordance with registered project description document, V9.0^{/5/}.
- All physical features (project technology) are in place.
- The actual monitoring systems and procedures comply with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan^{/5/}, the approved methodology^{/7/} including applicable tool(s) and/or, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline.
- The data collection procedures and records are as per the monitoring methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves V1.1^{/8/}

The verification followed the requirements mentioned in the VCS standard, version 4.7^{/1/} and VCS guidelines, V4.4^{/2/} ensuring the quality and consistency of the report.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of verification for this project activity involves assessing the claims made by the project proponent in the monitoring report^{/8/}, emission reduction calculation sheet^{/9/} and other supporting evidence (as mentioned in appendix 2) made available to the verifier for this monitoring period from 01/03/2024 to 30/09/2024, in accordance to:

- VCS standard, V4.7^{/1/}
- VCS program guideline, V4.4^{/2/}
- VCS Methodology from Sectoral Scope 3 –VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1.^{/7/}
- Other relevant rules and requirements, including host part requirements^{/31/}.

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

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

1.3 Level of Assurance

The verification of the project activity is conducted by doing a thorough assessment of Monitoring report^{/8/}, Registered PD^{/5/}, emission reduction calculation sheet^{/9/} and all the relevant documents, and Distribution Database^{/11/} (as mentioned in appendix 2) of the report.

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

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

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

This is the 3rd monitoring report for the “DelAgua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in Rwanda” (VCS ID 4150), Grouped Project (“GP”) by DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited (DHRV) & DelAgua Projects Pte. Ltd., which is aimed at distributing fuel-efficient improved cookstoves (ICS) to local communities in Rwanda.

The ICS disseminated under this GP is based on rocket stove design principles, which reduce GHG emissions from biomass burning through improved combustion efficiency of wood fuel and decreased wood fuel consumption.

Across the six instances, no units Kuniokoa Generation 2 stoves were distributed in the current monitoring period. Since the project start date, a total of 548,327 units have been distributed^{/11/}. Technical specification of the stove technology has been cross verified from JPDMR^{/5/} and manufacture specifications.

An onsite audit for the project activity was conducted from 06/11/2024 to 09/11/2024. Furthermore, it was confirmed that the project has not involved the supply of dissemination of improved cookstoves for period 01/03/2024 to 30/09/2024 but were distributed in previous monitoring period. Emission reduction of 1,400,322 tCO₂e have been achieved in the current monitoring period.

The start date of the project activity is 24/01/2023 for PAI1, 11/10/2021 for PAI2, 14/05/2022 for PAI3, 11/01/2022 for PAI4, 22/03/2023 for PAI5 and 19/05/2023 for PAI6, verified from the PP interview^{/10/}, verification against distribution database^{/11/} and by cross verifying against previous monitoring period report^{/36/} and verification report^{/16/}. The crediting period for the project activity is 11/10/2021 to 10/10/2028, as verified using PD^{/5/}, validation report^{/6/} and onsite audit^{/10/}. The crediting period for the project activity is 11/10/2021 to 10/10/2028, as verified using PD^{/5/}, validation report^{/6/} and during on site audit^{/10/}.

Based on this, the assessment team confirms that the project activity 4150 'DeLaGua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in Rwanda' is implemented and operational in accordance with applied methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1^{/7/}, Project Description Document^{/5/}, VCS standard^{/1/} and VCS guidelines^{/2/}. It has also been assessed and verified that emission reduction calculation for this monitoring period from 01/03/2024 to 30/09/2024 has been done conservatively and found to be appropriate.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

The Registered Project activity has been undergoing 3rd Verification under its first crediting period (7 years), the approach adapted to ensure the quality and credibility of emission reduction is described in the following sections.

2.1 Method and Criteria

The method and criteria used for verification consist of following phases.

A risk-based approach has been applied for the process.

Desk review:

- A document review of the monitoring report^{/8/}, emission reduction calculation sheet^{/9/} and other evidence like monitoring survey data^{/12/}, signed user agreements^{/14/}, project distribution database^{/11/} (as mentioned in Appendix 2 of the report) were strategically reviewed and risk assessment was undertaken.

- Project activity sources contributing to the leakage as well as project emissions are assessed.
- The frequency of measurements, QA/QC procedures and other relevant documents are verified.

An onsite audit for the project was conducted from 06/11/2024 to 09/11/2024. Further details regarding the process have been mentioned in section 2.3 and 2.4 of the report.

- Interview of the project representatives were conducted to discuss the implementation and operational status of the project with respect to the registered monitoring plan^{/5/}.
- Discussion of QA/QC procedure, data collection, storage and transfer.
- Interview and visual observation on the condition of the project technology stove, baseline stoves, perceived opinion on SDG claim's of the projects, grievances if any
- Monitoring period claimed (01/03/2024 – 30/09/2024) was verified from the ER calculation^{/9/}, as well as from the previous monitoring period^{/36/} and its verification report^{/16/} to ensure that the period claimed is continuing from the last monitoring period and no double claim made.

Resolution of all the issues and findings raised, and the final verification statement was issued.

2.2 Document Review

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

- The completeness of the information with reference to the register PD^{/5/}.
- Review of project information, monitoring plan specifically monitoring frequency, quality assurance and quality control system against the registered PD^{/5/} and applicable VCS standard and applied methodology version 1.1.
- A review of the QA/QC procedures were conducted to make sure the implementation is as per the register PD^{/5/}.
- Project specific assessment against applicable national framework and legislation requirement^{/31/32/33/}.

All the other evidence reviewed is mentioned in Appendix 2 of this report. The cross checks between information provided in the Monitoring report^{/8/}, VCS PD^{/5/} and information from sources other than those used, if available, the team's sectoral or local expertise and, if necessary, independent background investigations.

2.3 Interviews

During this verification, an on-site visit was performed by the assessment team.

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

- Project technology usage
- Project technology model and overall condition (repairs/maintenance)
- Project unique identification barcode
- Baseline stove and baseline fuel
- Confirmation on signing end user agreements
- Perception on smoke level of project technology vs baseline stove

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

S.No	PAI	Stove barcode	Type of correspondent	District	Details discussed	Date of onsite Visit	Audit team member
1	1	AC016697	Household	Nyamagabe	Operationality of Project stove, Kitchen observation to understand if project ICS stove was recently used, usage rate, Benefits of using project stoves (SDGs)	06/11/2024	Jean Bosco
2	1	AC021988	Household	Nyamagabe		06/11/2024	
3	5	SB042585	Household	Karongi		06/11/2024	
4	2	BC222668	Household	Musanze		07/11/2024	
5	2	BC248202	Household	Musanze		07/11/2024	
6	3	DA090352	Household	Musanze		07/11/2024	
7	3	DA092381	Household	Musanze		07/11/2024	
8	4	ST011311	Household	Nyagatare		08/11/2024	
9	6	RC046781	Household	Ngoma		09/11/2024	
10	6	RC033503	Household	Ngoma		09/11/2024	

Based on the interviews conducted with project beneficiaries during the onsite visit and kitchen observations of the verifier team, it can be concluded that project ICS are actively used by the households.

Table 2 provides a detailed overview of the onsite interview process conducted during the verification. These tables outline the personnel involved in the interviews, along with their respective roles. The interviews specifically targeted individuals responsible for monitoring the project activity, data collection and management, as well as those involved in the quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) procedures. The tables serve to identify the individuals interviewed and provide relevant information regarding their roles within the project.

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

During the site visit, the verifier team interviewed PP's representative and implementation partners employed monitoring teams. Interviews were conducted as part of the verification process for data collection and storage for data sets of distribution database^{/11/} and monitoring survey^{/14/}. Manika Mongia (Team Leader, technical expert), Randolph Paulo Rernabe Morales (Auditor) and Jean Bosco (Auditor/technical expert/Country expert) and project proponent were available during opening and closing meetings conducted remotely. The interviews with the project end users and stakeholders were conducted by Auditor/ country expert/ technical expert Jean Bosco during the onsite visit. Furthermore, a remote call was conducted with project proponent to discuss the project data flow and management procedure.[/]. The list of interviewed personals is as followed:

Table 2: Project implementation field team interviewed from 06/11/2024 to 09/11/2024

S.No	Name of the person Interviewed	Affiliation	Details Discussed	Audit Team
1	Thacienne Menyugaruke (Field Analyst -Training)	DelAgua	Project monitoring survey execution, project distribution mechanism, data collection (distribution database), grievances mechanism	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira

2	Holazmiana Musa (Data and training analyst)	DelAgua	Project monitoring survey execution, project distribution mechanism, data collection (distribution database), grievances mechanism	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira
3	Habiruaua Emmanuel (CHW)	DelAgua	Project monitoring survey execution, project distribution mechanism, data collection (distribution database), grievances mechanism	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira
4	Nzirukirimana Angelique (CHW)	DelAgua	Project monitoring survey execution, project distribution mechanism, data collection (distribution database), grievances mechanism	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira
5	Karekezi Damascene (CHW)	DelAgua	Project monitoring survey execution, project distribution mechanism, data collection (distribution database), grievances mechanism	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira
6	Mutuyeyezu Raphael (CHW)	DelAgua	Project monitoring survey execution, project distribution mechanism, data collection (distribution database), grievances mechanism	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira
7	Umurerwa Domina (CHW)	DelAgua	Project monitoring survey execution, project distribution mechanism, data collection (distribution database), grievances mechanism	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira

8	Habimana Theogene (CHW)	DelAgua	Project monitoring survey execution, project distribution mechanism, data collection (distribution database), grievances mechanism	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira
9	David Kitt	DelAgua	Project implementation and operation, Project design, monitoring procedure, data and information flow, compliance of monitoring plan with monitoring methodology and approved VCS-PD, Roles and responsibility, Qualification and Training, VCU calculation and completeness of monitoring report, Electronic Monitoring system, Data collection and data flow, Monitoring surveys, Sample size	Manika Mongia Randulph Paulo Rernabe Morales
10	Ashutosh Tiwari	DelAgua		Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira

2.4 Site Visits

The VVB carried out an on-site visit from 06/11/2024 to 09/11/2024 and physically inspected the project technical design and implementation as specified in the VCS PDMR^{/5/} & MR^{/8/}.

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

Duration of the Onsite-Audit: 06-09/11/2024			
S.No	Assessment Criteria	Means of Verification	Assessment Opinion
1	The assessment of the implementation and operation of the registered project activity	Registered PDMR ^{/5/} and Joint Validation and verification report Interviews with PP ^{/10/}	The information mentioned with reference to project implementation, capacity and commissioning in MR is found consistent with the documents and information received during interviews.

2	A review of the monitoring survey for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters.	Monitoring survey ^{/12/} and emission reduction ^{/9/} calculation sheet. Interviews with households ^{/10/}	The information related to the monitoring survey generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters mentioned in MR is found to be consistent with documents crosschecked and information received by interviews.
3	Interviews with relevant personnel to determine whether the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan in the PD ^{/5/}	Interviews with PP ^{/10/} Training records ^{/22/}	All the information related to operational and data collection is found to be inline with the PD ^{/5/} and MR ^{/8/} .
4	A check of the monitoring equipment including data transfer and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PD, the applied methodology including the tools applied	Interviews with PP ^{/10/}	Monitoring practices were verified with interview from PP, and it has been observed that all the practices are found to be in line with the PD.
6	A review on calculation of emission reductions	Monitoring survey ^{/12/} and emission reduction ^{/9/}	The values mentioned for ER calculation are found to be in line with the monitoring survey ^{/12/} . Methods, formulae, and emission factors for calculating baseline emissions have been followed in accordance with the applied methodology ^{/7/} .
7	An identification of quality control and quality assurance procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters	Interviews with PP ^{/10/}	Methods, formulae, and emission factors for calculating baseline emissions have been followed in accordance with the applied methodology ^{/7/} . All the QA/AC procedures were also verified on-site.

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

The Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities (Version 9.0)^{/18/} states under paragraph 28 that “When the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have applied a sampling approach, the VVB may apply acceptance sampling as described in the steps indicated in paragraphs 29–38 below as part of validation/verification activities”.

Since the PP has monitored parameters ($N_{y,i,j}$ and μ_y) through surveys, verification team conducted acceptance sampling in line with paragraph 30 and 31 of the sampling standard version 9.0^{/18/}.

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

- (a) The estimated volume of annual GHG emission reductions of the project activity or the PoA being verified is equal to or less than 100,000 t CO₂ eq.;
- (b) The security conditions in the project region prevents inspection of many samples (e.g. conflict zones); or
- (c) The project activity or the PoA is located in a least developed country or a host Party with 10 or fewer registered CDM project activities at the end of the monitoring period being verified.

The grouped project is located in Rwanda, which is a Least Developed Country (LDC)^{/20/} Thus, the verification team can choose a different sample size than one indicated in para 32 of the sampling standard^{/18/}.

The verification team selected random sample of PP’s monitoring survey records (parameter- $N_{y,i,j}$ and μ_y) to check the acceptability (or otherwise) of the data for each such record with PP’s sample records and determined if the PP’s sample records meet the requirements.

Sample Size:

AQL	UQL	Producer Risk	Consumer Risk	Sample Size; Min	Acceptance No.
0.5%	15%	5%	20%	10	0

The verification team covered a total of 10 samples across from 6 PAIs to confirm monitoring survey results.

PAIs	Number of samples	District
1	2	Nyamagabe
2	2	Musanze
3	2	Musanze
4	1	Nyagatare
5	1	Karongi
6	2	Ngoma

During the onsite visit, all the households interviewed were found to have inefficient baseline stove/metal stoves using firewood and confirmed that the project stove was operational with pot skirt used. Fair emission reduction calculations are performed based on appropriately recorded usage during the monitoring survey^{/12/} for the current monitoring period. The verification team would like to conclude that based on acceptance sampling approach the project participant's sample record meets the requirement.

2.5 Resolution of Findings

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

The Corrective Action Request (CAR) was raised if:

- Modifications to the implementation, operation, and monitoring of the registered project activity have not been sufficiently documented by the project participants.
- Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data, or calculations of emission reductions that will impact the number of emission reductions.

The Clarification Request (CL) was raised if:

- Information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable requirements have been met.

The Forward Action Request (FAR) was raised if:

- If the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.

During verification a total of 2 CARs, 11 CLs and 0 FAR were raised. The details of all the issues communicated to the PD can be found in Appendix 4. The issues raised were closed successfully.

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

No forward action request has been raised for this monitoring period.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

There is no validation activity undertaken as a part of current verification.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

There is no validation activity performed as a part of the this verification.

3.1 Methodology Deviations

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

3.2 Project Description Deviations

No project description deviations have been applied to the grouped project activity during the reported monitoring period.

3.3 New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects

There are no new project activity instances in the current monitoring period.

3.4 Baseline Reassessment

Did the project undergo baseline reassessment during the monitoring period?

☐ Yes

☒ No

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Details

The project “DelAgua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in Rwanda” (VCS ID 4150) Grouped Project (“GP”) by DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited (DHRV) & DelAgua Projects Pte. Ltd. fall into sectoral scope 03 and is appropriately selected in the VCS PD & MR and is implemented in Rwanda. The project entity i.e., DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited (DHRV) & DelAgua Projects Pte. Ltd. are correctly listed in the VCS PD. No other project proponent or project partners are identified involved in the project implementation. This is verified against project information on Verra Registry, previous verification report as well as confirmation from the field team during interviews in the onsite visit^{10/}.

The start date of the Grouped project activity is 11/10/2021 (under PAI2), which is verified from the joint validation & monitoring report^{6/} as the joint PD & MR^{5/}. The start date for the rest of the PAIs as following: 24/01/2023 for PAI1, 14/05/2022 for PAI3, 11/01/2022 for PAI4, 22/03/2023 for PAI5 and 19/05/2023 for PAI6 verification against distribution database^{11/}, which is later than start date of the Grouped Project.

The crediting period of the Grouped project activity is from 11/10/2021 to 10/10/2028 and

The project crediting period is correctly filled in VCS PD^{5/}, which is seven years (twice renewables). The selected crediting period is consistent with the project start date and the first crediting period spans from 11/10/2021 to 10/10/2028 (both days included).

The project is correctly classified as a large project as per VCS Standard^{11/} as the average annual emission reductions are more than 300,000 tCO₂e. The achieved annual average emission reductions are 1,400,322 tCO₂eq for the current monitoring period. The achieved emission reductions are consistent with the corresponding ER spreadsheet^{9/}.

Project design, including eligibility criteria for grouped projects:

The project activity involves distribution of improved cookstoves in households of Rwanda. The project is a voluntary initiative as host country laws do not mandate the distribution of ICS to the local communities^{/31/}. The project proponents are DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited (DHRV) & DelAgua Projects Pte. Ltd. who are using carbon finance to support local partners engaged in different activities like production, distribution, and maintenance of various product technologies. This project includes technologies designed to reduce GHG emission by supplying high efficiency ICS to end-users and promoting public health to tackle several health challenges caused due to using less efficient stoves. The description of the ICS models is given in PD^{/5/} & MR^{/8/} and was confirmed from manufacturer's specification (verified from previous monitoring period verification report^{t/36/16/}).

The grouped project activity envisages implementation of one model of ICS i.e. Kuniokoa Generation 2 which is verified during the site visit^{/10/} and as well as the verified purchase order (see CL#4).

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion:
Audit history	The project activity is undergoing 3rd Verification during its first crediting period. The assessment team has verified that audit history using the Project webpage ^{/4/} , all the previous verification has been published under Verra. It has been concluded that the information present in section in 1.2 of MR is appropriate.
Double counting and participation under other GHG programs	The project activity is not registered under any other GHG and non-GHG program or registry. This has been confirmed by means of research on relevant applicable registries and available information in public domain and through declaration from the Project Owner. The assessment team has searched for similar projects having same nature, project technology, location and project proponent as well as legal owner. It was concluded that no such projects having same location and geo-coordinates, technology or project/legal owners are registered in various carbon schemes like CDM, GCC, and Gold Standard.
No double claiming with emissions trading programs or binding emission limits	The project activity has been thoroughly searched on the various websites of various emission trading programs and or ETS programs running in various counties, using nature, project technology, location and project proponent as well as legal owner as the search option.

No double claiming with other forms of environmental credit	As discussed above the, the project has been thoroughly searched in the currently active environment schemes and found that the project is not registered with any other environmental credits. PP has also submitted a declaration stating that the project is not registered with any other registry (see CL#1). Therefore, it can be concluded that the project is not claiming any credits from other programs/schemes.
Supply chain (scope 3) emissions double claiming	The grouped project activity which aims at distribution of ICS to households does not result in any Scope 3 emissions in its supply chain.
Sustainable development contributions	As claimed in section 1.12 of the monitoring report, the project is claiming positive impact for the following: -SDG 1.14 impact for the total number of ICS distributed under the grouped project is 548,327 hence, 548,327 HHs receiving the project ICS now have access to basic cooking services. This is verified through project database as well as through site visit^{/10/} for the accuracy and completeness of the distribution database. -SDG 3 impact calculated at Project instances level and calculated for number of households that are affected with project implementation which is verified to be 95.92% i.e. 525,982 HHs receiving the project ICS now claiming positive perceived impact in terms of smoke level from the project implementation. Claim is verified against survey monitoring data and verified through site visit^{/10/}. -SDG 5 impact is claimed through the calculated % respondents from monitoring survey with perceived positive impact on the amount of time tending fire and collecting wood. 93.79% of the survey participants that claimed the positive impact is used to calculated as 514,267 households out of the total distributed 548,327 units. The data is verified using acceptance sampling approach during site visit^{/10/}.

	-SDG 7 impact is claimed by the number of households with access to clean to clean fuels and technology. In the monitoring period, total of 525,982 out of 548,327 units has been disseminated from the start date of the project are operational. This is verified through verification from the record of distribution database as well as cross checked with site visit conducted to sampled household users. -SDG 8.3 impact is claimed by the number of informal employments that is created by the project implementation. 3,240 informal employments are claimed which is calculated using total employed personnel of DelAgua in various positions and locations that are working for the project. -SDG 12 impact is calculated by: a. number of CHWs that were educated: which is calculated in the same approach as how SDG 8.3 impact is made. In total 3,240 personals that have received education for their role to perform the tasks to carry out survey & household visits. b. number of end users per household that are educated for stove usage and apply sustainable cooking practices is claimed as per number of units distributed which in total of 548,327 units which is 548,327 households. -SDG 13 impact is claimed through the emission reduction calculated by the project implementation which the detailed assessment can be found in section 5.3 of this report. -SDG 15.4 impact is claimed through the reduction firewood as the effect of project implementation. The claim is verified through calculation using number of ICS distributed, usage rate, By,savings and stove years. In total, 770,470 ton of wood saving is claimed in MP and 2,882,730 ton across 6 PAIs for the entire crediting period.
Additional information relevant to the project	No commercially sensitive information has been excluded by the PP.

4.2 Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement

4.2.1 Stakeholder Identification

Stakeholder Identification	It has been observed and verified during on-site audit ^{10/} that the project activity is in line with the monitoring plan ^{5/} and there has been no new stakeholder identification done.
Legal or customary tenure/access rights	It has been observed and verified during on-site audit that the project activity is in line with the monitoring plan ^{5/} and there are no new legal or customary access right.
Stakeholder diversity and changes over time	It has been observed and verified during on-site audit that the project activity is in line with the monitoring plan ^{5/} and also personnel and stakeholders were interviewed during onsite audit ^{10/} (details of which are mentioned in section 2.3 of report) and it can be concluded that there is no change in stakeholder diversity over project lifetime till now.
Expected changes in well-being	It has been observed and verified during on-site audit that the project activity is in line with the monitoring plan ^{5/} and also stakeholders were interviewed during onsite audit (details of which are mentioned in section 2.3 of report) and it can be concluded that there is no expected change Wellbeing of stakeholder
Location of stakeholders	It has been observed and verified during on-site audit that the project activity is in line with the monitoring plan ^{5/} and there is no change in the location of stakeholders.
Location of resources	It has been observed and verified during on-site audit that the project activity is in line with the monitoring plan ^{5/} and no change in location of resources.

4.2.2 Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication

Ongoing consultation	No additional stakeholder consultation was carried out in this monitoring period as the initial stakeholder has the same stakeholder composition. PP has a continuous grievance mechanism in place for the local stakeholders. The beneficiaries of the project ICS have been provided with the following means to contact the PP: Directly registering complains at the nearest cell office. A toll-free helpline on which the end users can seek assistance. Speaking to the DelAgua CHW network to share their feedback
----------------------	---

	PP has submitted grievance register in order to address CL#8. VVB confirms that no major grievances have been recorded for the current monitoring period.
Date(s) of stakeholder consultation	No additional stakeholder consultation was executed in this MP
Communication of monitored results	The government stakeholders have been informed through the preparation and submission of a Monitoring Report. As verified onsite, VVB confirms that there is no major grievance recorded for the current monitoring period.
Consultation records	Refer section 2.2 of the registered PD for details of consultation conducted prior to validation and records of local meetings conducted before distribution in monitoring period.
Stakeholder input	PP claimed that there are no major inputs/grievances that is recorded that is relevant to project implementation process. The same is concluded from the data collected from users and stakeholder interviewed during site visit ^{/10/} .

4.2.3 Free, Prior, and Informed Consent

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Consent	During the onsite visit, Memorandum of Understanding ^{/35/} between DelAgua and Ministry of Environment to distribute improved cookstoves to rural households across Rwanda was verified . In addition to this Collaboration Agreements of DelAgua and the districts ^{/29/} is crosschecked.
Outcome of FPIC discussion	There is no concern. Therefore, no FPIC required.

4.2.4 Grievance Redress Procedure

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Grievance received and steps taken to resolve the grievance including the outcomes of the resolution	The verification team conducted on-site assessments and interacted with local stakeholders, as detailed in section 2.3 of the report. Notably, no negative comments or feedback were received from the local stakeholders during these interactions, according to the verification team's records.

	The PP has a continuous grievance mechanism in place for the local stakeholders. The beneficiaries of the project ICS have been provided with the following means to contact the PP: •Directly registering complains at the nearest cell office. •A toll-free helpline on which the end users can seek assistance. •Speaking to the DelAgua CHW network to share their feedbacks VVB has conducted interviews with the PP representatives and the end users and found that there was constant on-going communication directly with the beneficiary households. The project proponent has disclosed its feedback and grievance redressal mechanism under section 2.1.2 - 2.1.4 of the MR^{/8/}. It is crucial to emphasize that the responsibility for addressing grievances related to the grouped project activity is shared between the local implementation partners and the project proponent. Any grievances that arise during the operation of the grouped project activity will be conveyed to the project proponent for resolution. To facilitate ongoing communication with stakeholders, an established grievance mechanism is in place. Based on interviews and observations, the assessment team evaluated that the grievance redressal procedure adequately addresses issues that may arise during project planning and implementation. Beneficiaries and stakeholders are provided with the project proponent's contact information and are encouraged to reach out with any problems, questions, or grievances. During the current monitoring period, no major grievance is claimed received. The same is concluded from the site visit^{/10/} (interviews with users).
Grievance procedure redress	PP has a continuous grievance mechanism in place for the local stakeholders. The beneficiaries of the project ICS have been provided with the following means to contact the PP: •Directly registering complaints at the nearest cell office. •A toll-free helpline on which the end users can seek assistance. •Speaking to the DelAgua CHW network to share their feedbacks

	Activities of the field team is presented in form of log of activities extracted from internal data monitoring 'DM_ADM Log Location'^{/21/} and 26.0 GRM - 4150 – LIVE^{/37/} which includes household visits & trainings in which grievances can be collected. From the information collected from site visit interviews with project technology users and project implementer partners' field team, no major inputs/grievances that are identified that is evaluated to be material to project design and implementation. VCS standard^{/1/} para 3.18.8 is applicable in case the project is affecting property rights. The grouped project is an improved cookstove dissemination which is evaluated to have no risk on affecting any property right, Indigenous Peoples (IPs), local communities, nor customary rights.
--	---

4.2.5 Public Comments

Through onsite visit call^{/10/}, confirmation is obtained from Project Proponent that no public comment received for this grouped project. Through virtual demonstration, it is confirmed that no email communication are received from Verra in relation to this aspect till date. The same claim is confirmed in section 2.1.5 of the monitoring report^{/8/}.

Comments received	Actions taken by the project proponent	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
From the evidence gathered, no public comment has been received	N/A	N/A

4.2.6 Risks to Local Stakeholders and the Environment

4.2.6.1 Management Experience

It was confirmed during the onsite visit that the DelAgua staff are well-trained, with prior experience in distribution and monitoring. They received training on the questionnaire before conducting the surveys. The Training records and personnel competency have been verified by the assessment team during the onsite visit^{/10/}.

4.2.6.2 Risk Assessment

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

Natural and human induced risks to stakeholders' wellbeing	During the onsite visit ^{/8/} interview with of the personnel and stakeholders was conducted where they confirmed that climate crises and natural disasters can precipitate displacement and migration, resulting in the relocation of households. Further they added that the grouped project involved distribution of ICS that are portable and lightweight. Consequently, users of the project's ICS could easily carry them in case relocation becomes necessary. The structure of ICS was verified onsite, and end users were interviewed to verify the risk associated. No Risk was detected with respect to the project activity ^{/10/}
Risks to stakeholder participation	From the communication channel established and communicated to project technology user through several mechanisms: •Directly registering complaints at the nearest cell office. •A toll-free helpline on which the end users can seek assistance. •Speaking to the DelAgua CHW network to share their feedbacks With this communication approach in place, inputs from stakeholders are able to be received, collected and follow up upon. Project proponent also clarified that communication can take place following normal tribal route where beneficiaries log the grievance with their tribal leader which then shall notify field team to log the grievances and follow up on it. From the information collected from site visit interviews with project technology users and project implementer partners' field team, no inputs/grievances that are identified that is evaluated to be material to project design and implementation
Working conditions	No risk identified. DelAgua internal policies and Handbook which are mandatory to be signed by employed personals ^{/17/} is verified. Rwanda has Labor Law in effect ^{/23/} in place that cover employee's right. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit ^{/10/} .
Safety of women and girls	No risk identified. No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit ^{/10/} . The nature of the project is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which based on technology performance claimed from manufacturer and perceived stove performance from user from monitoring survey ^{/12/} and cross checked through verifier's site visit ^{/10/} , the project implementation benefits women and girls through reduction of smoke during meal preparation and shorter cooking time.
Safety of minority and marginalized groups, including children	No risk identified, PP have code of conduct and policy in place in relevant to hiring workers under legal age as well as Rwanda Labor Law ^{/23/} in effect. No evidence is detected from the site visit and interaction between verifier team and monitoring field team.

Pollutants (air, noise, discharges to water, generation and release of hazardous materials and chemical pesticides and fertilizers)	No risk identified. Project technology BURN which is provided with manufacturer's technology specification which is verified through BURN Website ^{/26/} with higher thermal efficiency which in effect reduces wood fuel usage. The project technology utilizes wood fuel and operates as cookstove which does not generate more waste than baseline stove. Based on perception of users as verified from monitoring survey, majority of the users claimed less smoke is generated from the project across all 6 PAIs.
---	--

4.2.7 Respect for Human Rights and Equity

4.2.7.1 Labor and Work

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Discrimination	No risk identified. Rwanda has Labor Law in effect ^{/23/} in place that cover employee's right. PP their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers discrimination issues ^{/17/} . No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit ^{/10/} .
Sexual harassment	No risk identified. Rwanda has Labor Law in effect ^{/23/} in place that cover employee's right. PP their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers sexual harassment issues ^{/17/} . No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit ^{/10/} .
Gender equity in labor and work	No risk identified. Rwanda has Labor Law in effect ^{/23/} in place that cover employee's right. PP their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers both discrimination and sexual harassment issues ^{/17/} . No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit ^{/10/} .
Forced labor	No risk identified. Rwanda has Labor Law in effect ^{/23/} in place that cover employee's right. PP their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers Forced labor related issues ^{/17/} . No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit ^{/10/} .
Child labor	No risk identified. Rwanda has Labor Law in effect ^{/23/} in place that cover employee's right. PP their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers Child Labor related issues ^{/17/} . No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit ^{/10/} .
Human trafficking	No risk identified. Rwanda has Labor Law in effect ^{/23/} in place that cover employee's right. PP their own internal code of conduct and policy in place which covers Human trafficking related issues ^{/17/} . No issues detected from the interviewed personals during the site visit ^{/10/} .

4.2.7.2 Human Rights

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Human Rights	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which present no risk to Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage. The employed worker's rights are assessed in section 4.2.7.1. Rwanda has been a member of ILO since 1962 which summary of the ratifications over the years by the country ^{/34/} .

4.2.7.3 Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage

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

4.2.7.4 Property Rights

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Disputes over rights to territories and resources	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which present no risk to property rights. Through signed user agreements it is clearly communicated that the stove is distributed free of charge and in return the credit for claiming carbon emission reduction is with PP. Assessment of the project based on the project technology and activities was executed against applicable national rules and regulations ^{/31/} , and international human rights laws and standards ^{/34/} .
Respect for property rights	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which present no risk to property rights.

4.2.7.5 Benefit Sharing

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Summary of the benefit sharing plan	N/A. The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which present no risk to property rights. Through signed

		user agreements it is clearly communicated that the stove is distributed free of charge and in return the credit for claiming carbon emission reduction is with PP.
Benefit sharing during the monitoring period		N/A. The nature of the project implementation does not have benefit sharing arrangement through all parties involved.

4.2.8 Ecosystem Health

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

4.2.8.1 Rare, Threatened, and Endangered species

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

4.2.8.2 Introduction of Species

Species introduced	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
--------------------	--

NA	
----	--

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

	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Invasive species	NA

4.2.8.3 Ecosystem conversion

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

4.3 Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations

The monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the provision of monitoring plan; the verification team reviewed if:

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

The monitoring system and all applied procedures are in compliance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS-PD^{/5/} and the applied methodology VMR0006 version 1.1^{/7/}, based on the information included in the final monitoring report, there are several procedures for data collecting depending on the methodology applicable for each step of the project.

PP conducted sampling surveys to gather information needed for the monitoring of $N_{y,i,j}$ and μ_y parameters. Monitoring surveys were conducted across all PIs in September and October 2024^{/12/}. Minimum sample size is calculated and verified for each parameter and PAI in reference to CDM Guideline Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and PoA^{/27/} using total distributed units as target population in each corresponding PAI. Using stratified random sampling approach, PP has identified various sample population for each PAI with actual sample data set collected at higher sample size than calculated as depicted below.

PAI	Calculated minimum samples needed		Actual Samples Surveyed for both parameters
	$N_{y,i,j}$	μ_y	
1	43	52	70
2	43	52	67
3	43	52	63
4	43	52	63
5	43	52	63
6	43	52	68

PP's calculation for sample size is presented in transparent spreadsheet in ER calculation^{/9/} tab Sample Size Cal & Results.

Sampling captured information on monitoring variables with required confidence/precision 95/10 confidence/precision basis in corresponding to the scale of the Group Project which is large project in accordance to VCS Standard^{/1/} and CDM Guideline Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and PoA^{/27/}.

Accuracy and data traceability from the presented survey data is requested to be demonstrated by PP during onsite visit^{/10/} from the internal data management system to the extracted spreadsheet. Data presented and used for ER calculation is concluded to be complete and accurate

Calculation for relative precision from survey data is calculated at for both monitored parameters $N_{y,i,j}$ and μ_y is presented in the ER calculation^{/9/} tab Sample Size Cal & Results with calculated margin of error value less than the precision level limit of 10%.

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

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

Parameter $n_{y,i,j}$, μ_y , % pot skirt usage rate are verified to be matching the monitoring data survey.

Parameter	Description of Parameter	Assessment approach
$n_{y,i,j}$ (used to calculate $N_{y,i,j}$)	Number of project devices of type i	-Visual inspection of the premises to see if the project stove is operational and in use. -Interview with end user to verify that project stove is still in use
μ_y	Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y	Interview with end user and visual inspection to determine if a pre-project (replaced) stove is still being used in addition to project stove
% pot skirt usage rate	Fraction of frequency of pot skirt used when project stove is used	-Visual inspection of the presence pot skirt and demonstration of the skirt with the stove - Interview with end user to on the frequency of the pot skirt

The verifier team carried out the site visit concluded that from 10 sampled households, no discrepancy sighted between the data collected from site visit^{10/} with monitoring data reported by PP. This satisfied para 33 of CDM Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities^{18/}, thus the VVB set of records is accepted.

Emission reduction (ER)

The methodology does not calculate baseline and project emissions separately. The steps taken and the equations and parameters applied in the VCS-PD^{/5/} to calculate the project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions comply with the requirements of the selected methodology including applicable tool(s).

$$ER_y = \sum_i \sum_j ER_{y,i,j} - LE_y$$

Quantification of baseline emissions:

According to section 8.4 of methodology VMR0006, version 1.1^{/7/}, emission reductions shall be calculated as:

$$ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,savings,i,j} \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{wood\ fuel} \times (EF_{wf,CO2} + EF_{wf,non\ CO2}) \times N_{y,i,j} \times 0.95$$

Where;

i = Indices for the situation where more than one type of project device is introduced to replace

the pre-project devices

j = Indices for the situation where there is more than one batch of project device

ER_y = Emission reductions during year y in tCO₂e

ER_{y,i,j} = Emission reductions by project device of type i and batch j during year y in tCO₂e

Calculation and approach used to leading to ER claim is cross checked

Quantification of leakage emissions:

In accordance with the section 8.3 of the applied methodology, VMR0006, version 1.1^{/7/}, a default factor of 0.95 to account for leakage has been applied.

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

Quantification of project emissions:

Project emissions are not applicable to the grouped project activity as the applied methodology,

VMR0006, version 1.1^{/7/}, provides a direct equation for the calculation of emission reductions and does not provide calculations of project emissions separately.

The grouped project employs methodology namely VRM0006^{/7/} v1.1. Following Project Description Document^{/5/} section 5.1 and 5.2, the parameters determined ex-ante and monitored ex-post as per methodology requirements are as follows.

The data and parameters fixed (ex-ante):

S.No	Parameter	Value	Means of verification
1	Bold Annual quantity of woody biomass that would have been used in the household in the absence of the project activity to generate useful thermal energy equivalent to that provided by the project devices.	4.4092 (rounded up to 4.41 in MR) ton/household/annum	Verification against Project Description ^{/5/} and their corresponding verification reports.
2	$f_{nr,b,y}$ Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass.	0.8872	Verification against Project Description ^{/5/} and their corresponding verification reports.
3	$EF_{WF,CO2}$ CO2 emission factor of biomass that is substituted or reduced for wood	112 tCO ₂ e/TJ	Verification against methodology default value and IPCC Guidelines ^{/25/}

4	$EF_{WF,non-CO_2}$ Non-CO ₂ emission factor of biomass that is substituted or reduced for wood	26.23 tCO ₂ e/TJ	Verification against methodology default value and IPCC Guidelines ^{/25/}
5	Leakage Factor	0.95	Verification against methodology default value
6	η_p Efficiency of ICS at the start of project activity	·0.434 for project stove without skirting ·0.513 for project stove with pot skirting	100% of the units distributed across the PAIs is confirmed as Kuniokoa Generation 2 Verification against Project Description ^{/5/} and their corresponding verification reports. Site visit ^{/10/} observation on the project technology confirmed the stove model. The value is also verified against BURN website ^{/26/} for technical specification for this stove model.
7	$NCV_{biomass}$ Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass	0.0156 TJ/tonne	Verification against methodology default value and IPCC Guidelines ^{/25/}

The data and parameters monitored (ex-post):

1. Parameter: $N_{y,i,j}$ (Number of project devices of type i and batch j operating during year y)

Means verification	of	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology ^{7/} requirement, the parameter is measured directly or based on a representative sample. Project Proponent carried out habit survey ^{14/} with questionnaire determining whether project technology is used (user vs non-user) for each project instances sample sets. Calculation is carried out for each project instance using respective total units distributed with usage rate % from monitoring survey. As per methodology ^{7/} requirement and PD ^{5/} , the monitoring frequency is at least once every two years. The parameter is calculated using usage rate obtained from monitoring survey carried out in Sep 2024 – Oct 2024 for MP3. Frequency monitoring for this parameter is evident meeting the methodology requirement.
		Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	As per methodology ^{7/} requirement and PD ^{5/} , the monitoring frequency is at least once every two years. The parameter is calculated using usage rate obtained from monitoring survey carried out in Sep 2024 – Oct 2024 for MP3. Frequency monitoring for this parameter is evident meeting the methodology requirement. Sampling requirement for the survey to obtain the data parameter is assessed with

		presented data that Project Proponent sampling plan is adjusted to satisfy sample size to achieve 95/10 confidence precision relevant to the size of the project as per CDM Project Activities and Programmes of Activities requirement ^{/18/} .
	Monitoring equipment	N/A. The parameter is calculated using total stove distributed with usage rate.
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	N/A
	Calibration frequency /interval:	N/A, no equipment is used as the parameter is calculated using total stove distributed multiplied with usage rate derived from monitoring survey (survey habit ^{/14/}).
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A

	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A														
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A														
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Stove Operating Fraction for determination of $N_{y,i,j}$ values are verified through data analysis of data presented as survey habit^{/12/} for each project instances for usage rate of project technology is 95.92%. The user is determined as user if project stove is used within the last 6 months (factors of proportional of project stove together with baseline stove is calculated in other monitored parameter) multiplied with total distributed units per project instances as verified in ER calculation^{/9/} tab 'Summary'. Value of $N_{y,i,j}$ is verified: <table><tr><th>PAI #</th><th>Values (units)</th></tr><tr><td>PAI 1</td><td>24,228</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 2</td><td>242,343</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 3</td><td>94,678</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 4</td><td>23,820</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 5</td><td>94,734</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 6</td><td>46,178</td></tr></table>	PAI #	Values (units)	PAI 1	24,228	PAI 2	242,343	PAI 3	94,678	PAI 4	23,820	PAI 5	94,734	PAI 6	46,178
	PAI #	Values (units)														
PAI 1	24,228															
PAI 2	242,343															
PAI 3	94,678															
PAI 4	23,820															
PAI 5	94,734															
PAI 6	46,178															
If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	Comparison on the value of usage rate is carried out against Site visit carried out by verifier															

		team including verification using verbal confirmation with project technology user ^{/10/} with consistency concluded between the PP's monitoring survey data and verifier's collected data ^{/10/}
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Monitoring survey as carried out to obtain value for usage rate (ny,i,j) used in calculating Ny,i,j is captured using mobile apps and collected and stored in internal database system. Traceability of the data from the presented excel data file ^{/12/} was performed from the data source using sampled data set during onsite audit ^{/10/} with no discrepancy sighted. Site visit carried out by verifier team including verification using verbal confirmation with project technology user ^{/10/} Calculation of the value is verified as well as the value claimed in both ER ^{/9/} and monitoring report ^{/8/} .
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	Monitoring is verified to be carried out as per Project Description Document ^{/5/} and methodology ^{/7/} requirement with no deviation.
Findings	No finding raised	
Conclusion	No new stoves were distributed in the current monitoring period.	
	PAI #	Values (units)
	PAI 1	24,228
	PAI 2	242,343

	PAI 3	94,678	
	PAI 4	23,820	
	PAI 5	94,734	
	PAI 6	46,178	

2. Parameter: $\eta_{new,i,j}$ (Efficiency of the device of each type I and batch j implemented as part of the project activity)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology ^{/7/} requirement, the parameter is to be measured annually using one of the options presented. PP has adopted equation 5 as one of the options to be used as per methodology. Based on site visit observation, purchase invoice ^{/24/} (see CL#4) and joint PDMR ^{/5/} , it is verified that the project stove that is distributed across 6 PAIs from the start of the project implementation is Kuniokoa 2. The efficiency of this stove model is influence whether pot skit is used ^{/26/} . This value is derived from the monitoring survey using frequency of pot skirt claimed used when project stove is used. Data analysis performed from the presented spreadsheet.
-----------------------	---	--

		Another factor influenced this parameter is the stove age as per methodology default value as 0.99 efficiency loss per year. Value presented for this parameter is verified Frequency monitoring for this parameter is evident meeting the methodology requirement. Throughout all project instances, the earliest stove distributed is on 11/10/2021 (under PAI2)		
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	As per methodology^{/7/} requirement and PD^{/5/}, there are 5 options to measure this parameter in which each project instance shall apply. In this monitoring report, PP stated that option 5 is used in which the value is calculated using equation 5 of the methodology to calculate loss in efficiency per year, and therefore this parameter does not need to be monitored. The calculation is verified with evidence of equation 5 of the methodology is applied and thermal efficiency of project technology is calculated using weighted average of number of units distributed in each PAI with efficiency rate for each stove age. % proportional of pot skirt used is calculated into the formulation with the end value of <table><tr><td>PAI</td><td>$\eta_{new,i,j}$</td></tr></table>	PAI	$\eta_{new,i,j}$
PAI	$\eta_{new,i,j}$			

		PAI 1	0.4694
		PAI 2	0.4642
		PAI 3	0.4602
		PAI 4	0.4612
		PAI 5	0.4665
		PAI 6	0.4717
	Monitoring equipment	N/A. The parameter is calculated using equation 5 of the methodology.	
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	N/A	
	Calibration frequency /interval:	N/A. The parameter is calculated using equation 5 of the methodology.	
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A	

	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Verifier team performed calculation using same equation with same end value obtained. Verification on the number of units distributed in each age group for each PAI against project distribution database ^{/11/} , data analysis from the presented monitoring survey ^{/12/} as well as data traceability from internal data management system from the provided survey spreadsheet used for ER calculation during onsite visit ^{/13//10/} .
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	NA, as this is a calculated value using methodology equation.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The value is calculated as project technology η_{new} value for each PAI using weighted average of number units distributed for each stove age and % pot skirt utilization. The survey data presented in ER file ^{/9/} under tab 'Usage Survey Data' with calculation for each PAI is under tab ' $\eta_{new,i,j}$ Calculation'

	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation? Monitoring is verified to be carried out as per Project Description Document^{/5/} and methodology^{/7/} requirement with no deviation.														
Findings	No finding raised														
Conclusion	The value of this parameter is verified and accepted as: <table><tr><td>PAI</td><td>$\eta_{new,i,j}$</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 1</td><td>0.4694</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 2</td><td>0.4642</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 3</td><td>0.4602</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 4</td><td>0.4612</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 5</td><td>0.4665</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 6</td><td>0.4717</td></tr></table>	PAI	$\eta_{new,i,j}$	PAI 1	0.4694	PAI 2	0.4642	PAI 3	0.4602	PAI 4	0.4612	PAI 5	0.4665	PAI 6	0.4717
PAI	$\eta_{new,i,j}$														
PAI 1	0.4694														
PAI 2	0.4642														
PAI 3	0.4602														
PAI 4	0.4612														
PAI 5	0.4665														
PAI 6	0.4717														

3. Parameter μ_y (Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology ^{/7/} requirement, the parameter is to
-----------------------	---	---

		be obtained from survey at minimum once every two years. The parameter is to be monitored using 2 options with option a is to be used when baseline stoves are decommissioned and no longer used; and option b is to be used when both the improved cookstove and baseline cookstoves are used together. Parameter μ_y is sighted derived from monitoring survey data which was executed on survey carried out in September 2024 – October 2024 for MP3. Frequency monitoring for this parameter is evident meeting the methodology requirement. The sampling requirement for the survey to obtain the data parameter is assessed with presented data that Project Proponent sampling plan is adjusted to satisfy sample size to achieve 95/10 as per CDM Project Activities and Programmes of Activities requirement^{20/}.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Following methodology^{7/} requirement, under option b the parameter is to be obtained from survey designed to capture the cooking habits and stove usage of households in the region, including quantification of use of baseline cookstoves, to obtain evidence on the frequency of usage of both the

		improved cookstoves and baseline cookstoves. The parameter is determined by taking average of ratio of frequency of usage of project stove by confirming the frequency to household user under the context of 6 months period for both cooking and boiling water. During the data analysis of the monitoring survey, CL#6 was raised to further clarify the data interpretation into value claimed. The approach PP has implemented based on the questionnaire format of the survey, data interpretation and analysis for precision level, it is concluded to satisfy methodology requirement^{7/}.
	Monitoring equipment	NA, as the survey data is obtained by verbal confirmation on the frequency on the use of project technology for boiling water and cooking, which is used to determine μ_y
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	NA, as the survey data is obtained by verbal confirmation on the frequency on the use of project technology for boiling water and cooking, which is used to determine μ_y

	Calibration frequency /interval:	NA, as the survey data is obtained by verbal confirmation on the frequency on the use of project technology for boiling water and cooking, which is used to determine μ_y
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A, as no monitoring/measuring equipment used.
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A, as no monitoring/measuring equipment used.
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A, as no monitoring/measuring equipment used.
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Value reported for each project instances as each instance is calculated as proportional fraction of the use of project stove and baseline stove in the last 6 months for cooking and boiling water. Data analysis on survey data concluded that the value is calculated accordingly. Data Traceability for the survey data presented was carried out during onsite visit ^{13//10/} .
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	N/A as this parameter is derived from monitoring survey which is project specific.

		Verification comparing the value claimed in MP2 is performed, with value sighted as: The value obtained for previous MP (MP 2): <table><tr><th>PAI</th><th>Fraction</th></tr><tr><td>PAI 1</td><td>0.24</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 2</td><td>0.27</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 3</td><td>0.17</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 4</td><td>0.16</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 5</td><td>0.17</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 6</td><td>0.15</td></tr></table> The value obtained for current MP (MP 3): <table><tr><th>PAI</th><th>Fraction</th></tr><tr><td>PAI 1</td><td>0.24</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 2</td><td>0.28</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 3</td><td>0.29</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 4</td><td>0.35</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 5</td><td>0.27</td></tr><tr><td>PAI 6</td><td>0.24</td></tr></table> Overall, the value of μ_y for current MP is higher across all 6 PAIs (PAI1-6).	PAI	Fraction	PAI 1	0.24	PAI 2	0.27	PAI 3	0.17	PAI 4	0.16	PAI 5	0.17	PAI 6	0.15	PAI	Fraction	PAI 1	0.24	PAI 2	0.28	PAI 3	0.29	PAI 4	0.35	PAI 5	0.27	PAI 6	0.24
PAI	Fraction																													
PAI 1	0.24																													
PAI 2	0.27																													
PAI 3	0.17																													
PAI 4	0.16																													
PAI 5	0.17																													
PAI 6	0.15																													
PAI	Fraction																													
PAI 1	0.24																													
PAI 2	0.28																													
PAI 3	0.29																													
PAI 4	0.35																													
PAI 5	0.27																													
PAI 6	0.24																													

	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The approach PP has implemented based on the questionnaire format of the survey, data interpretation and analysis for precision level, it is concluded to satisfy methodology requirement ^{7/} . The approach resulted in simplified questionnaires that is easily conveyed by survey team and understood by survey participants. The calculation of the value of itself is also simple fraction based on the frequency.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	NA, no such deviation is found.
Findings	No Finding raised	
Conclusion	Looking at the methodology requirement, measuring approach adopted by PP to obtain the value for this monitored parameter in this MP is evaluated to be meeting the requirement. Data traceability was able to be demonstrated and at the end data accuracy for the value calculated was achieved.	

4. Parameter η_{old} (Efficiency of baseline stove)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology ^{7/} requirement, the parameter is fixed for each individual household at the time of project Implementation. In the PD ^{5/} , the baseline device replaced within each household will be captured at the point of ICS distribution and recorded in the
-----------------------	---	---

		monitoring database. PP has provided project distribution database ^{/11/} .
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Following methodology ^{/7/} requirement, the parameter is fixed for each individual household at the time of project Implementation. In the PD ^{/5/} , the baseline device replaced within each household will be captured at the point of ICS distribution and recorded in the monitoring database. PP has provided project distribution database ^{/11/} .
	Monitoring equipment	Following the options presented in the methodology: - default value of 0.1 and 0.2 can be used or -surveyed prior to implementation of project activity No equipment is needed for monitoring this value.
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	N/A as the parameter is collected during the distribution point through verbal confirmation and collected in the follow up household visit after project stove distribution as confirmed through remote call (see CL#07)

	Calibration frequency /interval:	N/A as the parameter is collected during the distribution point through verbal confirmation
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A.
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A.
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A.
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Data analysis is performed with the presented project distribution database in which anomalies were detected and raised as CL#10.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	N/A as methodology default value is applied which requires evidence for satisfying conditions set by methodology in order for the value to be applied.

	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Through monitoring survey ^{/12/} , data can be retrieved into several format including excel file for calculation, traceability and other functions which is demonstrated by PP during remote call ^{/15/} . Data transfer process was demonstrated by PP during remote call with no data discrepancy is sighted.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	PP has provided evidence of data monitoring as presented in form of project distribution data ^{/13/} from the start of project date.
Findings	No Findings Raised	
Conclusion	Project proponent has presented evidence in conformance against monitoring method and data collection as per methodology requirements.	

5. Life Span (Operating lifetime of project device)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology ^{/7/} requirement, the parameter is to be determined once at the time of Project stove installation with source of data as manufacturer's specification. Based on site visit observation, purchase invoice ^{/24/} (see CL#4) and joint PDMR ^{/5/} , it is verified that the project stove that is distributed across 6 PAIs from the start of the project implementation is Kuniokoa 2. The life time of the stove technology is verified through validated joint PDMR ^{/5/} as its
-----------------------	---	---

		corresponding joint validation verification report ^{/6/} .
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Following methodology ^{/7/} requirement, the parameter is to be determined once at the time of Project stove installation with source of data as manufacturer's specification. Across 6 PAIs, the age stove of the cookstove is the oldest is between 2-3 years based on project distribution database ^{/11/} and project start date.
	Monitoring equipment	N/A
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	N/A
	Calibration frequency /interval:	N/A
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	N/A

	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	N/A
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	N/A
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	PP is claiming 10 years for this parameter which is consistent from validated PDMR ^{/5/} as this value is derived from manufacturer's declaration.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	PP submitted monitoring survey for stove operational status. The result is recorded with 95.92% of stoves in operational condition. The same was verified during onsite visit ^{/10/} through visual observation as well as verbal confirmation with the household users.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	N/A.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	N/A as this is set at is to be determined once at the time of Project stove installation with source of data as manufacturer's specification. PP has monitored the condition of the stove during monitoring survey ^{/12/} with data verified through site visit ^{/10/} .
Findings	No Finding raised	

Conclusion	Life span of the distributed stoves is verified as claimed by PP which is 10 years. The data is derived from manufacturer's specification with actual monitored data obtained from monitoring survey provided the same conclusion that 95.92% of the stoves used are operational. Site visit ^{/10/} conducted by verifier team confirmed the accuracy of the data claimed.
------------	---

6. Date of commissioning of batch j

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following JPDMR ^{/5/} section 6.2 this parameter is monitored and nothing on this parameter is found in the methodology ^{/7/} section 9.2. In JPDMR ^{/5/} for this parameter under 'description' section, it is detailed "Project Participant may opt to group the devices in "batches" and the latest date of commissioning of a device within the batch shall be used as the date of commissioning for the entire batch". In the monitoring report ^{/8/} , the parameter is stated to be 'Fixed and recorded at the time of commissioning/distribution of the last project device in the batch' which is claimed as 11-October-2021 ^{/38/} which is consistent with the value claimed in JPDMR ^{/5/} . Based on site visit observation ^{/10/} and joint PDMR ^{/5/} , it is verified that the project stove that is distributed across 6 PAIs from the start of the project implementation is Kuniokoa 2. During the remote call, it was confirmed that PP has not grouped distributed units
-----------------------	---	---

		into batches as the same stove models are used throughout the 6 PAIs for the entire crediting period.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	NA.
	Monitoring equipment	NA.
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	NA.
	Calibration frequency /interval:	NA.
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	NA.
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	NA.
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA.

	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	In the monitoring report ^{/8/} , the parameter is stated to be 'Fixed and recorded at the time of commissioning/distribution of the last project device in the batch' which is claimed as 11/10/2021 which is consistent with the value claimed in JPDMR ^{/5/} . Based on site visit observation ^{/10/} and joint PDMR ^{/5/} , it is verified that the project stove that is distributed across 6 PAIs from the start of the project implementation is Kuniokoa 2. During the remote call, it was confirmed that PP has not grouped distributed units into batches as the same stove models are used throughout the 6 PAIs for the entire crediting period. Start date of Grouped Project is verified against JPDMR ^{/5/} is sighted to be consistent as the date claimed for this parameter.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	N/A as this parameter is project specific parameter.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	N/A
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	No deviation is sighted as PP's approach is to use the date of first stove instalment.
Findings	CL#10 was raised and successfully closed	

Conclusion	The parameter is not regulated by the methodology ^{/7/} and following JPDMR ^{/5/} the date claimed under this parameter is concluded to be following JPDMR i.e. start date of first unit instalment.
------------	--

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

The assessment team has thoroughly verified the calculation done for the quantification of the emissions reduction for the project activity, under this monitoring period from 01/03/2024 to 30/09/2024.

4.4 Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals

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

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

The verification team can confirm that sufficient evidence is available for the whole monitoring period and the same is verifiable. Based on the distribution database, total credited stoves 548,327 units (across six PAIs are distributed and no ICS have been distributed in MP 3. Spot checks are performed, and log^{/21/} is maintained. Information related to district wise household visited and related analysis, recommendations and conclusion is recorded in internal audit report. (See CL#6 for details) The verifier team evaluated the approach chosen by PP to be acceptable from the conservativeness principle as worthwhile still meeting the requirement of the applied methodology.

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

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

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

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

The calculations of baseline emissions as presented in the corresponding ER sheet of final Monitoring Report were checked and found to be consistent with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan^{/5/} and the applied methodology.

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

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

The assessment team has verified all the primary supporting related to operations, quality, and generation of data during the monitoring period such as cross verification against initial/raw data source (users' signed agreements^{/14/}, internal database record for distribution database for user's information, baseline stove and fuel type; monitoring survey and; technical specification of ICS model^{/26/}, training sessions for competence evaluation of monitoring personals and survey execution guidance^{/22/}, data quality check for plausibility and accuracy, CL#6 was raised to verify QA/QC measures and training in relation to the competence of the field team. Evidence provided in the form of internal audit reports, training records, project stove training material used for households visit/training^{/30/}.

ER calculation with formulations and units' conversion as well as data transfer from data sources into reports. The photographs were only used as means of secondary cross check of the information verified from Primary sources. As this is the 3rd monitoring period of the project's first crediting period, information regarding project capacity commission and monitoring system is already verified in previous monitoring report which are also cross checked with previous report. Thus, a reasonable level of assurance is achieved.

.

4.5 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

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

5 VERIFICATION OPINION

5.1 Verification Summary

The project activity VCS – 4150, “DelAgua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in Rwanda” has undergone 3rd verification with monitoring period from 01/03/2024 to 30/09/2024 (including both days). DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited (DHRV) & DelAgua Projects Pte. Ltd. are responsible for the collection, analysis, aggregation, preparation (conversion factors, assumptions, methodology, calculations) and presentation of activities and related GHG data in its public disclosures (including but not limited to monitoring report, emission reduction calculation sheet, submitted documents/ emails/ communications). Our responsibility of performing this work is to the management of DelAgua and in accordance with terms of reference agreed with the DelAgua in the master service agreement. The verification engagement assumes that the GHG data provided to us is complete, sufficient, true and free from material misstatements. SustainCERT disclaims any liability or co-responsibility for any decision a person or an entity would make based on this verification statement towards the issuance and utilization of VCUs hereby verified and certified. The verification was carried out during November – December 2024 by a team of qualified GHG auditors.

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

We have complied with the VCS standard/1/ and other requirements mentioned, during the verification engagement and maintained independence. SustainCERT was not involved in the preparation of any statements or reports or data except for this Verification Statement and Report. SustainCERT maintains complete impartiality toward stakeholders interviewed during the verification process. SustainCERT did not provide any services to DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited (DHRV) & DelAgua Projects Pte. Ltd. and its subsidiaries in the scope of verification that could compromise the independence or impartiality of our work.

5.2 Verification Conclusion

The Verification of the project titled 'DelAgua Clean Cooking Grouped Project in Rwanda' VCS ID – 4150, have been undertaken by SustainCERT, as requested by DelAgua Health Rwanda (Voluntary) Limited, project proponent for the monitoring period 01/03/2024 to 30/09/2024 (including both the days) as reported in monitoring report^{/8/}. The project activity is implemented in accordance with the registered monitored plan in PD^{/5/} and the emission reduction from the project activity from the project activity. It is our responsibility to express an independent verification statement on the reported GHG emission reductions from the project activity.

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

In our opinion, the GHG emissions reductions reported for the project activity for the period 01/03/2024 to 30/09/2024 are fairly stated in the project monitoring report^{/8/}. The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly based on the approved baseline and monitoring methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1 and the monitoring plan contained in the PD^{/5/}.

Verification period: 01/03/2024 to 30/09/2024

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

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Reduction VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Removal VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCUs (tCO ₂ e)
01/03/2024 to 30/09/2024	1,400,322	-	-	1,400,322	-	1,400,322
Total	1,400,322	-	-	1,400,322	-	1,400,322

5.3 Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison

Vintage period	Ex-ante estimated reductions/removals	Achieved reductions/removals	Percent difference	Explanation for the difference
01/03/2024 to 30/09/2024	1,217,534	1,400,322	15.01% higher	The primary reason for higher VCUs in the current monitoring period attributed to higher ICS distribution than envisaged ex-ante during current monitoring period. The number of ICS units mentioned ex-ante were only an indicative number for ex-ante calculations and may differ from actual implementation which depends upon market demand and user preferences, deemed outside the control of PP.
Total	1,217,534	1,400,322	15.01% higher	

APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION

Use the table below to describe the commercially sensitive information included in the monitoring report to be excluded in the public version.

Section	Information	Justification	Assessment conclusion	method	and
	N/A				

APPENDIX 2: TABLE OF REFERENCE

S. No	Document Title	Version	Date
1	VCS standard https://verra.org/documents/vcs-standard-v4-7/	4.7	16/04/2024
2	VCS guidelines https://verra.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/VCS-Program-Guide-v4.4.pdf	4.4	29/08/2023
3	Validation and Verification Manual https://verra.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/VCS Validation Verification Manual v3.2.pdf	3.2	19/10/2016
4	VCS Project Webpage, VCS ID - 4150 (https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/4150)		
5	Joint Project Description & Monitoring Report MP1 Document 'JPDMMR_4150_v6_clean' (https://registry.verra.org/mymodule/ProjectDoc/Project_ViewFile.asp?FileID=107650&IDKEY=akjalskjf098234kj28098sfkjlf098098kl32lasjdflkj909j148449350)	6.0	03/12/2023
6	Joint Validation and Verification (MP1) report 'VCS.VAL.23.33_DelAgua_FVR_15122023_Clean' (https://registry.verra.org/mymodule/ProjectDoc/Project_ViewFile.asp?FileID=107743&IDKEY=I0e98hfalksuf098fnsdalfkjfoijmn4309JLKJFJla ksjfla9l148577597)	2.1	14/12/2023
7	Applied Methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1 (https://verra.org/methodology/vmr0006-methodology-for-installation-of-high-efficiency-firewood-cookstoves/)	1.1	

8	Monitoring report MP3 (01/03/2024 to 30/09/2024)	3.0	30/01/2025
9	Emission reduction calculation sheet 'VERRA VCS 4150 MP3 ER sheet v 2.0 27112024- EXTERNAL'	2.0	27/11/2024
10	Onsite audit report (06/11/2024 – 09/11/2024)		
11	12.0 VERRA VCS 4150 MP3 Database_Confidential		27/11/2024
12	Emission reduction calculation sheet 'VERRA VCS 4150 MP3 ER sheet v 2.0 27112024- EXTERNAL' tab 'Usage Survey Data'	2.0	27/11/2024
13	Project platform data collection and retention		Demonstrated by PP on 27/11/2024
14	User's signed agreements		
15	Remote call with Project Proponent (to discuss data flow and management systems)		27/11/2024
16	Verification Report MP 2	3.0	09/10/2024
17	DelAgua internal policy and employment handbook: CHSS Policy – Rwanda Risk Register _ Rwanda Signed Employee Handbook – Rwanda Approved Code of Conduct-CBW Signed Code of Conduct		
18	Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	9	
19	No Double counting declaration		

20	UN List of Least Developed Country (https://unfccc.int/topics/resilience/workstreams/national-adaptation-programmes-of-action/ldc-country-information).		Accessed on 27/11/2024
21	DelAgua field team activity log records		
22	Attendance list for training sessions field team		
23	Rwanda Labor Law (https://webapps.ilo.org/dyn/travail/docs/530/rwanda_)		
24	Kuniokoa Stove Purchase Order		
25	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories; Chapter 2 Stationary Combustion	2006	
26	Burns Website (product specification) Kuniokoa https://www.burnstoves.com/products/wood-stoves/kuniokoa/		
27	CDM Guideline Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and PoA	4	16/10/2015
28	VCS Methodology Requirements	4.4	29/08/2023
29	District collaboration agreements		2022
30	Training evidences for monitoring team: -CHWs Attendance list -Household Visit photo -Tubeho Neza Flipbook UPDATE 2019 V5 (Training Material) -MS Training Attendance		

	-Training Photo (monitoring survey team) -1.0 SDG 8 - List of Employees – Rwanda		
31	Rwanda environmental laws and regulations: 1. Law No. 04/2005 2. Ministerial Order No. 003/2008 3. Ministerial Order No. 004/2008 4. General Guidelines and procedure for EIA (https://elaw.org/resource/rwanda-environmental-impact-assessment-law-and-regulations)		Accessed 22/11/2024
32	Rwanda Clean Cooking Initiatives: Clean Cooking Results-based Financing (CC-RBF) (https://www.reg.rw/what-we-do/rbf-programs/rbf-clean-cooking/)		Accessed 22/11/2024
33	Rwanda 7 Years Government Programme: National Strategy for Transformation (NST1) 2017–2024 National Strategy For Trsansformation -NST1.pdf (minaloc.gov.rw)		Accessed 22/11/2024
34	Rwanda (country profiles) from ILO database International Labour Standards country profile: Rwanda (ilo.org)		Accessed 22/11/2024
35	Signed MoU between DelAgua and Government of Rwanda		12/10/2021
36	Monitoring report MP 2	5	04/10/2024
37	Grievance Record		01/03/2024 – 30/09/2024
38	Start Date Evidence		

APPENDIX 3: ABBREVIATIONS

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

APPENDIX 4: PROJECT FINDINGS

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 01	
VCS Standard, v4.7	VCS Standard, v4.7 3.23.1 Project proponents shall not seek credit for the same GHG emission reduction and carbon dioxide removal under the VCS Program and another GHG program. Projects issuing GHG credits from different time periods under the VCS Program and another GHG program shall also conform with the rules and requirements in the Registration and Issuance Process.	PP shall provide confirmation whether project is currently active in any other environment schemes and claiming credits. PP shall provide signed declaration stating that the project is not registered with any other registry. In case PP have received or are seeking credit for reductions and removals from a project activity under the VCS Program and another GHG program, PP shall provide the required information as per VCS Standard v4.7 para 3.23.2 (1)-(4).	In accordance with Section 3.23 (1)–(4) of the VCS Standard, v4.7, a signed declaration letter is being provided to the VVB to confirm that there is no double counting of credit claims. This declaration confirms, among other assurances, that: ○ The stoves are neither registered nor in the process of registration as a project activity under any other carbon offset program/mechanism. ○ The stoves are not deregistered from any other carbon offset program. ○ The stoves are not rejected or excluded from any other GHG programs. ○ The net GHG emission reductions or removals generated during the monitoring period are not utilized for compliance under any other such mechanism. ○ The stoves are not availing any other forms of environmental credit for the crediting period.
	Round-2	VVB has reviewed “10.0 Project 4150 declaration 2024-11-18 – signed” submitted by PP. The document is found in line with VCS Standard v4.7 para 3.23.2 (1)-(4). #CLOSED	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
CL 02			
Metho dology require ment	Methodology requirement: monitoring record	PP shall provide complete record for the date of commissioning of project devices as per methodology requirement section 9.3 Data recording “The project proponent must compile data on each cook stove that is derived from the total sales record with project technologies differentiated by different project scenarios”.	ICS database is being submitted with the relevant information in line with section 9.3 of the VMR0006 ver 1.1. Please note that the PP cannot share the names and telephone numbers of households, as doing so would breach the Rwandan data protection law, Law No. 058/2021 of 13/10/2021, relating to the Protection of Personal Data and Privacy (DPP Law). This law establishes a comprehensive legal framework for protecting individuals’ fundamental right to privacy and ensures the responsible use of personal data in Rwanda. This approach was previously verified and approved by Verra.
	Round-2	VVB has reviewed “12.0 VERRA VCS 4150 MP3 Database_Confidential” submitted by PP. VVB confirms that data recording for all distributed ICS are done in line with 9.3 of the VMR0006 ver 1.1 except name of the project users and their contact details. Justification provided by PP is acceptable by VVB. #CLOSED	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
CL 03			
VCS Standards 4.7	VCS Standard 4.7 3.7 Ownership Project and jurisdictional proponents must demonstrate that	PP shall provide evidence of project ownership from the process that generates GHG emission reductions in form of End User Agreement as regulated in section 1.7 of the JPD MR for the distributed cookstoves in this monitoring period for the following:	1) At the time of Improved Cookstove (ICS) distribution, each ICS beneficiary transfers the rights of credit ownership to the Project Proponent (PP) through an agreement written on an end user receipt poster. These posters are available in both English and the local language (Kinyarwanda) to ensure that the beneficiaries have a clear understanding of the agreement before signing it. A photograph of the end

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 03	
	they have the legal right to control and operate project or program activities	1) Samples distributed units: pending with record of the distributed units to be provided by PP (see CL 02) photograph of user with signature on poster and justification whether the level of understanding of user on agreement is adequate depending on the medium used for communicating details of agreements. 2) Confirmation from PP through written and signed documents from: a) Memorandum of Understanding with the Government of Rwanda, b) Manufacturer agreements with specifics confirming that DelAgua is the sole owner of all technologies purchased under this project as well as carbon credit generated from the technology implementation is within the jurisdictions of DelAgua.	user holding the poster is taken and stored in the PAI database. A sample PDF containing such distribution evidence, including the photograph of the user holding the poster, is being submitted. 2) i) Signed MoU with the Government of Rwanda is being submitted. ii) The manufacturer agreement is being submitted. This document explicitly states that the manufacturer acknowledges that that it has no right, title or claim to any carbon or impact credit earned or registered by DelAgua or any of its affiliates and associates pursuant to the use of the Products.
	Round-2	1. PP has submitted sample photographs of end user receipt poster. The document is found to be inline with the section 1.7 of PDMR and section 3.7 of VCS Standard v4.7. #CLOSED 2. a. VVB has reviewed 21 MOU documents between DelAgua and districts involved in the project activity. Also, VVB has sighted signed MoU between Government of Rwanda (Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning) and Delagua Health Rwanda Implementation Ltd. Following which DelAgua has signed Collaboration Agreements with the districts that the project has been delivered in (to date.) #CLOSED b. VVB has reviewed "9.1 DelAgua Carbon Rights Letter BURN" which is dated on 12 June, 2023. The Manufacturer has clearly mentioned that Burn has no right to claim	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 03	
		Carbon credits. The document is acceptable #CLOSED	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 04	
	Eligibility criteria	The PP shall provide evidence that all operational distributed units in MP3 are Burn Kuniokoa G2 stoves, such as purchase invoices from the manufacturers. Additionally, VVB has sighted name of the stove surveyed for the monitoring period is not in line with the name of stove mentioned in the registered PDMR. PP shall clarify the discrepancy and ensure consistency through all documents.	The PP confirms that no Improved Cookstoves (ICS) were distributed during the current monitoring period (MP3). However, all the ICS distributed until the end of MP2 are Burn Kuniokoa G2 stoves. Section 3.1 of the MR clearly outlines the implementation status of the ICS distributed under the project, stating that by the end of the current monitoring period, the grouped project had disseminated only Burn Kuniokoa G2 stoves across all six Project Activity Instances (PAIs). Since no ICS were distributed during MP3, purchase invoices for this monitoring period are not applicable. Further, as supporting evidence, the PP is submitting manufacturer invoices for the ICS distributed under the project during the previous monitoring periods. Regarding the discrepancy noted by the VVB, please refer to columns AG and AH of the tab "Usage Survey Data" in the ER sheet. These columns list the local and English names of the stoves. <i>Tubeho Neza</i> is the local name for the DelAgua project ICS, also referred to as the <i>DA Stove</i>. This stove is alternatively named the <i>Live Well Stove</i>. Hence, <i>Tubeho Neza</i>, <i>DA Stove</i>, and <i>Live Well Stove</i> are all local names referring to

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
CL 04			
			the project ICS, which is the Burn Kuniokoa G2 stove as stated in the PDMR. Thus, this is not a discrepancy, but rather a clarification of the use of local nomenclature for the Burn Kuniokoa G2 stoves. This is also added in section 3.1 of MR.
	Round-2	PP has submitted Purchase orders (Manufacturer invoices) for the distributed ICS for the Stoves distributed until MP 2. It is crosschecked across the ICS distribution database that no new stove is distributed in MP 3. Furthermore, justification regarding the local name of the stove provided by PP is accepted. PP has updated section 3.1 of the MR to include local name of the ICS. #CLOSED	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
CL 05			
MR template v4.4	Detailed for various sections under section 2.3 of MR	PP shall provide appropriate details on benefit sharing on how this is not applicable for the project.	The project activity involves distribution of improved cookstoves to individual households and it does not require acquisition of property. Hence, this is not applicable and the same has been mentioned in the section 2.3.5 of the MR.
	Round-2	PP has updated section 2.3.5 of the MR to include the reason of non-applicability. #CLOSED	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 06	
	VCS Standard (v4.7) 3.16.2 Quality management procedures to manage data and information shall be applied and established ISO 14064-2 (2019) Section 6.10 Monitoring the GHG project The monitoring plan shall include the following, as applicable: h) controls that include internal data check for input, transformation and output, and procedures for corrective actions;	Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.4 of MR PP shall provide evidence on the measures implemented within the MP in relation to competence of the interested entities i.e., contractors involved in project implementation and monitoring in form of: Training record for project technology distributors 1) List of supervisors/contractors used and their training records. Electronic record for spot checks and its comparative analysis wrt to initial distribution logs as per 4.3 of the MR.	The monitoring surveys were carried out by DelAgua's internal staff. These enumerators are well-trained and have previous experience conducting monitoring. Before the surveys, they received training on the questionnaire. The training attendance sheet and a photo from the training session are provided as supporting evidence. This training attendance sheet also includes the roles of these DelAgua employees. PP conducts internal audits regularly as mentioned in the submitted audit report. These audits are performed by the DelAgua team for their QA/QC processes and team training. It's important to note that these internal audits are independent of the annual monitoring surveys and are only for DelAgua's internal purposes. Household visits were subject to a quality audit which is evidenced through the submission of Quality Audit Report to the supervise for internal purposes. Regular checking of quality by DA staff is part of their regular roles, with schedules created that allow 1 day per HHV team to be supervised by DA staff. This is evidenced by the submission of a sample of results from the "DM_ADM Log Location Form" which is to be filed out by staff when they are in the field on a certain day. Whilst specific data of the HHV quality check is not captured, staff are trained to highlight and flag any concerns they see in the HHV to their direct supervisor. This Audit however has been conducted at the start of this year and the same report is being submitted. The results of the internal audit are used for programme efficiency and staff training, rather than as a core document within the credit issuance process.
	Round-2	1. PP has submitted the training records for the monitoring survey trainings dated 23/09/2024 for the current monitoring period. The sheet clearly details out the names of the personnel involved in conducting the monitoring survey. #CLOSED 2. PP has submitted DM_ADM Log Location document and Quality audit report dated 1st March 2024. The report give details on the Spot checks	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 06	
		and related analysis, recommendation and conclusion. #CLOSED	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 07	
	Monitored parameters and Monitoring Survey	Monitoring parameters: PP shall provide evidence on parameters: - Traceable evidence of the survey data provided in excel form from its initial raw data collected form. In section 4.3 of the MR that monitored data is collected on smart phone-based surveys. PP shall provide evidence of this. - During monitoring survey beneficiary for BC093604 has responded 'No' for pot skirt available. PP shall clarify how is % under column BB is calculated. - VVB has sighted hard entered values under column BB and AZ under tab 'Usage survey data' in the ER spreadsheet. PP shall provide rationale behind the values obtained. - VVB has sighted 'No' under usage status of ICS whereas 29% is mentioned under usage of Tubebo Neza Stove (%). PP shall clarify. - VB has sighted 'yes' for Does the smoke reduced after using DA stove whereas usage of Tubebo Neza stove is 0% in Tab 'usage survey data' in ER spreadsheet. PP shall clarify. - VVB has sighted that the proportion of HH confirming the reduction in smoke using project	- All monitoring surveys were conducted using phone-based applications. Once a survey is completed and submitted, the survey details are sent to the DelAgua server and are no longer stored or accessible through the phone-based app. The data extracted from this server is then transferred to an excel sheet, which is later submitted in the ER sheet. To provide evidence of this process, we are sharing dummy sample screenshots taken from the phone-based app. These screenshots illustrate how the surveys were conducted on the smartphone app. Additionally, the PDF of the monitoring survey questionnaire, which was extracted from the phone-based app, is also included for further verification. - PP has included provisions in the questionnaire to separately assess information on ICS usage and pot-skirt usage. To adopt a conservative approach, a value of 'not in use' has been applied wherever responses indicate non-use for either ICS or pot-skirt at any point. Consequently, the percentage in column BB has been calculated based on the corrected 'not in use' status for BC093604. - The values in columns AZ and BB under the 'Usage Survey Data' tab have been corrected to reflect calculated values rather than hard-entered values.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 07 ICS is more wrt to stove operationality fraction. Similarly, proportion of HH confirming the reduction in amount of time spent on collection of firewood and cooking time wrt to stove operational fraction which is determined across all PAs using monitoring survey. PP shall clarify on the discrepancy identified.	- As explained earlier, PP has included provisions in the questionnaire to separately assess information on ICS usage. To ensure a conservative approach, a value of 'not in use' has been applied wherever responses indicate non-use for ICS at any point. The formula has been adjusted accordingly, and the usage for this sample is now calculated as 0% as a conservative measure. - The field 'Does the smoke reduce after using the DA stove?' has now been formula-based and is applicable only where the ICS is in use. - As mentioned above, both questions related to smoke reduction and time-saving after using the project stove are now applied as conservative measures in the ER sheet. These metrics are considered only where the ICS is in use. If the ICS is not in use, any response of "Live Well stove creates less smoke" in column BE regarding smoke reduction or any response of "The time required has decreased" in column CB regarding time-saving is treated as "No" to ensure a conservative approach. Please refer to columns BF and CC in the 'Usage Survey Data' tab of the ER sheet for details.
	Round-2	- PP has provided screenshots for app-based survey forms as "28.0 MS form" document. During the remote call PP has clearly demonstrated the flow of surveyed data in the platform in line with section 4.3 of the MR. #CLOSED - PP has corrected the value in column BB in line with column S of the usage survey data tab in the ER Spreadsheet. VVB confirms that value of 'not in use' has been applied wherever responses indicate non-use for either ICS or pot-skirt at any point in the usage survey data tab. #CLOSED - VVB confirms that the values in columns AZ and BB under the 'Usage Survey Data' tab have been corrected to reflect calculated values rather than hard-entered values. #CLOSED	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
CL 07			
		4. PP has now updated cell AZ 82 to correctly reflect the usage of project stove inline with the survey conducted in the current monitoring period. #CLOSED 5. PP has appropriately updated column “Does the smoke reduced after using the DA stove” in line with usage status of ICS column in the usage survey data tab of the ER spreadsheet. #CLOSED 6. PP has corrected Ex post survey results tab. VVB confirms that parameter 3.9.1 and 5.4 are inline with Stove operating fraction determined in the monitoring survey of the current monitoring period. #CLOSED	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
CL 08			
VCS Standard v4.7	2.1 Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation VCS standard v4.7 a.Section 3.18.1 b.Section 3.18.2-3 c.Section 3.18.7-8 d.Section 3.18.3-14	1) Under section 2.1.2 Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication, PP shall provide evidence of the ongoing grievance mechanism for the current monitoring period. 2) Under section 2.1.3 Free, Prior, and Informed Consent, PP shall provide evidence of signed Collaboration Agreements with all of districts in which distribution have taken place.	1) As part of the ongoing communication with local stakeholders, end users were informed about the grievance register during LSC, which is maintained at the local office locations of the PP. Local field staff and resource persons also serve as a medium for escalating grievances from project beneficiaries within their respective zones to the PP. Moreover, DelAgua, the implementing partner, provides a toll-free helpline for stakeholders to connect with them for assistance or to raise concerns. Grievance register is being submitted. 2) The Collaboration Agreements with districts were submitted and previous MP and were validated by VVB. No new distribution has been made in this MP. Further the collaboration agreement with districts are being submitted for reference.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
CL 08			
	Round-2	1. PP has submitted the Grievance records for the current monitoring period in line with section 3.18.4 of the VCS Standard v 4.7 and is found satisfactory. #CLOSED 2. PP has submitted MoUs with all the districts where ICS distribution has taken place as part of the project activity. Documents are found appropriate. #CLOSED	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
CL 9			
VCS standard, v4.7	VCS standard Section 3.19.2-22	Under section 2.2.2 of the monitoring report, 1) As per the MR template v4.4 PP shall use the table below to describe the risks identified at validation. Describe the commensurate mitigation or preventative measure in place to address the identified risk during the monitoring period. 2) Signed code of conduct (in respect to child labor and women/girls exploitations, discriminations, sexual harassment) signed by employees, vendors and suppliers. PP shall provide clarification whether this requirement is applicable to all Community Health Workers claimed to be employed in this MP as stated in section 1.12 Sustainable Development Contributions). 3) PP shall provide a sample of consent forms taken from end-users during the monitoring survey.	1. Risk identified and their mitigation or preventive measures taken has been addressed in the MR in line with MR template v 4.4. 2. Sample signed code of conduct are being submitted. 3. PDF of sample of consent forms taken from end-user during the monitoring survey is being submitted.
	Round-2	1. PP has appropriately added risk identified and Mitigation or preventive measures taken inline with the MR template guide v 4.4. #CLOSED 2. PP has submitted Signed Employee Handbook – Rwanda, Approved Code of conduct - CHW and samples of signed code of conduct by CHWs. This	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
CL 9			
		clarifies on proper protocols are will in place and are practices for all the appointed employees including CHWs claimed under section 1.12 of the MR document. #CLOSED 3. PP has submitted the questionnaire format in which acceptance of the end users for the monitoring survey is recorded. Same was verified in usage survey Data tab column I in the ER spreadsheet. #CLOSED	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
CL 10			
VCS standard, v4.7	Project Start date and ER spreadsheet	1. As per section 3.8 of the VCS Standard v 4.7 11 October 2021 is mentioned as start date whereas the same date is not sighted under tab ICS distribution summary of the ER spreadsheet. PP shall clarify the discrepancy identified. Also provide appropriate evidence in line for the start date. 2. Ex post survey results tab parameter' 7.1.2 Proportion of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technology' VVB has sighted different values for same parameter in the tab i.e cell I 11 and I 14. PP shall clarify the inconsistency observed in the ER spreadsheet.	1. There was a date format error (dd-mm to mm-dd) and hence 11/10/2021 was mentioned as 10/11/2021 in the ICS distribution summary. This has now been corrected in the ICS distribution summary. Distribution form for 1st ICS distributed under the project is being submitted as evidence confirming the start date of project is as 11 Oct 2021. 2. This has been revised and corrected for parameter 7.1.2 under tab "Ex post survey results tab parameter".
	Round-2	1. PP has now corrected the format error identified for the start date and submitted evidence of the start date of project activity in line with section 3.8 of the VCS standard v4.7. The evidence submitted and the update done is found satisfactory. #CLOSED 2. PP has now updated the value of proportion of population with primary reliance on fuels and technology to ensure consistency of values across	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 10	
		Ex Post Survey results Tab of the ER Spreadsheet. #CLOSED	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
		CL 11	
VCS Monitoring Report Template	VCS Monitoring Report Template Section 1.12 Sustainable Development Contributions	In table 1 of section 1.12 of the monitoring report: 1. PP shall provide relevant employment records of personnel claimed under SDG 8. PP shall confirm if project activity employment is meeting with the minimum salary requirement of the host country during the current monitoring period. 2. Under SDG 12.8 impact claim, PP shall provide evidence in the form of training material, dates, and records of attendance.	1. Employment records for personnel claimed under SDG 8 are being submitted as required. Please note that Rwanda does not have an officially established minimum wage under its current labor laws ¹ . "The minimum wage of RWF 100, as defined in the 1980 labor law, is outdated and falls far below international standards, including those set by the International Labour Organization (ILO). Despite this, Delagua ensures that all employees, including Community Health Workers (CHWs), are compensated with significantly amount of salaries. This reflects Delagua's commitment to fair and equitable compensation practices, aligning with ethical standards and promoting decent work. 2. Training evidences for SDG 12.8 are being submitted.
	Round-2	1. PP has submitted Signed Employee Handbook – Rwanda, Approved Code of conduct - CHW and samples of signed code of conduct by CHWs. This clarifies on proper protocols are will in place and are practices for all the appointed employees including CHWs claimed under section 1.12 of the MR document. Moreover, footnote provided by PP	

1

[https://www.lloydsbanktrade.com/en/market-potential/rwanda/work-conditions#:~:text=Officially%20there%20is%20no%20minimum,International%20Labour%20Organisation%20\(ILO\).&text=The%20average%20monthly%20wage%20for,is%20RWF%2056%20C668%20\(ILO\).](https://www.lloydsbanktrade.com/en/market-potential/rwanda/work-conditions#:~:text=Officially%20there%20is%20no%20minimum,International%20Labour%20Organisation%20(ILO).&text=The%20average%20monthly%20wage%20for,is%20RWF%2056%20C668%20(ILO).)

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
CL 11			
		is reviewed by VVB and considered satisfactory. Therefore, it can be ensured that appropriate compensation is provided to the employees in the project activity. #CLOSED 2. PP has submitted record of attendance for CHW training dated 02/09/2024 and is found appropriate. #CLOSED	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
CAR 01			
VCS Monitoring Report Template	VCS Monitoring Report Template 4.4 GHG Emission Reductions and Carbon Dioxide Removals	Under Section 4.1 of the MR Data parameter <i>EFwf</i> CO₂, <i>EFwf</i> non-CO₂ Justification of choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures applied is inconsistent with registered PDMR. Under Section 4.2 of the MR Data parameter <i>Ny</i>, <i>i,j</i> , Life span, Date of commissioning of batch j Frequency of monitoring/recording is inconsistent with the registered PDMR.	Justification of choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures applied for parameters <i>EFwf</i> CO₂, <i>EFwf</i> non-CO₂ have been revised under section 4.1 of the MR in line with the registered PDMR. Frequency of monitoring/recording for the parameters <i>Ny</i>, <i>i,j</i> , Life span, Date of commissioning of batch j have been now made consistent under section 4.2 of the MR with registered PDMR.
	Round-2	PP has now updated section 4.1 and 4.2 to ensure the Justification of choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures applied for Data parameter <i>EFwf</i> CO₂, <i>EFwf</i> non-CO₂ and Frequency of monitoring/recording of Data parameter <i>Ny</i>, <i>i,j</i> , Life span, Date of commissioning of batch j respectively in consistence with the registered PDMR. #CLOSED	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments	Developer Response
CAR 02			
VCS Monitoring Report Template	VCS Monitoring Report Template 4.4 GHG Emission Reductions and Carbon Dioxide Removals	1. PP shall rectify the Reduction VCUs (tCO₂e) for vintage 01-January-2024 – 29-February-2024 under section 5.4 of the MR. 2. In line with MR template guideline section 5.4 VVB did not sight the explanation of the percentage difference between estimated ER value and Achieved ER value. PP shall provide the appropriate Explanation.	1. Section 5.4 of the MR has already reflected the correct VCUs (tCO₂e) for vintage 01-January-2024 – 29-February-2024 in line with the registered MP2 MR and ER sheet. 2. Explanation of the percentage difference between estimated ER value and Achieved ER value has been provided in the section 5.4 of the revised MR.
	Round-2	1. VVB confirms that Section 5.4 is updated for vintage 01-January-2024 – 29-February-2024 w.r.t verified and submitted MP 2 documents. #CLOSED 2. PP has updated section 5.4 to provide justification on the percentage difference between the Estimated ER value and achieved ER value. The achieved ER have exceeded the estimated ER value and the justification provided by PP is found satisfactory #CLOSED	

APPENDIX 5: COMPETENCE OF TEAM MEMBERS AND TECHNICAL REVIEWERS

Competency Statement	
Name	Manika Mongia
Years of Experience	3+
Qualifying Roles	
Team Leader	Yes
Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) / CE Region 6 (Hindi)
Technical Expert	Yes (1.1)
Financial Expert	No
Independent Reviewer	No
Approval	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT
Date	23/02/2024

Competency Statement	
Name	Randulph Paulo Rernabe Morales
Years of Experience	1+
Qualifying Roles	
Team Leader	No
Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) / CE Region 6 (Hindi)
Technical Expert	No
Financial Expert	No
Independent Reviewer	No
Approval	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT
Date	04/08/2023

Competency Statement	
Name	Muskan Chawla
Years of Experience	2+
Qualifying Roles	
Team Leader	No
Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) / CE Region 6 (Hindi)

Technical Expert	Yes (1.1, 1.2)
Financial Expert	No
Independent Reviewer	Yes
Approval	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT
Date	05/09/2023

Competency Statement	
Name	Jean Bosco Rwiyamirira
Years of Experience	1+
Qualifying Roles	
Team Leader	No
Auditor	Yes
Country Expert	Yes, CE Region 1 (English) CE Region 3, (French)
Technical Expert	Yes (1.1 ² and 1.2)
Financial Expert	No
Independent Reviewer	No
Approval	
Approved by	Head of Quality and Compliance, SustainCERT

²As per CDM technical area this translates into 3.1 (energy demand)

Date	02/05/2024
------	------------