



**Verified Carbon
Standard**

VERIFICATION REPORT FOR

“BIOLITE AFRICA IMPROVED STOVE PROGRAM”



SUSTAINCERT

Report ID	VCS4151_01062024-31102025
Project title	BIOLITE AFRICA IMPROVED STOVE PROGRAM
Project ID	4151 ¹
Verification period	01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025 (inclusive both days)
Original date of issue	07-July-2026
Most recent date of issue	12-August-2026
Version	04

¹ <https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/4151>

VCS Standard Version	4.7
Client	Biolite Inc
Prepared by	SustainCERT S.A.
Approved by	Mr. Agustín Calle de Miguel <i>Director - GHG Auditing</i>
Work carried out by	Team Leader, Auditor and Technical Area Expert (TA 3.1): Dr. Atul Takarkhede Auditor: Zhiyue Wang Local Experts: Jean Bosco (Rwanda and Uganda), Rija Rakotoson (Madagascar), Akeem Olawale Olaniyi (Nigeria), Namory Diakhate (Senegal, Cote D'Ivoire) Independent Reviewer: Mr. Shivraj Sharma (TA 3.1)

Summary:

A project description

The 2nd verification of the grouped project titled 'Biolite Africa Improved Stove Program' VCS ID – 4151², has been undertaken by SustainCERT, with accordance to the relevant VCS standard, V4.7^{2/}, VCS Program Guide, V4.4^{3/}. Relevant requirements of the ISO 14064-2:2019 and ISO 14064-3:2019^{27/}, as well as applicable criteria for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting has been applied for verification.

The grouped project involves distribution of improved cookstoves (ICS) in the households/small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in Sub-Saharan African countries, targeting Rwanda, Malawi, Nigeria, Mali, Madagascar, Senegal, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Zambia and Uganda^{8/}.

During this Monitoring Period from 01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025, 67,458 nos. of new ICS were distributed^{15/} and total 142,866 ICS were distributed from start date of the project activity. The registered description (VCS PD) comprises of 10 countries^{8/}. For the current MP, PP has distributed ICS in 08 countries namely, Rwanda, Nigeria, Madagascar, Senegal, Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, DRC and Uganda whereas No ICS units have been distributed under Malawi and Zambia till the end of MP2^{13/}. As in Mali and DRC relatively small number of ICS distributed, these have not been monitored by PP in MP2 and thus not considered for emission reduction claim.

ICS models mentioned in the registered PD i.e. Jiko Fresh, Jiko Bora Mama Yao, Jiko Malkia and Jiko Safi was introduced in the grouped project activity during previous monitoring period. No new ICS model has been distributed in present verification period.

The Purpose and scope of verification

² <https://registry.terra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/4151>

Purpose:

SustainCERT has provided verification service for the current grouped project activity to perform independent periodic verification for the monitoring period 01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025 (inclusive both days). SustainCERT has conducted an independent review and ex-post determination of the monitored Green House Gas (GHG) emission reductions that have occurred against the VCS standard, V4.7^{3/}, VCS Program Guide, V4.4^{4/}, the Project baseline^{8/}.

Scope of verification

The scope of verification is to establish/verify that:

- The grouped project activity has been implemented and operated as per the approved registered PD^{8/}.
- The physical features (technology, project equipment and monitoring/metering equipment, if any) of the project are in place in accordance with registered PD.
- The monitoring report and other supporting documents provided are complete in accordance with the latest applicable version of VCS standard.
- The actual monitoring systems and procedures comply with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the registered monitoring plan, the approved methodology 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 grouped project activity is undergoing second verification from 01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025 (inclusive both days), under renewable 1st crediting period (07 years & renewable twice) from 01-June-2022 to 31-May-2029 (inclusive both days)^{8/13/}.

The Method and Criteria used for Verification.

Desk Review:

- Review of project information, monitoring plan specifically monitoring frequency, the equipment calibration requirement, quality assurance and quality control system against the registered PD and applicable VCS standard and applied methodology VCS Methodology from Sectoral Scope 3 (Energy Demand)– VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1^{6/}.
- Remote audit Interviews 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^{8/} and applied methodology^{6/}.
- A detailed cross check of the information provided in the monitoring report against the relevant evidence such as data sources, technical specification of measuring equipment.
- A detailed cross check of the calculations made for the estimation of greenhouse gas emissions.
- An evaluation of data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emissions reduction.

The number of findings raised during verification:

A risk-based approach has been followed for the verification of the project. During verification, 04 CARs, 09 CLs and no FAR were raised during verification. All the issues raised were resolved successfully, details for which can be found in appendix 4 of the report.

Any uncertainties associated with the verification:

The assessment team thoroughly reviewed the monitoring report^{/13/} and the emission reduction calculation sheet^{/14/} against the relevant evidence and applicable VCS requirements, VCS standard V4.7 and VCS guideline V4.4. There are no uncertainties detected with the project during this verification.

Summary of the verification conclusion:

The review of monitoring report^{/13/}, emission reduction calculation sheet^{/14/} along with relevant supporting evidence^{/14/,/15/} and the interview with relevant personnel during remote audit have provided the assessment team with sufficient evidence to confirm the applicable criteria. SustainCERT confirms the grouped project activity has been successfully implemented in accordance with the registered PD and applied methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves V1.1 meeting all the relevant VCS requirements.

SustainCERT confirms that the monitoring period 01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025 (including both the days) in its implementation has generated 589,525 tCO_{2e} of emission reductions^{/14/} from reducing the amount of wood fuel equivalent combustion through reduced charcoal usage in the ICS.

The management of Biolite (the Project Proponent) and Climate Secure, the entity who has prepared monitoring report^{/8//13/} are responsible for the GHG emissions data preparation and its reporting on the basis set out within the project's Monitoring Plan indicated in the registered PD 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	9
2	VERIFICATION PROCESS	10
2.1	Method and Criteria.....	10
2.2	Document Review	12
2.3	Interviews.....	13
2.4	Site Visits.....	16
2.5	Resolution of Findings	18
2.6	Eligibility for Validation Activities	18
3	VALIDATION FINDINGS	18
3.1	Methodology Deviations.....	18
3.2	Project Description Deviations.....	19
3.3	New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects.....	19
3.4	Baseline Reassessment	23
4	VERIFICATION FINDINGS.....	23
4.1	Project Details	23
4.2	Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement	31
4.3	Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations.....	39
4.4	Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals.....	55
4.5	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis.....	56
5	VERIFICATION OPINION.....	56
5.1	Verification Summary	56
5.2	Verification Conclusion	57
5.3	Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison	58
	APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION	59
	APPENDIX 2: TABLE OF REFERENCE.....	60

APPENDIX 3: ABBREVIATIONS.....	62
APPENDIX 4: PROJECT FINDINGS.....	63

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

SustainCERT has undertaken the verification activity of the grouped project titled “Biolite Africa Improved Stove Program” VCS ID – 4151 for the monitoring period 01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025 (including both the days). The purpose of the verification is to conduct an independent review of the project information and confirm:

- The grouped project activity is implemented in accordance with registered PD^{8/}.
- All physical features (technology, project equipment) are in place.
- The actual monitoring systems and procedures comply with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the approved monitoring plan, the approved methodology 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^{6/}

The verification followed the requirements mentioned in the VCS standard, version 4.7^{2/} and VCS guidelines, V4.4^{3/} ensuring the quality and consistency of the report.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of verification for this grouped project activity involves assessing the claims made by the project proponent in the monitoring report^{13/}, emission reduction calculation sheet^{14/} and other supporting evidence (as mentioned in appendix 2) made available to the verifier for this monitoring period from 01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025 (inclusive both days), in accordance to:

- VCS standard, V4.7^{2/}
- VCS program guideline, V4.4^{3/}
- VCS Methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1^{6/}
- Other relevant rules and requirements, including host part requirements.

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 grouped 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 assessment team has conducted a thorough assessment of monitoring report^{/13/}, registered PD^{/8/}, Ex-post emission reduction calculation sheet^{/14/} along with Monitoring survey^{/14/} and Distribution Database^{/15/} of the grouped project.

SustainCERT has planned and performed the verification by obtaining evidence and other information and explanations that assessment team considers necessary to give reasonable assurance that reported estimated GHG emission reductions are fairly stated. All documentary evidence were verified during the - Remote audit Interviews and through photos & supportive evidence were shared by PP to arrive at a positive verification conclusion by the assessment team.

The level of assurance of the verification report falls under reasonable assurance engagements. Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance regarding material misstatements, but not an absolute one.

Reasonable assurance includes the understanding that there is a likelihood that material misstatements will not be prevented or detected on a timely basis. To achieve reasonable assurance, the Auditor needs to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to reduce audit risk to an acceptably low level.

Through an exhaustive process of documentary review, interviews with the project proponents, site visits or remote audits, assessment on GHG Emission Reductions calculations against applicable methodology and any other regulatory document and reporting of objective evidence, the VVB can reach a reasonable level of assurance on the conduction of the verification process. The achieved level of assurance for this verification is thus a reasonable level of assurance as per the requirements set out in the applied VCS Standard version 4.7 clause 4.1.10 (1).

VVB applied a materiality threshold of 1% with respect to omission or misstatements concerning reported quantities as per VCS Standard version 4.7, clause 4.1.10 (4).

In our opinion, the verified GHG emissions reductions were calculated correctly based on the approved monitoring methodology “VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1. and the VCS standard v.4.7 (paragraph 4.1.10) and referring to equations approved as a part of registered PD.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The grouped project has envisaged distribution of ICS in 10 countries in the sub-Saharan African countries however, during this this verification PP has considered distribution in 6 countries only. Small number of ICS distributed in Mali (3,091 ICS) and DRC (3,965 ICS) distributed till end of second monitoring period. Hence, these have not been monitored in MP2 and thus, not considered for emission reduction claims^{14/}. The project involves distribution of ICS in households and/or SMEs ^{15/}. For the current monitoring period, the ICS distribution is for households only as evident from the audit interviews and project ICS database^{15/}. The said countries are Rwanda, Nigeria, Madagascar, Senegal, Côte d'Ivoire, and Uganda. Each country represents one Project Activity (PA) and the ICS distributed under each PA are considered as Project Activity Instances (PAIs) which is found acceptable.

The registered PA under the current grouped project activity and PAIs included under each PA are as below:

PA	Country	Total PAIs implemented (ICS distributed) current monitoring period ³
1	Rwanda	86,722
2	Malawi	0
3	Nigeria	17,232
4	Mali	3,091 (not considered for ERs during this MP02)
5	Madagascar	3,779
6	Senegal	7,134
7	Côte d'Ivoire	9,296
8	Democratic Republic of Congo	3,965 (not considered for ERs during this MP02)
9	Zambia	0
10	Uganda	11,647
Total		135,810 (Excluding Mali & DRC)

For the current monitoring period, PP has distributed a total of 67,458 ICSs in these 06 countries to the households which are considered for issuance during this monitoring period^{15/}. Distributed ICS are portable ICS which use Charcoal as a fuel replacing the existing inefficient baseline stoves which also utilized Charcoal. Thus, the GHG emission reductions are claimed on saving of wood fuel equivalent to Charcoal usage.

As a part of the registered PD, 04 stove models were planned with option to add new ICS during the crediting period which fulfills the grouped project inclusion criteria about efficiency. The ICS distribution is observed for 04 out of 05 ICS models namely, Jiko Fresh, Jiko Malkia, Jiko bora Mama Yao and Jiko Safi. The distribution nos. verified are as below for this MP:

ICS Type	Year		Total nos.
	2024	2023	
Jiko Fresh	167	198	365
Jiko Malkia	3,066	1,519	4,585

³ Though distribution happened in Mali & DRC, due to monitoring survey constraints, PP excluded these two countries during this verification.

Jiko Bora Mama Yao	20,344	35,878	56,222
Jiko Safi	4,531	1,755	6,286
Total	28,108	39,350	67,458

Distribution till end of this MP:

ICS Type	Year				Total
	2022	2023	2024	2025	
Jiko Fresh	3,523	11,598	2,845	198	18,164
Jiko Malkia	2,758	11,965	9,737	1,519	25,979
Jiko Bora Mama Yao	4,351	19,539	32,441	35,878	92,209
Jiko Safi	0	0	4,759	1,755	6,514
Total	10,632	43,102	49,782	39,350	142,866

The start date of the grouped project activity is 01-June-2022, verified from distribution database/^{15/}. The crediting period for the grouped project activity is 01-June-2022 to 31-May-2029 (inclusive both days), as verified based on registered PD/^{8/} and validation report/^{9/}.

Based on this, the assessment team confirms that the grouped project activity is implemented and operational in accordance with applied methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1/^{6/}, VCS PD/^{8/}, VCS standard/^{2/} and VCS guidelines/^{3/}. It has also been assessed and verified that emission reduction calculation for this monitoring period from 01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025 (inclusive both days) has been done conservatively and found to be appropriate.

For the current monitoring period, the grouped project has achieved 589,525 tCO₂e of emission reductions/^{14/}. The country wise and vintage wise verified emission reductions are as below:

Country	Emission Reductions (tCO ₂ e)		Total Emission Reductions Achieved (tCO ₂ e)
	2024	2025	
Rwanda	115,269	275,618	390,887
Nigeria	30,081	51,881	81,962
Madagascar	3,514	5,311	8,826
Senegal	9,446	13,427	22,873
Côte d'Ivoire	13,036	19,278	32,314
Uganda	14,221	38,442	52,664
Total	185,568	403,957	589,525

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Method and Criteria

Verification Process: The project assessment is based on the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, Version 03.0, “VCS program guide v.4.4 and VCS standard v.4.7” and is conducted

using standard auditing techniques and pre-approved audit plan to assess the correctness of the information provided by the project proponent as per following verification schedule:

Scope of the assessment	Date
Initial meeting/Interview	01-June-2026
Interview with relevant personnel	04-June-2026 to 09-June-2026
Final meeting	23-June-2026

The Verification process has been conducted following the regulatory documents and based on the ISO 14064-3:2019 and ISO 14065:2020 using standard auditing techniques as required by the VCS Standard v4.7.

Before the assessment begins, members of the team covering the technical scope(s), sectoral scope(s), and relevant host country experience for evaluating the VCS project activity are appointed in accordance with the SustainCERT procedures and policies, that are in accordance with ISO 14065:2020 regulatory provisions.

SustainCERT has completed a strategic review and risk assessment of the project activities and processes in order to gain a full understanding of:

- Activities associated with all the sources contributing to project emissions and emission reductions, including leakage if relevant;
- Protocols used to estimate or measure GHG emissions from these sources;
- Collection and handling of data;
- Controls on the collection and handling of data;
- Means of verification; and
- Compilation of the information in the VCS MR.

Based on the above, the VVB prepared a Verification Plan and applied an evidence-gathering plan designed to collect sufficient and appropriate evidence upon which to base the conclusion and to consider the inherent risk for the verification. The evidence-gathering plan is based on analytical procedures & tests and considers thresholds for materiality as per the regulatory documents applied for this verification (five percent for projects and one percent for large projects as per the applied para 4.1.10 (4) of VCS Standard version 4.7). For the current verification, a materiality threshold of 1% was considered being large project.

The applied evidence-gathering plan is used by VVB to determine the conformity of the statements made by client against the principles and requirements of applied regulatory documents during current verification.

The evidence-gathering plan designed by the VVB takes into consideration, as a minimum:

- The selection and management of the data and information;
- The processes for collecting, processing, consolidating, aggregating and reporting the data & information;
- Systems and processes in place to ensure the validity and accuracy of the data and information;

- The design and maintenance of the system to control the data and information;
- Systems, processes and personnel that support system in place, including activities for ensuring data quality;
- The plans for instrument maintenance and calibration where appropriate;

Once the project's initial documentation is received by the assessment team, the members of the assessment team carried out:

- SustainCERT has verified the implementation of the monitoring plan and the data presented in the Monitoring Report for the monitoring period applicable to this verification process.

The process of verification involved the following relevant milestones:

- The signature of the contract for verification between the PP and the VVB;
- A kick-off meeting/communication to require the documentary material to perform an initial desk review;
- An initial desk review of the documentary evidences prepared by the PP;
- The issuance of findings coming from this initial desk review (if any);
- The conduction of an remote audit, including interviews with project proponent and project stakeholders (see Sections 2.3 and 2.4 below);
- The issuance of findings from the Site Visit/remote inspection and communication of such deviations (if any) to the PP;
- The assessment of their resolution and closure, when appropriate;
- Once all the findings have been closed, the elaboration of this Verification Report, in which such findings (if any) are described;
- The conduction of an independent Technical Review;
- Upon conclusion of the Technical Review, signature of the corresponding Verification Deed & issuance of Final Verification Report (FVR) done.

The process of this verification assessment has implied sampling plan for remote audit interviews, data/document verification and described/explained in relevant sections.

2.2 Document Review

As part of verification, the primary activity performed was the strategic review and risk assessment of the documents submitted using a dedicated protocol. A detailed review of MR/^{13/} and ER sheet/^{14/} was conducted to check:

- The completeness of the information with reference to the register PD.
- Review of project information, monitoring plan, equipment calibration requirement, quality assurance and quality control system against the registered PD and applicable VCS standard and applied methodology.
- A review of the QA/QC procedures were conducted to make sure the implementation is as per the register PD.

All the other evidence reviewed is mentioned in Appendix 2 of this report. The assessment team cross-checked information provided in the Monitoring report with registered PD and other information sources, if available along with, the team's sectoral or local expertise and, if necessary, independent background investigations.

2.3 Interviews

The grouped project activity is undergoing 2nd MP verification. In line with the para 4.1.12 of VCS Standard, Version 4.7, the VCS Program site visits is required during the first verification of the project after validation. The grouped project activity involves multiple 10 countries, while in the current monitoring report, an assertion has been made only for 06 out of these 10 countries. PP has defined each individual, standalone stove unit as a Project Activity Instance. During the document review, VVB noted that PP has disseminated new ICSs in the aforesaid 06 countries, since last monitoring period, however, no new country has been added in the grouped project. Based on risk assessment and evidence gathering plan, VVB has opted for the remote audit for this 02nd Verification.

During the remote audit, the PP representatives were questioned about the implementation of the grouped project activity. Several topics like the distribution date, Stove serial numbers, location, stove usage etc. were discussed. To cross-check the information provided by PP/users, other documents like distribution database, survey results, validation reports & independent web search etc. were also verified. The details of the people interviewed during remote audit are given below.

The remote audit was carried out between 04-June-2026 to 09-June-2026.

Table 1: Project technology users interviewed

Sr. No	Country	End User Name	Stove Sr. No	Date of Remote Audit
1	Cote D Ivoire	Ahou Angele Patricia	CCA03006517	06-06-26
2	Cote D Ivoire	Aya Edith	14674253	06-06-26
3	Cote D Ivoire	Coulibaly Issa	14379486	08-06-26
4	Cote D Ivoire	Djaha Juliette	14373874	06-06-26
5	Cote D Ivoire	Kalpy Herbert Fly	CCA03000665	06-06-26
6	Cote D Ivoire	Kobenon Abenan Kouman Justine	14680046	06-06-26
7	Cote D Ivoire	Kohou Lou Nenenan Horielle Victorine	CCA03005739	06-06-26
8	Cote D Ivoire	Mahoua	CCA03003513	08-06-26
9	Cote D Ivoire	Sanou Madou	CCA03005976	08-06-26
10	Cote D Ivoire	Santos Grace	CCA03004480	06-06-26
11	Cote D Ivoire	Zida Ismael	14681459	06-06-26
12	Madagascar	Rasolonirina Jean	13675113	05-06-26
13	Madagascar	Rahelinirina Sylviane Stella	CCA03012120	05-06-26
14	Madagascar	Rakotoarinavalona Sitrakiniaina Ravosoa Nandrianina	CCA03011432	05-06-26
15	Madagascar	Rasoloarindrasana Mariette Lys Emma	CCA03011255	05-06-26

Sr. No	Country	End User Name	Stove Sr. No	Date of Remote Audit
16	Madagascar	Vohangimalala Esperance Ranedson	CCA03012048	05-06-26
17	Madagascar	Razafiarivonjy Lala Harinjaka	CCA01013646	05-06-26
18	Madagascar	Hery Tiana Nirinaharilao Rene Nantenaina	13669299	05-06-26
19	Madagascar	Randriamanantena Lovanirina Eric Patrick	13679461	05-06-26
20	Nigeria	Antony Deji	14737829	06-06-26
21	Nigeria	Adetuberu Kunle	14931699	06-06-26
22	Nigeria	Abigail Gana	15425883	06-06-26
23	Nigeria	Ismail Salawu	15501111	06-06-26
24	Nigeria	Toyin Samuel	16595498	06-06-26
25	Nigeria	Mukhtar Madaki	16605794	06-06-26
26	Nigeria	Mohammed Adamu Abdullahi	16651400	06-06-26
27	Nigeria	Isaac Oluwakemi	CCA03008168	06-06-26
28	Nigeria	Ogunniyi Atinuke Amudalat	CCA03009425	06-06-26
29	Nigeria	Rasaq Muhammad Awal	CCA03010121	06-06-26
30	Nigeria	Micheal Toyin Ayobami	CCA03012956	06-06-26
31	Rwanda	Kazimili Niyonzima	17044627	04-06-26
32	Rwanda	Mariam Mugirazina	15794059	04-06-26
33	Rwanda	Petero Nkusi	EC001014601	04-06-26
34	Rwanda	Iyamuremye Damyeri	15819364	04-06-26
35	Rwanda	Anastasie Mukanyandwi	17016256	04-06-26
36	Rwanda	Furaha Louise	16688853	04-06-26
37	Rwanda	Job Kwizera	15090049	04-06-26
38	Rwanda	Uwihanganye Avira	17079014	04-06-26
39	Senegal	Dioum Mayram	14316411	05-06-26
40	Senegal	Konate Awa	14346558	05-06-26
41	Senegal	Dieng Fatou Aly	13863991	05-06-26
42	Senegal	Ayssetou Diop	15515036	05-06-26
43	Senegal	Sarr Maty	CCA03019267	05-06-26
44	Senegal	Diouss Fatou	CCA03019344	05-06-26
45	Senegal	Tall Salamata	13866179	05-06-26
46	Senegal	Sarr Fatou	14357006	05-06-26
47	Uganda	Maimuna Namubiru	CCA02036302	04-06-26
48	Uganda	Namugwere Naume	CCA02036100	04-06-26
49	Uganda	Harriet Nawanghoma	CCA01006982	04-06-26
50	Uganda	Onzima Moreen	CCA01042344	04-06-26
51	Uganda	Rajab Munyi	EC001019529	04-06-26
52	Uganda	Lamech Turyashaba	EC001019250	04-06-26
53	Uganda	Sharifu Badebye	CCA02030659	04-06-26
54	Uganda	Musa Nkuutu	CCA02036108	04-06-26

Table 2: List of PP representative & local stakeholders

S. No	Stakeholder name	Type of correspondent	Details Discussed	Date of Audit
1.	Kiberinka Vestine	Community group leader	Feedback on Project; Awareness Campaign by	04-June-2026
2.	Nyirambarushimana Immaculate	Community member	PP, Carbon Credit Benefits, Positive-	04-June-2026
3.	Ingabire Florence	Private sector representative	Negative Feedback,	04-June-2026

S. No	Stakeholder name	Type of correspondent	Details Discussed	Date of Audit
4.	Ucha David	Other interested party	Grievance, ongoing communication etc.	04-June-2026
5.	Waswa Akim	Community member		05-June-2026
6.	Jean Randimbarison	Community member		05-June-2026
7.	Rija Dominique Rajaona	Other Interested party		05-June-2026
8.	Maryam Bello Lapai	Private sector representative		06-June-2026
9.	Mr Aliyu Alfa	Private sector representative		06-June-2026
10.	Mme N'Guessan Stephanie	Private sector representative		06-June-2026
11.	M Takio Mario	Private sector representative		08-June-2026
12.	Toumany Mboup	Community member		08-June-2026
13.	Abdou Marie Ba	Private sector representative		08-June-2026
14.	Hesbon Nyangena	BioLite	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, ER calculations etc.	04-June-2026 to 09-June-2026
15.	Stanley Kiriungi	BioLite		
16.	Mr. Divakar Singg	Climate secure		
17.	Rishabh Pathania	Climate secure	Completeness of monitoring report, ER calculations etc.	
18.	Sagrika Kalta	Climate secure		

Tables 1 & 2 provide a comprehensive overview of the remote interview process conducted during the verification. These tables outline the personnel involved in the interviews, along with their respective roles. The interviews specifically targeted end users/individuals responsible for monitoring grouped 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 remote audit, and the main topics of the interviews are summarized in the table above:

Remote audit was emphasized on project technology users 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 ICS unique identification number
- Baseline stove and baseline fuel
- Confirmation of signing end user agreements
- Perception on smoke level of project technology vs baseline stove

During the remote audit, verifier team has interviewed the PP's representative, 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/^{15/}and monitoring survey/^{14/}.

2.4 Site Visits

In the current monitoring period (MP2), the VVB carried out a remote audit from 04-June-2026 to 09-June-2026 and inspected the project's technical design and implementation as specified in the VCS PD and monitoring report. The remote audit was conducted to verify the accuracy and completeness of the project implementation. The views obtained during remote audit observations were considered while concluding the verification opinion.

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

The Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, Version 09.0/^{31/} 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".

The verification team selected random sample of PP's monitoring and project KPT survey records (parameter- $N_{y,i,j}$ & $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$) 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. Assessment team AQL, UQL, Producer Risk & Consumer Risks based on the para 39 of Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities Version 09.0 as presented in below table as the either countries are having LDC status &/or

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^{31/}. However, for Nigeria & Cote d'Ivoire assessment team selected 11 samples each from monitoring survey & project KPT survey based on para 30 & 31 of Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities Version 09.0^{31/}.

Sample Size for Nigeria & Cote d'Ivoire:

AQL	UQL	Producer Risk	Consumer Risk	Sample Size; Min	Acceptance No.
0.5%	20%	10%	10%	11	0

Sample Size for Senegal, Rwanda, Uganda, & Madagascar :

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

The verification team covered 8 samples from Monitoring survey for LDC countries and for Nigeria & Cote d'Ivoire consisting of 11 from monitoring survey from each country as stated above. Thus, samples were chosen on the weightage of the number of PP samples, age-wise and model wise. The sampling strategy remains representative, conservative, and compliant with both the applied methodology and the VCS rules.

The purpose of the sampling was to verify the accuracy and representativeness of the PP's monitoring survey data and to assess implementation consistency of improved cookstoves in domestic or community settings in each PA. Each country represents one Project Activity (PA) and the ICS distributed under each PA are considered as Project Activity Instances (PAIs). A random sampling approach was applied using the population of ICS distributed per PA. Based on the survey results for each PA, assessment team noted that stove usage behaviour, implementation practices, and cooking patterns are consistent. The minimum sample size of 8 & 11 was determined as mentioned above. The team remotely inspected stove installations and conducted interviews to confirm monitoring results, correct usage, installation, and distribution integrity. All the households interviewed confirmed that the project stove was operational. The team verified through household interviews and remote observations that stove usage behaviour, implementation practices, and cooking patterns are consistent with the monitoring results in the PA, thus justifying a PA level sampling frame.

The verification team would like to conclude that based on acceptance sampling approach the project participant's sample record meets the requirement.

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

2.5 Resolution of Findings

As discussed above, a risk-based approach has been applied for the verification of the grouped project activity. During the verification, 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, and the approach used to resolve these issues is in Appendix 4 of this report.

As a part of findings, three types of findings are raised by the assessment team as below.

The Corrective Action Request (CAR) is 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) is raised if:

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

The Forward Action Request (FAR) is raised if:

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

During verification a total of 04 CARs, 09 CLs and 00 FARs were raised. The findings are mentioned in the Appendix 4 below. All the findings raised were closed successfully.

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

The grouped project activity is in its 2nd verification. No FAR that has been raised during the current verification period, and no FAR has been raised during the project's registration & previous verification as well.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

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

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

3.1 Methodology Deviations

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

3.2 Project Description Deviations

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

3.3 New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects

This is 2nd verification and during current monitoring period, PP has added 142,866 ICS under the grouped project under different project activities. The details of ICS included are presented in the project distribution database/^{15/}. The operational conditions of these ICS were confirmed on sampling basis, and all were found operational.

The ICS distribution was initiated on 01-June-2022 which is the date of distribution of ICS in PA /^{15/}. The last date of distribution for the current monitoring period is 31-October-2025 which marks the end of current monitoring period /^{15/}. Below table provided distribution status, i. e. grouped project implementation of ICS models for all the countries which was cross checked and confirmed based on project distribution database.

PA#	Country	Status of Implementation (number of ICS (PAIs) distributed)								Total
		Jiko Fresh		Jiko Malkia		Jiko Bora Mama Yao		Jiko Safi		
		2024	2025	2024	2025	2024	2025	2024	2025	
1	Rwanda	0	0	0	0	18,512	34,651	764	34	53,991
2	Nigeria	13	0	826	117	1,832	1,227	0	0	4,015
3	Madagascar	154	198	157	20	0	0	0	0	529
4	Senegal	0	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	34
5	Côte d'Ivoire	0	0	293	209	0	0	0	0	502
6	Uganda	0	0	1,790	1,139	0	0	3,737	1,721	8,387
Total		167	198	3066	1,519	20,344	35,878	4,501	1,755	67,458

As per the registered PD, all the PAIs added during the current monitoring period shall meet the eligibility criteria set in the section 1.4 of the registered VCS PD/^{8/}. The assessment of the same is provided below:

No.	Eligibility Criterion	Description/ Required condition	Means of Verification / Supporting evidence for inclusion	VVB assessment
1	Applicability Conditions	The project activity shall meet applicability conditions for methodology	PA shall demonstrate compliance with VMR0006 version 1.1 in	For the current monitoring period, PP has distributed 142,866 nos. of ICS under 08 (including 67,458 new ICSs) PAs. VVB noted that the

No.	Eligibility Criterion	Description/ Required condition	Means of Verification / Supporting evidence for inclusion	VVB assessment
		(VMR0006 version 1.1) as defined in section 3.2.	the PD or Joint PD MR, as applicable. MoV: PD/ Joint PD MR section 3.2 justifying the applicability criteria of applied methodology.	distributed ICS must follow applicability conditions of VMR0006 methodology i. e. the PAIs are implemented in household premises or in community-based kitchens and each ICS must have minimum 25% thermal efficiency. The submitted project database/^{15/}, remote interviews has confirmed that the distributed ICS are implemented in household premises. Further, the technical specifications of the distributed ICS/^{24/} were cross checked to confirm distributed ICS are having minimum 25% efficiency as 45.7%, 55.1%, 50.7% and 56.90% for Jiko Fresh, Jiko Bora Mama Yao, Jiko Malkia and Jiko Safi respectively. Thus, VVB confirms that the eligibility criterion is confirmed.
2	Geographical Area	The project activity instance shall be located within the physical / geographical boundary of countries covered under the grouped project as specified in 1.1 and 1.4 above.	All ICS implemented / distributed in a PA shall be within the Geographic boundary of Grouped Project. MoV: ICS installation database showing ICS location to be in corresponding country.	VVB has checked the submitted kml file/^{12/} for the implemented ICS and the project database/^{15/}. This evidence confirmed that distributed ICSs are within the 06 project activities (countries) which are part of registered VCS PD. Thus, VVB confirms that the eligibility criterion is confirmed.
3	Baseline Scenario	The project activity shall have the baseline as usage of non-renewable fuel (wood/charcoal) to meet equivalent thermal energy needs.	PA shall capture the baseline fuel of project ICS beneficiaries to show that the baseline scenario is use of non-renewable biomass. MoV: ICS installation database / user registration records showing baseline fuel for ICS distributed.	VVB has checked the submitted project database/^{15/} to confirm the distributed ICS are using Charcoal as a fuel and the baseline is identified as either 3 stone or inefficient charcoal stove. The same was also confirmed based on user registration records submitted/^{15/}. Thus, VVB confirms that the eligibility criterion is confirmed.
4	Technology Type	The project activity shall involve distribution of ICS devices with more than 25% rated efficiency	Only ICS having more than 25% rated thermal efficiency shall be allowed to register in the grouped project.	For the current monitoring period, PP has distributed 67,458 nos. of ICS under 06 PAs. The technical specifications of the distributed ICS were cross checked/^{24/} to confirm distributed

No.	Eligibility Criterion	Description/ Required condition	Means of Verification / Supporting evidence for inclusion	VVB assessment
			MoV: Manufacturer specifications / Manufacturer Certificate / laboratory testing WBT certificates for ICS	ICS are having minimum 25% efficiency as 45.7%, 55.1%, 50.7% and 56.90% for Jiko Fresh, Jiko Mama Yao, Jiko Malkia and Jiko Safi respectively. Thus, VVB confirms that the eligibility criterion is confirmed.
5	Additionality	The project activity shall demonstrate additionality as per the following: Step 1: Regulatory Surplus and either of Step 2: Positive list Or Step 3: Project Method	The PA shall be demonstrated as additional via the following: Demonstrate that 1. The new PAI is not mandated by any law, statute, or other regulatory framework, or for UNFCCC non-Annex I countries, any systematically enforced law, statute, or other regulatory framework. 2. New PAIs are distributed stoves at zero cost to the end-user and/or has no other source of revenue other than the sale of GHG credits as confirmed by the PP. Or Where new PAIs are not provided at zero cost / free to the end-user or has source of revenues	For the current monitoring period, PP has distributed 67,458 nos. of ICS under 06 PAs. 1. VVB has checked the government regulations for these 06 countries ⁴ to confirm that there are no laws or regulations which mandates ICS usage. 2. The interviews with end users and ICS distribution agreements with them has confirmed that, distributed ICS are provided at a subsidized rate to the end users/ ^{21/} . As a part of registered VCS PD/validation, through investment analysis, PP has established that ICS distribution is not financially feasible. For Jiko Safi, PP has submitted investment analysis sheet/ ^{23/} which was assessed. The assessment confirmed that, the ICS distribution at the subsidized price is financially not attractive. Thus, VVB confirms that the eligibility criterion is confirmed.

⁴ Rwanda – no specific document found from the government authority which guides/rules about ICS use. https://www.rsb.gov.rw/fileadmin/Standard_Publications/Standards_for_public_review/DRS_290_2023.pdf – a cookstove specification document was checked but its about biomass cookstove specifications and does not mandate anything about its use. Nigeria – There is a policy brief [Cth Clean Cooking Policy Guide.cdr](#) from Clean Technology Hub of Nigeria but it recommends use of ICS but does not mandate. Mali – No government mandate found but [MALI ALLIANCE FOR CLEAN COOKSTOVES : Promouvoir la Cuisine Propre en Afrique](#) confirms that ICS are being promoted in this country. Madagascar – No government mandate on ICS use but [Energy policy : Madagascar Promotes Clean Cooking](#) a government policy is pushing for cleaner cooking practices. Senegal – no country specific documentation found which mandates ICS usage. Ivory coast - no country specific documentation found which mandates ICS usage and in Uganda – Also does not have nay mandate to use ICS but has proposed a bill [Gov't proposes law on use of clean energy | Parliament of Uganda](#) which encourages adaptation of sustainable cooking technologies.

No.	Eligibility Criterion	Description/ Required condition	Means of Verification / Supporting evidence for inclusion	VVB assessment
			other than the sale of GHG credits, demonstrate that the proposed project activity is either: 1) not the most economically or financially attractive, or 2) not economically or financially feasible using investment analysis.	
6	Start date	The project activity shall start on or after the start date of the Grouped Project.	The start date of grouped project is considered as 01-June-2022 which is also the start date of (the date of distribution of first ICS). The start date of all other PAs to be included in the grouped project shall be after this date. MoV: Distribution record / user agreement showing the date of distribution for the	PP has shared ICS distribution database/ ^{15/} and agreement copies/ ^{17/} . The review of the same confirmed that the earliest distributed ICS were on 01-June-2022. The same is considered as the start date for the grouped project. The same is found acceptable. Thus, VVB confirms that the eligibility criterion is confirmed.
7	Crediting Period	The project activity shall have a renewable crediting period.	Refer PA PD / Joint PD and MR section 1.9	The review of registered PD/ ^{8/} confirmed that, the grouped project activity has chosen renewable crediting period of 07 years twice. The start date and end date of the 1 st crediting period are 01-June-2022 and 31-May-2029 which is acceptable. Thus, VVB confirms that the eligibility criterion is confirmed.
8	Double Counting	The project activity shall confirm that: 1. It is not registered as a project activity in any other mechanism. 2. The project activity is not leaving any other program to join the Grouped Project.	MoV: Declaration by the Project Owner / Project Developer	PP has provided declaration/ ^{19/} which says that during ICS distribution, PP will ensure that PA/PAI is not / will not be registered under any other mechanism/grouped project. The same is found acceptable. Thus, VVB confirms that the eligibility criterion is confirmed.
9	Project Ownership	The ownership of the PA shall be clearly demonstrated by virtue of the following: • End user agreements transferring the ownership of credits from the	MoV: End user agreement for ICS under the PA Or Product packaging/warranty card template	PP has submitted copies of end user agreements. During interviews with end users, the agreements signed with the respective end users were also checked. This review ensured that ICS carbon credits are owned by the PP and same has been agreed by the end users.

No.	Eligibility Criterion	Description/ Required condition	Means of Verification / Supporting evidence for inclusion	VVB assessment
		use of project ICS to the CME/PP. Or Disclaimer on the product packaging / warranty card assigning the rights of ownership of credits to the PP directly		Thus, VVB confirms that the eligibility criterion is confirmed.

As a part of the registered PD, 04 stove models were planned with option to add new ICS during the crediting period which fulfills the grouped project inclusion criteria about efficiency. Assessment team verified the technical specification ^{/24/} and efficiency report ^{/22/} for the same.

Through above assessment, VVB confirmed that all the new ICSs added in the project activity meets the applicability condition and therefore, a reasonable level of assurance is achieved.

3.4 Baseline Reassessment

Did the project undergo baseline reassessment during the monitoring period?

☐ Yes ☒ No

The project activity has not undergone any baseline reassessment during the current monitoring period.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Details

The project “BIOLITE AFRICA IMPROVED STOVE PROGRAM” is Grouped Project (“GP”) by Biolite with Project activity across 10 countries in sub-Saharan region. The countries involved are Rwanda, Malawi, Nigeria, Mali, Madagascar, Senegal, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Zambia and Uganda. Only 8 countries have PAI distributed in the project activity and in the current MP only 6 are being claimed for emission reductions. The grouped project is implemented to distribute Improved Cook Stoves (ICS) with higher efficiency replacing existing inefficient cookstove in households.

Although the ICSs were distributed in 8 countries, the number of units distributed remains relatively low for Mali & DRC. The end users are geographically dispersed across multiple locations, making monitoring activities logistically challenging and economically unfeasible during the current monitoring period. And thus, for the current monitoring period, the ICS are distributed in households in 6 out of 10 PAs are considered. Total nos. of new ICS distributed is

67,458 nos. during this monitoring period and total 142,866 ICS were distributed from start date of the project activity.

Section 1.8 of the submitted MR/^{13/} discusses about the project activity locations for the current monitoring period. As mentioned earlier, in the current monitoring period, new ICS commissioned in 06 out of 10 PA (countries) are claimed. The said PAs are in Rwanda, Nigeria, Madagascar, Senegal, Côte d'Ivoire, and Uganda. The geographical co-ordinates limiting the Project Activity (PA) geographical limits were checked as presented in the section 1.8 of submitted MR/^{13/} and found appropriate.

The project is owned by Biolite Inc and holds the rights to the carbon crediting generated. The same entity is responsible for maintenance and record keeping of the data for this grouped project. Climate Secure is the other entity responsible for preparation of monitoring report and calculation of emission reduction for this grouped project.

For the current monitoring period, the PP has distributed following ICS models. No a new ICS model added during the current monitoring period. The distributed ICS model has replaced existing baseline stoves operating on the Charcoal as a fuel. Thus, the GHG emission reductions are claimed on saving of wood fuel equivalent to Charcoal usage.

Stove Model	Jiko Fresh	Jiko Malkia	Jiko Bora Mama Yao	Jiko Safi
Photo				
Thermal Efficiency	45.70%	50.07%	55.10%	56.90%
Estimated Life	7 Years	7 Years	7 Years	7 Years
Weight	6 kg	5.3 kg	5.8 kg	3.7 kg
Dimensions (cm)	27.5 x 27.5 x 22.5	40 x 21 x 8.8	29 x 29 x 26.5	33.8 x 33.8 x 22.1
Fixed/Portable	Portable	Portable	Portable	Portable
Grate/Chimney	Grate	Grate	Grate	Grate

The distribution of ICS for the current monitoring period is as below:

Vintage wise ICS numbers distribution:

ICS Type	Year		Total nos.
	2024	2025	
Jiko Fresh	167	198	365
Jiko Malkia	3,066	1,519	4,585
Jiko Bora Mama Yao	20,344	35,878	56,222
Jiko Safi	4,531	1,755	6,286
Total	28,108	39,350	67,458

Country wise (PA wise) ICS distribution:

PA	Country	Total PAs implemented (ICS distributed) during current monitoring period
1.	Rwanda	53,991

2.	Nigeria	4,015
3.	Madagascar	529
4.	Senegal	34
5.	Côte d'Ivoire	502
6.	Uganda	8,387
Total		67,458

This is 2nd periodic verification of the grouped project activity with monitoring period from 01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025. The registered grouped project activity has a crediting period of 07 years renewable twice with the start date as 01-June -2022. The end date of 1st crediting period is 31-May-2029.

The start date of grouped project activity is 01-June-2022, when the 1st batch of ICS were distributed and commissioned in the participating Project Activities.

The grouped project has claimed 589,525 tCO₂e of emission reductions for the current monitoring period. More details are available in the verified emission reduction workbook presented to the assessment team. Following table provides Project Activity (country) wise and vintage wise emission reductions from the grouped project for the current monitoring period.

Country	Emission Reductions (tCO ₂ e)		Total Emission Reductions Achieved (tCO ₂ e)
	2024	2025	
Rwanda	115,269	275,618	390,887
Nigeria	30,081	51,881	81,962
Madagascar	3,514	5,311	8,826
Senegal	9,446	13,427	22,873
Côte d'Ivoire	13,036	19,278	32,314
Uganda	14,221	38,442	52,664
Total	185,568	403,957	589,525

The assessment team has reviewed following documentation to confirm the project design, description presented above is in line with the registered VCS PD and VCS rules and requirements.

1. VCS PD^{/8/} and ex-ante emission reduction workbook^{/14/}
2. Issuance documents for first verification (MR & Verification report)^{/18/}
3. Project ICS distribution database for all 06 PAs^{/15/}
4. End user agreements between PP and end users^{/17/}
5. Kml file for Project Activities under the current grouped project^{/12/}
6. Technical datasheet for the ICS distributed as PAI^{/24/}
7. Monitoring survey details^{/14/}
8. Kitchen Performance Tests (KPTs) carried out in first monitoring period^{/14/}
9. Ex-post emission reduction workbook^{/14/}
10. VCS standard and applicable methodology^{/2//6/}

During current monitoring period, the grouped project has added 67,458 nos. of project activity instances under 06 project activities. The eligibility of these PAIs have already been assessed above in section 3.3 of this report to confirm that they abide by the requirements.

Findings: CAR 01, 02, 03, & CL 04 were raised and successfully closed. Refer Appendix 4 for more information.

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion:												
Audit history	The grouped project activity is undergoing 2nd verification under its 1st renewable crediting period. The assessment team has verified audit history using the Project webpage^{5/}, <table><tr><th>Type</th><th>Period</th><th>Program</th></tr><tr><td>Validation</td><td>24-April-2023 -09-June-2023</td><td>VCS</td></tr><tr><td>Verification</td><td>01-June-2022 -31-May- 2024</td><td>VCS</td></tr><tr><td>Verification (Ongoing)</td><td>01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025</td><td>VCS</td></tr></table> It has been concluded that the information present in section 1.2 of MR/^{13/} is appropriate.	Type	Period	Program	Validation	24-April-2023 -09-June-2023	VCS	Verification	01-June-2022 -31-May- 2024	VCS	Verification (Ongoing)	01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025	VCS
Type	Period	Program											
Validation	24-April-2023 -09-June-2023	VCS											
Verification	01-June-2022 -31-May- 2024	VCS											
Verification (Ongoing)	01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025	VCS											
Double counting and participation under other GHG programs	The grouped 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 registries⁵ and available information in public domain and through declaration from the Project Proponent. The assessment team has searched for similar projects with the same nature, capacity and proponent as well as legal owner. It was concluded that no such projects have same location and geo-coordinates, technology or project/legal owners are registered in various carbon schemes like VERRA, GCC, Gold Standard etc.⁶. The following assessments were made by the VVB team to verify the same: 1. The VVB team reviewed the ICS Distribution database (column M) and objectively confirmed that, the baseline technology being replaced by project ICS, for each beneficiary was 3 stone fire / traditional inefficient stove. The VVB team also reviewed randomly sampled customer warranty registration forms to confirm the information in the ICS distribution database with respect to baseline technology is accurate.												

⁵ Registries checked included but not limited to Gold Standard for Global Goals (GS4GG), Global Carbon Council (GCC), CERCARBONO, International Carbon Registry (ICR), American Carbon Registry (ACR) etc.

⁶ Registries checked included but not limited to VERRA, Gold Standard for Global Goals (GS4GG), Global Carbon Council (GCC), CERCARBONO, International Carbon Registry (ICR), American Carbon Registry (ACR) etc.

	2. The VVB team also reviewed the project ex-post usage survey form to confirm that it includes a specific question (no 4) that captures information on each type of stove present in the randomly sampled beneficiary household. The project has a provision to assess and discount the emission reduction by fraction of sampled users that report using other improved wood or charcoal stove. The VVB team reviewed usage survey forms to confirm that none of the sampled beneficiary(ies) reported presence of another improved wood or charcoal stove in their household. 3. Moreover, during the remote audit observations and interviews with end-users, the VVB team made visual inspections of the sampled beneficiary kitchens to confirm if any other improved wood or charcoal stove was present. None of sampled household (54 samples audited by VVB) had other improved stove except only one unit of Biolite ICS. Thus, the VVB team confirms with reasonable level of assurance that the risk of enrolling a beneficiary under VCS 4151, who is already participating in another carbon program/scheme, is non-existent.
No double claiming with emissions trading programs or binding emission limits	The grouped project activity has been thoroughly searched on various websites of various emission trading programs and ETS programs running in various counties, using nature, capacity and project proponent as well as legal owner as the search option. The project does not claim double counting^{19/} with other emission trading programs or binding emission limits. It was concluded that no such projects having same location and geo-coordinates, technology or project/legal owners are registered in other emission trading programs or binding emission limits various carbon schemes like GCC, ICR and Gold Standard⁷. Therefore, it is confirmed by VVB that the project is not double claiming with other emission trading programs or binding emission limits thereby complying with VCS Standard, v4.7; Sections 3.24.3.
No double claiming with other forms of environmental credit	As discussed above the, the project has been thoroughly searched in the currently active environment schemes⁸ and found that the project is not registered with any other environmental credits. PP has also submitted a declaration^{19/} stating that the project is not registered with any other registry.

⁷ Registries checked included but not limited to Gold Standard for Global Goals (GS4GG), Global Carbon Council (GCC), CERCARBONO, International Carbon Registry (ICR), American Carbon Registry (ACR) etc.

⁸ Registries checked included but not limited to Gold Standard for Global Goals (GS4GG), Global Carbon Council (GCC), CERCARBONO, International Carbon Registry (ICR), American Carbon Registry (ACR) etc.

	Therefore, it can be concluded that the project is not claiming 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: a. SDG 1 project specific indicator - Average monthly household savings due to reduction in expenditure on purchase fuel after shifting to project technology. The assessment team verified that the distributed ICS led to saving in the use of fuel required for preparation of food etc. The interviews with end users confirmed that this led to monetary savings for them. The monthly savings presented in table 1 section 1.12 of MR based on monitoring survey results were found appropriate as below for this MP: <table> <tr> <th>Country</th><th>Monthly Savings</th></tr> <tr> <td>Rwanda</td><td>8,462 RWF</td></tr> <tr> <td>Nigeria</td><td>6,430 NGN</td></tr> <tr> <td>Madagascar</td><td>8,868 MGA</td></tr> <tr> <td>Senegal</td><td>4,608 XOF/CFA</td></tr> <tr> <td>Côte d'Ivoire</td><td>3,762 XOF/CFA</td></tr> <tr> <td>Uganda</td><td>27,360 UGX</td></tr> </table> b. SDG 3.9 project specific indicator - % users reporting reduction in Smoke/PM emissions after shifting to ICS in project. The assessment team verified that the distributed ICS led to reduction in smoke during activities conducted using the same. The interviews with end users confirmed that this led to better working environment (i.e. less smoke while using project ICS). The qualitative data in terms of % beneficiaries confirming reduced exposure to smoke/particulate matter exposure, presented in table 1 section 1.12 of MR based on monitoring survey results were found appropriate for current MP. Verified values are as below: <table> <tr> <th>Country</th><th>% Beneficiaries</th></tr> <tr> <td>Rwanda</td><td>90.91%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Nigeria</td><td>84.31%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Madagascar</td><td>80.85%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Senegal</td><td>88.24%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Côte d'Ivoire</td><td>92.16%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Uganda</td><td>87.76%</td></tr> </table>	Country	Monthly Savings	Rwanda	8,462 RWF	Nigeria	6,430 NGN	Madagascar	8,868 MGA	Senegal	4,608 XOF/CFA	Côte d'Ivoire	3,762 XOF/CFA	Uganda	27,360 UGX	Country	% Beneficiaries	Rwanda	90.91%	Nigeria	84.31%	Madagascar	80.85%	Senegal	88.24%	Côte d'Ivoire	92.16%	Uganda	87.76%
Country	Monthly Savings																												
Rwanda	8,462 RWF																												
Nigeria	6,430 NGN																												
Madagascar	8,868 MGA																												
Senegal	4,608 XOF/CFA																												
Côte d'Ivoire	3,762 XOF/CFA																												
Uganda	27,360 UGX																												
Country	% Beneficiaries																												
Rwanda	90.91%																												
Nigeria	84.31%																												
Madagascar	80.85%																												
Senegal	88.24%																												
Côte d'Ivoire	92.16%																												
Uganda	87.76%																												

c. SDG 5.4 – SDG indicator – Proportion of time spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age, and location

The assessment team verified that the distributed ICS led to time saving for preparation of food etc. which is primarily due to better efficiency of ICS/²⁴/. The interviews with end users confirmed that use of ICS has led to time savings for them. The time savings in hours per day presented in table 1 section 1.12, of MR based on monitoring survey results were found appropriate.

Time savings (hours per day) per household from cooking / fuel procurement activities verified during this verification are as below

Country	Time savings (hours/day)
Rwanda	1.18
Nigeria	1.73
Madagascar	0.79
Senegal	1.06
Côte d'Ivoire	1.29
Uganda	1.62

d. SDG 7.1 – SDG indicator 7.1.2- Proportion of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technology

The submitted distribution database has confirmed that during this MP, PP has distributed 67,458 new ICS i. e. project activity instances with 04 different ICS models with better efficiency than the baseline stoves leading to cleaner cooking technology. The ICS numbers mentioned in table 1 section 1.12 of MR based on monitoring survey results were found appropriate. During VVB audit, the assessment team confirmed that the sampled ICS are operational from the date of distribution till end of the current monitoring period. Further, following usage rate was verified during this MP.

Country	ICS Usage Rate (%)
Rwanda	90.92%
Nigeria	83.60%
Madagascar	70.77%
Senegal	88.24%
Côte d'Ivoire	92.02%
Uganda	86.14%

e. SDG 8.5 – SDG indicator 8.5.1 - Average hourly earnings of female and male employees, by occupation, age, and persons with disabilities

The assessment team during interviews with PP representative has confirmed that PP has generated employment through project ICS manufacturing, distribution and its grouped project monitoring activities. The attendance sheet, training records/^{25/} confirmed that grouped project has created employment opportunities for both, male and female. The employment numbers mentioned in table 1 section 1.12 of MR based on grouped project employment records were found appropriate. Following employments were provided by PP during this MP.

Country	Employment Generated
<i>Rwanda</i>	1,808 (826- Male, 982-Female)
<i>Nigeria</i>	136 (32- Male, 104-Female)
<i>Madagascar</i>	133 (65- Male, 68-Female)
<i>Senegal</i>	25 (01- Male, 24-Female)
<i>Côte d'Ivoire</i>	35 (09- Male, 26-Female)
<i>Uganda</i>	17 (11- Male, 06-Female)

f. SDG 13 – SDG indicator 13.2.2 - Total greenhouse gas emissions per year

Review of submitted emission reduction workbook, distribution database, registered VCS PD for fixed parameter and emission reduction calculation has confirmed that the values presented in table 1 section 1.12 of MR are appropriate. The grouped project has claimed 589,525 tCO_{2e} emission reductions for the current monitoring period which is found appropriate.

g. SDG 15.2 – SDG indicator 15.2.1 - Progress towards sustainable forest management

The grouped project is aimed at saving non-renewable biomass fuel (wood fuel equivalent of Charcoal) through use of efficient improved cookstoves. The review of ICS usage rate, its efficiency, wood fuel consumption calculated through KPT results and cross check of the same with the sampled household has confirmed the wood equivalent savings claimed. The review of excel workbook has been verified to confirm the value presented in table 1.1 in section 1.12 of the MR as below.

Country	NRB saved (wood eq.)
<i>Rwanda</i>	181,270
<i>Nigeria</i>	38,009
<i>Madagascar</i>	4,093
<i>Senegal</i>	10,607
<i>Côte d'Ivoire</i>	14,985
<i>Uganda</i>	24,422

Additional information relevant to the project

No commercially sensitive information has been excluded by the PP except the information related to ICS beneficiary(ies) personal details (Name, Address and Phone number) which have been protected in ICS distribution database and ER calculation sheet for personal data privacy and protection. Assessment team verified both private and public versions and found correct.

4.2 Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement

4.2.1 Stakeholder Identification

As confirmed with Project Proponent, the make-up of the stakeholders of the group project activities has not changed. The assessment is performed using project database distribution location as well as assessment of whether new project activity instances distributed in the monitoring report are detected with material discrepancies.

Within the grouped project activities implementation in the monitoring report, no change is detected in terms of project location, monitoring activities as well as changes detected in socio-economic condition within the project area. During current monitoring period, no new ICs model has been added.

Findings: CL 03 was raised and successfully closed. Refer Appendix 4 for more information.

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Stakeholder identification	N/A As stakeholder is identified to be the same as initial identification process as verified against VCS PD.
Legal or customary tenure/access rights	N/A Since the beneficiary households have been provided with an improved cookstove for their personal, private use, as verified against VCS PD.
Stakeholder diversity and changes over time	Stakeholders identified to be the same as initial identification process as verified against VCS PD.

Expected changes in well-being	The project has positively impacted end user lives by reducing smoke emissions and fuelwood equivalent consumption of charcoal. This has been confirmed through project beneficiaries during the remote audit.
Location of stakeholders	The stakeholders of this grouped project are located within each PA i.e. different countries (PA-1 to PA-10) and same is in-line with the registered PD.
Location of resources	N/A as this is an improved cookstove project.

4.2.2 Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Ongoing consultation	PPs has recorded evidence of implementation for on-going consultation in section 2.1.2 of MR. During remote audit call, confirmation on availability of grievance register/ ^{16/} at the local offices of the implementation partner/distribution agencies was confirmed.
Date(s) of stakeholder consultation	No stakeholder consultation meetings were conducted during the current monitoring period. This was confirmed through sampled end user's interviews.
Communication of monitored results	https://global.bioliteenergy.com/pages/carbon-monitoring-results The webpage specifically created for monitoring results display was checked by the assessment team to confirm that the information related to the project design, implementation, and monitoring outcomes is publicly available. Also interviews with stakeholders confirmed that physical copies of monitoring results were displayed at the notice boards at the local offices.
Consultation records	No consultation was conducted for the current monitoring period. However, some minor grievances were received which are summarized in section 2.1.2 of MR and were cross checked against the physical records during the assessment round.
Stakeholder input	No major grievances were received during the current monitoring period as evidence from the copies of grievance register/ ^{16/} . Minor grievances raised were addressed by the PP as evident in section 2.1.2 of MR.

4.2.3 Free, Prior, and Informed Consent

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Consent	VCS standard para 3.18.8 is applicable in case the project is affecting property rights. The grouped project implementation leads to improved cookstove dissemination which is evaluated to have no risk on affecting any property right, Indigenous Peoples (IPs), local communities, nor customary rights.
Outcome of FPIC discussion	VVB team reviewed the signed beneficiary agreements and confirmed that the PP holds ownership rights to the carbon credits generated from the use of the distributed improved cookstoves (ICS).

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 remote audit assessments and interacted with local stakeholders. PP has received few comments during the present verification period, from the local stakeholders during these interactions, according to the verification team's records. VVB team reviewed the grievance records, grievance register, and supporting evidence submitted by the PP. VVB team verified that the reported grievances, primarily related to physical damage of the improved cookstoves during transit, were appropriately recorded, investigated, and resolved through repair or replacement of the affected components. VVB team also confirmed that an established grievance redressal mechanism is in place, accessible to beneficiaries through local offices, field staff, and official communication channels, and concludes that the grievances were addressed in a timely and appropriate manner. 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.

	The established grievance mechanism led to registration of some minor grievances. The same are detailed in section 2.1.4 of MR with action taken against the same. The same is found acceptable. 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. The grievance registers are available at the local offices, and this was confirmed by the end users during the interviews. Findings: CL 03 was raised and successfully closed. Refer Appendix 4 for more information
Grievance redress procedure	VVB team confirmed that the explanation on grievance procedures has been explained in detail in section 2.1.4 of the monitoring report. The procedure, in accordance with VCS Standard v4.7; Section 3.18.4, is explained in section 2.1.4 of the monitoring report. The interviews with end users confirmed that they are aware of the communication channels and locations of grievance registers at the local offices. Also, they affirmed that if they cannot go to the offices, the field staff notes down their issues if any and are duly escalated for its addressal. This is evident from the minor grievances received and its addressal as mentioned in the section 2.14 of MR for the current monitoring period.

4.2.5 Public Comments

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/4/	N/A	N/A

4.2.6 Risks to Local Stakeholders and the Environment

4.2.6.1 Management Experience

The grouped project is managed by Biolite who has expertise in cookstove manufacturing⁹. They have developed carbon projects under various standards as confirmed through internet search. Section 2.2.1 of MR clearly define roles and responsibilities of the Biolite along with Climate Secure¹⁰ which is active as a carbon project advisor.

4.2.6.2 Risk Assessment

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Natural and human-induced risks to stakeholders' wellbeing	No risk identified. The grouped project involves distribution of ICS replacing inefficient baseline stoves. Thus, distribution of ICS itself is a stakeholder's wellbeing is evident as it offers sustainable, safer alternative. This is confirmed by sampled end user during the interviews. The grouped project has no nature or human induced risk to stakeholders' wellbeing as it does not involve any such risk through ICS usage.
Risks to stakeholder participation	No risk identified. The grouped project involves use of ICS replacing inefficient cookstoves reducing the risk to stakeholder participation rather than increasing the same. Further the interviews of end users confirmed that they are happy with its usage thus confirming that more participation is possible through dissemination of technology. And no risk is involved to the new or existing stakeholder participation.
Working conditions	No risk identified. The interviews with PP representatives involved in grouped project operation and end users have confirmed that ICS usage is quite safe. Further, the interviews confirmed that working conditions for PP representatives have mutual respect for everyone, it's free from harassment, no discrimination or human rights violations observed.
Safety of women and girls	No risk identified. The project implementation benefits women and girls through reduction of smoke during meal preparation and shorter cooking time. Also reduce the time taken for fuel collection. This is confirmed through interviews with the sampled end users which mainly consists of women who are the actual users of the IAPs.
Safety of minority and marginalized groups, including children	No risk identified. The PP and implementation partners have code of conduct and policy in place in relevant to hiring worker who are above legal age. The grouped project itself as no risk to minority and

⁹ <https://www.bioliteenergy.com/collections/portable-stoves>

¹⁰ <https://www.climate-secure.com/carbon-offset-project-develop.html>

	marginalized groups, including children as the ICS distribution and usage has no impact on the same.
Pollutants (air, noise, discharges to water, generation of waste, release of hazardous materials)	No risk identified. The project technology is of improved cook stove with good efficiency to burn non-renewable biomass to generate enough heat for end usage. The review of manufacturer specification, actual usage of ICS has given enough confidence to the assessment team that the grouped project will not generate Pollutants (air, noise, discharges to water, generation of waste, release of hazardous materials). The review of datasheet and interviews with PP representative and end users has confirmed that any discharges such as ash, replacement material due to wear and tear of ICS is not hazardous and has no negative impact on the end users and environment. The claim of SDG 3 about reduction in the smoke exposure confirms the same.

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. Biolite has internal code of conduct and policy/ ^{25/} in place to prevent discrimination issues. The assessment team has verified the document, and no issues were detected from the remote interview with personnel.
Sexual harassment	No risk identified. Biolite has internal code of conduct and policy/ ^{25/} in place to prevent sexual harassment issues. The assessment team has verified the document, and no issues were detected from the remote interview with personnel.
Gender equity in labor and work	No risk identified. Biolite employee agreements/ ^{20/} for the current monitoring period has been verified. From the employee contracts submitted by PP, both genders are employed without gender biasness as evident in SDG data too in the above section in this report. According to remote interview with personnel, no issues were reported.
Forced labor	No risk identified. BIOLITE has internal code of conduct and policy in place to prevent human trafficking, forced labor, and child labor. The assessment team has verified the document, and no issues were detected from the remote interview with personnel.
Child labor	No risk identified. BIOLITE has internal code of conduct and policy in place to prevent human trafficking, forced labor, and child labor. The assessment

	team has verified the document, and no issues were detected from the remote interview with personnel.
Human trafficking	No risk identified. BIOLITE has internal code of conduct and policy in place to prevent human trafficking, forced labor, and child labor. The assessment team has verified the document, and no issues were detected from the remote interview with personnel.

4.2.7.2 Human Rights

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
N/A	The nature of the project implementation is through the dissemination of improved cookstove which present no risk to human rights. The employed worker's rights are assessed in section 4.2.7.1.

4.2.7.3 Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
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
N/A	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 on a discounted price and in return the credit for claiming carbon emission reduction is with Biolite.

4.2.7.5 Benefit Sharing

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

Summary of the benefit sharing plan	N/A. The project is implemented through the dissemination of improved cookstove. Through signed user agreements it is clearly communicated that the stove is distributed on a discounted price and in return the ownership of carbon emission reduction is with Biolite.
Benefit sharing during the monitoring period	N/A. The nature of the project implementation does not have benefits sharing arrangements 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. No risk identified. VVB team reviewed the project design, Monitoring Report, and supporting documentation and confirmed that the project activity involves only the dissemination of improved cookstoves (ICS) without any baseline fuel switch or other interventions that could adversely affect biodiversity or ecosystems. The project does not impact intact or High Conservation Value (HCV) ecosystems, critical habitats, landscapes, key biodiversity areas, or designated sites. Furthermore, the use of improved cookstoves contributes to reduced fuelwood consumption, thereby supporting the conservation of surrounding ecosystems. The project is implemented 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 serves a positive impact on surrounding ecosystem.
Soil degradation and soil erosion	N/A. The project is implemented through the dissemination of improved cookstove to replace the traditional baseline stove. The project implementation has no effect on soil degradation and soil erosion.
Water consumption and stress	N/A. The project is implemented 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 at replacing 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 project is implemented through the dissemination of improved cookstove to replace the traditional baseline stove which does not present risk for local species or habitats.
Areas needed for habitat connectivity	N/A. The nature of the project is through the dissemination of improved cookstove to replace the traditional baseline stove which does not present risk for areas needed for habitat connectivity as it has no relevance.

4.2.8.2 Introduction of Species

Species introduced	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
N/A	N/A. The project is implemented through the dissemination of improved cookstove to replace the traditional baseline stove which does not involve introduction of species in its implementation.

Existing invasive species	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
N/A	N/A. The project is implemented through the dissemination of improved cookstove to replace the traditional baseline stove which does not involve introduction of species in its implementation.

4.2.8.3 Ecosystem conversion

Item	Evidence gathering activities and evidence checked
Ecosystem conversion	N/A. The project is implemented 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 assessment team ensured that the monitoring has been conducted in accordance with the provision of registered monitoring plan.

The verification team reviewed whether.

- The monitoring of GHG emission reductions resulting from the VCS grouped project activity is verified against the registered monitoring plan in the VCS-PD and the applied methodology.

- 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 follow the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS-PD and the applied methodology VMR0006 version 1.1. 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. The organizational structure^{/25/}, along with roles and responsibilities throughout project implementation, has been provided in the MR and verified.

PP conducted sampling surveys to gather information needed for the monitoring of $N_{y,i,j}$ and $B_{y=1,new,i,survey}$ parameters. PP conducted monitoring survey between December 2025 to February 2026 across all the project activities (i.e. countries).

As per the registered PD, CDM Sampling standard has been used to determine the sample size to achieve 90/10 confidence precision according to the CDM Standard for sampling and surveys for project activities and programme of activities, version 9.0. The sample size calculation is presented in the section 4.3 of MR. The calculations were checked and it was confirmed that the calculated sample size is acceptable and has achieved 90/10 confidence precision level. Since the ICS distribution lasted for more than a year, PP has used stratified sampling for each PA to find out acceptable sample size.

The Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities (Version 9.0)^{/7/} 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. During the remote audit, end-user interviews and field checks confirmed that the selected households reflected consistent stove use behaviour and technology implementation. The team verified that the newly distributed ICS units were installed in eligible settings and that the sampling methodology was suitable for confirming monitoring results across the grouped project area. Details on the sampling can be found in section 2.4 of the verification report.

Details of the sampled users are detailed in section 2.3 of the verification report. Data collected from the remote audit on the sampled survey verified against habit survey and project distribution database^{/15/}.

Parameter	Description of Parameter	Assessment approach
$n_{y,i,j}$	Proportion of operational ICS	Inspection of the premises to see if the project stove is operational and in use and interview with end user to verify that project stove is still in use

Emission reductions (ER)

The methodology does not calculate baseline and project emissions separately. The steps taken and the equations and parameters applied in the VCS-PD^{8/} to calculate the project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions comply with the requirements of the selected methodology including applicable tool(s).

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

Where:

- i = Indices for the situation where more than one type/model of improved cook stove is introduced to replace the baseline stove
- j = Indices for the situation where there is more than one batch of improved cookstove of type i
- ER_y = Emission reductions during year y in t CO₂e
- $ER_{y,i,j}$ = Emission reductions by improved cook stove of type i and batch j during year y in t CO₂e

$$ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,savings,i,j} \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{wood\ fuel} \times (EF_{wf,CO_2} + EF_{wf,non\ CO_2}) \times N_{y,i,j} \times 0.95 \quad (2)$$

Where:

- $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ = Quantity of woody biomass that is saved in tonnes per improved cook stove of type i and batch j during year y
- $f_{NRB,y}$ = Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass (f_{NRB})
- $NCV_{wood\ fuel}$ = Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted or reduced (IPCC default for wood fuel, 0.0156 TJ/tonne)
- EF_{wf,CO_2} = CO₂ emission factor for the use of wood fuel in baseline scenario (IPCC default for wood fuel, 112 tCO₂/TJ)
- $EF_{wf,non\ CO_2}$ = Non-CO₂ emission factor for the use of wood fuel in baseline scenario (IPCC default for wood fuel, 26.23 tCO₂/TJ)
- $N_{y,i,j}$ = Number of improved cook stoves of type i and batch j operating during year y
- 0.95 = Discount factor to account for leakage

The project has two options to calculate $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ as per the methodology and as evident in the registered PD, equation 4 was chosen for the same.

$$B_{y,savings,i,j} = B_{y=1,new,i,survey} \times \left(\frac{h_{new,y,i,j}}{h_{old}} - 1 \right) \quad (4)$$

Where:

- $B_{y=1,new,i,survey}$ = Annual quantity of woody biomass used by improved cookstoves in tonnes per device of type i and batch j , determined in the first year of the implementation of the project through a sample survey.
- h_{old} = Efficiency of baseline cookstove
- $h_{new,i,j}$ = Efficiency of the improved cook stove type i and batch j determined through water boiling test (WBT) or efficiency may be determined using Equation 5 by utilizing manufacturer's specifications.

$$h_{new,i,y} = h_p \times (DF_n)^{y-1} \times 0.94 \quad (5)$$

Where:

- h_p = Efficiency of project stove (fraction) at the start of project activity
- $(DF_n)^{y-1}$ = Discount factor to account for efficiency loss of project cookstove per year of operation (fraction). This value may be based on actual monitoring or based on manufacturer's declaration on expected loss in efficiency or through publicly available literature on relevant industry standards. Alternatively, a default value of 0.99 efficiency loss per year can be considered.
- 0.94 = Adjustment factor to account for uncertainty related to project cookstove efficiency test

The review of excel spreadsheet – 'ER summary' which is part of the submitted ex-post excel workbook/^{14/} provides details calculations for the achieved emission reductions. The same were checked and found appropriate.

Quantification of leakage emissions:

In accordance with section 8.3 of the applied methodology, VMR0006, version 1.1, a default factor of 0.95 to account for leakage has been applied which is evident in the equation mentioned above.

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, provides a direct equation for the calculation of emission reductions and does not provide calculations of project emissions separately.

The annual vintage-wise emission reductions are presented in the table below for each project activity (PA) i. e. country under this grouped project activity.

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-June-2024 to 31-December-2024	185,568	0	0	185,568	0	185,568
01-January-2025 to 31-October-2025	403,757	0	0	403,757	0	403,757
Total	589,525	0	0	589,525	0	589,525

Data and parameters fixed (ex-ante):

As per registered PD, following parameters are fixed for the entire crediting period using default values as per the methodology:

$\eta_{new,i,j}$: Fixed ex-ante using default discount factor as per methodology in equation (5)
 η_{old} : Fixed ex-ante using default values as per the methodology
 $NCV_{biomass}$: Fixed ex-ante using default values as per the methodology

S.No	Parameter	Value		Means of verification
1	η_p Efficiency of project stove at the start of PA-1 to PA-10	ICS Model	Manufacturer Efficiency	The efficiency of ICS mentioned was cross checked against manufacturer's specifications/ technical data sheet/ ^{24/} and confirmed. The same values are also mentioned in the registered VCS PD.
		Dura Stove	38.10%	
		Jiko Fresh	45.70%	
		Jiko Bora		
		Mama Yao	55.10%	
		Jiko Malkia	50.07%	
		Jiko Safi	56.90%	

S.No	Parameter	Value	Means of verification																						
2	$NCV_{woodfuel}$ Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass	0.0156 TJ/tonne	The assessment team checked and confirmed that the value is IPCC default value ^{/26/} for wood fuel, based on the gross weight of the wood that is 'air-dried', may be used if fuel used in the project device is woody biomass / renewable biomass in line with applied methodology default value. Since the fuel being used in the project stoves is Charcoal, a charcoal to wood conversion factor of 6 is applied for the calculation of parameter - $B_{y=1,new,i,survey}$.																						
3	f_{nrb} Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass.	<table> <tr> <th>Country</th> <th>f_{NRB}</th> </tr> <tr><td>Rwanda</td><td>0.8511</td></tr> <tr><td>Malawi</td><td>0.7084</td></tr> <tr><td>Nigeria</td><td>0.8230</td></tr> <tr><td>Mali</td><td>0.6107</td></tr> <tr><td>Madagascar</td><td>0.6297</td></tr> <tr><td>Senegal</td><td>0.5437</td></tr> <tr><td>Côte d'Ivoire</td><td>0.7642</td></tr> <tr><td>DRC</td><td>0.7692</td></tr> <tr><td>Zambia</td><td>0.8003</td></tr> <tr><td>Uganda</td><td>0.7383</td></tr> </table>	Country	f_{NRB}	Rwanda	0.8511	Malawi	0.7084	Nigeria	0.8230	Mali	0.6107	Madagascar	0.6297	Senegal	0.5437	Côte d'Ivoire	0.7642	DRC	0.7692	Zambia	0.8003	Uganda	0.7383	Verified against value as applied in the registered VCS PD.
Country	f_{NRB}																								
Rwanda	0.8511																								
Malawi	0.7084																								
Nigeria	0.8230																								
Mali	0.6107																								
Madagascar	0.6297																								
Senegal	0.5437																								
Côte d'Ivoire	0.7642																								
DRC	0.7692																								
Zambia	0.8003																								
Uganda	0.7383																								

S.No	Parameter	Value	Means of verification
4	EF_{WF,CO_2} CO ₂ Emission factor for the fossil fuels projected to be used for substitution of non-renewable woody biomass	112 tCO ₂ e/TJ	Verified against default value as per applied methodology VMR006, version 1.1 page 10 and as per the registered VCS PD.
5	$EF_{WF,non-CO_2}$ Non-CO ₂ emission factor of biomass that is substituted or reduced for wood	26.23 tCO ₂ e/TJ	Verified against default value as per applied methodology VMR006, version 1.1 page 10 and as per the registered VCS PD.
6	η_{old} Thermal efficiency of baseline cookstove	0.10 for Firewood 0.20 for Charcoal	Verified against default value as per applied methodology VMR006, version 1.1 and as per the registered VCS PD. For the current monitoring period, the project ICS has replaced baseline stove using Charcoal as confirmed during the site audit interviews.

S.No	Parameter	Value	Means of verification																																																												
7	DF_n Discount factor to account for efficiency loss of project cookstove per year of operation (fraction).	0.99	Verified against default value as per applied methodology VMR006, version 1.1 and as per the registered VCS PD.																																																												
8	$\eta_{new,i,j}$ Efficiency of the device of each type i and batch j implemented as part of PA-1 to PA-10	<table><tr><th></th><th></th><th>Jiko Bora Mama Yao</th><th>Jiko Malkia</th><th>Jiko Safi</th><th></th></tr><tr><th>Age</th><th>Jiko Fresh</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></tr><tr><th></th><th>$\eta_{new, Jiko Fresh}$</th><th>$\eta_{new, Mama Yao}$</th><th>$\eta_{new, Jiko Malkia}$</th><th>$\eta_{new, Jiko Safi}$</th><th></th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>42.96%</td><td>51.79%</td><td>47.07%</td><td>53.49%</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>42.53%</td><td>51.28%</td><td>46.60%</td><td>52.95%</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>42.10%</td><td>50.76%</td><td>46.13%</td><td>52.42%</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>41.68%</td><td>50.26%</td><td>45.67%</td><td>51.90%</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>41.27%</td><td>49.75%</td><td>45.21%</td><td>51.38%</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>40.85%</td><td>49.26%</td><td>44.76%</td><td>50.86%</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td>40.44%</td><td>48.76%</td><td>44.31%</td><td>50.36%</td><td></td></tr></table>			Jiko Bora Mama Yao	Jiko Malkia	Jiko Safi		Age	Jiko Fresh						$\eta_{new, Jiko Fresh}$	$\eta_{new, Mama Yao}$	$\eta_{new, Jiko Malkia}$	$\eta_{new, Jiko Safi}$		1	42.96%	51.79%	47.07%	53.49%		2	42.53%	51.28%	46.60%	52.95%		3	42.10%	50.76%	46.13%	52.42%		4	41.68%	50.26%	45.67%	51.90%		5	41.27%	49.75%	45.21%	51.38%		6	40.85%	49.26%	44.76%	50.86%		7	40.44%	48.76%	44.31%	50.36%		Assessment team noted that as per Option V given in the methodology: “Efficiency of the improved cookstoves to be estimated using equation 5 of applied approved methodology where, loss in efficiency per year is calculated, and therefore this parameter does not need to be monitored”. The values presented here were calculated using the above option based on technical specifications of the ICS being used in the grouped project and hence acceptable. The
		Jiko Bora Mama Yao	Jiko Malkia	Jiko Safi																																																											
Age	Jiko Fresh																																																														
	$\eta_{new, Jiko Fresh}$	$\eta_{new, Mama Yao}$	$\eta_{new, Jiko Malkia}$	$\eta_{new, Jiko Safi}$																																																											
1	42.96%	51.79%	47.07%	53.49%																																																											
2	42.53%	51.28%	46.60%	52.95%																																																											
3	42.10%	50.76%	46.13%	52.42%																																																											
4	41.68%	50.26%	45.67%	51.90%																																																											
5	41.27%	49.75%	45.21%	51.38%																																																											
6	40.85%	49.26%	44.76%	50.86%																																																											
7	40.44%	48.76%	44.31%	50.36%																																																											

S.No	Parameter	Value	Means of verification
			same is also mentioned in the registered VCS PD and hence found appropriate.

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 of verification	<table> <tr> <td>Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency</td><td> Following methodology/^{6/} requirement, the parameter is measured directly or based on a representative sample. Project Proponent carried out monitoring surveys with questionnaire determining whether project technology is used (user vs non-user) for each project instance under each Project activity with the help of stratified random sample sets. The choice of data calculation method is as per the CDM sampling standard in line with registered VCS PD and methodology. As per methodology requirement and registered VCS PD, the monitoring frequency is at least once every two years. The parameter is calculated using usage rate obtained from monitoring survey carried out in December 2025 to February 2026. Frequency monitoring for </td></tr> </table>	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology/^{6/} requirement, the parameter is measured directly or based on a representative sample. Project Proponent carried out monitoring surveys with questionnaire determining whether project technology is used (user vs non-user) for each project instance under each Project activity with the help of stratified random sample sets. The choice of data calculation method is as per the CDM sampling standard in line with registered VCS PD and methodology. As per methodology requirement and registered VCS PD, the monitoring frequency is at least once every two years. The parameter is calculated using usage rate obtained from monitoring survey carried out in December 2025 to February 2026. Frequency monitoring for
Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology/^{6/} requirement, the parameter is measured directly or based on a representative sample. Project Proponent carried out monitoring surveys with questionnaire determining whether project technology is used (user vs non-user) for each project instance under each Project activity with the help of stratified random sample sets. The choice of data calculation method is as per the CDM sampling standard in line with registered VCS PD and methodology. As per methodology requirement and registered VCS PD, the monitoring frequency is at least once every two years. The parameter is calculated using usage rate obtained from monitoring survey carried out in December 2025 to February 2026. 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 requirement and PD, the monitoring frequency is at least once every two years. The parameter is calculated using usage rate obtained from monitoring survey carried out in December 2025 to February 2026. 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 90/10 and requirements of the methodology as mentioned in the registered VCS PD.
	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
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring	N/A

	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?																															
	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																														
	Values of the monitoring parameter	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Country</th><th>MP 2</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rwanda</td><td>78,850</td></tr> <tr> <td>Nigeria</td><td>14,405</td></tr> <tr> <td>Madagascar</td><td>2,674</td></tr> <tr> <td>Senegal</td><td>6,294</td></tr> <tr> <td>Côte d'Ivoire</td><td>8,554</td></tr> <tr> <td>Uganda</td><td>10,033</td></tr> <tr> <td>Total</td><td>120,810</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Country</th><th>Usage Rate MP 2</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rwanda</td><td>90.92</td></tr> <tr> <td>Nigeria</td><td>83.60%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Madagascar</td><td>70.77%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Senegal</td><td>88.24%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Cote d'Ivoire</td><td>92.02%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Uganda</td><td>86.14%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Country	MP 2	Rwanda	78,850	Nigeria	14,405	Madagascar	2,674	Senegal	6,294	Côte d'Ivoire	8,554	Uganda	10,033	Total	120,810	Country	Usage Rate MP 2	Rwanda	90.92	Nigeria	83.60%	Madagascar	70.77%	Senegal	88.24%	Cote d'Ivoire	92.02%	Uganda	86.14%
Country	MP 2																															
Rwanda	78,850																															
Nigeria	14,405																															
Madagascar	2,674																															
Senegal	6,294																															
Côte d'Ivoire	8,554																															
Uganda	10,033																															
Total	120,810																															
Country	Usage Rate MP 2																															
Rwanda	90.92																															
Nigeria	83.60%																															
Madagascar	70.77%																															
Senegal	88.24%																															
Cote d'Ivoire	92.02%																															
Uganda	86.14%																															
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values are verified through data analysis of the presented data for each project activity for usage rate of project technology multiplied with total distributed units per project instances as verified in ER calculation workbook.																														
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	Remote audit carried out by verifier team including verification using verbal confirmation with project technology user.																														
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission	Monitoring survey carried out to obtain value for usage rate ($n_{y,i,j}$) used in calculating $N_{y,i,j}$. Traceability of the data from the submitted excel data file was performed from the data source																														

	reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	using sampled data set during remote audit.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	Monitoring is verified to be carried out as per the approved VCS PD and methodology requirement with no deviation.
Findings	No finding raised,	
Conclusion	The parameter has been calculated accurately.	

2. Parameter Life span (Operating lifetime of the project device for projects opting Equation 5 for determining project stove efficiency)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	The parameter is monitored in line with applied methodology and registered PD. The value is fixed and recorded at the time of project stove installation, which is appropriate.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes. As the parameter measures lifetime of the stove and same is recorded from the time of sale. The same is in line with the registered monitoring plan and monitoring methodology.
	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	N/A

	selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	
	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
	Values of the monitoring parameter	7 years
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Submitted manufacturer's specifications and review of registered PD confirmed the values presented are correct. Project database was verified to confirm that ICS distribution is from 01-June-2022 thus within its operational life span.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	N/A. During site visit, sampled ICS were visually checked for the operating conditions and were found operational. The interviews with end users confirmed that the stoves are operational from their distribution date.
	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.
Findings	No finding raised.	
Conclusion	Life span of the distributed stoves is verified as claimed by PP which is 7 years according to the registered PD. The life span of the new introduced model has been cross-checked by the VVB against manufacturer specifications and found correct and in line with the registered PD life span details. The data is derived from manufacturer's specifications with actual monitored data obtained from monitoring	

	surveys and provided the same conclusion that 100% of the stoves that were reported operational during monitoring surveys were also operational during remote audits. Site visit and interviews conducted by verifier team confirmed the accuracy of the data claimed.
--	--

3. Parameter $B_{y=1, new, i, j, survey}$ (Annual quantity of woody biomass used by improved cookstoves in tonnes per device of type i, determined in the first year of the implementation of the project through a sample survey)

Means of verification	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Following methodology requirement, the parameter is to be obtained from survey.																																						
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes. Following methodology requirement, the parameter is to be obtained from survey in the first year of implementation. Parameter has been already verified during first monitoring period verification. No further assessment required.																																						
	Monitoring equipment	Calculated																																						
	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	The monitoring equipment used to measure the biomass values is duly calibrated and/or newly purchased weight scale as confirmed during site interviews. The accuracy of the weigh scale is not defined by the local/national standards and PP has calibrated the scales as per manufacturer’s requirements. The calibration details checked are presented below: <table><tr><th>Country</th><th>Brand</th><th>Model</th><th>Number of units</th><th>Date of calibration</th></tr><tr><td>Uganda</td><td>Crane Scale</td><td>Hanging Scale</td><td>1</td><td>02-June-2024</td></tr><tr><td>Rwanda</td><td>WeiHeng</td><td>Ebalance</td><td>1</td><td>01-September-2023</td></tr><tr><td>Nigeria</td><td>Shahin</td><td>JP Series</td><td>1</td><td>22-July-2023</td></tr><tr><td>Cote d'Ivoire</td><td>WeiHeng</td><td>WH-A08</td><td>7</td><td>No calibration, Scale brand new</td></tr><tr><td>Senegal</td><td>EureCare</td><td>Hanging Scale</td><td>1</td><td>20-October-2023</td></tr><tr><td>Madagascar</td><td>WeiHeng</td><td>WH-A08</td><td>1</td><td>21-September-2023</td></tr></table>					Country	Brand	Model	Number of units	Date of calibration	Uganda	Crane Scale	Hanging Scale	1	02-June-2024	Rwanda	WeiHeng	Ebalance	1	01-September-2023	Nigeria	Shahin	JP Series	1	22-July-2023	Cote d'Ivoire	WeiHeng	WH-A08	7	No calibration, Scale brand new	Senegal	EureCare	Hanging Scale	1	20-October-2023	Madagascar	WeiHeng	WH-A08	1
Country	Brand	Model	Number of units	Date of calibration																																				
Uganda	Crane Scale	Hanging Scale	1	02-June-2024																																				
Rwanda	WeiHeng	Ebalance	1	01-September-2023																																				
Nigeria	Shahin	JP Series	1	22-July-2023																																				
Cote d'Ivoire	WeiHeng	WH-A08	7	No calibration, Scale brand new																																				
Senegal	EureCare	Hanging Scale	1	20-October-2023																																				
Madagascar	WeiHeng	WH-A08	1	21-September-2023																																				

	as per the manufacturer's specification?	
	Calibration frequency /interval:	N/A the methodology or registered PD does not specify the calibration interval.
	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 the methodology or registered PD does not specify the calibration interval.
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	Yes. The remote interviews and review of calibration certificates have confirmed the same.
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole	Yes. The remote interviews and review of calibration certificates have confirmed that the monitoring equipment were calibrated at the time when project KPTs were conducted

	reporting period?															
	Values that are monitored	Parameter has been already verified during first monitoring period verification. No further assessment required. <table><tr><td>Country</td><td>$B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$</td></tr><tr><td>Rwanda</td><td>0.323</td></tr><tr><td>Nigeria</td><td>0.320</td></tr><tr><td>Madagascar</td><td>0.260</td></tr><tr><td>Senegal</td><td>0.325</td></tr><tr><td>Côte d'Ivoire</td><td>0.238</td></tr><tr><td>Uganda</td><td>0.379</td></tr></table>	Country	$B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$	Rwanda	0.323	Nigeria	0.320	Madagascar	0.260	Senegal	0.325	Côte d'Ivoire	0.238	Uganda	0.379
Country	$B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$															
Rwanda	0.323															
Nigeria	0.320															
Madagascar	0.260															
Senegal	0.325															
Côte d'Ivoire	0.238															
Uganda	0.379															
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The parameter is not calculated rather measured as the parameter $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ is calculated using equation 4 which is following one of the options presented by the methodology^{/7/} to obtain ER value during first verification. The values were conducted using KPTs and the KPT data is presented in the excel sheet - KPT Data^{/14/}.														
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross checked with other available data?	N/A.														
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	N/A.														
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either deviation?	N/A. The parameter is not calculated rather measured as the parameter $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ is calculated using equation 4 which is following one of the options presented by the methodology to obtain ER value.														

Findings	No finding raised.
Conclusion	This parameter is listed as one of the monitored parameters both in methodology and registered PD. Looking at the methodology requirement, the parameter $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ is set to be monitored from survey, which is used to calculate value for $B_{y,savings,i,j}$. The parameter $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ as per methodology can be calculated using equation 3 or 4. PP has opted for option 4 evident from the claim made in section 5.4 of the monitoring report and ER calculation. Parameter has been already verified during first monitoring period verification. No further assessment required.

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 grouped project activity, under this monitoring period from 01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025.

Findings: CAR 04 and CL 05, 06, 07, 08, 09 were raised and successfully closed. Refer Appendix 4 for more information.

4.4 Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals

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

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

The verification team can confirm that sufficient evidence is available for the whole monitoring period and the same is verifiable.

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 below sections this report.
- The calculations of baseline emissions as presented in the corresponding ER sheet and final Monitoring Report were checked and found to be consistent with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan 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 documents related to operations, quality, and generation of data during the monitoring period such as cross verification against initial/raw data source (as presented in appendix 2 below) for competence evaluation of monitoring personals and survey execution guidance, data quality check for plausibility and accuracy, 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. Information regarding project capacity and monitoring system was verified. Thus, a reasonable level of assurance is achieved.

Findings: CL02 was raised and successfully closed. Refer Appendix 4 for more information.

4.5 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

As per VCS standard 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 grouped project activity VCS – 4151, “BIOLITE AFRICA IMPROVED STOVE PROGRAM” has undergone 2nd verification with monitoring period from 01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025 (including both days). Biolite is responsible for the collection, analysis, aggregation, preparation (conversion factors, assumptions, methodology, calculations) and presentation of activities and related GHG data in its public disclosures (including but not limited to monitoring report, emission reduction calculation sheet, submitted documents/ emails/ communications). Our responsibility for performing this work is to the management of Biolite in accordance with terms of reference agreed with Biolite 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 VCU's hereby verified and certified.

SustainCERT applies its own quality management system and compliance policies for quality control, in accordance with ISO/IEC 17029:2019, ISO 14065:2020 and ISO 14064-3:2019 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 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 Biolite Inc and its subsidiaries on the scope of verification that could compromise the independence or impartiality of our work.

5.2 Verification Conclusion

The Verification of the project titled 'BIOLITE AFRICA IMPROVED STOVE PROGRAM' VCS ID – 4151, has been undertaken by SustainCERT, as requested by Biolite, project proponent for the monitoring period 01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025 (including both the days) as reported in monitoring report. The grouped project activity is implemented in accordance with the registered monitored plan in registered VCS PD and the emission reduction from the grouped 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 grouped project activity for the period 01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025 are fairly stated in the project monitoring report. 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 VCS PD.

Verification period: From 01-June-2024 to 31-October-2025

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 VCU's (tCO ₂ e)	Removal VCU's (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCU's (tCO ₂ e)
01-Jun-2024 to 31-Dec-2024	185,568	0	0	185,568	0	185,568
01-Jan-2025 to 31-Oct-2025	403,957	0	0	403,957	0	403,957
Total	589,525	0	0	589,525	0	589,525

5.3 Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison

Based on PDD Estimates

Vintage period	Ex-ante estimated reductions/removals	Achieved reductions/removals	Percent difference	Explanation for the difference
01-Jun-2024 to 31-Dec-2024	332,348	185,568	-44.16%	The achieved ERs are less than the estimated ERs. The lesser ERs are primarily due to differences between ex-ante assumptions and actual monitored performance including usage rate and ICSs distribution throughout monitoring period.
01-Jan-2025 to 31-Oct-2025	472,120	403,957	-14.43%	
Total	804,468	589,525	-26.71%	

Based on Actual ICS distributed:

Vintage period	Ex-ante estimated reductions/removals	Achieved reductions/removals	Percent difference	Explanation for the difference
01-Jun-2024 to 31-Dec-2024	413,113	185,568	-55.08%	The achieved ERs are less than the estimated ERs. The lesser ERs are primarily due to differences between ex-ante assumptions and actual monitored performance including usage rate and ICSs distribution throughout monitoring period.
01-Jan-2025 to 31-Oct-2025	586,852	403,957	-31.16%	
Total	999,965	589,525	-41.04%	

APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION

Section	Information	Justification	Assessment method and conclusion
N/A	Name, Address and Phone number of end-users	No commercially sensitive information has been excluded by the PP except the information related to ICS beneficiary(ies) personal details (Name, Address and Phone number) which have been protected in ICS distribution database and ER calculation sheet for personal data privacy and protection.	Assessment team verified both private and public versions and found correct for personal information like Name, Address and Phone number and thus accepted.

No commercially sensitive information that is excluded in the public version of the monitoring report.

APPENDIX 2: TABLE OF REFERENCE

S. No	Document Title	Version	Date
1.	Contract copy between VVB and project proponent (Biolite)		18-June-2025
2.	VCS standard https://verra.org/documents/vcs-standard-v4-7/	4.7	Last accessed on 02-December-2025
3.	VCS guidelines https://verra.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/VCS-Program-Guide-v4.4.pdf	4.4	Last accessed on 02-December-2025
4.	Validation and Verification Manual https://verra.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/VCS_Validation_Verification_Manual_v3.2.pdf	3.2	Last accessed on 02-December-2025
5.	VCS Project Webpage, VCS ID – 4151 Verra Search Page		Last accessed on 02-December-2025
6.	VCS 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	Last accessed on 02-December-2025
7.	Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities https://cdm.unfccc.int/sunsetcms/storage/contents/stored-file-20210531160756223/Meth_Stan05.pdf	9.0	Last accessed on 02-December-2025
8.	Registered VCS PD	5	06-June-2024
9.	Validation report	7	07-June-2024
10.	VERRA Project Review Report (First Verification)	-	12-June-2024
11.	Ex-ante emission reduction workbook	4	06-May-2024
12.	Kml file for project activities and project activity instances		
13.	Monitoring report Initial version Final version Final version (PRR Rd#01)	1.2 1.3 2.0	02-June-2026 02-July-2026 06-August-2026
14.	Ex-post Emission Reduction workbook containing emission reduction calculation, sample size calculator, monitoring survey results and KPT data		

S. No	Document Title	Version	Date
	Initial version	1	02-June-2026
	Final version (private & public versions)	2	02-July-2026
	Final version (PRR Rd#01)	4.0	06-August-2026
15.	Project Activity Instance (ICS) distribution database (private & public versions)	-	-
16.	Grievance registers records for all the project activities for the monitoring period	-	-
17.	Monitoring survey forms along with sample agreements signed with users	-	-
18.	Issuance documents for first monitoring period Monitoring Report, Version 5.1 dated 26-February-2026 Verification Report, Version 04, 27-February-2026 Final ER sheet	-	-
19.	Double counting Declaration	-	06-May-2022
20.	Employment Contract	-	-
21.	Evidence to confirm discounted prices being paid by end users	-	-
22.	Efficiency certificate by CREEC for Jiko Safi (B/TR/2023/081)		04-december-2023
23.	Investment analysis conducted for additionality of newly added ICS – Jiko Safi	-	-
24.	Manufacturer's specifications for the ICS being used under the current monitoring period	-	-
25.	Biolite Africa Expansion PoA Organizational Chart.pdf Biolite AML_CFT (anti-money laundering) Policy.pdf Biolite Environmental and Social Policy.pdf Biolite Fraud Prevention Policy.pdf Biolite Kenya Certificate of Incorporation.pdf BIOLITE WARRANTY POLICY MASTER TEMPLATE.pdf Biolite Supplier Code of Conduct Signed 08052022 SSM.pdf Biolite employee register and training records	-	-

S. No	Document Title	Version	Date
26.	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories; Chapter 2 Stationary Combustion	2006	-
27.	ISO 14064-2:2019 ISO 14064-3:2019	-	-
28.	Site visit/remote audit records	-	-

APPENDIX 3: ABBREVIATIONS

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

APPENDIX 4: PROJECT FINDINGS

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#01	Developer Response
VCS Standard, v4.7		Kindly submit supporting documents mentioned in the MR and to support the MR reporting:	The requested documents are being submitted.
VCS_Validation_Verification_Manual_v3.2		• No double counting declaration • Samples of consent and carbon right transfer agreements signed by the end users • Grievance registry and redressal records • Evidence of Human Rights and Equity safeguards, including Employee Handbook, Environment and Social Policy, and Anti-Money Laundering Policy • Sample monitoring survey forms • Evidence of trainings for survey field team • Employment evidence • Physical copies of the monitoring results displayed on noticeboards at the PP's office • Evidence of employee wages meet or exceed industry standards and comply with minimum wage regulations • Manufacturer specification certificates of the ICS models	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#01	Developer Response
	Rd 2	Documents are submitted. Finding is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#02	Developer Response
VCS Standard, v4.7 VCS Monitoring Report Template, v4.4	SD Contributions	1. As per the MR template requirements, evidence of the project's SD contributions shall be provided as appendices to this report. Kindly provide the evidence or refer to the evidence in the MR. 2. In the MR section 1.12, it mentions that "Till the end of the current monitoring period, 75,472 units of ICS (project activity instances) were distributed within the grouped project boundary. Of the 10 PAs in the grouped project, project activity instances (ICSSs) were distributed in 8 PAs only (till the end of the monitoring period). However, in the other section of the MR and the project database, the total distribution is 142,866 ICS. In addition, 2 of the 8 PAs, Mali and DRC are not reported in the SDG contributions in the same section. Kindly clarify the discrepancies in the countries considered during this MP and associated SDG contributions. 3. SDG 7.1 The number of ICS Distributed over project lifetime reported in MR is consistent with what's in the project database submitted. However, if using the number of ICS distributed during this MP + ICS distributed in MP1, the total distribution is higher than what's reported in this MR for over project lifetime. Kindly clarify the difference. 4. SDG 8.5	1. Section 1.12 of the Monitoring Report has been updated to clearly reference the supporting evidence for the project's Sustainable Development (SD) contributions to the relevant sections. Additionally, all supporting documents and evidence pertaining to the reported SD contributions are being submitted for reference. 2. The PD clarifies that the figure reported in Section 1.12 of the MR contained a typographical error. The section has been revised to reflect the correct cumulative number of Improved Cookstoves (ICS) distributed under the grouped project activity until the end of the current monitoring period, i.e., 142,866 units, consistent with the project database and other sections of the MR. With regard to Mali and the DRC, the PD confirms that although ICSSs were distributed in these countries, the number of units distributed till the end of the monitoring period, remains relatively low compared to other PAs. Furthermore, the end users are geographically dispersed wider across multiple locations in these two countries, making monitoring activities logistically challenging and economically unfeasible during the current monitoring period. Therefore, as a conservative approach, the PD decided not to undertake monitoring activities in Mali and DRC for

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#02	Developer Response
		The employment generated equals the employment generated over project lifetime. However, as per the MR template requirement, the current project contribution should be the contribution during the current MP and should not include the contributions generated in the previous MP. Also, there is removal of two countries during this MP, thus clarify the changes in the employments. Kindly clarify.	the current monitoring period. Consequently, no emission reductions, sustainable development contributions, or other project benefits have been claimed for ICS distributed in these two countries, even though the ICS distributed in these two countries are presumably under operation, generating emission reductions and sustainable development impact. Accordingly, only the six monitored countries i.e., Rwanda, Nigeria, Madagascar, Senegal, Côte d'Ivoire, and Uganda were considered for project surveys, emission reduction calculations, and Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) contribution assessments during the current monitoring period. 3. PD confirms that the difference is intentional. During the current monitoring period, the PD received request from some users with ICS distributed in MP1, regarding loss / theft of their stoves and requesting new ICS as replacement. Thus, as a conservative measure, the PD decided to exclude these records from future claims and from the cumulative eligible project population reported in the current Monitoring Report. Accordingly, the cumulative number of ICS reported in the current monitoring period is lower than the sum of the distributions reported during MP1 and this monitoring period. This reflects a conservative reporting approach adopted by the PD following the internal QA/QC review.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#02	Developer Response
			4.The employment generation figures reported in the Monitoring Report have now been revised based on the latest employment records. The employment figures presented in the current Monitoring Report under SDG 8 reflect the total number of individuals employed under the project during the 2nd monitoring period. This includes a gender-disaggregated breakdown of the workforce engaged in project-related activities, comprising 944 male employees and 1209 female employees. Thus, the figures reported under “Employment Generated” are based on the employment status observed during the current monitoring period. Supporting employment records are being submitted for verification. Additionally, under “Employment Generated over Project Lifetime”, the PD has reported the maximum employment figure observed in any monitoring period during the crediting period. This figure represents the peak number of individuals employed by the project at any point in time. The approach avoids potential double counting of individuals employed across multiple monitoring periods and is conservative compared to aggregating employment figures across monitoring periods, which could overstate the total employment generated by counting the same individual more than once.
	Rd 2	1. PP has referred to the corresponding evidence of the SD contributions in the MR. Finding is closed.	4. PD clarifies that, as per the registered VCS Project Description (Page 33), the monitoring parameter under “Current project contributions” for quantifying SDG 8 is defined as “Number of male/female employment created by project.” In line with the registered

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#02	Developer Response
		2. MR is corrected and clarification is accepted. The total number of ICS and the reported SD contributions (only for the 6 countries excluding Mali and DRC) are found consistent with the project database and ER calculation sheet. Finding is closed. 3. Clarification is accepted. It is more conservative by excluding the replaced ICS from ER calculations. Finding is closed. 4. MR lacking the number of additional employment generated during this MP. Kindly clarify and revise table accordingly. Finding is open.	monitoring plan, this parameter represents the total number of individuals employed and engaged in project activities during the current monitoring period, rather than only the additional employment generated during that monitoring period. Accordingly, the Monitoring Report presents the total workforce engaged in the project during the current monitoring period, (i.e. including those employees that got employed in previous MPs and still under employment in the current MP and new employees engaged in the current MP) with a gender-disaggregated breakdown. Supporting employment records have already been submitted for verification, and the values reported in the Monitoring Report are consistent with these records and the requirements of the registered VCS PD. Therefore, no further revision of the Monitoring Report is considered necessary.
	Rd 3	PP has reported instantaneous number of employees during this MP and thus finding is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#03	Developer Response
VCS Standard, v4.7	Stakeholder and Safeguards	1. In section 2.1.2, it states that “Information related to the project design, implementation, and monitoring outcomes was publicly disseminated through the website of the PP”. The assessment team has checked the PP website and found that MP1 were available on the website. The results of MP2 is not available yet. As per the VCS Standard 3.18.6, Prior to each validation/verification event, the project proponent shall communicate relevant information to the stakeholders, including results of monitoring. Kindly clarify how these information was communicated to the stakeholders prior to the verification.	1. The PD confirms that, in accordance with VCS Standard Section 3.18.6, the monitoring outcomes for the current monitoring period were published on the PD’s website prior to the verification and made publicly available to stakeholders. As evidence, the PD is submitting screenshots of the relevant webpage showing the publication of the monitoring results. Additionally, the weblink for the publication of monitoring results has been updated in Section 2.1.2 of the Monitoring Report. 2. MR section 2.1.2 has now been updated to correctly reflect the grievances that were received during

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#03	Developer Response
		2. In MR section 2.1.2 Consultation records, the minor grievance records reported are same as the MP1 MR and contain country Mali which is excluded from this MP's reporting. Kindly clarify and ensure that the grievances reported are from the current monitoring period. 3. In section 2.1.4, a) The same issue as point 2 was found. Kindly submit the grievance registry for VVB to cross check. b) If there are broken stoves reported during this MP, kindly clarify if there are any non-functional days of the stoves before replacement and if the non-functional days are accounted in the ER calculation. c) Kindly describe the steps taken to resolve the grievance as required by the VCS MR template. 4. Kindly clarify if there is a waste policy for the broken parts of the stove or non-functional stoves.	the current MP. Consequently, the grievance records pertaining to Mali has now been removed. 3. Responses: a. Section 2.1.4 of the Monitoring Report (MR) has been updated to correctly reflect the grievances received during the current MP. Additionally, the grievance documents are being submitted for reference. Furthermore, the PD has added a tab titled "Grievance Discount" in the ER Sheet to account for and discount any emission reductions associated with the reported grievances. b. The PD has added a tab titled "Grievance Discount" in the ER Sheet to account for and discount any emission reductions associated with the reported grievances. Please refer to cells E206:E209 in the "Grievance Discount" tab and cells U16:U22 in the "ER Summary" tab for details of the applied discount and its impact on the emission reduction calculations. c. Refer to the above response. 4. The ICS distributed under the grouped project are made from simple, non-toxic, and commonly used materials. The primary components include steel cladding/grates and basic insulation materials such as ceramic. At end-of-life, the stoves do not pose any waste concerns, as the materials can be easily managed without creating environmental risk. In local practice, metal parts are commonly collected and purchased by

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#03	Developer Response
			scrap buyers, similar to other household items, ensuring they are reused or recycled through the existing informal recycling channels. The remaining clay or ceramic components are inert and naturally degrade without harmful impact.
	Rd 2	1. PP has referenced in MR the link of the MP2 result on their website, as well as submitted the MP2 result report, audit meeting schedule, and photo of the physical result report. Finding is closed. 2. MR is corrected and the number of grievances are found consistent with the grievance records. Finding is closed. 3. a) PP has submitted the grievance records and the copy of the physical grievance book. Closed. b) It is found that there are multiple Physical Damages reported and repairs/replacement happened. The stove failure days are accounted into the GHG emission reduction calculation as per the ER sheet "Grievance discount". However, as per the Grievance discount calculation, the Fraction of Grievance (%) with respect to ICS population is calculation by "COUNTA(A2:A200)/SUM('ER Summary'!Q27:Q34)", where Q27:Q34 is the total number of ICS of the 8 countries. According to the MR and ER calculation, only 6 countries are included in the ER calculation. In addition, the grievance records do not contain grievance from Mali and DRC. Kindly clarify why the total number of ICS of the 8 countries is used for this grievance discount calculation. Open.	3. Responses: b) The grievance discount calculation in the ER sheet has been revised to ensure consistency with the emission reduction calculations. Since no emission reductions have been claimed for ICS distributed in DRC and Mali during the current monitoring period, the denominator used to calculate the grievance fraction has been updated to include only the ICS population from the six countries included in the emission reduction calculations. Consistent with this approach, no grievance records from DRC and Mali have been considered in the grievance discount calculation, as these countries were excluded from the current monitoring period's emission reduction claim. The updated ER sheet is being submitted for the verification team's review. c) Section 2.1.4 of the Monitoring Report already describes the actions taken to address the reported grievances, including repair, replacement, and other corrective measures, where applicable.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#03	Developer Response
		c) Resolutions of the grievance are provided but grievance redress procedure is not provided in the MR. As per the MR template requirement, kindly describe the steps taken to resolve the grievance in MR 2.1.4. Open. 4. Clarification is accepted. Finding is closed.	In addition, Section 2.1.4 has now been updated to include the following details: The Project Developer has established a grievance redress mechanism to ensure that all concerns related to the project are addressed in a timely and transparent manner. Beneficiaries may submit grievances through project field staff, local representatives, customer support channels, or during routine monitoring visits. Upon receipt, the grievance is recorded by the team, including details such as the nature of the grievance, and date of receipt etc. The grievance is then reviewed to determine the appropriate corrective action. Depending on the type of grievance, the concerned field team investigates the issue and implements the necessary corrective measures, such as repairing or replacing damaged cookstoves or components, offering user guidance, or taking other appropriate actions. Following implementation of the corrective action, the grievance record is then updated with the actions taken, resolution status, and closure date.
	Rd 3	3. b) PP has submitted revised monitoring report and ER sheet and ER calculations are found correct. Finding is closed. c) Grievance redressal process is now added in Section 2.1.4 of MR and found correct. Finding is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#04	Developer Response																																	
VCS Standard, v4.7	Project implementation status	1. in section 1.1 of the MR, The number of ICS distributed in year 2022, 2023, and 2024 is different from what's reported in the first monitoring period. Kindly clarify this difference. <table><tr><th rowspan="2">ICS Type</th><th colspan="3">Year</th><th rowspan="2">Total</th></tr><tr><th>2022</th><th>2023</th><th>2024</th></tr><tr><td>Jiko Fresh</td><td>3,524</td><td>11,615</td><td>2,692</td><td>17,831</td></tr><tr><td>Jiko Makia</td><td>2,758</td><td>11,977</td><td>6,685</td><td>31,420</td></tr><tr><td>Jiko Bora Mama Yao</td><td>4,351</td><td>19,551</td><td>12,101</td><td>36,003</td></tr><tr><td>Jiko Salt</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>228</td><td>228</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>10,633</td><td>43,143</td><td>21,696</td><td>75,472</td></tr></table> 2. Mali and DRC a) In section 3.1 of the MR, it mentions that “The PA-1 to PA-10 have been under continued operation since their start date, and being implemented as per the registered PD.” However, PA Zambia and Malawi are not implemented as per the project database. Kindly clarify. b) In section 1.8 project location, Mali and DRC are not included, while the project activities have been implemented in this two countries as per MP1 documents. Kindly clarify. c) In addition, Mali and DRC are excluded in the reported GHG emission reductions, while ICS in the 2 countries are presented in MR section 3.1 and project database. Kindly clarify why GHG emission reductions generated by ICS in Mali and DRC are 0.	ICS Type	Year			Total	2022	2023	2024	Jiko Fresh	3,524	11,615	2,692	17,831	Jiko Makia	2,758	11,977	6,685	31,420	Jiko Bora Mama Yao	4,351	19,551	12,101	36,003	Jiko Salt	0	0	228	228	Total	10,633	43,143	21,696	75,472	1. Please refer to the response provided for the 3rd finding/comment under Findings/Comments CL#02 above. 2. Responses: a. Section 3.1 of the Monitoring Report has been revised to reflect the implementation status of the Project Activities. The statement has been updated to exclude PA-2 (Malawi) and PA-9 (Zambia). The revised text now reflects only those PAs that have been under continued operation. b. PD confirms that the omission of Mali and DRC from Section 1.8 of the Monitoring Report was an inadvertent error. The Monitoring Report has been revised to include both countries under the project location section. c. The PD confirms that although ICSs were distributed in these countries, the number of units distributed remains relatively low. Furthermore, the end users are geographically dispersed across multiple locations, making monitoring activities logistically challenging and economically unfeasible during the current monitoring period.
ICS Type	Year			Total																																
	2022	2023	2024																																	
Jiko Fresh	3,524	11,615	2,692	17,831																																
Jiko Makia	2,758	11,977	6,685	31,420																																
Jiko Bora Mama Yao	4,351	19,551	12,101	36,003																																
Jiko Salt	0	0	228	228																																
Total	10,633	43,143	21,696	75,472																																

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#04	Developer Response
			Therefore, as a conservative approach, the PD decided not to undertake monitoring activities in Mali and DRC for the current monitoring period. Consequently, no emission reductions have been claimed for ICS distributed in these two countries.
	Rd 2	1. Clarification is accepted. It is more conservative by excluding the replaced ICS from ER calculations. Finding is closed. 2. a) MR is updated. Closed. b) MR is updated. Closed. c) Clarification is accepted. It is more conservative by excluding the replaced ICS from ER calculations. Kindly provide the same information in the MR to ensure clarity and transparency of the reporting. Open.	2. Response: c. Section 4.3 of the Monitoring Report has been updated to improve the clarity and transparency of the reporting. The revised section now clarifies that although ICSs were distributed in DRC and Mali, the number of units distributed remains relatively low and the end users are geographically dispersed across multiple locations, making monitoring activities logistically challenging and economically unfeasible during the current monitoring period. Therefore, as a conservative approach, the PD did not undertake monitoring activities in these two countries during the current monitoring period, and consequently no emission reductions have been claimed for the ICSs distributed in DRC and Mali.
	Rd 3	2. c) PP has provide clarification on exclusion of Mali and DRC during this monitoring period and found correct. Finding is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#05	Developer Response
VCS Standard, v4.7	Are the parameters monitored and reported correctly?	Section 4.2, 1. Ny,i,j a) Value monitored For Nigeria, as per ER sheet "Sample Size Cal & Res_Nyij", Ny,i,j was calculated using ICS number of 17217 (i.e., sum(J58:J62)). However, the total distributed ICS in Nigeria was 17,232 as per the distributed database. Kindly clarify this inconsistency. Same issue was found for Madagascar and Senegal. Kindly check and clarify. b) Comments In the MR, it states that "During the stove distribution only one unit of ICS was distributed to each household to ensure that there is no ICS stacking in each household. Additionally, the presence of multiple project ICSs in a household was also determined ex-post during sampling surveys. No household was found using more than on project ICS and adjustment to ICS population is not applicable." However, there is one sample in the usage survey result found to have 2 project ICS in use (Sample 30, column AZ answer is 2). Kindly clarify this inconsistency and if there is any discount need to be applied to the total ICS population as per the registered PD. c) Comments According to PD section 5.2 "During the stove distribution, the presence of pre-existing project ICS, if any, shall be monitored and in case a preexisting project ICS is found in the same household, the subsequent (second) ICS will not be included in the ER calculations."	1. Responses: a. PD clarifies that the difference arises from Batch 4 ICS units distributed during the current monitoring period. In Nigeria, 15 units of Batch 4 ICS were distributed, increasing the total distributed ICS count from 17,217 to 17,232. Similarly, 60 and 34 units of Batch 4 ICS were distributed in Madagascar and Senegal, respectively. Due to the very small number of Batch 4 ICS units, in these countries, establishing separate sampling frames and conducting independent sample-based monitoring was not viable. Therefore, the PD applied the monitoring results derived from the weighted average of other monitored strata (ICS batches) within the respective countries for the calculation of emission reductions associated with these Batch 4 units. Given, batch 4 units were not monitored, hence sampling frame size in ER sheet "Sample Size Cal & Res_Nyij", is lower than total number of units listed in the ICS database. b. The PD confirms that only one ICS is distributed to each household under the project, thereby preventing project stove stacking at the time of distribution. The value of "2" reported for Sample 30 in Column AZ was due to a data entry error. This can be verified from the response to the associated survey question, "3.6. Are there other BioLite project stoves being used?", which was answered as

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#05	Developer Response
		Based on the ER sheet Usage data, there are 22 HH have traditional charcoal stove still in use, 36 HH have improved charcoal stove (other than project ICS) in use, 19 HH have 3-stone fire / traditional wood / biomass stove in use, 3 HH have Improved Wood / biomass stove in use, 76 HH have LPG/Gas stove in use, 10 HH have Electrical / Induction stove in use, 4 HH have other stoves in use. Kindly clarify if the use of non-project improved stoves and the continued use of baseline stoves are accounted in the ER calculations. 2. By=1,new,i,j,survey a) In Frequency of monitoring/recording, it states "Determined in the first year of project implementation." It is not clear what is the frequency been determined. Kindly clarify and provide the same information in MR. b) As per the registered PD, By=1,new,i,j,survey is determined in the first year of project implementation. The values remain the same for MP1 and MP2 as per the MRs. According to the ER sheet, the KPT results (kg/person meal) remain the same as per the KPT results from MP1, while the values of person meal – project ICS used for calculation are from the usage survey of the current MP. In this sense, the KPT results (kg/person meal) remain fixed but By=1,new,i,j,survey (tonnes/device/year) is not fixed involving the different values of person meal – project ICS. Kindly clarify the calculation of By=1,new,i,j,survey and the value applied.	"No". Therefore, the household was having only one project ICS under possession. The typographical error has been corrected, and the updated ER sheet is being submitted for verification. Accordingly, no adjustment to the ICS population is required. C. PD has already accounted for the use of non-project stoves and the continued use of baseline stoves in the ER calculations. This was accounted for by considering only those meals prepared using the Project ICS in the emission reduction (ER) calculations (Column 'FB' in the 'Usage Data' tab). Furthermore, the ICS Relative Utilization Factor was applied to account for situations where meals were prepared using both the Project ICS and other cookstoves, thereby ensuring that ERs were attributed only to the proportion of cooking undertaken on the Project ICS. The project stove utilization factor represents ratio of meals cooked on project ICS against total number of meals cooked in the household (including all stacked stoves). This approach ensured that the emission reduction volumes included adjustment against stove stacking reported in project surveys. Refer column "ICS relative utilization (to discount stacking with other Stove)" (Column 'FD') and cell

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#05	Developer Response
			'FG21 to FL21' of the "Usage data" tab in the ER sheet. The parameter adjusts the project ICS utilization value (Average person meals served / day on Project ICS) applied in cell "FG20 to FL20" of the "Usage data" tab and 'C18 to C23' of the 'Default & other parameters' to discount the continued use of non-project stoves alongside the project ICS. 2. Responses: a. PD clarifies that the statement "Determined in the first year of project implementation" has been adopted directly from the applied methodology, specifically for the parameter By=1,new,i,j,survey as defined on Page 17 of the applied methodology i.e., "Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves v1.1". Since the stated monitoring frequency is in line with the applied methodology, no revision to the Monitoring Report is deemed necessary In accordance with the methodology requirements, this parameter was determined during the first monitoring period. b. The value of By=1,new,i,j,survey reported in the Monitoring Report remains unchanged from MP1, as this parameter is required to be determined only in the first year of project in accordance with the applied methodology. Therefore, the same value is reported in subsequent monitoring periods.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#05	Developer Response
			However, for the purpose of emission reduction calculations, the project applied the actual project service level observed during current monitoring period. The actual fuel savings are calculated using the KPT results (kg/person meal) established during MP1 (refer Cells D18:D23 of the “Default & Other Parameters” tab in the ER Sheet) together with the person-meal values derived from the usage survey conducted during the current monitoring period (refer Cells C18:C23 of the “Default & Other Parameters” tab). Based on these inputs, the actual fuel savings for the current monitoring period are calculated (refer Cells F18:F21 of the “Default & Other Parameters” tab). The person-meal values obtained from the current usage survey reflect the actual project service level achieved during the monitoring period and incorporate any adjustments related to stove stacking. Accordingly, while the KPT-derived fuel consumption rate remains fixed as established in MP1, the actual fuel savings and resulting emission reductions may vary according to the service levels and stove stacking conditions observed during the current monitoring period (refer response to CL#05, Comment C for further details). This approach ensures that emission reductions are calculated based on the actual project service level achieved during the monitoring period, while appropriately discounting any stove stacking observed among project users.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#05	Developer Response
	Rd 2	1. a) Clarification is accepted. Kindly provide the same clarification in the sampling section of the MR. Open. b) ER sheet is corrected. Closed. c) The use of other stove is monitored and discounted in the ER calculation as per the ER sheet. Closed. 2. a) Clarification is accepted. Closed. b) Clarification is accepted. The KPT results used remained the same as surveyed in MP1 and the Bysaving reflects the current MP usage accounting stove stacking, which is more conservative and accurate. Closed.	1. Response: a. Section 4.3 of the Monitoring Report has been updated to incorporate the above clarification in the sampling section, thereby improving the clarity and transparency of the reporting.
	Rd 3	1. a) PP has now revised Section 4.3; sampling method to clarify ICS considered for sampling due to smaller batch sizes. Finding is closed.	2.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#06	Developer Response
VCS Standard, v4.7	Is the monitoring plan implemented as per the methodology requirements and the registered PD?	Section 4.3 1. In Sampling Objective, it mentions that the monitoring frequency of Ny,i,j is annual, while it is At least once	1. The PD clarifies that the monitoring frequency specified in the Monitoring Report as “annual” is consistent with the requirement of conducting monitoring “at least once every two years” as prescribed in the registered PD. Annual monitoring represents a more frequent monitoring

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#06	Developer Response
		every two years in the PD and MR section 4.2. kindly clarify this difference. 2. Based on the usage data in the ER sheet, the project distributed area includes both rural and urban areas. It is not clear from the sampling implementation in the MR whether rural/urban area affects the sampling stratification and if it is considered during the sampling. Kindly clarify. 3. The MR lacks details on framework and the approach used to ensure homogeneity within each PAI/Country.	approach and therefore fully complies with the minimum monitoring frequency requirement. Nevertheless, to avoid any ambiguity and ensure consistency between the Monitoring Report and the registered PD, section 4.3 of the Monitoring Report has been updated accordingly. 2.The PD confirms that ICS distribution under the project has been carried out across the project area irrespective of whether households are located in rural or urban areas, provided that they meet the project eligibility criteria and use charcoal and/or inefficient baseline cookstoves. The rural/urban classification was not considered as a stratification parameter for sampling because it is not expected to materially influence the monitored parameter, namely stove usage(Ny,i,j). The same ICS technology is distributed across both rural and urban households, and all participating households share comparable baseline cooking practices. Therefore, stratification based on rural/urban classification was not considered necessary to improve the precision or representativeness of the monitoring results. Instead, ICSs with rated thermal efficiencies within a $\pm 5\%$ threshold of each other were grouped under a common sampling stratum. Subsequently, the sampling frame was stratified into batches based on the date of ICS distribution, which is considered a more relevant factor for capturing potential variations in stove usage over time.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#06	Developer Response
			3. The framework and approach used for sample stratification have already been described in Section 4.3 of the Monitoring Report. The project targets only those households that meet the project eligibility criteria, including the use of traditional and inefficient cookstoves and biomass-based fuels in the baseline scenario. As a result, the target population within each country is considered sufficiently homogeneous, as all eligible households use traditional and inefficient cooking technologies in the baseline scenario and have been provided with project cookstoves under the same project implementation framework. To ensure a robust and representative sampling approach, the PD stratified the population based on factors that are more directly relevant to the monitored parameter, i.e., the usage rate. Specifically, ICSs with rated thermal efficiencies within a $\pm 5\%$ threshold of each other were grouped under a common sampling stratum. Subsequently, the ICSs within each sampling frame were stratified into batches based on their date of distribution. This approach ensured that different ICS technologies and stove vintages were adequately represented within the sample within each stratum. Therefore, the sampling framework is considered appropriate and consistent with the registered monitoring plan.
	Rd 2	1. Clarification is accepted. Closed.	2. Section 4.3 of the Monitoring Report has been updated to incorporate the detailed sampling approach adopted by PP.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#06	Developer Response
		2. PP clarification accepted. However, Section 4.3 of the MR found lacking all aspects and procedure of sampling approach adopted by PP. Finding is Open. 3. Section 4.3 of the MR found lacking all aspects and procedure of sampling approach adopted by PP as clarified. Finding is Open.	3. Section 4.3 of the Monitoring Report has been updated to incorporate the detailed sampling approach adopted by PP.
	Rd 3	PP has updated Section 4.3 of the monitoring report appropriately reflecting all aspects and procedure of sampling approach adopted. Findings thus closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#07	Developer Response
VCS Standard, v4.7	Are the quantification of GHG emission reduction correct?	η_{old} 1. According to the PD section 5.1, “A default value of 0.1 shall be used if the baseline device is a three-stone fire using firewood (not charcoal).” As per the project database, there are three-stone stoves as baseline stoves. However, in the ER sheet Default & other parameters F18-F23, only M11 $\eta_{old, charcoal}$ of 0.2 was used for calculating By,savings. Kindly clarify why the default value of 0.1 was not used. 2. According to the PD section 5.1, “Further, if wood baseline technology is replaced by project charcoal ICS, then in that case PP will apply leakage against charcoal fuel usage as per para 41 of AMS II.G. v 11.1.” As per the project database, there are three-stone stoves replaced by the project ICS. However, it is not sighted that the leakage default value of 0.030 t CH₄/t charcoal (based on para 41 of AMS II.G. v 11.1) was used in the ER calculation in the MR and ER sheet. Kindly clarify.	1. The PD would like to clarify that the three-stone stoves identified in the project database represent charcoal based inefficient baseline cooking technologies. As specified in Section 5.1 of the registered Project Description, the default baseline efficiency value of 0.1 is applicable only for three-stone fires using firewood (i.e., non-charcoal fuel). Since the baseline fuel in the project is charcoal, the value of $\eta_{old, charcoal} = 0.2$ has been applied in the emission reduction calculations, consistent with the requirements of the registered Project Description. Furthermore, the application of a baseline efficiency value of 0.2 is highly conservative compared to a value of 0.1. A higher baseline efficiency would result in lower estimated

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#07	Developer Response
			fuel savings and consequently lower emission reductions. Therefore, the use of $\eta_{old, charcoal} = 0.2$ is both consistent with the registered Project Description and conservative in terms of emission reduction estimations. 2. The PD would like to clarify that the leakage factor is applicable only in cases where a wood baseline technology is replaced by a project charcoal ICS. The three-stone stoves identified in the project database represent charcoal based inefficient baseline cooking technologies and not woodfuel based baseline devices. It is worthy to note that woodfuel and charcoal are completely different fuel in terms of usage (continuous fed vs batch fed respectively) as well as procurement (collected vs purchase resp). Thus, it is rather unlikely that a user using woodfuel as a primary fuel in the baseline switches to charcoal stove in the project (that too when the project ICS is being purchase by user and not being sold for free) given significant behavioral change is required to shift from woodfuel to charcoal. Therefore, the condition specified in Section 5.1 of the registered Project Description is not applicable to the project population considered during the current monitoring period. Accordingly, no leakage adjustment was required in the emission reduction calculations.
	Rd 2	1. Clarification is accepted and found more conservative in ER calculations. Closed. 2. Clarification is accepted and found more conservative in ER calculations. Closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#08	Developer Response
VCS Standard, v4.7	Distribution database	1. SENEGAL -During remote audit Serial number mismatch identified for end user Awa Ciss (SENEGAL). The provided serial number differs from the one provided in the spreadsheet (14340397 Vs 14357006 (Note: The stove was initially purchased by Fatou Sarr for her). Kindly clarify. 2. SENEGAL - End user; Fatou Aly Dieng (Stove id: 13863991); Salamata Tall (stove id: 13866179) & Mayram Dioum (stove id: 14316411) stated that not using the baseline stove anymore but still uses other LPG. Whereas end-user; Fatou Diouss - stove id 3019344 is having & using other ICS (Jambar make) along with project ICS. PP requested clarify how fuel/stove staking considered for emission reduction calculations. 3. Madagascar- End-user; Rahelinirina Sylviane Stella (stove id CCA03012120); Rahelinirina Sylviane Stella (Stove id: CCA03011255) found to be using baseline Traditional metallic charcoal stove sometimes for cooking. 4. Madagascar-Rahelinirina Sylviane Stella (Stove id: CCA03011255) found to be using other ICS stove sometimes for cooking. Hery Tiana Nirinaharilalao René Nantenaina (stove id: 13669299) has an induction stove because the clay stove was broken. But they bought a new clay stove again just after a few days. Thus, PP requested clarify how fuel/stove staking considered for emission reduction calculations. 5. CIV- End user KALPY HERBERT FLY (stove id CCA03000665) - project ICS is not working properly so using other stove and still not contacted distributor PP. Thus, PP requested clarify how fuel/stove staking considered for emission reduction calculations.	1. PD confirms that the ICS serial number recorded in the project survey spreadsheet, i.e., 14357006, is the correct serial number and corresponds to the stove being used by the beneficiary. To substantiate this, photographic evidence showing the ICS with the serial number clearly visible is being submitted for the verification team's review. 2. Response to finding (2), (3),(4) and (5) PD has already accounted for the use of non-project stoves and the continued use of baseline stoves in the ER calculations. This was accounted for by considering only those meals prepared using the Project ICS in the emission reduction (ER) calculations (Column 'FB' in the 'Usage Data' tab). Furthermore, the ICS Relative Utilization Factor was applied to account for situations where meals were prepared using both the Project ICS and other cookstoves, thereby ensuring that ERs were attributed only to the proportion of cooking undertaken on the Project ICS. The project stove utilization factor represents ratio of meals cooked on project ICS against total number of meals cooked in the household (including all stacked stoves). This approach ensured that the emission reduction volumes included adjustment against stove stacking reported in project surveys.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#08	Developer Response
			Refer column “ICS relative utilization (to discount stacking with other Stove)” (Column ‘FD’) and cell ‘FG21 to FL21’ of the “Usage data” tab in the ER sheet. The parameter adjusts the project ICS utilization value (Average person meals served / day on Project ICS) applied in cell ‘FG20 to FL20’ of the “Usage data” tab and ‘C18 to C23’ of the ‘Default & other parameters’ to discount the continued use of non-project stoves alongside the project ICS. SENEGAL: For samples 13863991, 13866179, 14316411, and CCA03019344, a discount factor has already been applied to account for other stove stacking with Biolite ICS reported during the usage survey as explained above. Additionally, the PD clarifies that the other ICS reported for sample 3019344 was introduced after the monitoring survey, as confirmed by the end user during the audit. MADAGASCAR: For samples CCA03012120 and CCA03011255, a discount factor has already been applied to account for other stove stacking with Biolite ICS reported during the usage survey, as explained above. MADAGASCAR: For samples CCA03011255 and 13669299, a discount factor has already been applied to account for other stove stacking with Biolite ICS reported during the usage survey, as explained above. Additionally, the PD clarifies that the other clay stove reported for

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#08	Developer Response
			sample 13669299 was introduced after the monitoring survey, as confirmed by the end user during the audit. CIV: For samples CCA03000665, a discount factor has already been applied to account for other stove stacking with Biolite ICS reported during the usage survey, as explained above. Additionally, the PD clarifies that the other stove reported for this sample was introduced after the monitoring survey, as confirmed by the end user during the audit.
	Rd 2	1. PP has now provided correct stove id and matching with distribution database resubmitted. Closed. 2, 3, 4, 5. Clarification is accepted and the stove stacking is found accounted in the ER calculation. Closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#09	Developer Response
VCS Standard, v4.7	Eligibility criteria and additionality?	PP requested to clarify how eligibility of the newly added stove with some user fees was justified and demonstrated. Kindly clarify and justify along with evidence including any NPV calculations.	1. The PD confirms that the newly included stove has been distributed at a user fee level that is equal to or lower than the price considered during project registration. Therefore, the inclusion of the stove remains consistent with the eligibility conditions established in the registered project documentation and does not require any additional financial additionality assessment or NPV analysis. To substantiate this, sample sales receipts demonstrating the user contribution amount for their ICS purchase are being submitted for the VVB reference.

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CL#09	Developer Response
	Rd 2	The fee in the 3 sample sales receipts are found lower than the total costs of the corresponding stove model in specific country. This is in line with the registered PD as "The project will distribute ICS at a subsidized price (i.e. at a price lower than the purchase cost of ICS)." Clarification is accepted. Finding is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CAR#01	Developer Response
VCS Standard, v4.7	Is the MR following the VCS Standard and MR template requirements?	1. There are different formats of date in the MR. Kindly correct the format to DD-Month-YYYY as per the MR template requirement.	1. The date formats throughout the Monitoring Report have been reviewed and corrected to the required DD-Month-YYYY format, updated MR is being submitted for reference.
VCS Monitoring Report Template, v4.4		2. There are a few typo errors in the MR. Kindly refer to the MR and correct.	2. The typographical errors identified in the MR have been reviewed and corrected as per the comments provided by the VVB team.
		3. The table was removed from Appendix 1. Kindly keep the table and provide the information in the table as per the MR template requirement.	3. Appendix 1 of the monitoring report has been updated.
	Rd 2	1. Dates are corrected in the MR. Finding is closed.	
		2. MR is corrected. Finding is closed.	

		3. MR is corrected. Finding is closed.	
--	--	---	--

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CAR#02	Developer Response
VCS Standard, v4.7	Grouped projects	In MR section 3.3, it is not clear how many new project activity instances are included during this MP. Kindly provide the information in the MR.	Section 3.3 of the Monitoring Report has been updated to clearly specify the number of new project activity instances included during the current monitoring period.
	Rd 2	MR is updated. Finding is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CAR#03	Developer Response
VCS Standard, v4.7	Is the monitoring plan implemented as per the methodology requirements and the registered PD?	In section 4.3 g) Demonstration that the required confidence/precision level has been met, it says The snapshots above demonstrate that required precision is met for <u>both</u> parameters of interest. However, there is only one parameter monitored during this MP and there is one result (Madagascar) not met the precision requirement. Kindly correct the MR to ensure that the reporting is accurate.	Section 4.3(g) of the Monitoring Report has been revised to accurately reflect the monitoring results as follows: "The snapshots above demonstrate that the required precision is met for the parameter of interest ($N_{y,i,j}$) across all applicable results, except for Madagascar. In the case of Madagascar, where the precision requirement was not met, the lower confidence bound has been applied conservatively in accordance with Section 5.3 of the registered Project Description." The Monitoring Report has been updated accordingly.
	Rd 2	MR is corrected. Finding is closed.	

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CAR #04	Developer Response
VCS Standard, v4.7	Quantification of GHG emission reductions	In section 5.4, 1. table comparison of ex-ante ER estimates against actual ERs achieved, it says “higher ex-post VCUs in the current monitoring period than the ex-ante estimates”. However, Ex-post ERs are lower than ex-ante estimated ERs. In addition, based on the equation of ER calculation, a higher number of ICS distributed will lead to a higher value of ER. The explanation is not accepted. Kindly correct. 2. In table comparison between adjusted Ex-ante estimates (based on actual number of stoves installed) and ex-post achieved emission reductions, the explanation given is “The negative percent difference indicates that the ex-post achieved values are lesser than the ex-ante estimates (for actual number of stoves installed).” This does not explain the difference between the ex-ante and ex-post ER. Kindly provide an explanation on why the difference happen.	1. The table comparison of section 5.4 has been updated. Refer to the response below for more details. 2. The PD clarifies that the difference between the ex-ante estimated, and ex-post achieved emission reductions is primarily attributable to the actual monitored project performance differing from the assumptions applied during the ex-ante assessment. In particular, the monitored usage rates across the major countries are lower than those assumed during the ex-ante estimation, resulting in lower ex-post emission reductions. Additionally, ex-ante estimates typically assume that all ICS units planned for distribution within a given year contribute emission reductions for the full year. In practice, stove distributions occur throughout the year, and emission reductions are therefore adjusted using the applicable year fraction based on the actual distribution date, resulting in lower achieved emission reductions even where the total number of distributed ICS units is consistent with projections. Furthermore, the monitoring surveys identified continued use of baseline and/or other cookstoves alongside the project ICS. An appropriate discount was applied as a conservative measure to account for such parallel usage, further reducing the ex-post emission reduction as detailed under the response to CL#05 (1.C).

Rule	Assessment Question	Findings/Comments CAR #04	Developer Response
			These factors collectively explain the variance between the ex-ante estimates and the ex-post achieved emission reductions. The explanation in the Monitoring Report has been updated accordingly.
	Rd 2	1. MR is updated and the explanation of the difference is accepted. Finding is closed. 2. MR is updated and the explanation of the difference is accepted. Finding is closed.	

Page Kept Blank Intentionally