



POA VALIDATION REPORT

HESTIAN INNOVATION LTD.

BIOMASS ENERGY CONSERVATION
PROGRAMME

Report No: 8000449119 – 14/021

Date: 2015-07-23

TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
JI/CDM Certification Program
Langemarckstraße, 20
45141 Essen, Germany
Phone: +49-201-825-3335
Fax: +49-201-825-2139
www.tuev-nord.de
www.global-warming.de

P-No.: 8000449119 – 14/021

PoA Validation Report:	Report No. 8000449119 – 14/021	Rev. No. 0	Date of 1st issue: 2015-07-23	Date of this rev. 2015-07-23
PoA:	Title: Biomass Energy Conservation Programme		Initial PoA-DD Version: 2014-02-12	Final PoA-DD Version: 2015-07-07, v07
Project Participant(s):	Non-Annex 1 country: Republic of Malawi, Republic of Rwanda		Annex 1 country: N/A	
	PP from Non-Annex 1 country: Hestian Innovation Ltd.		PP from Annex 1 country: N/A	
	Coordinating Managing Entity Hestian Innovation Ltd.			
Applied methodology/ies:	Title: Energy Efficiency Measures in Thermal Applications of Non-Renewable Biomass		No.: AMS-II.G ver. 06	Scope / TA: 3/3.1
Validation team / Technical Review and Final Approval	Validation Team: Dr. Grzegorz Kochaniewicz (TL) David Lubanga (TM)		Technical review: S. Winter LI Yongjun	Final approval: R. Winter
Expected Emission reductions: [t CO₂e]	Expected emission reductions over the first crediting period: 336,825		PoA starting date: 2014-02-15	
Confidential content:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Key dates of validation:	Publication of PoA -DD: 2014-02-15	Draft Report issued: 2014-03-16	On-site (from): 2014-11-10	On-site (to): 2014-11-13
Summary of Validation Opinion:	<p>In detail the conclusions can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The PoA is in line with all relevant host country criteria (Republic of Malawi, Republic of Rwanda) and all relevant UNFCCC requirements for CDM. Project activity approvals have been obtained from DNA of Republic of Malawi, Republic of Rwanda vide the Letters of Approval (HCA) dated 2015-04-01 from DNA of The Republic of Malawi and from DNA of The Republic of Rwanda dated 2015-05-15. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The PoA additionality is sufficiently justified in the PoA-DD. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The eligibility criteria established for CPA inclusion are deemed appropriate and sufficient. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The monitoring plan is transparent and adequate. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The calculation of the PoA emission reductions is carried out in a transparent and conservative manner, so that the calculated emission reductions of 336,825 tCO₂e are most likely to be achieved by the first real case CPAs within the (1st renewable) crediting period. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All information has been consistently applied in the generic CPA-DD form. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The conclusions of this report show, that the PoA, as it was described in the project documentation, is in line with all criteria applicable for the validation. 			
Document information:	Filename: FValR PoA Report_rev1		No. of pages: 129	

Abbreviations

BAU	Business as usual
CA	Corrective Action / Clarification Action
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CL	Clarification Request
CME	Coordinating / Managing Entity
CO₂	Carbon dioxide
CO_{2e}	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CP	Certification Program
CPA	Component Project Activity
CPA-DD	Component Project Activity Design Document
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EB	CDM Executive Board
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
GSCP	Global Stakeholder Consultation Process
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
PoA	Programme of Activities
PoA-DD	Programme of Activities Design Document
QC/QA	Quality control/Quality assurance
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard

Table of Contents	Page
1 OBJECTIVE / SCOPE	6
2 POA DESCRIPTION.....	7
2.1 PoA Characteristics	7
2.2 Involved Parties, Coordinating / managing entity(ies), Project Participants of the PoA and operators of individual CPAs	8
2.3 Characteristics of rcCPA	8
2.4 Technical Programme Description	8
3 METHODOLOGY AND VALIDATION SEQUENCE.....	9
3.1 Validation Steps	9
3.2 Contract review	9
3.3 Appointment of team members and technical reviewers	10
3.4 Consideration of Public Stakeholder Comments	11
3.5 Validation Protocol	11
3.6 Review of Documents	12
3.7 Site Visit and Follow-up Interviews	12
3.8 Project comparison	13
3.9 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests	13
3.9.1 Definition	13
3.9.2 Draft Validation Reporting	13
3.9.3 Final Validation Reporting	13
3.10 Technical review	14
3.11 Final approval	14
4 VALIDATION FINDINGS	15
5 VALIDATION ASSESSMENT SUMMARY	40
5.1 General Description of the PoA	40
5.1.1 Technology to be employed	40
5.1.2 Small Scale PoAs & Debundling	40
5.1.3 Definition of a typical Component Project Activity (CPA)	40
5.2 PoA Baseline	41
5.2.1 Application of the Methodology	41
5.2.2 PoA Boundary and CPA Boundary	41
5.2.3 Baseline Identification	41
5.2.4 Algorithms and formulae used to determine emission reductions	42
5.3 Additionality Determination	47
5.3.1 PoA	47
5.3.2 CPA level	47
5.4 Operational, Management and Monitoring Plan of the PoA	48

5.5	Crediting Period	49
5.6	Environmental Impacts	49
5.7	Comments by Local Stakeholders	49
5.8	Participation	49
5.8.1	Definition of Roles	49
5.8.2	LOA	50
5.8.3	MoC	50
5.9	Project Documentation Editorial Aspects	50
6	VALIDATION OPINION	51
7	REFERENCES	52
	ANNEX 1: VALIDATION PROTOCOL.....	58
	ANNEX 2: ASSESSMENT OF APPLICABILITY CRITERIA	119
	ANNEX 3: ASSESSMENT OF BASELINE IDENTIFICATION	121
	ANNEX 4: ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL PARAMETERS.....	122
	ANNEX 5: ASSESSMENT OF BARRIER ANALYSIS	123
	ANNEX 6: OUTCOME OF THE GSCP	124
	ANNEX 7: ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA ASSESSMENT	125
	ANNEX 8: STATEMENTS OF COMPETENCE OF INVOLVED PERSONNEL	128

1 OBJECTIVE / SCOPE

The purpose of a PoA validation is to have an independent third party assess the project design. In particular the project's baseline, the monitoring plan (MP), and the project's compliance with

- the requirements of Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol;
- the CDM modalities and procedures as agreed in the Marrakech Accords under decision 3/CMP.1
- the annex to the decision;
- subsequent decisions made by COP/MOP & CDM Executive Board and
- other relevant rules, including the host country legislation and sustainability criteria

are validated in order to confirm that the programme design as documented is sound and reasonable and meets the stated requirements and identified criteria. Validation is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders on the quality of the project and its intended generation of certified emission reductions (CERs).

The validation scope is given as a thorough independent and objective assessment of the programme design including especially: the correct application of the methodology (ies), the programme's baseline study, additionality justification, local stakeholder commenting process, environmental impacts and monitoring plan, which are included in the PoA-DD and other relevant supporting documents, to ensure that the proposed CDM programme activity meets all relevant and applicable CDM and PoA criteria.

The information included in

- the completed Clean Development Mechanism Programme of Activities Design Document Form (the "CDM-PoA-DD") incl.
 - Part A: Programme of activities (PoA) and
 - Part B: Generic component project activity (CPA)
- one completed real case CDM-CPA-DD (the "Real-Case CDM-CPA-DD"), and
- the relevant supporting documents

was reviewed against the requirements as set out by the UNFCCC. The validation team has, based on the requirements in the Validation and Verification Standard^{VVS/}, carried out a full assessment of all evidence to assess the compliance of the programme with the key areas as outlined in section 7. and 8.4 of the VVS (version 07.0) as well as the Standard for Demonstration of additionality, development of Eligibility Criteria and Application of Multiple Methodologies for Programme of activities^{/POAS/}.

The validation is not meant to provide any consulting to the project participants. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the programme design.

2 POA DESCRIPTION

2.1 PoA Characteristics

Essential data of the PoA is presented in the following Table 2-1.

Table 2-1: PoA / rcCPA Characteristics

Item	Data		
PoA title	Biomass Energy Conservation Programme		
1st CPA (real case) title	Malawi Biomass Energy Conservation Programme CPA 1		
PoA size	<input type="checkbox"/> Large Scale <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small Scale		
PoA Scope (according to UNFCCC sectoral scope numbers for CDM)	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Energy Industries (renewable- /non-renewable sources)
	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Energy distribution
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Energy demand
	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Manufacturing industries
	<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Chemical industry
	<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Construction
	<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Transport
	<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Mining/Mineral production
	<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Metal production
	<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Fugitive emissions from fuels (solid, oil and gas)
	<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Fugitive emissions from production and consumption of halocarbons and hexafluoride
	<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Solvents use
	<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Waste handling and disposal
	<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Afforestation and Reforestation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Agriculture
	<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Carbon capture and storage of CO ₂ in geological formations
Applied Methodology/ies	AMS-II.G ver. 06		
Technical Area(s)	3.1: Energy Demand		
Starting date of the PoA	2014-02-15		
CPA Crediting period	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Renewable Crediting Period (7 y) <input type="checkbox"/> Fixed Crediting Period (10 y)		
Start of crediting period of 1 st (real case) CPA	2016-01-01, or at the date of PoA registration		
Estimated tCO ₂ e reductions of the 1 st CPA over the 1 st crediting period	Annual average	Malawi Biomass Energy Conservation Programme CPA 1 (39,771)	
	Total estimation over the 1 st crediting period	336,825	

2.2 Involved Parties, Coordinating / managing entity(ies), Project Participants of the PoA and operators of individual CPAs

The following parties to the Kyoto Protocol and project participants are involved in this PoA (Table 2-2).

Table 2-2: PoA Parties and project participants

	Name of Party/ies	Name of the Entity/ies	Private or Public	CME
Host Country/ies	The Republic of Malawi	Hestian Innovation Ltd.	Private	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	The Republic of Rwanda	Hestian Innovation Ltd.	Private	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Annex 1 Country/ies	N/A			<input type="checkbox"/>

2.3 Characteristics of rcCPA

The details of the 1st (real case) CPA is (are listed) in table 2-3.

Table 2-3: Characteristics of rcCPA

No.	CPA Details
CPA No.:	1
CPA title:	Malawi Biomass Energy Conservation Programme CPA 1
CPA Host Country / Region:	Republic of Malawi
Operator / Implementer:	Hestian Innovation Ltd.
CPA location / address:	Republic of Malawi
Geographical coordinates:	Coordinates of the Republic of Malawi (13 30 S, 34 00 E)

2.4 Technical Programme Description

The proposed PoA aims to disseminate improved cooking stoves to households in Malawi and Rwanda. The *Chitetezo Mbaula* is a portable ceramic cook-stove for CPAs in Malawi, while the *Canarumwe* is mostly fixed stove to be distributed by CPAs in Rwanda. The stoves reduce consumption of non-renewable biomass through improved more efficient combustion and heat transfer.

The technical key data are provided in table 2-4 below

Table 2-4: Technical data of the programme activity

Parameter	Unit	Value
Type	-	Chitetezo Mbaula, Canarumwe
Thermal Efficiency	%	30.6% ¹
Material	-	Clay soil (Ceramic)
Average Lifespan	Months	47
Capacity	-	Single pot
Manufacturer	-	Local Production Groups

¹ Tests (2012) by the Regional Stove Testing Centre, Centre for Research in Energy and Energy Conservation (CREEC), at College of Engineering, Design, Art and Technology, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda (creec@tech.mak.ac.ug).

3 METHODOLOGY AND VALIDATION SEQUENCE

3.1 Validation Steps

The validation of the PoA consisted of the following steps:

- Contract review
- Appointment of team members and technical reviewers
- Publication of the following programme documents:
 - the CDM-PoA-DD (incl. generic CDM-CPA-DD)
 - the Real-Case CDM-CPA-DD
- Desk review of the abovementioned PDDs and supporting documents
- Validation planning
- On-Site assessment
- Background investigation and follow-up interviews with personnel of the project developer and its contractors
- Draft validation reporting
- Resolution of corrective actions (if any)
- Final validation reporting
- Technical review
- Final approval of the validation

3.2 Contract review

To assure that

- the PoA falls within the scopes for which accreditation is held,
- the necessary competences to carry out the validation can be provided,
- Impartiality issues are clear and in line with the CDM accreditation requirements

a contract review was carried out before the contract was signed.

3.3 Appointment of team members and technical reviewers

On the basis of a competence analysis and individual availabilities, a validation team, consisting of one team leader and one additional team member, as well as the Technical Review personnel were appointed.

The list of involved personnel, the tasks assigned and the qualification status are summarized in the table 3-2 below.

Table 3-2: Involved Personnel

	Name	Company	Function ¹⁾	Qualification Status ²⁾	Scheme competence ³⁾	Technical competence ⁴⁾	Host country Competence	On-site visit
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Dr. Grzegorz Kochaniewicz	-	TL	LA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	David Lubanga	-	TM ^{A)}	A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	LI Yongjun	-	TR ^{B)}	SA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	-
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Stefan Winter	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH	TR ^{B)}	SA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.1	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Rainer Winter	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH	FA ^{B)}	SA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	-

¹⁾ TL: Team Leader; TM: Team Member; TR: Technical review; OT: Observer-Team; OR: Observer-TR; FA: Final approval

²⁾ GHG Auditor Status: A: Assessor; LA: Lead Assessor; SA: Senior Assessor; T: Trainee; TE: Technical Expert

³⁾ GHG auditor status (at least Assessor)

⁴⁾ As per S01-MU03 or S01-VA070-A2 (such as 1.1, 1.2, ...)

⁵⁾ In case of verification projects

A) Team Member: GHG auditor (at least Assessor status), Technical Expert (incl. Host Country Expert or Verification Expert), not ETE

B) No team member

All team members contributed to the review of documents, the assessment of the programme activity and to the preparation of this report under the leadership of the team leader.

All team members as indicated in the table above attended in the complete site-visit.

Statements of competence for the above mentioned team members are enclosed in annex 8 of this report.

3.4 Consideration of Public Stakeholder Comments

Acc. to the modalities and procedures the draft PoA-DD, as received from the project participants, have been made publicly available on the dedicated UNFCCC CDM website prior to the commencement of the validation activity. Stakeholders have been invited to comment on the PoA-DD within the 30 days public commenting period.

In case comments are received, they are taken into account during the validation process. The comments and the discussion of the same are documented in annex 6 of this report.

3.5 Validation Protocol

In order to ensure consideration of all relevant assessment criteria, a validation protocol is used. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria and requirements, means of validation and the results from validating the identified criteria. The validation protocol reflects the generic CDM requirements each CDM project has to meet as well as PoA specific issues as applicable. The validation protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organises, details and clarifies the requirements that a CDM PoA is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent validation process where the validating entity will document how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the determination.

The validation protocol is described in Figure 1.

Validation Protocol Table A-1: Requirement checklist				
Checklist Item	Reference	Validation Team Comment	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
<i>The checklist items in Table A-1 are linked to the various requirements the project should meet. The checklist is organised in various sections. Each section is then further sub-divided as per the requirements of the topic and the individual project activity.</i>	<i>Gives reference to the information source on which the assessment is based on</i>	<i>The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist item in detail. It includes the assessment of the validation team and how the assessment was carried out. The reporting requirements of the VVS shall be covered in this section.</i>	<i>Assessment based on evidence provided if the criterion is fulfilled (OK), or a CAR, CL or FAR (see below) is raised. The assessment refers to the draft validation stage.</i>	<i>In case a corrective action or a clarification the final assessment at the final validation stage is given.</i>

Figure 1: Validation protocol table

The completed validation protocol is enclosed in Annex 1 to this report.

3.6 Review of Documents

The published PoA-DD and supporting background documents related to the programme design and baseline were reviewed.

Furthermore, the validation team used additional documentation by third parties like host party legislation, technical reports referring to the project design or to the basic conditions and technical data.

3.7 Site Visit and Follow-up Interviews

The validation team has carried out a site visit in order to assess the information included in the project documentation and to gain additional information regarding the compliance of the PoA with the relevant criteria applicable for CDM. Most of the sites in the Republic of Malawi included in the project activity have been visited.

However, due to the fact that it is a greenfield project and no particular activities have been carried out so far in Rwanda, a site visit was not carried out in the Republic of Rwanda. All relevant project documentation has been provided in the PP's offices.

During validation the validation team has performed interviews to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. The main topics of the interviews are summarized in table 3-3.

Table 3-3: Interviewed persons and interview topics

Interviewed Persons / Entities	Interview topics
Project Participants (PPs), Cooperating Managing Entity (CME), CPA operators representatives Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chronological description of the programme activity with documents of key steps of the implementation. - Current status of programme design - Technical details of the programme realization, programme feasibility, designing, operational life time, monitoring of the programme - Host Government Approval - Approval procedures and status - Monitoring and measurement equipment and system. - Sampling plan design - Crediting period - Programme activity starting date - CER allocation / ownership - Baseline study assumptions - Additionality - Sustainable development issues - Monitoring of CPAs - Analysis of local stakeholder consultation - EIA - Roles & responsibilities of the project participants w.r.t. project management, monitoring and reporting - National Legislation - Editorial issues of the PoA-DD and CPA-DD - LoAs

A comprehensive list of all interviewed persons is part of section 7 'References'.

3.8 Project comparison

The validation team has compared the proposed CDM PoA with similar PoA or CDM projects or technologies that have similar or comparable characteristics and with similar projects in the host country in order to achieve additional information esp. regarding:

- Programme technology
- Additionality issues
- Reasons for requests for reviews and rejections within the CDM registration process.

3.9 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

3.9.1 Definition

A **Corrective Action Request (CAR)** will be established where:

- mistakes have been made in assumptions, application of the methodology or the programme documentation which will have a direct influence on the programme results,
- the requirements deemed relevant for validation of the PoA with certain characteristics have not been met or
- there is a risk that the PoA would not be registered by the UNFCCC or that emission reductions would not be able to be verified and certified.

A **Clarification Request (CL)** will be issued where information is insufficient, unclear or not transparent enough to establish whether a requirement is met.

A **Forward Action Request (FAR)** will be issued when certain issues related to project implementation should be reviewed during the first verification.

3.9.2 Draft Validation Reporting

After reviewing all relevant documents and taking all other relevant information into account, the validation team issues all findings in the course of a draft validation report and hands this report over to the project proponent in order to respond on the issues raised and to revise the programme documentation accordingly.

3.9.3 Final Validation Reporting

The final validation starts after issuance of the proposed corrective action (CA) of the CARs, CLs and FARs by the project proponent. The project proponent has to reply

on those and the requests are “closed out” by the validation team in case the response is assessed as sufficient. In case of raised FARs the project proponent has to respond on this, identifying the necessary actions to ensure that the topics raised in this finding are likely to be resolved at the latest during the first verification. The validation team has to assess whether the proposed action is adequate or not.

In case the findings from CARs and CLs cannot be resolved by the project proponent or the proposed action related to the FARs raised cannot be assessed as adequate, no positive validation opinion can be issued by the validation team.

The CAR(s) / CL(s) / FAR(s) are documented in chapter 4.

3.10 Technical review

Before submission of the final validation report a technical review of the whole validation procedure is carried out. The technical reviewer is a competent GHG auditor being appointed for the scope this PoA falls under. The technical reviewer is not considered to be part of the validation team and thus not involved in the decision making process up to the technical review.

As a result of the technical review process the validation opinion and the topic specific assessments as prepared by the validation team leader may be confirmed or revised. Furthermore reporting improvements might be achieved.

3.11 Final approval

After successful technical review of the final report an overall (esp. procedural) assessment of the complete validation will be carried out by a senior assessor located in the accredited premises of TÜV NORD.

Only after this step the request for registration can be started (in case of a positive validation opinion).

4 VALIDATION FINDINGS

In the following table the findings from the desk review of the published PoA-DD and generic CPA-DD, visits, interviews and supporting documents are summarised:

Table 4-1: Summary of CARs, CLs and FARs issued

Validation topic ¹⁾	No. of CAR	No. of CL	No. of FAR
Part A: CDM-PoA-DD			
Description of project activity (PoA-A): - PoA and CPA specification - Technical PoA and CPA description - CPA Eligibility criteria - Project Participants Technologies and/or measures	4	2	0
Application of selected approved baseline and monitoring methodology (PoA-B) - Application of the Methodology to the PoA and a typical CPA - Programme Boundary and locations - Baseline identification - Calculation of GHG emission reductions Project emissions Baseline emissions Leakage - Additionality determination of the PoA - Monitoring Methodology - Monitoring Plan - Project management planning	3	1	0
Duration and Crediting Period of the PoA (PoA-C)	1	0	0
Environmental impacts (PoA-D)	0	1	0
Local Stakeholder Consultation (PoA-E)	0	1	0
Approval, Authorization and other aspects (PoA-F): - Letter of Approval - Contribution to sustainable development - MoC - PoA-DD editorial aspects	0	2	0

Validation topic ¹⁾	No. of CAR	No. of CL	No. of FAR
Part B: Generic CDM-CPA-DD			
Overall Consistency with finalized PoA-DD	0	0	0
General description of the CPA (CPA-A) - Responsible entity/individual for the CPA - Identification and description of the CPA - Technical description of the CPA	0	1	0
Eligibility of CPA and Estimation of Emission Reductions (CPA-B) - CPA reference to the PoA - Justification to CPA inclusion eligibility criteria - Demonstration of CPA additionality - Confirmation of CPA boundary - CPA Emission Reduction - CPA Monitoring Plan	1	0	0
Duration and Crediting Period of the CPA (CPA-C)	1	0	0
Environmental impacts (CPA-D)	0	1	0
Local Stakeholder Consultation (CPA-E)	0	1	0
SUM	10	10	0

¹⁾ The letters in brackets refer to the validation protocol

The following tables include all raised CARs, CLs and FARs. For an in depth evaluation of all validation items it should be referred to the validation protocols (see Annex 1).

The findings of the verification process are summarized in the tables below.

Finding	A1		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part II section A.2 1. This section shall be filled out completely as per PoA template and CDM PS § 37 b) and §38 requirements Associated checklist question(s): A.1.1 to A.1.5		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	1. This is revised to include confirmation that the PoA is a voluntary action by the CME, a brief description of how the proposed PoA contributes to sustainable development and implementation framework.		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): A.2	New version No.: 02
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	1. Section A.2 of the revised PDD version 02 has been revised to include the stated goal, implementation framework, and how the voluntary PoA contributes to sustainable development		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed		

Finding	A2		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part II section A.6 1. The PoA-DD does not state the service level of the project stove relative to the baseline option. 2. Details on project stove thermal efficiency relative to the baseline are to be included and supported by credible sources/means. 3. Clarify whether the same stove type will be distributed in both countries or CPAs will have the discretion for as long as the stove complies with specific eligibility criteria. PoA-DD does not seem to allow room for other types as per the meth. Associated checklist question(s): A.1.1 to A.1.3		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is</i>	1. This is now expanded to clarify that project stove is primarily better in terms of thermal efficiency compared to the baseline. 2. This is now expanded to reference results of independent laboratory thermal efficiency. Please refer to CREEC (Centre for Research in Energy and Energy Conservation) August 2012		

Finding	A2		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
<i>requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	<p>Report, Testing the Chitetezo Mbaula, in PDF and Microsoft Excel – CREEC Results Table 90-10 Precision</p> <p>3. This is now clarified and room has been made to allow for other devices as per the methodology.</p>		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): A.2	New version No.:02
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>1. Section A.6 of the revised PDD version 02 includes the efficiency of the improved cookstove in the PoA (30.6%), compared to the default efficiency of the baseline stove (10%) as per the applied methodology.</p> <p>2. Sufficient evidence has been provided^{TEF} and validated supporting the average thermal efficiency of the project stove (30.67%).</p> <p>3. It has now been clarified that other stove technologies that meet the stated eligibility requirements under the PoA are admissible as part of CPAs</p>		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed</p>		

Finding	A3		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part II section A.6</p> <p>The ongoing similar project activities in a different scheme (the GS) could have an impact on the PoA baseline, especially given that the improved Chitetezo stove is being disseminated in all areas of Malawi (rural, peri-urban and urban). PP shall clarify the following with appropriate evidence.</p> <p>1. Applicability of the same baseline, despite many households having a charcoal stove especially in urban areas (Malawi & Rwanda)</p> <p>2. Unique identification of PoA cook-stoves and how it will be ensured that no double counting occurs.</p> <p>3. Confirm that the efficiency of the portable <i>Chitetezo Mbaula</i> to be disseminated in Malawi is the same as the fixed <i>Canarumwe</i> stove preferred in Rwanda</p> <p>Associated checklist question(s): A.1.1 to A.1.3</p>		

Finding	A3								
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD						
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	<p>1. The project continues to primarily target firewood users, even in peri-urban and urban areas. As per the 2011 Welfare Monitoring Survey conducted by the National Statistics Office based on a random sample that covered 14,000 households drawn from all the Districts of the country, the vast majority of households use firewood as their main source of energy (88%), with others using charcoal (7%), electricity (3%) and very few use paraffin, gas and other sources. Even in urban areas more households predominantly use firewood (44%) than charcoal (41%) as their source of energy. This PoA specifically targets firewood users, which represent over 90% of rural households and more than half of urban households, that don't use electricity. An area such as urban Blantyre, for example, where households predominantly use charcoal, is not as an important market for this PoA. Using another example, household heads that do not have any formal education use firewood as their main source of energy almost entirely (97.3%) - they are among this PoAs target market.</p> <p>2. PoA cookstoves will carry unique identification which will be defined within CPA documents in time for verification. Identification codes used for stoves will be made available in time for verification.</p> <p>3. Technology is the same ceramic stove. The name varies based on local vernacular; Chitetezo Mbaula in Chichewa (Malawi) and Canarumwe in Kinyarwanda (Rwanda).</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD</td> <td>Section(s): A.2</td> <td>New version No.:02</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS</td> <td>Worksheet(s):</td> <td>New version No.:</td> </tr> </table>			<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): A.2	New version No.:02	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): A.2	New version No.:02							
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:							
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>1. The baseline applied is justified through studies carried out in the entire project boundary across all districts. It has been established that an overwhelming proportion of households use non-renewable biomass as their main source of energy. Moreover, baseline non-renewability of biomass f_{NRB} is drawn from the default UNFCCC value of 81% covering the entire country.</p> <p>2. Cook-stoves under the PoA CPAs will have a unique identification distinguishable from the ongoing project activities in the respective countries.</p> <p>3. The Chitetezo Mbaula and the Canarumwe have similar characteristics. Emission reductions will be based on new stove thermal efficiency of 30.6%</p>								
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed								

Finding	A4		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part III section A.1</p> <p>1. Additionality and demonstration that each CPA does not exceed 180 GWh_{th}, and that each isolated unit in each household is no larger than 5% of the CDM SSC thresholds has not been adequately demonstrated as per EB 68, Annex 27 § 2 (c).</p> <p>Associated checklist question(s): A.2.1, B.5.1.1</p>		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	<p>1. This has been included with reference made to ex-ante estimations of emission reductions per household using a project stove, and confirmation that this is not larger than 5% of the CDM SSC threshold.</p>		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): B.1, B.2, B.5.2.1	New version No.: 02
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>1. PP has demonstrated that the SSC PoA is additional as each ICS is not larger than 5% of SSC thresholds as per EB 68 Annex 27. The improved cookstoves in Malwawi and Rwanda are expected to result in wood fuel savings and reduction in emission reductions of 3,056 tCO₂e and 2,983 tCO₂e respectively. Eligibility criterion f) ensures that all CPAs conform to PoA additionality requirements</p>		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed</p>		

Finding	A5		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part III section A.2</p> <p>The following are observed shortcomings with the PoA eligibility criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CME to clarify what ER contracts are 2. Criterion c): The level, type of service, and/or performance specifications are missing 3. Criterion d): The criterion does not adhere to the guidelines of the CDM PS version 07 § 213 and § 216. 4. Criterion e): Eligibility criterion not well defined. 5. Criterion g): Eligibility criterion not well defined 6. Criterion k): Eligibility criterion not well defined 7. Criterion l): PP has not demonstrated that the CPAs shall not be part of a larger scale project activity in line with relevant provisions (§§8 and/or 10) of EB 54, Annex 13 		

Finding	A5		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
	<p>8. Eligibility criteria as required by AMS-II.G version 06 methodology applicability not considered. (e.g only new stoves, and at least 20% rated efficiency)</p> <p>9. General referencing of the PoA-DD sections found to be incorrect</p> <p>10. General eligibility requirements to comply with applicability conditions of AMS-II.G version 06</p> <p>11. As per PoA Standard version 03.0 §17, each eligibility criterion shall have verifiable evidence</p> <p>Associated checklist question(s): A.3.5</p>		
<p>Corrective Action #1</p> <p><i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i></p>	<p>1. Clarified (Emission Reduction contracts signed by purchaser and/or end-user of stove)</p> <p>2. This is now included. 3. This is revised.</p> <p>4. This is revised.</p> <p>5. This is revised.</p> <p>6. This is revised.</p> <p>7. This is clarified/confirmed.</p> <p>8. This is revised.</p> <p>9. This is revised.</p> <p>10. This is revised.</p> <p>11. This is revised.</p>		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): B.2	New version No.: 02
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<p>DOE Assessment #1</p> <p><i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i></p>	<p>1. The ER Contracts have now been clarified as the end-user stove purchase agreements</p> <p>2. The EC c) is still not well defined as per PoA prescription</p> <p>3. The criterion stating how the start date of a CPA would be defined is included and deemed sufficient.</p> <p>4. The EC e) adequately stipulates that each CPA shall adhere to the applicability conditions of the applied methodology version 06.</p> <p>5. Please explain how the revision has been done with clear referencing of the PoA-DD</p> <p>6. Please explain how the revision has been done with clear referencing of the PoA-DD</p> <p>7. Please explain how the revision has been done with clear referencing of the PoA-DD</p> <p>8. Please explain how the revision has been done with clear</p>		

Finding	A5		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
	<p>referencing of the PoA-DD</p> <p>9. Please explain how the revision has been done with clear referencing of the PoA-DD</p> <p>10. Please explain how the revision has been done with clear referencing of the PoA-DD</p> <p>11. Please explain how the revision has been done with clear referencing of the PoA-DD. This is unclear</p>		
<p>Corrective Action #2</p> <p><i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i></p>	<p>2. The minimum service level is now defined as well as specifications of project technology relative to baseline.</p> <p>5. Level of environmental impact analysis and reference to PoA-DD section E.1 included. Section E.1 explains that project is not listed as project requiring EIA in Malawi. For Rwanda, the PoA activity meets the criteria for EIA exemption; however, a confirmation of exemption is to be required from the Rwanda Environmental Management Authority.</p> <p>6. The text is now expanded to indicate that the ER target for each CPA shall not exceed the small-scale CPA aggregate energy savings limit of 60 GWh per year or 180 GWh thermal per year in fuel input.</p> <p>7. This section is now expanded to confirm that project emission reductions of 2.9 tCO₂e and 3.0 tCO₂e in Rwanda and Malawi, respectively, fall below 0.6 ktCO₂e threshold and qualifies for exemption from debundling check as per Annex 13 of EB54 report.</p> <p>8. This is now addressed in item (c) of the eligibility criteria: “As per the methodology, any stoves to be included under the PoA in future, whether single pot or multi pot, portable or in-situ, shall have a minimum rated efficiency of 20%.”</p> <p>9. This is revised and further referencing made to relevant sections of the PoA-DD and generic CPA-DD.</p> <p>10. Reconciliation of applicability and eligibility can be found between PoA-DD revised eligibility criteria in B.2 and PoA-DD section B.3. Specific reference to item 5 of the methodology version 6 is made under item (ii) of PoA-DD section 3, with further reference made to the guidelines for sampling and surveys to be applied.</p> <p>11. Please refer to submitted supporting documentation and reports to verify eligibility criteria.</p>		
<p>DOE Assessment #2</p> <p><i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure,</i></p>	<p>2. Project technology and minimum requirements as per applied methodology have now been defined.</p> <p>5. Level of EIA now defined as done at PoA level and all CPAs are exempted from the same. For Rwanda, the PoA activity meets</p>		

Finding	A5		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
<p><i>additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i></p>	<p>the criteria for EIA exemption, and this is confirmed through an EIA exemption letter from the Rwanda development Board, dated 12/05/2015^{/EIA/}.</p> <p>6. Each CPA aggregate energy savings limit has now been defined to conform to the applied methodology and PoA additionality requirements</p> <p>7. The text has been revised confirming that each unit will be no larger than 1% of small-scale thresholds and therefore CPAs exempted from debundling check</p> <p>8. OK as addressed in Eligibility Criterion c)</p> <p>9. Referencing has been improved as per the new PoA-DD template.</p> <p>10. Ok as revised. EC e) now mandates all CPA to conform to the meth applicability conditions. Section B.2 of the PoA-DD includes all eligibility and applicability conditions vital for CPA admissions.</p> <p>11, Pending</p>		
<p>Corrective Action #3</p> <p><i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA.DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i></p>	<p>11. This has now been revised to be prescriptive.</p>		
<p>DOE Assessment #3</p> <p><i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i></p>	<p>Each PoA EC where applicable, shall prescribe the supporting documents required to prove each EC</p>		
<p>Corrective Action #4</p> <p><i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA.DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i></p>	<p>New table now inserted in PoA-DD section B.2 clearly prescribing the supporting documentation required to prove each EC.</p>		
<p>DOE Assessment #4</p> <p><i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure,</i></p>	<p>All EC have now prescribed ways in which CPA will prove admissibility. Conforms to §17 of the PoA Standard version 03.0.</p>		

Finding	A5		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.			
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed		

Finding	A6		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)	Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part III section A.3, Part Xi section A.1 1. The AMS-II.G methodology version quoted is not valid. 2. Methodology applicability criteria also not included and not justified Associated checklist question(s): B.2.1 to B.2.3		
Corrective Action #1 This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.	1. Most up to date methodology (<i>AMS-II.G Small-scale Methodology: Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass (Version 06.0)</i>). now applied. 2. This is revised.		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): B.3	New version No.: 02
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
DOE Assessment #1 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	1. Methodology version has been revised in the revised PDD version 02 2. Not all applicability conditions are stated.		
Corrective Action #2 This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.	2. The single applicability criterion, item 5 of the methodology, "The aggregate energy savings of a single project activity shall not exceed the equivalent of 60 GWh per year or 180 GWh thermal per year in fuel input." is discussed under item (ii) of PoA-DD section B.3 "application of technologies/measures and methodologies"		
DOE Assessment #2 The assessment shall encom-	2. All methodology applicability conditions are now added to cover both the CPAs and PoA		

Finding	A6		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
pass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.			
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed		

Finding	B1								
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD						
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR						
Description of finding Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)	<p>Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part III section A.3, Part Xi section A.6.3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Methodological choices and equations for BE, PE, and LE to be revised to conform to the new methodology AMS-II.G version 06; employing direct referencing and demonstrating clearly and justifying of methodological choices made as per the new PoA-DD and CPA-DD template forms version 03.0. 2. Actual values/sample calculations need to be included in each equation as per template requirements 3. Data and parameters monitored for each generic CPA shall also be included in the PoA-DD. 4. Revised ex-ante ER estimations as per the valid methodology version <p>Associated checklist question(s): B.6.1 to B.6.6</p>								
Corrective Action #1 This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is revised. Please see equation in generic CPA-DD section B.6.3 and further description of monitoring of these values in generic CPA-DD B.7.2 2. This is revised. Please see values included in parameter tables under generic CPA-DD section B.6.2 3. This is revised. Parameters to be monitored are found in tables of generic CPA-DD section B.7.1. 4. This is revised. Please see revised ex-ante ER Calculations Excel. <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD</td> <td>Section(s): B.6.1 to B.6.3,</td> <td>New version No.:02</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS</td> <td>Worksheet(s):</td> <td>New version No.:</td> </tr> </table>			<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): B.6.1 to B.6.3,	New version No.:02	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): B.6.1 to B.6.3,	New version No.:02							
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:							
DOE Assessment #1 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure,	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new methodology version has been adopted and the equations applied appropriately referenced and justified in section B.6.3 of the PoA-DD part II (gPoA-DD section). 								

Finding	B1		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
<p><i>additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i></p>	<p>2. Equations correctly selected but actual values/sample calculations not included</p> <p>3. Data and parameters monitored is now part of section B.7.1 of the gPoA-DD. However, monitored parameter $By=1,new,i,survey$ appears to be omitted.</p> <p>4. Equations for ex-ante emission reductions have been correctly applied but samples are not included in the generic PoA-DD as indicated in point 2 above</p>		
<p>Corrective Action #2</p> <p><i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i></p>	<p>2. Sample calculations have been included</p> <p>3. $By=1,new,i,survey$ is not explicitly included in B.7.1 but $n_{new,i}=1 \times \Delta n_{y,i,a}$ has been included, which allows for $By=1,new,i,survey$ to be calculated.</p> <p>4. Sample calculations have been included</p>		
<p>DOE Assessment #2</p> <p><i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i></p>	<p>2. Sample calculations have been included for a typical CPA</p> <p>3. The $By=1,new,i,survey$ parameter is monitored annually via sample surveys as prescribed by the methodology. The validation team does not agree with this suggested method. Besides, the definition of this parameter in section B.7.1 is not correct.</p> <p>4. Sample calculations are included but vital units are missing</p>		
<p>Corrective Action #3</p> <p><i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i></p>	<p>3. As part of option 2 to measure $B_{y,saving,i,a}$, described in paragraph 17 of the methodology, $By=1,new,i,survey$, is to be determined in Rwanda and Malawi in the first year of the introduction of the devices. through a sample survey to be conducted together with surveys for proportion of operational stoves and the proportion of discontinued use of baseline stoves (the sample size of which have been assessed to avoid bias and to ensure reliability).</p> <p>For $By=1,new,i,survey$, surveyed households would not include those that are identified as either (i) continue to use baseline technology through response to the survey or through observation by enumerator or (ii) no longer use the improved cookstoves.</p> <p>From the remaining households, a measurement campaign is to be applied whereby households estimate amounts of woody biomass that is used in the project scenario using an appropriate local metric (e.g. bundles of wood) for an easily understood period (e.g. per week). The average local metric unit (e.g. bundles) of bone dry woody biomass is calculated based on samples collected in each cluster (i.e. GVH in Malawi or Sector in Rwanda, as detailed in B.3 of the PoA). For example, the average of 10 bundles of wood would</p>		

Finding	B1		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
	be calculated per cluster (i.e. GVH or Sector) and adjusted for moisture content. 4. Measurements for the woodfuel savings have been included in B.6.3		
DOE Assessment #3 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	3. By=1,new,i,survey has now been included in B.7.1, and measurement methods and frequency conform to the applied methodology 4. Units have been included and deemed correct.		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed		

Finding	B2		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part IV</p> <p>The management System is not described as per requirements of §§19, 20 of the PoA standard (EB 65, Annex 03), and §200 of the CDM PS version 07: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operational and management arrangements for the implementation of the PoA and a clear definition of roles and responsibilities of personnel involved in the CPA inclusion 2. Procedures for technical review of the CPA inclusion 3. A system/ procedure to avoid double accounting (new CPAs or already existing cook-stoves) 4. A records and documentation control process for each CPA including stove replacement procedures. Procedures for checking and handling used stoves that fall below the prescribed methodology efficiency (20%) 5. Measures for continuous improvement of the PoA management system 6. CME competencies and procedures to check the technical and eligibility aspects of potential CPAs 7. Procedures for data management and records control 8. PoA detailed management/organizational structure showing clearly the position of CPA implementers and other third parties connected to the programme of activities. <p>Associated checklist question(s): B.7.1.1 to B.7.1.6</p>		

Finding	B2		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	1. This is revised. Please see section C of PoA-DD 2. This is revised. Please see section C of PoA-DD 3. This is included. Please see section C of PoA-DD 4. This is included. Please see section C of PoA-DD 5. This is included. Please see section C of PoA-DD 6. This is included. Please see section C of PoA-DD 7. This is included. Please see section C of PoA-DD 7. This is included. Please see section C of PoA-DD 8. This is included. Please see section C of PoA-DD		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): B.7.2	New version No.:02
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	1. A management structure has been included in the revised PoA-DD detailing roles and responsibilities in the operations of the proposed PoA. This includes data recording, quality check, monitoring and surveying. The chart allows for efficient operations and to ensure data integrity and safety 2. Not fulfilled 3. Not fulfilled. Please include guidelines on unique identification of the PoA ICSs 4. Not fulfilled 5. Not fulfilled 6. Not fulfilled 7. Not fulfilled 8. Resolved as per point 1 above.		
Corrective Action #2 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	2. Technical review of CPA inclusion is conducted by CME and assesses eligibility and competence of CPA implementer. Once assessed positively the CME builds the capacity of the implementer. The process is described in Section C. 3. Guidelines on unique identification of the PoA ICSs have been included. The place and time of production of all stoves promoted as part of this PoA are to be traceable so that any given stove can be allocated to to a particular CPA and is described in Section C. 4. Each CPA implementer to have a stove replacement policy detailing (i) records and documentation control process for each CPA including stove replacement procedures and (ii) procedures for checking and handling used stoves that fall below the prescribed methodology efficiency.		

Finding	B2		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
	<p>5. As part of operational and management planning for the PoA a set of measures for continuous improvement of the PoA management have been detailed in Section C.</p> <p>6. CME assesses competence, technical and eligibility procedures of potential CPAs and implementer to be checked as part of the technical review of CPA inclusion</p> <p>7. Procedures for data management and records control are now detailed in Section C.</p>		
DOE Assessment #2 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>2. Procedures for assessment of competence and technical review have now been included in section C.</p> <p>3. Information on unique identification to avoid double counting is assessed as sufficient</p> <p>4. It is unclear measures to be taken on how or at what point the efficiencies of ICSs will be determined to be below the prescribed 20%. OPEN</p> <p>5. PP has included information on continuous improvement which includes training of personnel and regular management reviews.</p> <p>6. CME assesses competence, technical and eligibility procedures of potential CPAs and implementer.</p> <p>7. Procedures for data management and records control detailed in Section C are sufficient.</p>		
Corrective Action #3 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	<p>4. CPA implementers are to be guided by the CME based on evidence generated through on-going testing conducted as part of the monitoring plan of the POA whereby the CME can accurately extrapolate at which state specific improved cook stove devices fall below the minimum efficiency level of 20% due to wear and tear and / or partial breakages. When this state, which is to be clearly defined and documented by the CME, is reached the said improved cook stoves are to be disqualified from being considered for emission reductions in this PoA</p>		
DOE Assessment #3 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>4. CPA implementers will receive guidance after appropriate tests are conducted by the CME, to ensure that the applicability condition of the methodology are met, in as far as minimum thermal efficiency is concerned. (§14, 16, of AMS II. G version 06)</p>		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed</p>		

Finding	B3		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part III section A.3, Part Xi section A.6.4 The sampling plan prescribed by the proposed PoA for all the CPAs must adhere to the sampling guidelines (EB67, Annex 06) and the requirements of the sampling standard (EB50, Annex 30): - see also CDM PS version 07 §210 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sampling objective, target population, sampling frame, and the sampling method all shall clearly be outlined and justified under the sampling plan both in section B.3 of the PoA-DD and section B.2 of the generic CPA-DD template forms versions 03. 2. Equations used in the estimation of mean values shall be from credible sources and referenced as such. 3. Accordingly, an eligibility criterion for all CPAs to adhere to the PoA recommended sampling plan is to be included. Associated checklist question(s):		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is revised. Please see section B.7.2 of the generic CPA-DD 2. This is revised. Please see section B.7.2 of the generic CPA-DD 3. This is revised. As per text of generic CPA-DD section B.5 "Each CPA will be assessed using eligibility criteria detailed in POA-DD Section B.2, for inclusion into the POA." 		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): B.3	New version No.:02
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please follow the guidelines as follows to establish a robust sampling plan for the PoA paying attention to the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sampling Standard version 04.1; §7, 12, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21 • Guidelines for sampling & surveys for PoAs §30-39, 41 • Applied meth: § 39-40 2. Sampling equations in the determination of clusters c and sample sizes n are neither referenced nor choices justified. 3. Eligibility criterion j has been established to ensure that each CPA adheres to the sampling guidelines prescribed by the PoA 		
Corrective Action #2 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sampling plan included with description of sampling approach, important assumptions, and justification for the selection of the chosen approach; minimum sample size addressed; what to do if minimum precision is not reached as per 39 on applied methodology; single sampling plan covering a group of CPAs is undertaken applying 95/10 confidence/precision; sampling plan 		

Finding	B3		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
<i>requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	<p>will ensure that samples are randomly selected and are representative of the population. Target population, sampling method, sampling size, sampling frame discussed in B.3. Sampling plan present a reasonable approach for obtaining unbiased, reliable estimates of the variables and the population is clearly defined. As per point 40 of the applied methodology the CME proposes to monitor efficiency of devices in a common survey with other monitoring parameters (i.e. the usage survey).</p> <p>2. Sampling equations sourced and now justified in this section.</p>		
DOE Assessment #2 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>1. Sampling plan has been revised and found to conform to all requirements of the CDM methodology, sampling guideline and standard. Sampling approach, vital assumptions, referencing and justification of applied equations have been included in section B.3 of the PoA-DD. A more detailed assessment is to be found in section 5 of this report.</p> <p>2. The equation referenced as 'point 15' is not consistent with the one in paragraph 15 page 55 of the Guideline - Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, version 03.0 (EB75, Annex 08)</p>		
Corrective Action #3 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	<p>2. The equation was indeed referenced incorrectly and is now correctly referenced as equation 4 paragraph 27, page 56 of 98 of the Guideline - Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, version 03.0 (EB75, Annex 08)</p>		
DOE Assessment #3 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>2. Referencing has been corrected</p>		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed</p>		

Finding	B4								
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD						
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR						
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part XI section A.6.4</p> <p>The monitoring system does not conform to the prescription of the AMS-II.G version 06 § 33-38, and § 243 of the CDM VVS version 07.</p> <p>Associated checklist question(s): F.3.1</p>								
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	<p>1. This is revised and detailed under section B.7 of the generic CPA-DD.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD</td> <td>Section(s): B.7.2</td> <td>New version No.:02</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS</td> <td>Worksheet(s):</td> <td>New version No.:</td> </tr> </table>			<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): B.7.2	New version No.:02	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): B.7.2	New version No.:02							
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:							
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>1. The monitoring system has been elaborated to cover monitored parameters in section B.7.2 of the PoA-DD version 02. However, requirement of §37 a) applicable to the programme activity is omitted from the monitoring system</p>								
Corrective Action #2 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	<p>1. The monitoring system has been elaborated to cover monitored parameters in section B.7.2 of the PoA-DD version 02. However, requirement of §37 a) applicable to the programme activity is omitted from the monitoring system</p>								
DOE Assessment #2 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>1. As per requirement 37, as it is assumed that pre-project stoves continue to be used in this PoA, monitoring shall ensure that the fuel-wood consumption of those stoves is excluded from $B_{old,i}$. As per B.6.3 of the PoADD, the PP has chosen to use equation 2 of the Methodology, so $B_{old,i}$ is not applied however $B_{y=1,new,i,survey}$ considers ex-ante continued use of pre-project stoves and is adjusted accordingly to achieve conservative estimates of emission reductions. Ex-post continued use of pre-project stoves is to be estimated through surveys.</p>								
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed</p>								

Finding	C1		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part V section A.1, A.2 1. Start date of the PoA project activity is not described as per §§213 of the CDM PS version 07, § 113, 239 of the CDM VVS version 07, and section D.1 of the PoA-DD version 03 template form requirements 2. Date format also not conforming to template guidelines 3. Duration of PoA is incorrectly stated Associated checklist question(s): C.1.1 to C.1.4		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	1. This is revised. As per Section D. of the PoA-DD, start date of the PoA is 17/02/2014, the date that the PoA-DD was uploaded to the UNFCCC website for global stakeholder consultation. 2. This is revised. Date now in day/month/year order of template guidelines. 3. This is revised to 28 years.		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): D.1 & D.2	New version No.:02
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	1. The PoA start date is correctly defined but the date that the PoA-DD was uploaded for GSCP appears to be inconsistent with the CDM UNFCCC website. 2. Date format is correct as per template guidance 3. The duration of the PoA is clearly stated as 28 years		
Corrective Action #2 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	1. This is now corrected to date stated on UNFCCC website.		
DOE Assessment #2 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	1. Start date of the PoA conforms to CDM guidelines		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed		

Finding	E1		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part VI section A.1, A.2 1. Appropriate justification or references are required that no negative environmental impacts are identified or expected, and that environmental impact assessment not required in Malawi and Rwanda. CME shall also furnish the validation team with evidence/ exemption for the EIA. 2. CME shall also consider whether trans-boundary environmental impacts considered in the analysis 3. During onsite visit it has been observed from similar projects run by the PP, that the harvesting of soil by stove production groups leaves large tracts of degraded land that could impinge on safety as well as the environment/farmlands. The issues were effectively raised during the LSC. PP shall elaborate on mitigation measures as a result of this feedback Associated checklist question(s): D.1.1, D.1.2		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	1. This is revised and expanded under E.2 of the PoA-DD. This is done for Malawi and forthcoming for Rwanda. 2. This is revised. As per section E.2 of the PoA-DD, "...impacts may extend even to areas outside of the project target areas; however, impact would be minimal and outside of the CME's scope for monitoring." 3. This is addressed in PoA-DD section F.3 <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD Section(s): E.2 & F.3 New version No.: 02 <input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS Worksheet(s): New version No.: </div>		
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	1. It has now been clarified in PoA-DD section E.1 that the PoA is exempted from an EIA in Malawi. In Rwanda an exemption has been issued from the Rwanda Development Board ^{/EIA/} to Hestian Innovation Ltd. 2. It has now been clarified that only positive impacts are expected from the project. Trans-boundary impacts outside PP's scope of operations 3. In section F.3, PP has outlined prevention, education, and mitigation measures as a result of clay harvesting. This includes providing instruction on responsible clay harvesting techniques, restoration and use of sustainable woodfuel harvesting and fuel efficient kilns.		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed		

Finding	F1		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part VII section A.1, A.2, A.3</p> <p>The following issues have been raised in as far as the stakeholder consultation process is concerned:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is unclear whether stakeholder consultation process is to be carried out PoA or CPA level and if so specific dates when they were done. 2. The process of identification and invitation of relevant stakeholders is unclear, with no relevant evidence. Please furnish the validation team with the full stakeholder consultation report containing invitations, a list of attendees, signatures, and means of invitations 3. Actual dates and durations in which meetings were held. Please confirm whether the meetings were before the publication of the POA-DD/CPA-DD for the GSCP as per CDM requirements. 4. Positive and/or negative comments received in those meetings 5. How the comments were received and compiled, and considered, and from which particular stakeholders <p>Associated checklist question(s): E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4</p>		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is clarified to be at PoA level and detailed under F.1 of the PoA-DD. 2. This is clarified and detailed in the submitted stakeholder consultation report dated 15122014. 3. This is expanded under F.1 of the PoA-DD. 4. This is summarised in F.2 of the PoA-DD and detailed in the submitted stakeholder consultation report.. 5. This is revised. Please see SCR 15122014 		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s):F.1 & F.2	New version No.:
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:

Finding	F1		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	1. Stakeholder consultation is clarified to be conducted at PoA level. The specific dates for both host countries have been added in section F.1 of the PoA-DD. 2. The detailed stakeholder consultation report ^{/LSCR/} is submitted to the validation team. Feedback comments from stakeholders have also been availed. The PP has additionally included the summary information in section F.1 of the PoA-DD. It is assessed that the report is complete and meets the requirements of the CDM. 3. Actual dates have now been included in section F.1 4. Issues raised by attendees have been included in section F.2 5. OK as checked		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed		

Finding	G1		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part VIII 1. The LoA from the host country Republic of Malawi shall be availed to the DOE for validation in accordance with relevant provisions of the CDM validation and verification standard, version 07 2. The LoA from the host country Republic of Rwanda shall be availed to the DOE for validation in accordance with relevant provisions of the CDM validation and verification standard, version 07 3. It is unclear whether Hestian Malawi Ltd and Hestian Ltd Rwanda are registered project entities in the two host countries Associated checklist question(s): F.2.1		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	1. This is forthcoming 2. This is forthcoming 3. This is clarified in PoA-DD section A.4		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): N/A	New version No.: 02
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:

Finding	G1		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	1. Pending 2. Pending 3. It has now been clarified in the revised PoA-DD version 02 section A.4, that the CME PP is Hestian Innovation Ltd. Therefore, the LoAs shall reflect the same PP		
Corrective Action #2 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	1. Submitted 2. Submitted		
DOE Assessment #2 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	1. A host country letter of approval (LoA) serial number EAD/99/07/26A dated 2015-04-01 has been granted by the DNA of the Republic of Malawi (Environmental Affairs Department). The letter has been received from the PP, and is signed by an authorized party for the Director of Environmental Affairs. In accordance with the stipulations of § 81-83 of the CDM PS version 09.0, and §51-59 of the CDM VVS version 09.0, the letter confirms that: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hestian Innovation Limited is the sole project participant/CME of the proposed project activity Malawi has ratified the Kyoto Protocol Malawi's participation in the CDM and the PoA is voluntary The project assists Malawi in achieving sustainable development The LoA is unconditional 2. A host country letter of approval (LoA) serial number 0906/DNA/2015 dated 2015-05-15 has been granted by the DNA of the Republic of Rwanda (Rwanda Environment Management Authority). The letter has been received from the PP, and is signed by an authorized party –The Director General. In accordance with the stipulations of § 81-83 of the CDM PS version 09.0, and §51-59 of the CDM VVS version 09.0, the letter confirms that: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hestian Innovation Limited is the sole project participant/CME of the proposed project activity The Republic of Rwanda has ratified the Kyoto Protocol The Republic of Rwanda's participation in the CDM and the PoA is voluntary The project assists The Republic of Rwanda in achieving 		

Finding	G1		
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
	<p>sustainable development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LoA is unconditional <p>Both letters contain the precise PoA title. The DOE confirms that the Hestian Innovation Limited is the authorized PP in both the countries and consistent with the PoA-DD and CPA-DDs.</p>		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed		

Finding	G2								
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD						
Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR						
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part VIII</p> <p>The MoC(s) from the PoA CME shall be availed to the DOE for validation in accordance with relevant provisions of the CDM validation and verification standard, version 07</p> <p>Associated checklist question(s): F.3.1</p>								
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	<p>This is submitted.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD</td><td>Section(s): N/A</td><td>New version No.: N/A</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS</td><td>Worksheet(s):</td><td>New version No.:</td></tr> </table>			<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): N/A	New version No.: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): N/A	New version No.: N/A							
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:							
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>MoC^{/MoC/} dated 2014-12-13 is submitted and signed by an authorized person, and assessed as completed as per the MoC CDM template requirements. The sole entity communicating with the EB will be Hestian Innovation Ltd., and the primary authorized signatory will be John O'Connor.</p> <p>Hestian Innovation has a contractual relationship with the DOE, and is mentioned as the CME in the LoAs</p>								
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed								

P-No.: 8000449119 – 14/021

Finding	G3								
Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD						
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR						
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Draft PoA-DD version 01 editorial 1. PP is requested to complete all sections of the PoA-DD as per the latest PoA-DD template form available in the UNFCCC website (version 03). Associated checklist question(s): F.4.1								
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the PoA-DD is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	This is revised <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD</td> <td>Section(s): All sections</td> <td>New version No.: 02</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS</td> <td>Worksheet(s):</td> <td>New version No.:</td> </tr> </table>			<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): All sections	New version No.: 02	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in PoA-DD	Section(s): All sections	New version No.: 02							
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:							
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	1. The PoA-DD has been updated with the latest PoA-DD template version 03.0 and guidelines as found in the CDM UNFCCC website.								
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed								

5 VALIDATION ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

5.1 General Description of the PoA

5.1.1 Technology to be employed

Section A of the finalized PoA-DD version 07 contains a complete description of the proposed Programme of Activities. The description provides a detailed understanding of the purpose and intended operational modes of the Greenfield project activity. The Biomass Energy Conservation (BEC) PoA focuses on the construction and dissemination of improved portable ceramic cook stoves to households in rural, peri-urban and urban households in the Republic of Malawi and the Republic of Rwanda.

5.1.2 Small Scale PoAs & Debundling

The proposed Programme of Activities is a small-scale project. Each CPA shall not exceed 180 GWh_{th} aggregate energy savings. CPA implementers shall demonstrate that each CPA has a total thermal energy output of less or equal to 180 GWh_{th} to conform to eligibility criteria.

The PoA is thus eligible for SSC projects. The PoA applies the approved and applicable CDM methodology *AMS-II.G ver. 06: Energy Efficiency Measures in Thermal Applications of Non-Renewable Biomass*.

The PoA is not a de-bundled component of a large-scale PoA. Each unit stove does not exceed 1% of the SSC threshold (1.8 GWh_{th}/year), and therefore the programme of activities is exempted from the de-bundling check.

No other such PoA is registered in Malawi or Rwanda applying similar technologies and by the same project proponent^{/gs/unfccc/IM01/PoA-DD/}.

5.1.3 Definition of a typical Component Project Activity (CPA)

The CPAs within the framework of The Biomass Energy Conservation (BEC) PoA have been correctly defined. A typical CPA will involve dissemination of upto 14,000 improved cook-stoves that are more efficient (30.6%) and use less wood for household cooking and heating than the traditional stoves (considered to be only 10% efficient) by the methodology.

Information in the finalized CPA-DDs is consistent with the PoA description and the generic CPA-DD. Eligibility criteria for admission of CPAs into the PoA have been appropriately defined and verified to be complete as per guidelines of the Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of

multiple methodologies for Programmes of Activities (Version 3.0), and relevant provisions of the CDM VVS version 07.0.0 and the CDM Project Standard version 07.0.0.

5.2 PoA Baseline

5.2.1 Application of the Methodology

The PoA applies the EB approved and valid small-scale methodology AMS-II.G: Energy Efficiency Measures in Thermal Applications of Non-Renewable Biomass, version 06. All applied methodological tools valid and approved for the PoA.

All methodology applicability conditions and stipulations have been met for this type of project activity. The PoA is not expected to result in significant emissions, related both to project and leakage, other than those listed in the applied methodology.

5.2.2 PoA Boundary and CPA Boundary

The geographical boundaries and boundaries related to GHG sources / sinks are correctly given in section A.5, B.2, and B.3 of the PoA-DD and justified.

The geographical boundaries of the PoA are given as the boundaries of the Republics of Malawi and Rwanda. As per AMS II.G version 06, The project boundary of ICS devices in a typical CPA would be the physical, geographical site of the efficient devices that burn biomass. The boundary defined in the CPA-DDs complies with the defined programme boundary. The assessment of sources and gases included in the project boundary are appropriately given in the PoA-DD. It is expected that CO₂ is the major baseline and Project emission gas as a result of combusting non-renewable biomass. The sources are justified and there are no other sources which are impacted by the programme and not addressed by the applied meth. No other GHG emission source greater than 1%, not addressed by the methodology is identified.

Eligibility criteria (a) for CPA inclusion have been established to ensure compliance with the PoA boundary. All applicable national and/or sectoral policies and regulations within the chosen boundary been taken into consideration.

5.2.3 Baseline Identification

The description of baseline identification in the PoA-DD is transparent and verifiable.

The procedure to identify the most plausible baseline scenario derived from the applied methodology has been applied correctly and is transparently and sufficiently documented and justified in the PoA-DD.

As per applied methodology AMS.II.G version 06, the baseline is pre-defined as *“the use of fossil fuels for meeting similar thermal energy needs” provided by the project activities.*

Therefore, the CPA baseline scenario is correctly defined as:

“in the absence of the project activity, the three-stone fire is one of the main “stoves” used to meet household cooking needs.”

The DOE checked and confirms that the CME has correctly applied the AMS.II.G, version 06 to arrive at the baseline determination.

All relevant national/sectoral circumstances and policies are considered and stated in the PoA-DD. Through the Biomass Energy Strategy, the government has signed on as a national partner to the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves and announced a target of 2 million clean and efficient cookstoves in the country by 2020 (2013).

The use of the three-stone traditional fire is the prevailing practice among the targeted households.

5.2.4 Algorithms and formulae used to determine emission reductions

a) Data not monitored

All data not monitored are included in section B.6.2 of the PoA-DD and considered correct and complete as per AMS-II.G version 06: -

i. **$f_{NRB,y}$**

Fraction of woody biomass saved by the project activity in year y that can be established as non-renewable biomass. The values are 0.81 for Malawi and 0.98 for Rwanda as determined by the UNFCCC and approved by respective countries' DNAs.

ii. **$NCV_{biomass}$**

Net calorific value of the non-renewable biomass that is substituted. The value of 0.015 TJ/t applied as per AMS-II.G version 06.0

iii. **$EF_{projected_fossilfuel}$**

Emission factor for the substitution of non-renewable biomass by similar consumers. The value of 81.6 tCO₂/TJ applied as per AMS-II.G version 06.0

iv. **η_{old}**

Efficiency of the system being replaced. The value of 0.10 applied as per AMS-II.G version 06.0

v. **L_y**

Leakage adjustment factor for period y . The value of 0.95 applied as per AMS-II.G version 06.0

b) Data Monitored

All data monitored are included in section B.7.1 of the PoA-DD and considered correct and complete as follows: -

- i. $B_{y=1,new,i,survey}$
Annual quantity of woody biomass used by project devices in tonnes per device of type i. This is determined via sample surveys
- ii. $N_{y,i,a}$
Number of project devices of type i and age a that are operating in year y
- iii. $\mu_{y,i}$
Number of days of utilization of the project device during the year 'y'
- iv. $n_{new,i=1} \times \Delta n_{y,i,a}$
Calculated to determine the efficiency of the used device relative to the efficiency at time of first use (year 1)

The monitoring plan for the parameters has been checked and deemed to be appropriate for the purpose of ER determination

c) Methodological choices and Formulae for the determination of Emission Reductions (ER)

i. Baseline and Leakage emissions

For household cookstoves, the PoA-DD prescribes the following equations for the determination of emission reductions for each CPA

$$ER_y = \sum ER_y$$

$$= \sum_{y,savings,i,a} n_{y,savings,i,a} \times N_{y,i,a} \times (\mu_{y,i} / 365) \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{biomass} \times EF_{projected_fossilfuel} - LE_y$$

equation 1 of AMS-II.G version 06

equation 2 of AMS-II.G version 06

Where:

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

a = is the indices for the age (in years) of the cook stoves that are operating in the year 'y' of the crediting period. At any year y of the crediting period (e.g. y = 1, 2, 3... or 7) there will be a population of operational devices of the type i with age varying from a=1 (the cook stoves installed during the current year y) up to the age a=y (the cook stoves installed during the first year of the crediting period).

Since the lifetime of cook stoves is often shorter than the length of the crediting period and cook stoves are likely to show significant efficiency losses over time, this aspect is captured through the monitoring plan

ER_y = Emission reductions during year y in t CO₂e

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

$B_{y,savings,i,a}$ = Annual quantity of woody biomass that is saved in tonnes per cook stove device of type i and age a in year y

$N_{y,i,a}$ = Number of project devices of type i and age a operating in year y

$\mu_{y,i}$ = Number of project devices of type i and age a operating in year y

$f_{NRB,y}$ = Fraction of woody biomass saved by the project activity in year y that can be established as non-renewable biomass using survey methods or government data or default country specific fraction of non-renewable woody biomass, fixed ex-ante at the beginning of each crediting period

$NCV_{biomass}$ = Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted (IPCC default for wood fuel, 0.015 TJ/tonne, based on the gross weight of the wood that is 'air-dried')

$EF_{projected_fossilfuel}$ = Emission factor for the fossil fuels projected to be used for substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers. A value of 81.6 t CO₂/TJ is used

LE_y = Leakage emissions in the year y

ii. Determination of $B_{y,savings,i,a}$

For the determination of $B_{y,savings,i,a}$, PP has elected to apply equation below, as the WBT tool would be used for determining the efficiency of a representative sample of installed cookstoves (AMS-II.G version 06.0 § 17)

$$B_{y,savings,i,a} = B_{y=1,new,i,survey} \times ((n_{new,i,a=1} \times \Delta n_{y,i,a} / n_{old}) - 1)$$

equation 2 of AMS-II.G version 06

Where:

$B_{y=1,new,i,survey}$ = Annual quantity of woody biomass used by project devices in tonnes per device of type i , determined in the first year of the introduction of the devices. The values of 1.575 t/yr for Republic of Malawi and 1,271 t/yr for

Republic of Rwanda have been determined and validated ex-ante by the Gold Standard Foundation

$n_{new,i,a}$ = thermal efficiency of the device 'i' at age 'a' (WBT)

$n_{new,i,a=1}$ = thermal efficiency of the device at its first year of operation

$\Delta n_{y,i,a}$ = Factor to consider the efficiency loss of the project device type i due to its aging at the year y, expressed as $n_{new,i,a} / n_{new,i,a=1}$

d) Sampling Plan

The target population is low-income rural and peri-urban households that cook and heat water with firewood on three-stone fires or inefficient technologies, who have adopted the project efficient cookstoves. The CPAs are assumed to be homogenous in both Malawi and Rwanda.

Sampling would be done at PoA level. Therefore, as prescribed by the methodology § 39, and the Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, a 95% confidence level and margin of error of $\pm 10\%$ is necessary for the sampling parameters.

CPAs for the same country will be sampled together. But CPAs from the same country but with different technologies will not be sampled together.

The proposed sampling will involve the estimation of: -

1. The proportion of operational cookstoves, and;
2. The proportion of continued use of baseline technology
3. The mean thermal efficiency of operational stoves

Multi-stage sampling is considered the most appropriate sampling methodology whereby a number of groups can be first sampled and then units within each group are sampled. The main group is the primary sampling unit, and the subgroup is the secondary sampling unit.

In the case of the proposed PoA, the most appropriate group level to be sampled first is the administrative Group Village Head (GVH) level in Malawi and Sector level in Rwanda. A simple random sample (subgroup) is then drawn from a GVH or Sector.

Estimating the number of GVHs/Sectors to be sampled

This is as per the guidelines 'Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities' version 03.0. Equation 16 has been appropriately proposed.

$$c \geq \frac{\frac{SD_B^2}{\bar{p}^2} \times \frac{M}{M-1} + \frac{1}{\bar{u}} \times \frac{SD_w^2}{\bar{p}^2} \times \frac{(\bar{N} - \bar{u})}{(\bar{N} - 1)}}{\frac{0.1^2}{1.645^2} + \frac{1}{M-1} \times \frac{SD_B^2}{\bar{p}^2}}$$

Where:

c	Number of clusters (e.g. GVHs in Malawi) to be sampled
M	Total number of clusters in population (assumed to be about 120 GVHs that have 10 households or more)
\bar{u}	Number of units to be sampled within each group (pre-specified as 10 households)
\bar{N}	Average units per group (estimated to be 50 households per group)
SD_B^2	Unit variance - variance between groups
SD_w^2	Average of the group variances - average within group variation
p	Overall proportion (0.73)
1.96	Represents the 95% confidence required
0.1	Represents the 10% relative precision required

As per the standard for sampling and surveys, if there is more than one parameter to be estimated in a survey, the required sample size will be the largest number obtained in the calculations

For the estimation of the proportion of operational stoves and discontinued use of baseline stoves, CME would expect non-response at sub-group level and would over-sample accordingly by 20%.

For the estimation of mean efficiency and to secure unbiased estimate of the mean value, CME proposes drawing a sub-sample from the samples determining proportions of used project stoves/continued baseline use, as long as the minimum reliability levels are achieved. Due to the homogeneity of CPAs in terms of stove efficiency, simple random sampling is employed and the guidelines 'Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities' version 03.0 equation 4 is appropriately proposed.

$$n \geq \frac{1.96^2 NV}{(N-1) \times 0.1^2 + 1.96^2 \times V}$$

Where

V	$(SD / \text{expected mean})^2$
n	sample size
N	total number of households
Mean	expected mean
SD	expected standard deviation
1.96	represents 95% confidence required
0.1	represents the 10% relative precision

If the sample size is less than 30, then the Student's t-distribution shall be used as prescribed by the sampling standard version 04.1.

The designed sampling plan, selected approaches, assumptions, equations, and survey methods have been assessed. The sampling plan is considered sufficient for the estimation of the usage proportions and the mean thermal efficiency of the improved cookstoves over time; so that reported emission reductions are correct, and conservative.

The implementation of the sampling plan is proposed to be from local experts who are further trained on survey methods. The WBT protocol for testing of project technology efficiencies will conform to manufacture specifications on calibration and handling

All CPAs shall adhere to the sampling and emission reduction approaches prescribed in the registered PoA-DD

All data sources and assumptions for the ex-ante fixed parameters are appropriate and are the corresponding calculations correct and applicable to the programme activity.

The monitoring parameters are considered reasonable and the approaches in the estimated emission reductions at CPA level are plausible and conservative.

5.3 Additionality Determination

5.3.1 PoA

The PoA start date has been defined appropriately as 2014-02-15, date of publication of the project documents for GSCP as per §213 b) of the CDM Project Standard version 07.0.0.

In the absence of the proposed CDM PoA, households would continue to use less efficient traditional three-stone fireplace or other to meet their thermal energy needs. As per EB 68, Annex 27 §2 (c), each CPA under the PoA involves dissemination of improved portable ceramic cookstoves (isolated units) to households or communities where the size of each improved cook-stove is not larger than 5% of the SSC CDM thresholds. Therefore, this small-scale PoA is automatically additional and no further additionality analysis is necessary.

5.3.2 CPA level

Starting date / Consideration of CDM in decision making

As per the *CDM Glossary of Terms*, the starting date reported as the earliest date at which either the implementation or construction or real action of a CPA begins.

The real case CPAs starting dates is expected to be 2016-01-01, and therefore it is not prior to the start date of the PoA (2014-02-15).

1. Malawi Biomass Energy Conservation Programme CPA 1
2. Rwanda Biomass Energy Conservation Programme CPA 1

At the time of registration, no ICS had been disseminated under the CPAs.

Alternatives

The baseline is prescribed in the applied methodology AMS II.G version 06.

Investment analysis

The small-scale PoA is automatically additional as per positive list included in § 2 (c) of EB 68, Annex 27. Hence, no investment analysis is necessary.

Barrier analysis

The small-scale PoA is automatically additional as per positive list included in § 2 (c) of EB 68, Annex 27. Hence, no barrier analysis is necessary.

Common practice analysis

Additionality if not justified using common practice analysis. Furthermore, this is a small-scale PoA.

Additionality-related eligibility criteria

Eligibility criterion f) was established in order to assess additionality of each CPA. As the activity envisioned for each CPA is on the positive list of automatically additional SSC project activity, only the size requirement needs to be fulfilled to assess a CPA as additional. This is correctly described in eligibility criterion f) and has been established in accordance with all relevant requirements and guidelines.

5.4 Operational, Management and Monitoring Plan of the PoA

Section C of the PoA-DD includes an organization chart for the operation and management of the proposed but yet to be implemented PoA. The CME has defined roles and responsibilities, including data collection, management of the sales database, QA/QC, monitoring and reporting for the purposes of ER calculation. The CME takes the responsibility to oversee CPA inclusions through technical review of all documents and checking the competence of CPA implementers.

All stoves have a unique identification to avoid double counting

The monitoring plan cover all monitoring parameters given in the applied monitoring methodology or all parameters which have to be monitored w.r.t. the CPA/PoA boundary.

The means of implementation of the monitoring plan, including data management and quality assurance and quality control procedures, are assessed as sufficient to ensure that the ERs to be achieved by the individual CPA can be properly reported and verified.

5.5 Crediting Period

The choice of the crediting periods for the real case CPAs is 7 years renewable. The dates has been given as 2016-01-01, or the date of CPA registration. The start of crediting period is not before the PoA start of validation (starting date) which is 2014-02-15.

5.6 Environmental Impacts

The PoA-DD stipulates that analysis of environmental impacts is done at PoA-Level since environmental impacts are not expected to differ much between the different CPAs. No negative impacts are identified. It was confirmed during the onsite visit that no official EIA is required for this type of project for the host countries. An EIA clearance certificate was however issued by host country Rwanda^{/EIA/}. The assessment of environmental impacts and its level is deemed appropriate (CL E1).

5.7 Comments by Local Stakeholders

The CME has chosen to conduct the stakeholder consultation process at the PoA level. Therefore, all relevant local stakeholders invited in both countries to comment on the project. The PP has provided the dates of continuous LSC and comments from relevant stakeholders have been included in the PoA-DD. The comments were positive and some only amounted to suggestions for improvement. No significant negative comments were received. PP has also taken into account comments raised and included the same in the final PoA-DD.

5.8 Participation

5.8.1 Definition of Roles

The PoA-DD includes an identification of the CME as Hestian Innovation Limited. The CME (PP) is Hestian Innovation Limited for both host parties of the PoA. The name of the PP is consistent between the Project Design Documents (PoA-DD and CPA-DDs), the MoC and the LoA. The parties involved are not project participants. The CME oversees the implementation of the PoA in both host countries.

5.8.2 LOA

DNAs of both parties have issued the PoA with a host country Letter of Approval. The LoAs confirm that:

- The parties are a party to the Kyoto Protocol
- Participation of Malawi and Rwanda is voluntary
- That the PoA contributes to sustainable development to the host parties
- Refers to the precise project activity title in the PoA-DD intended for submission for registration

The LoAs are deemed authentic and signed by authorized persons.

5.8.3 MoC

In accordance with §54-58 of the CDM VVS version 07.0, and §80 of the CDM PS version 07.0, an MoC has been submitted by an authorized party on behalf of the sole project participant for the PoA (CME). PP has included the personal identity, specimen signature and contact details of the nominated entity to communicate with the UNFCCC EB.

The MoC has been received from the PP (Hestian Innovation Limited) with which TÜV NORD has the contractual relationship.

The representative^{/MoC/} who submitted the MoC statement to the DOE and the one who signed the written confirmation is authorized to do so on behalf of the respective project participant.

5.9 Project Documentation Editorial Aspects

The final PoA-DD is in compliance with latest PoA-DD Template version 03 and latest version of the guideline for completing PoA-DDs version 03.

6 VALIDATION OPINION

Hestian Innovation Limited has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program (CP) to validate the project: "Biomass Energy Conservation Programme" with regard to the relevant requirements of the UNFCCC for CDM project activities, as well as criteria for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria include article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the modalities and procedures for CDM (Marrakech Accords) and the relevant decisions by COP/MOP and CDM Executive Board

In the course of the pre-validation 10 Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and 10 Clarification Requests (CLs) were raised and successfully closed.

The review of the project design documentation and additional documents related to baseline and monitoring methodology; the subsequent background investigation, follow-up interviews and review of comments by parties, stakeholders and NGOs have provided TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP with sufficient evidence to validate the fulfilment of the stated criteria.

In detail the conclusions can be summarised as follows:

- The PoA is in line with all relevant host country criteria (Republic of Malawi, Republic of Rwanda) and all relevant UNFCCC requirements for CDM. Project activity approvals have been obtained from DNA of Republic of Malawi, Republic of Rwanda vide the Letter of Approval (HCA) dated 2015-04-01 from DNA of Republic of Rwanda dated 2015-05-15
- The PoA additionality is sufficiently justified in the PoA-DD.
- The eligibility criteria established for CPA inclusion are deemed appropriate and sufficient.
- The monitoring plan is transparent and adequate.
- The calculation of the PoA emission reductions is carried out in a transparent and conservative manner, so that the calculated emission reductions of 336,825 t CO₂e are most likely to be achieved by the two real case CPAs within the (1st renewable) crediting period.
- All information has been consistently applied in the generic CPA-DD form.

The conclusions of this report show, that the project, as it was described in the project documentation, is in line with all criteria applicable for the validation.

Kigali, 2015-07-23



Grzegorz Kochaniewicz
TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP
Validation Team Leader

Essen, 2015-07-23



Rainer Winter
TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP
Final Approval

7 REFERENCES

Table 7-1: Documents provided by the project participant

Reference	Document
/BS/	Baseline Survey Results for Malawi (2009) Baseline Survey Results for Rwanda (2013)
/CL/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSC_223 Clarification about the threshold of thermal energy savings in AMS-II.G • SSC_566 Clarification on monitoring requirements for stove efficiency for a project activity utilizing Kitchen Performance Test • SSC_595 Clarification on energy efficiency requirements for project cookstoves under AMS-II.G • SSC_654 Revision of AMS-II.G to include monitoring requirements for replaced project technologies • SSC_659 Clarification on ex-post monitoring of efficiency of improved cookstoves in AMS-II.G • SSC_660 Clarification on how to deal with differences in efficiency test under AMS-II.G • SSC_674 Clarification on the use of qualitative surveys to determine the amount of woody biomass under AMS II.G • SSC_684 Revision of AMS-II.G concerning sample size requirements for thermal efficiency testing • SSC_695 Clarification on thermal efficiency monitoring requirements under AMS-II.G (versions 3.0, 4.0 and 5.0) • SSC_703 Clarification on the requirement to avoid double counting under AMS-II.G • SSC_711 Clarification on the requirement to monitor continued use of baseline stoves under AMS-II.G
/CMU/	Chitetezo Mbaula User Manual
/CONT/	Household Stove Sales ER contracts
/CPA-DDrc/	Real Case CPA-Design Document named "Malawi Biomass Energy Conservation Programme CPA 1 ", version 05.0, dated 2015-07-07
/DATA/	Database excel sheets
/DEC/	Declaration that the PoA is not part of other certification schemes
/EIA/	Rwanda Environmental Impact Assessment , clearance Certificate for CDM Programme of Activities, dated 2015-05-12 (exemption)
/KPT/	KPT Study Results
/LoA/	Host Country letter of Approval for Malawi, dated 2015-04-01

Reference	Document
	Host Country letter of Approval for Rwanda, dated 2015-05-15
/MoC/	Modalities of Communication, dated 2014-12-13
/PoA-DD/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Project Design Document named “Biomass Energy Conservation Programme” hosted from 2014-02-15 to 2014-03-16; Final Project Design Document named “Biomass Energy Conservation Programme” version 07, dated 2015-07-07
/SM/	SAMPLING MANUAL: A Guide to Sampling Under the CDM with Special Focus to PoAs
/TR/	Training details
/WBT/	Chitetezo Mbaula Water Boiling Test (CREEC Test), August 2012
/XLS/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emission reduction calculation spreadsheet, version 1, dated 2014-11-02 Emission reduction calculation spreadsheet, version 04, dated 2015-05-20

Table 7-2: Background investigation and assessment documents

Reference	Document
/AMS-II.G/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMS-II.G ver. 06: Energy Efficiency Measures in Thermal Applications of Non-Renewable Biomass; AMS-II.G ver. 06: Energy Efficiency Measures in Thermal Applications of Non-Renewable Biomass GS Methodology: Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption, version 01
/CPM/	TÜV NORD JI / CDM CP Manual (incl. CP procedures and forms)
/EB50/	EB50, Annex 30: Standard for Sampling and Surveys for CDM project Activities and Programmes of Activities (version 04.1)
/EB54/	EB54, Annex 13: Guidelines on Assessment of Debundling for SSC Project Activities
/EB67/	EB67, Annex 06: Sampling and Surveys for CDM project activities and Programmes of Activities
/EB68/	EB 68, Annex 27: Guidelines on the Demonstration of Additionality of Small-scale Project Activities
/EB69/	EB 69, Annex 04: Standard for Sampling and Surveys for CDM project Activities and

Reference	Document
	Programmes of Activities (version 03.0)
/GGD/	zuGeneral Guidelines for SSC CDM Methodologies (Version 19.0)
/GS613/	Registered Gold Standard Project activity ID number 613
/IPCC/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPCC Good Practice Guidance & Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2000 • Revised 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Reference Manual
/KP/	Kyoto Protocol (1997)
/MA/	Decision 3/CMP. 1 (Marrakesh – Accords & Annex to decision (17/CP.7))
/PS/	CDM Project Standard (version 7.0)
/POAS/	Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for Programmes of Activities (Version 3.0)
/PDD-T/	Programme design document form for CDM programmes of activities (CDM-SSC-PoA-DD-FORM) - Version 03.0
/PS/	CDM Project Standard (Ver. 7.0.0).
/TA/	Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality (Ver. 7.0.0).
/VVS/	CDM Validation and Verification Standard (Version 07.0)
/WBT/	Chitetezo Mbaula Water Boiling Test (CREEC Test), August 2012

Table 7-3: Websites used

Reference	Link	Organisation
/cd4cdm/	www.cd4cdm.org	UNEP Risoe Centre
/dna1/	http://www.eadmw.org/	DNA webpage of Malawi Environmental Affairs Department
/dna2/	http://www.rema.gov.rw/	DNA webpage of Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA)
/ipcc/	www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp	IPCC publications
/unfccc/	http://cdm.unfccc.int	UNFCCC

Table 7-4: List of interviewed persons

Reference	Mol ¹		Name	Organisation / Function
/IM01/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Conor Fox	Hestian Innovation Ltd/ Director
/IM02/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Cristel Cheong	Hestian Innovation Ltd/ Project Development Consultant
/IM03/	V	<input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ms	Maya Stewart	Area 55 Consulting/ Director
/IM03/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	George Masache	Area 55 Consulting/ Data Manager
/IM04/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Elia Kwenda	Hope Ministry/ Centre Manager
/IM04/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Samuel Bonongwe	Hope Ministry/ Education Manager
/IM04/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Tovia Chirwa	Adziwa/ Agricultural Adviser
/IM04/	V	<input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ms	Mary Chikaonda	Children of Blessing/ Administrator
/IM04/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Yamungu Botha	Concern Universal/ Project Manager
/IM04/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr.	MacFary Kapanga	Concern Universal/ MIS Officer

Reference	Mol ¹		Name	Organisation / Function
		<input type="checkbox"/> Ms		
/IM04/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Lloyd Archer	Concern Universal/ SEMU Manager
/IM04/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Andrew Chingwenende	Concern Universal/ SCT Coordinator
/IM04/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Langster Mchekala	Concern Universal/ Field facilitator

¹⁾ Means of Interview: (Telephone, E-Mail, Visit)

ANNEX

- A1:** Validation Protocol
- A2:** Assessment of Applicability Criteria
- A3:** Assessment of Baseline Identification
- A4:** Assessment of Financial Parameters
- A5:** Assessment of Barrier analysis
- A6:** Outcome of the GSCP
- A7:** Eligibility Criteria Assessment
- A8:** Statement of competence of involved Personnel

ANNEX 1: VALIDATION PROTOCOL

Table A-1: Programme Requirements Checklist

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
A. General Description of the Programme of Activities				
A.1. Technology to be employed <i>Validation of programme technology focuses on the project engineering, choice of technology and competence/ maintenance needs. The DOE should ensure that environmentally safe and sound technology and know-how is used.</i>				
<p>A.1.1. Does the PoA-DD contain a clear, accurate and complete PoA description?</p> <p>(VVS, §§ 64, 69) <i>The PoA-DD shall contain a clear description of the project activity which provides the reader with a clear understanding of the precise nature of the programme activity and the technical aspects of its implementation.</i> <i>Pl. consider esp. chapters A.2, A.6 (in case of LSC) for assessment.</i> <i>§69 (a) Describe the process undertaken to validate the</i> </p>	<p>/PDD-T/ /PoA-DD/ /IM01/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The proposed Biomass Energy Conservation programme of activities aims to disseminate improved cook-stoves to households in Malawi and Rwanda</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i> By document review and onsite visit</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The aim of the PoA has been described. Nonetheless, the framework of implementation, technical aspects and other required information</p>	CAR A1	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>accuracy and completeness of the programme description.</i> <i>§69 (b) Contain the DOE's opinion on the accuracy and completeness of the programme description.</i>		prescribed by the latest PoA template are omitted. Hence CAR A1 has been raised		
A.1.2. Is this description in accordance with the real situation or (in case of greenfield projects) is it most likely that the PoA and the CPAs will be implemented acc to the descriptions in the PoA-DD and the CPA-DD?	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The PoA is greenfield. As per the description, the PoA and CPAs can be implemented in the two host countries. However, further information is required</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>By document review and onsite visit</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>CAR A1 has been raised</p>	CAR A1	OK
<p>A.1.3. Does the PoA description include</p> <p>1. a description of the:</p> <p>(a) Policy/measure or stated goal that the PoA seeks to promote;</p> <p>(b) Framework for the implementation of the proposed PoA.</p> <p>2. a confirmation that the PoA is a voluntary action by the CME.</p> <p>3. a brief description of how the proposed PoA contributes to sustainable development (not more than one page).</p> <p>(CDM-PoA-DD-Form, Attachment, A.2)</p>	/PDD-T/ /PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The draft PoA-DD version 01 has described only the policy. Further information is requested</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>By document review and onsite visit</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>CAR A1 has been raised</p>	<p>CAR A1</p> <p>CL A2</p>	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
A.1.4. In case the programme involves alteration of an existing installation or process, is a clear description available regarding the differences between the programme and the pre-programme situation? (VVS, § 68) <i>Describe the steps taken to validate this issue.</i>	/PDD-T/ /PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> The proposed PoA does not involve alteration of an existing installation in both Malawi and Rwanda <i>Validator's action:</i> By document review and onsite visit <i>Conclusion:</i> PoA does not involve alteration of an existing installation	OK	OK
A.1.5. Has a sufficient description of the general operating and implementing framework of the PoA and its CPAs been given? (VVS, §224)	/PDD-T/ /PoA-DD/	The general operating and implementing framework of the PoA and its CPAs has not been described. Therefore, CAR A1 has been raised	CAR A1	OK
A.2. Small scale project activity <i>It is assessed whether the project qualifies as small-scale CDM PoA</i>				
A.2.1. Does the programme fall within the small scale project activity threshold and applies a large-scale approved methodology? In this case, are the modalities and procedures for large-scale project activities followed? (VVS, § 158)	/PDD-T/ /PoA-DD/	The proposed PoA is a Type II energy efficiency project and falls within the small scale threshold applying the small-scale approved methodology AMS-II.G: Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass, version 05 (each CPA resulting in maximum reduction in energy demand of not more than 60 GWh or 180 GWh thermal per annum). However, at the time of desk review, this methodology version had expired. Hence, CAR A4 and CL A6 were raised	CAR A4 CAR A6	OK
In case of project activities applying a LSC-			OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
Methodology, go to B.1				
<p>A.2.2. Does the programme qualify as a small scale PoA as defined in decision 4 / CMP.1 annex II?</p> <p>(VVS, §§ 158–159)</p> <p><i>Please indicate whether the CPAs meet the eligibility criteria for small scale-projects. Especially consider whether the CPAs qualify within the thresholds of the three possible types of small-scale project activities</i></p>	<p>/PDD-T/ /PoA-DD/ /CPA-DD/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The CPAs meet the eligibility criteria for small scale-projects with each resulting in energy savings of not more than 60 GWh or 180 GWh thermal per year.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>By document review and onsite visit</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>The PoA is small-scale</p>	OK	OK
<p>A.2.3. Does the PoA make provisions for each CPA not to exceed the applicable threshold throughout the crediting period?</p> <p>(EB 74, Annex 05, §16 (k))</p>	<p>/PDD-T/ /PoA-DD/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>In Part III section A.2 of the PoA-DD version 01, the eligibility criterion (k) for inclusion of CPAs makes provision to ensure that each CPA aggregate energy savings does not exceed 60 GWh or 180 GWh thermal per year.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>By document review and onsite visit</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD makes appropriate provisions as per EB 74, Annex 05 §16 (k)</p>	OK	OK
<p>A.2.4. Are possible cross effects between CPAs (when applying multiple small scale methodologies) taken into account appropriately?</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>This is not applicable as the PoA applies only one small-scale methodology AMS-II.G, version 05</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p>	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
(EB 74, Annex 05, § 30)		By document review and onsite visit <i>Conclusion:</i> Proposed PoA applies one SSC CDM methodology		
A.2.5. Does the programme apply one of the approved small scale categories and any methodology(ies) and tool(s) referred therein? (VVS, § 152 (b)) <i>Check, if applicable the expiry dates of the applied methodology(ies). Further, take into consideration the general guidance to the methodologies², which provide guidance on equipment capacity, equipment performance, sampling and other monitoring related issues.</i>	/PoA-DD/ /unfccc/	<i>Description:</i> The proposed PoA applies only one small-scale methodology AMS-II.G, version 05, which is expired <i>Validator's action:</i> By document review <i>Conclusion:</i> The applied methodology version 05 is no longer valid and CAR A6 was raised	CAR A6	OK
A.2.6. Are the small scale CPAs not debundled components of a larger project activity? (VVS, § 238 and EB 74, Annex 05, § 16(I)) <i>Describe the steps taken to assess whether the CPA is not a debundled component of a large scale activity, in accordance to the "Guidelines on assessment of debundling for SSC project activities".</i> <i>In case each of the independent subsystems/measures included in the CPA of a PoA is no larger than 1% of the small-scale thresholds defined by the methodology (i.e. 150kW, 0.6 GWh, 0.6 ktCO₂e), then that CPA of the PoA is exempted from the de-bundling check, i.e. is considered as</i>	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> As per the PoA-DD version 01, the SSC CPAs are not considered de-bundled components of a larger project activity. However, PP has not demonstrated the same using EB 54, Annex 13 <i>Validator's action:</i> By document review <i>Conclusion:</i> CAR A4 was raised	CAR A4	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>not being a debundled component of a large-scale activity</i>				
A.3. Definition of a typical Component Project Activity (CPA) <i>The description of a typical CPA is assessed. The eligibility criteria shall be checked for appropriateness and completeness.</i>				
A.3.1. Has the POA-DD unambiguously defined a CDM component activity (CPA) under the PoA?	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD has defined a typical CPA within the PoA. The CPA will promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from non-renewable biomass fuel through dissemination of improved household cook-stoves under the PoA.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>By document review</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>A typical CPA is sufficiently defined</p>	OK	OK
<p>A.3.2. Does the PoA-DD contain a clear, accurate and complete description of the CPAs with regard to the technology / measures to be used?</p> <p>(VVS, § 224)</p> <p><i>The PoA-DD shall contain a clear description of a typical CPA which provides the reader with a clear understanding of the precise nature of the project activity and the technology / measure to be used.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD contains a clear and accurate definition of a CPA within the PoA. The CPA will promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from non-renewable biomass fuel through dissemination of improved ceramic household cookstoves under the PoA.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The draft PoA-DD version 01 was reviewed</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>Describe the process undertaken to validate the accuracy and completeness of the CPA description.</i>		A typical CPA is sufficiently defined		
A.3.3. Is all necessary information consistent between the finalized PoA-DD and the Generic CPA-DD?	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>All vital information is found to be consistent between the PoA-DD and the finalized generic CPA-DD</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The draft PoA-DD version 01 was reviewed</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>No discrepancies have been noted</p>	OK	OK
A.3.4. Does the generic CDM-CPA-DD include Name/contact details of the entity/individual responsible for the operation of the CPA?	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The generic CPA-DD contains name and contact details of the entity responsible for the CPA</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The draft PoA-DD version 01 was reviewed</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>No mistakes have been noted</p>	OK	OK
<p>A.3.5. Does the definition of eligibility criteria for inclusion of a CPA under the PoA include the following information:</p> <p>i) appropriate criteria for demonstration of additionality of the CPA, and</p> <p>ii) all type and/or extent of information (e.g.</p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i> All eligibility criteria have been clearly described, esp. w.r.t. the following points, and detailed assessments are included in Annex 7 of this report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Geographical requirement of the CPA boundary (2) Conditions to avoid double-counting (3) The specification of the technology/measure, including the level and type of service (4) Conditions to check the start date of the CPA 	CAR A4	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>criteria, indicators, variables, parameters or measurements) that shall be provided by each CPA in order to ensure its eligibility?</p> <p>(EB 74, Annex 05, §§ 10,11,12,13,14,15,16)</p> <p><i>Assess the specified eligibility criteria in the POA-DD in order to determine whether or not these criteria are sufficient to ensure that all CPAs would comply with the CDM requirements applicable to the PoA, these requirements shall include, inter alia,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>the means of demonstrating the additionality of the CPA and</i> <i>the applicability of the applied methodology.</i> <p><i>The eligibility criteria represents an essential element of ensuring the smooth functioning of programmatic CDM, therefore the validation team may raise CARs which ensure the ease of application of the eligibility criteria. Where required a CAR may be raised to request to specify additional criteria depending on the specific characteristics of the PoA. (EB 74 annex 5 para 16 Footnote 4).</i></p> <p><i>Detailed assessment on the final criteria are included in the dedicated Annex A-7 of this report.</i></p>		<p>(5) Methodology applicability requirements of the CPA (6) Other methodological / tool requirements of the CPA, (7) The additionality assessment criteria for each CPA (8) Local stakeholder consultation conditions of the CPA (9) Environmental impact analysis requirements of the CPA (10) Affirmation of no ODA diversion from Annex I Party to the CPA</p> <p>If applicable:</p> <p>(11) Target group and distribution mechanism requirement (12) Sampling requirements of the CPAs in accordance with the applicable guidelines by the EB (13) Requirements/Provisions for meeting threshold criteria on CPA level (SSC, Microscale) (14) De-bundling criterion for the CPA (15) Other eligibility criteria applicable for CPA implementation</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not all eligibility criteria have been clearly described and following findings have been raised accordingly (after successful closure of all the findings, detailed assessments are to be included in Annex 7 of the final report):</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i> By document review <i>Conclusion:</i> CAR A4 was raised</p>		
<p>A.3.6. Are the eligibility criteria defined verifiable, sufficiently objective and do allow to assess the inclusion of CPAs in the PoA?</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> <i>The the eligibility criteria as defined in the draft PoA-DD version 01 are deemed insufficient, sufficiently objective and do</i></p>	<p>CAR A5</p>	<p>OK</p>

P-No.: 8000449119 – 14/021

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
(EB 74, Annex 05, §§ 17,18)		<i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD was reviewed <i>Conclusion:</i> CAR A5 has been raised.		
A.3.7. In case of combination of technologies/measures and or methodologies: have distinct eligibility criteria been developed for each type of CPA? (EB 74, Annex 05, §§ 22, 31)	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> The proposed PoA does not involve a combination of measures, technologies or methodologies <i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD was reviewed <i>Conclusion:</i> This checklist item is not applicable to this project	OK	OK
A.3.8. In case of combination of technologies/measures and or methodologies: have provisions been made to ensure the compliance of a CPA using technologies/measures from several methodologies with all the eligibility criteria derived from the requirements of all the methodologies and are those described in the PoA-DD? (EB 74, Annex 05, §§ 29)	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> N/A please see A.3.7 above <i>Validator's action:</i> <i>Conclusion:</i>	OK	OK
B. Project Baseline, Additionality and Monitoring Plan				

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
B.1. Reference of the Methodology				
B.1.1. Do the PoA-DD and the generic CPA-DD correctly quote an applicable version of the methodology (ies)? (VVS, § 74)	/PoA-DD/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The applied methodology is correctly quoted and is identical to the version available on the UNFCCC website. <input type="checkbox"/> The applied version of the baseline and monitoring methodology is applicable and valid at the time of submission for stakeholder consultation.	CAR A6	OK
B.2. Applicability of the Methodology				
B.2.1. Does the programme apply (a) PoA-approved and applicable CDM methodology(ies) and (a) valid version(s) thereof? (VVS, §§ 70, 74, 76, 77) <i>Describe the steps taken to validate this issue.</i> <i>Describe for each applicability criterion listed in the selected approved methodology the steps taken to assess its fulfilment</i>	/PoA-DD/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The applied methodology is correctly quoted and is identical to the version available on the UNFCCC Website. <input type="checkbox"/> The applied version of the baseline and monitoring methodology is valid at the time of submission for stakeholder consultation. <input type="checkbox"/> All applicability criteria in the methodology, the applied tools or any other methodology component referred to therein are fulfilled (please make detailed assessment in Annex 2 of this protocol).	CAR A6 CAR A6	OK
B.2.2. In case of multiple methodologies: do the PoA-DD and the generic CPA-DD list all combinations of technologies/measures and/or approved methodologies that will be implemented in the PoA and define separate	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> The proposed PoA does not involve multiple methodologies <i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD was reviewed	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
eligibility criteria for each of them? (EB 74, Annex 05, § 28, VVS, § 190)		<p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>Not applicable</p>		
B.2.3. In case of multiple methodologies: is the combination of technologies/measures and/or methodologies approved? (EB 74, Annex 05, §§ 31, 32, 34, 35)	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The proposed PoA does not involve multiple methodologies</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD was reviewed</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>Not applicable</p>	OK	OK
<p>B.3. PoA and CPA Boundaries</p> <p><i>Project Boundaries are the limits and borders defining the GHG emission reduction programme</i></p>				
<p>B.3.1. Are the PoA's spatial boundaries (geographical) within which all CPAs included in the PoA will be implemented clearly defined?</p> <p>(VVS, §§ 72 (a), 82, 226)</p> <p><i>Provide information on how the validation of the geographical boundary has been performed either based on reviewed documented evidence or by describing what was observed/viewed during a site visit.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>As per Part II of the draft PoA-DD version 01, the geographical boundaries of the proposed PoA would be within the countries of Malawi and Rwanda</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD was checked</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>The spatial boundaries are clearly defined</p>	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>B.3.2. Are all sources and GHGs included in the PoA/CPA boundary as required in the applied methodology?</p> <p>(VVS, §§ 82 - 84)</p> <p><i>Provide information on how the validation of the GHGs and sources has been performed either based on reviewed documented evidence or by describing what was observed/viewed during a site visit.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>All sources of GHGs have been included in the PoA and thus all CPA boundaries in accordance with the applied and applicable methodology AMS-II.G version 05 and CDM guidelines (PoA-DD Part XI, section A.3)</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD was checked</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>All sources of GHGs have been duly included</p>	OK	OK
<p>B.3.3. In case the methodology allows to choose whether a source and/or gas is to be included, is the choice sufficiently explained and justified?</p> <p>(VVS, §§ 84)</p> <p><i>Confirm if the adequacy provided by the PPs is reasonable, based on assessment of supporting documented evidence provided by the PPs or by onsite observations.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The applied methodology AMS-II.G does not allow choosing which GHGs are to be included in the baseline or Project emissions.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD was checked</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>The GHGs included are deemed correct</p>	OK	OK
<p>B.3.4. Are provisions in place in case the implementation of a CPA might lead to emissions contributing more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emissions reductions within the project boundary and which are not addressed by the selected approved methodology?</p>	/PoA-DD/ /AMS-II.G/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Project emissions are not applicable under the applied methodology AMS-II.G. Emission reductions are based on fuel savings</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD and applied methodology were checked</p>	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
(VVS, § 87) <i>Describe the steps taken to validate this issue. If any emission sources that are expected to contribute more than 1% have been identified, the DOE shall request clarification of, revision to, or deviation from the methodology, as appropriate.</i>		<i>Conclusion:</i> PE is not relevant in the applied methodology.		
B.4. Baseline Identification <i>The choice of the baseline scenario will be validated with focus on whether the baseline is a likely scenario, and whether the methodology to define the baseline scenario has been followed in a complete and transparent manner.</i>				
B.4.1. Has the baseline scenario been determined according to the methodology? (VVS, §§ 72 (b), 89) <i>Describe how it is validated that the identification of the most plausible baseline scenario is carried out in accordance with the applied methodology and applied methodological tools. Please refer to table A-3.</i>	/PoA-DD/ /AMS-II.G/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The baseline is defined by the applied methodology and the PoA-DD refers to it. If the answer is Yes, continue to B.4.5 <input type="checkbox"/> The baseline is not directly defined by the applied methodology. For details of the assessment regarding the evaluation of the baseline scenario pl. refer to table A-3. <input type="checkbox"/> The determination has been carried out as per the procedure contained in the applied methodology. <input type="checkbox"/> The following CARs / CLs have been identified with respect to the selection of the baseline scenario:	CL A3	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
B.4.2. Is the list of alternatives complete? (VVS, § 90) <i>Describe how it was validated that all alternatives are plausible and that any scenarios that are supplementary to those required by the methodology are realistic and credible in the context of the project activity and that no alternative scenarios have been excluded.</i> <i>Fill in all alternatives in table A-3.</i>	/PoA-DD/ /AMS-II.G/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All plausible alternative scenarios listed in the approved methodology have been considered. In the course of document review and site visit, it has been validated that no other alternatives which supply comparable outputs and / or services are to be taken into consideration. Thus no plausible scenario has been excluded. <input type="checkbox"/> The following alternative scenarios/options have been omitted. Corresponding CAR(s)/CL(s) has /have been issued	OK	OK
B.4.3. Is the identified baseline scenario reasonable considering all possible types of CPAs and has the baseline scenario been determined using conservative assumptions where possible, including relevant references and sources? (VVS, § 91) <i>Describe whether the choice of the identified baseline scenario is reasonable by validating the <u>key assumptions, calculations and rationales</u> used in the PoA-DD. Describe whether these are listed, relevant and <u>conservatively interpreted</u> in the PoA-DD.</i>	/PoA-DD/ /AMS-II.G/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The baseline scenario is reasonable and has been determined using conservative assumptions where possible. Please refer to comments in table A-3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following CARs / CLs have been issued because assumptions used in the baseline determination have been assessed to be not conservative CL A3	CL A3	OK
B.4.4. Does the baseline scenario sufficiently take into account all relevant national and/or sectoral policies within the chosen project boundary such as sectoral reform initiatives, local fuel availability, power sector expansion plans, and the economic situation in the	/PoA-DD/ /AMS-II.G/	<i>Description:</i> The baseline is defined and prescribed by the applied methodology. In this particular PoA, the baseline scenario is the three stone fire used to meet similar household thermal needs <i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD and applied methodology were checked	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>project sector.?</p> <p>(VVS, §§ 93, 227)</p> <p><i>Describe whether the PP has shown that all relevant policies and circumstances have been identified and correctly considered in the PoA-DD. Two (2) types of national and/or sectoral policies have to be taken into account:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>National and/or sectoral policies or regulations that give comparative advantages to more emissions-intensive technologies or fuels over less emissions-intensive technologies or fuels, known as E+ policies. For this type of national and/or sectoral policies or regulations, only those that have been implemented before adoption of the Kyoto Protocol by the COP (decision 1/CP.3, 11 December 1997) shall be taken into account</i></p> <p>(b) <i>National and/or sectoral policies or regulations that give comparative advantages to less emissions-intensive technologies over more emissions-intensive technologies (e.g. public subsidies to promote the diffusion of renewable energy or to finance energy efficiency programmes), known as E- policies. For this type of national and/or sectoral policies or regulations, those that have been implemented since the adoption by the COP of the CDM M&P (decision 17/CP.7, 11 November 2001) need not be taken into account in identifying a baseline scenario.</i></p>		<p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>The baseline scenario is prescribed by the methodology</p>		
<p>B.4.5. What has been identified as the baseline scenario? Does the PoA-DD contain a verifiable description of the identified baseline scenario, including a description of the</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /POAS/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The baseline is defined and prescribed by the applied methodology. In this case, the baseline scenario is the three stone technologies used to meet similar household thermal needs. The project</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
technology that would be employed and/or the activities that would take place in the absence of the proposed CDM Component activity? (VVS, § 88, 92; CDM-PoA-DD-FORM, Attachment)	/PDD-T/	technology would be improved ceramic stoves in Malawi and Rwanda <i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD and applied methodology were checked <i>Conclusion:</i> The baseline scenario is prescribed by the methodology.		
B.5. Additionality Determination <i>The assessment of additionality will be validated with focus on whether the programme / CPA itself is not a likely baseline scenario.</i>				
B.5.1. Methodology				
B.5.1.1. Does the PoA-DD describe how the programme is additional (i.e. that none of the implemented CPAs would occur in absence of the CDM) and does the additionality justification follow the requirements of the applied methodology and/or methodological tools? (VVS, §§ 72 (d), 101-102 and EB 74, Annex 05, § 7) <i>Describe how it is validated that the additionality justification is carried out in accordance with the applied methodology and/or applied methodological tools. Further focus your assessment on the reliability and credibility of data, rationales and assumptions, justifications and documentations provided by the PP.</i>	/PoA-DD/ /EB 68/	<i>Description:</i> Additionality is defined at PoA level using the positive list and automatic additionality criteria. Whereby as per EB 68 Annex 27, each of the CPAs shall not exceed 180 GWh _{th} energy savings per year, and each improved cookstove is not larger than 5% of the small-scale CDM thresholds. However, CME has not numerically demonstrated the same. <i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD was checked <i>Conclusion:</i> CAR A4 has been raised	CAR A4	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.															
B.5.2. Assessment and Demonstration of Additionality of the PoA as a whole																			
B.5.2.1. Has it been demonstrated that in the absence of the CDM PoA, none of the implemented CPAs would occur? (EB 74 Annex 5, §7)	/PoA- DD/ /EB 68/	<i>Description:</i> Please see checklist item above <i>Validator's action:</i> PoA-DD has been checked <i>Conclusion:</i> CAR A4 has been raised	CAR A4	OK															
B.5.2.2. In case an investment analysis is used for the demonstration of additionality at CPA level: (a) Which option (I or II) has been chosen? (b) Dependent on the chosen option can all applicable confirmations be given? (EB 74, Annex 05, § 13) <i>In case option I is used, please assess whether the</i> <i>1. PoA-DD has defined the input parameters that will be used for the investment analysis</i> <i>2. defined list of input parameters is complete w.r.t. the applied investment analysis</i> <i>3. PoA-DD contains a description of how the values for these parameters will be obtained for each specific CPA</i> <i>4. description of sources/evidence which are to be</i>	/PoA- DD/ /EB 68/	<i>Description:</i> The following option has been chosen: <input type="checkbox"/> The investment analysis will be conducted to each CPA (Option I) In case option I is applied it is confirmed that <input type="checkbox"/> the PoA-DD has defined the input parameters that will be used for the investment analysis <input type="checkbox"/> the defined list of input parameters is complete w.r.t. the applied investment analysis <input type="checkbox"/> the PoA-DD contains a description of how the values for these parameters will be obtained for each specific CPA <table><tr><th>Parameter</th><th>Description</th><th>Assessment of appropriateness</th></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	Parameter	Description	Assessment of appropriateness													N/A	OK
Parameter	Description	Assessment of appropriateness																	

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>applied to determine the input values ensures that the parameters will be appropriate to specific CPAs. In case option II is chosen a range of values for each input parameter which qualify a CPA for inclusion in the PoA shall be determined through the application of an investment analysis. For further assessment please provide an assessment in the next sections.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Technical and economic criteria for the inclusion of the CPA are defined in the PoA-DD (Option II). In this context the following additional findings have been identified: N/A		
B.5.3. Assessment and Demonstration of CPA Additionality Identification of alternatives Step 1 (in case of SSC projects pl. skip steps 1 and 2 if appropriate; in cases where the baseline scenario is prescribed in the approved methodology, skip step 1, (VVS, § 115))				
B.5.3.1. Does the list of alternatives contain the status-quo situation, the programme not undertaken as a CDM project as well as all other viable alternatives for supplying the outputs or services that are to be supplied by the proposed CDM programme activity? Do all identified alternatives comply with enforced legislations? (VVS, §§ 114, 116) <i>Describe whether the list of alternatives is credible and complete. Describe how it is validated that the list of alternatives is complete, realistic and that the alternatives are credible and that all alternatives comply with the existing and enforced legislation.</i>	/PoA-DD/ /EB 68/	<i>Description:</i> Additionality is defined at PoA level using the positive list and automatic additionality criteria for SSC project activities. As per EB 68 Annex 27, each of the CPAs shall not exceed 180 GWh _{th} energy savings per year, and each improved cook-stove is not larger than 5% of the small-scale CDM thresholds. However, PP has not numerically demonstrated the same in the PoA-DD. <i>Validator's action:</i> PoA-DD has been checked <i>Conclusion:</i>	CAR A4	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>Describe the steps taken to validate this issue on the basis of your local and sectoral knowledge.</i>		CAR A4 has been raised		
B.5.4. Assessment and Demonstration of CPA Additionality Investment analysis Step 2 <i>In case the investment analysis as per step 2 is chosen to justify the additionality Annex 4 "Assessment of Financial Parameters" has to be used to provide additional details of the calculation parameters..</i>				
<p>B.5.4.1. Does the project documentation provide evidence that the project would not be the most economically or financially attractive alternative or economically / financially feasible without the revenues from the sale of CERs?</p> <p>(VVS, § 117) <i>In cases where the project activity would produce no financial or economic benefits other than CDM-related income, describe how it has been validated that at least one of the alternatives identified is less costly than the proposed project activity.</i></p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /EB 68/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities and CPAs is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	N/A	OK
<p>B.5.4.2. Is a clear, viewable and unprotected Excel spreadsheet available for the investment calculation?</p> <p>(EB 62 Annex 5, § 8)</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /EB</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, a clear, viewable and unprotected Excel spreadsheet is available.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, a respective Excel spreadsheet needs to be made available for investment calculation.</p>	N/A	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>Describe the steps taken to validate this issue.</i>	68/	In this context the following additional findings have been identified: N/A		
<p>B.5.4.3. Does the period chosen for the investment analysis reflect the technical lifetime of the project activity or in case a shorter period is chosen, is the fair value of the project activity's assets at the end of the investment analysis period (as a cash inflow) included?</p> <p>(EB 62 Annex 5 § 3, EB 73, Annex 8) <i>Describe how the technical lifetime / period chosen for calculating financial parameter(s) is reviewed and which documents were utilised in the course of review. Describe furthermore the approach used to check the inclusion of a potential fair value.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/ /EB 68/	<p><i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	N/A	OK
<p>B.5.4.4. Is the fair value calculated in accordance with local accounting regulations (where available) or international best practice?</p> <p>(EB 62 Annex 5, § 4) <i>State the accounting regulations applied for calculating the fair value and describe why these are applicable under the project specific circumstances. Describe potential mismatches between regulations and the approach applied for calculating the fair value.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	N/A	OK
B.5.4.5. Is the book value as well as the	/PoA-	<i>Description:</i>	N/A	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
expectation of the potential profit or loss included in the fair value calculation? (EB 62 Annex 5, § 4)	DD/	<p>Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>		
<p>B.5.4.6. Is an appropriate analysis method chosen for the project (simple cost analysis, investment comparison analysis or benchmark analysis)?</p> <p>(EB 65 Annex 21, EB 70, Annex 8, §32)</p> <p><i>Describe why the selected analysis method is appropriate under consideration of potential revenues and costs, potential project alternatives and potential available benchmark values.</i></p> <p><i>Assess whether the alternative to the CPA is to supply the same or substitute products or services. In this case, an investment comparison analysis shall be used.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	N/A	OK
<p>B.5.4.7. Were the input values used in the investment analysis valid and applicable at the time of the investment decision?</p> <p>(EB 62 Annex 5, § 6)</p> <p><i>Describe the steps taken to validate this issue</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p>	N/A	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<i>Conclusion:</i>		
<p>B.5.4.8. Are the input parameters based on values from Feasibility Study Reports that are approved by national authorities for proposed project activities?</p> <p>(VVS, § 122)</p> <p><i>In case the basis for input values is a Feasibility Study Report (FSR) describe how it has been ensured that the period in time between the finalisation of the FSR and the investment decision is sufficiently short so that it is unlikely that input values would have materially changed. Further confirm the consistency of values in FSR and POA-DD.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	N/A	OK
In case a simple cost analysis has been done, go to B.4.5;				
<p>B.5.4.9. Has been a suitable financial indicator chosen by the project participants?</p> <p>(VVS, § 120 (a))</p> <p><i>Describe the steps taken to validate this issue.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	N/A	OK
<p>B.5.4.10. Are depreciation and other non-cash related items only considered in the tax calculation and not as cash outflow?</p> <p>(EB 62 Annex 5, § 5)</p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p>	N/A	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<i>Conclusion:</i>		
B.5.4.11. Is the plant load factor (PLF) chosen in a conservative manner, taking into account that the PLF may be different in the framework of demonstrating additionality and calculating the ex-ante ER? (EB 48, Annex 11)	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable. Besides, this is not a renewable energy project. <i>Validator's action:</i> <i>Conclusion:</i>	N/A	OK
B.5.4.12. Does the CPA-DD and related spreadsheets contain a sensitivity analysis and does the same contain variation of parameters which may vary throughout the project lifetime? (EB 62 Annex 5, § 20-21) <i>Describe relevance of parameters used in the sensitivity analysis as well as their likeliness to vary during the project's lifetime. Parameters which are fixed on the basis of contracts, PPAs etc. may not be subject to variation and not adequate.</i>	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable. <i>Validator's action:</i> <i>Conclusion:</i>	N/A	OK
B.5.4.13. Were only variables that constitute more than 20% of either total project costs or total project revenues subjected to reasonable variation? (EB 62 Annex 5, § 20)	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable. <i>Validator's action:</i>	N/A	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<i>Conclusion:</i>		
<p>B.5.4.14. Have parameters, constituting less than 20% of total project costs or revenues, been identified with potential material impact on the financial parameter?</p> <p>(EB 62 Annex 5, § 20) <i>Describe whether those parameters are considered in the sensitivity analysis?</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	N/A	OK
<p>B.5.4.15. Is the range of variation reasonable in the specific context of the project activity, taking into consideration historic trends in the business sector?</p> <p>(EB 62 Annex 5, § 21) <i>Describe whether the range of variation is appropriate with focus on historic developments, e.g. price of oil / labour etc., energy potential in the region in question.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	N/A	OK
<p>B.5.4.16. In case of project IRR: Are the costs of financing expenditures (loan repayments and interests) excluded from the calculation of project IRR?</p> <p>(EB 62 Annex 5, § 9)</p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the costs of financing expenditures have been included.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, this requirement is not met.</p> <p>In this context the following additional findings have been identified: N/A</p>	N/A	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
B.5.4.17. In case of equity IRR: Is the part of the investment costs, which is financed by equity, considered as net cash outflow and is the part financed by debt excluded in net cash outflow? (EB 62 Annex 5, § 10)	/PoA-DD/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, in- and outflows have been considered correctly. <input type="checkbox"/> No, this requirement is not met. In this context the following additional findings have been identified: N/A	N/A	OK
In case a comparison analysis has been done, go to B.5.5				
B.5.4.18. Is the type of benchmark chosen appropriate for the type of IRR calculated (e.g. local commercial lending rates or weighted average costs of capital for project IRR; required/expected returns on equity for equity IRR)? (EB 62 Annex 5, §12) <i>Describe the steps taken to validate this issue.</i>	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable. <i>Validator's action:</i> <i>Conclusion:</i>	N/A	OK
B.5.4.19. Is a pre-tax benchmark applied in case of project IRR is calculated? In cases where a post-tax benchmark is applied, assess whether actual interest payable is taken into account in the calculation of income tax. (EB 62 Annex 5, § 11) <i>If this is not the case, ensure that taxation is excluded from the investment analysis.</i>	/PoA-DD/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> A pre-tax benchmark is applied <input type="checkbox"/> The benchmark is post-tax and the interest has been taken into account for the calculation <input type="checkbox"/> No, this requirement is not met. In this context the following additional findings have been identified: N/A	N/A	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>As per the guidance it is recommended to select a pre tax benchmark in order to describe the steps taken in assessing this requirement.</i>				
B.5.4.20. Have both benchmark and cash flows expressed consistently, i.e. real terms (excluding the effect of inflation) or nominal terms? <i>Describe the steps taken to validate this issue.</i>	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable. <i>Validator's action:</i> <i>Conclusion:</i>	N/A	OK
B.5.4.21. Is the benchmark value suitable for the project activity and is it reasonable to assume that no investment would be made at a rate of a lower return than the benchmark? (VVS, § 121 (c)) <i>Describe whether it is reasonable to assume that a lower rate of return would consequently result in the baseline scenario.</i>	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable. <i>Validator's action:</i> <i>Conclusion:</i>	N/A	OK
B.5.4.22. Is the benchmark applied based on parameters that are available and standard in the market? (VVS, 121 (b), EB 62 Annex 5, §§13, 15, 16, 18) <i>Assess whether company-specific benchmarks or benchmarks based on parameters that are available in the market are suitable to the project activity. A benchmark that includes the subjective</i>	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable. <i>Validator's action:</i>	N/A	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p><i>profitability expectations or risk profile of the project developer (size risk premiums, company own risk premium, etc) is not suitable for project activities open to be developed by other entities.</i></p> <p><i>If cost of equity is applied, assure that best financial practices are used and are based on data sources which can be cross-checked against third-party or publicly available sources.</i></p> <p><i>If cost of debt is used for the calculation of the benchmark, ensure that it is calculated as the cost of financing in the capital markets (e.g: commercial lending rates)</i></p> <p><i>If the cost/equity financing structure of the project is not yet available, 50% equity, 50% debt financing may be assumed as default.</i></p>		<p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>		
Following checklist is intended for cases where internal company benchmarks are applied, otherwise go to B.5.5				
<p>B.5.4.23. Is it ensured that the project cannot be developed by other developers than the PP, so that internal company benchmarks or expected returns are suitable for the project activity?</p> <p>(EB 62 Annex 5, §§ 13 – 14)</p> <p><i>Describe how it has been validated that there is only one possible project developer.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	N/A	N/A
<p>B.5.4.24. Was the benchmark consistently used in the past by the same company for similar projects with similar risks?</p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable.</p>	N/A	N/A

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
(EB 62 Annex 5, § 14) <i>If applicable, assess the past financial behaviour of the entity during the last 3 years in relation to similar projects.</i>		Validator's action: Conclusion:		
B.5.4.25. Was the cost of debt calculated based on the weighted average cost of debt financing of the legal entity owning the CDM project activity? (EB 62 Annex 5, § 16) <i>If applicable, assess whether loans, bonds or debt financing from a parent company are calculated according to the latest "Guidance on Investment Analysis".</i> <i>In case that the debt structure of the project is not yet available, the cost of debt can be assumed as the commercial lending rate in the company or the yield of a 10-year bond issued by the government of the host county.</i>	/PoA-DD/	Description: Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable. Validator's action: Conclusion:	N/A	N/A
B.5.4.26. Does the equity/debt ratio of the project reflect the long-term debt/equity finance structure of the legal entity owning the assets of the project activity? (EB 62 Annex 5, § 17) <i>Assess the latest balance sheets of the legal entity owning the assets of the project activity, in case these are available and audited by a third party within two years prior to the submission of the CPA-DD for validation, and the accounting</i>	/PoA-DD/	Description: Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated using investment analysis. Hence this is not applicable. Validator's action: Conclusion:	N/A	N/A

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
books reflect the total value of all assets needed for the project activity. If debt/equity financing structure is not available, 50% equity, 50% debt shall be considered as default.				
B.5.5. Assessment and Demonstration of CPA Additionality Barrier analysis Step 3 or SSC additionality assessment				
B.5.5.1. Are there any barriers given which have a clear and direct impact on the financial returns of the project? (VVS, § 125) <i>In case of LSC projects those issues <u>cannot be considered</u> as barriers and shall be assessed in the investment analysis. In case of SSC projects the same fundamentals as for LSC projects shall apply, i.e. the assessment of the investment barrier according to EB 62 Annex 5. Only unavailability of sources of finance and/or risk related barriers, for example, the risk related to technical failure that could have negative impact on financial performance are acceptable as barriers.</i>	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated barrier analysis. Hence this is not applicable. <i>Validator's action:</i> <i>Conclusion:</i>	N/A	OK
B.5.5.2. Has the unavailability of means of finance for the project been described and adequately substantiated? Do evidence doubtlessly prove that the financing of the project was assured only due to the benefit	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated barrier analysis. Hence this is not applicable.	N/A	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
of the CDM? (EB 50 Annex 13, § 9)		Validator's action: Conclusion:		
B.5.5.3. Would provision of additional financial means lead to the mitigation of the barrier(s) demonstrated? (EB 50 Annex 13, § 7) <i>Describe why provision of additional financial means would not lead to mitigation of the barrier(s) demonstrated and hence analysing the project's additionality within the framework of an investment analysis is inappropriate.</i>	/PoA-DD/	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.5.4. How is it justified and evidenced that the barriers given in the PoA-DD / CPA-DD are real? (VVS, § 126 (a))	/PoA-DD/	Description: Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated barrier analysis. Hence this is not applicable. Validator's action: Conclusion:	N/A	OK
B.5.5.5. How is it justified that one or a set of real barriers prevent(s) the implementation of the project activity and do not prevent the implementation of at least one of the alternatives?	/PoA-DD/	Description: Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated barrier analysis. Hence this is not applicable.	N/A	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
(VVS, § 126 (b))		<i>Validator's action:</i> <i>Conclusion:</i>		
B.5.5.6. Does the review of relevant background information on the nature of the company(ies) and entity(ies) involved in the financing and implementation of the project sufficiently justify that the barriers related to the lack of access to capital, technologies and skilled labour are real? (EB 50 Annex 13, § 4)	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated barrier analysis. Hence this is not applicable. <i>Validator's action:</i> <i>Conclusion:</i>	N/A	OK
B.5.5.7. Has it been demonstrated in an objective way how the CDM alleviates each of the identified barriers to a level that the project is not prevented anymore from occurring by any of the barriers? (EB 50 Annex 13, § 5)	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated barrier analysis. Hence this is not applicable. <i>Validator's action:</i> <i>Conclusion:</i>	N/A	OK
B.5.6. Assessment and Demonstration of CPA Additionality Common practice analysis Step 4 (in case of SSC projects or first-of-its-kind LSC projects skip this step)				

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>B.5.6.1. Is the defined region for the common practice analysis appropriate for the technology/industry type?</p> <p>(VVS, § 129 (a)) <i>Describe why the project activity is not common practice in a transparent and unambiguous manner. If a region other than the entire host country is chosen, describe why this region is more appropriate.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated common practice analysis. Besides, this is a SSC PoA, hence this is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	N/A	OK
In case of projects activities applying ACM002, go to B.5.6.4				
<p>B.5.6.2. To what extent similar projects have been undertaken in the relevant region?</p> <p>(VVS, § 129 (b)) <i>Similar projects are considered those that take place in a comparable environment w.r.t. regulatory framework, investment climate, access to technology and financing, etc. Registered CDM PA and PA that have been published on the UNFCCC website are not to be considered as similar.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated common practice analysis. Besides, this is a SSC PoA, hence this is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	N/A	OK
<p>B.5.6.3. In case similar projects are identified, are there any key differences between the proposed project and existing or ongoing projects and what kind of differences are observed?</p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i> Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated common practice analysis. Besides, this is a SSC PoA, hence this is not applicable.</p>	N/A	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
(VVS, § 129 (c))		<i>Validator's action:</i> <i>Conclusion:</i>		
<p>B.5.6.4. Has an output range as +/- 50% of the design output of the project activity been calculated in order to define the capacity range for "similar" projects?</p> <p>(EB 69 Annex 08, § 5)</p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated common practice analysis. Besides, this is a SSC PoA, hence this is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	N/A	OK
<p>B.5.6.5. Does N_{all} include only plants that have started commercial operation before the the start date of the project and are within the applicable output range?</p> <p>(EB 69 Annex 08, § 6)</p> <p><i>Under N_{all}, registered CDM projects and projects undergoing validation are not to be included.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated common practice analysis. Besides, this is a SSC PoA, hence this is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	N/A	OK
<p>B.5.6.6. Does N_{diff} include only plants that apply different "technology" than the project activity?</p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Additionality of the proposed programme of activities is not demonstrated common practice analysis. Besides, this is a SSC PoA,</p>	N/A	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
(EB 69 Annex 08, §§ 4, 8) <i>The term “technology” refers to energy fuel, investment climate (access to technology, subsidies, legal regulations, etc...) or unit cost of output.</i> <i>Assess how the essential distinctions to identify the different measures have been carried out.</i>		hence this is not applicable. <i>Validator’s action:</i> <i>Conclusion:</i>		
B.6. Algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emissions reductions <i>It is assessed whether the steps taken and the equations and parameters applied in the POA-DD/CPA-DD to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions comply with the requirements of the selected methodology including applicable tool(s).</i>				
B.6.1. Are the equations applied correctly according to the applied approved methodology? (VVS, §§ 72 (c), 96) <i>Describe clearly the steps taken to assess whether the methodology has been applied correctly to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions. Further take into consideration that all estimates of the baseline emissions can be replicated using the data and parameter values provided in the programme documentation</i>	/PoA-DD/	<input type="checkbox"/> The equations applied for calculation are correctly applied according to the approved methodology. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following mistakes have been identified in this context: <i>Description:</i> The applied methodology and equations are no longer valid <i>Validator’s action:</i> The PoA-DD and AMS-II.G version 06 were compared <i>Conclusion:</i> PP needs to revise the equations in accordance with the new methodology. CAR A6 & CAR B1 have been raised	CAR A6 CAR B1	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>B.6.2. In case the methodology allows for different methodological choices, are the equations applied properly justified and have they been used reflecting the other methodological choices (i.e. baseline identification)?</p> <p>(VVS, §§ 97, 98)</p> <p><i>Assess the correct selection and application of methodological choices. Describe whether proper justification has been provided (based on the choice of the baseline scenario, context of activity typical CPA and other evidence provided) and whether the correct equations have been used reflecting the relevant methodological choices.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>At the draft validation stage, the equations applied are no longer valid. Appropriate revisions shall be required for a proper assessment</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD and AMS-II.G version 06 were compared</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>PP needs to revise the equations in accordance with the new methodology. CAR A6 & CAR B1 have been raised</p>	CAR A6 CAR B1	OK
<p>B.6.3. Have conservative assumptions been used when calculating the emission reductions?</p> <p>(VVS, §§ 98, 99(a))</p> <p><i>Describe clearly the steps taken to assess whether all the assumptions and data used by the PP are listed in the POA-DD/CPA-DD including references and sources and are conservatively interpreted in the POA-DD/CPA-DD.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD outlines the approaches taken but actual calculations are pending.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD and AMS-II.G version 06 were compared</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>CAR A6 & CAR A6 have been raised</p>	CAR A6 CAR B1	OK
<p>B.6.4. Are all data sources and assumptions appropriate and parameters which remain fixed throughout the crediting period correct, applicable to the project and will lead to a conservative estimation of emission reductions?</p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD outlines the approaches taken but actual calculations are pending.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD and AMS-II.G version 06 were compared</p>	CAR A6 CAR B1	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
(VVS, § 98) <i>Describe clearly the steps taken to assess whether the values used for the fixed parameters are considered reasonable, correct and applicable in the context of the programme activity and typical CPA.</i>		<i>Conclusion:</i> CAR A6 & CAR B1 have been raised		
B.6.5. Are all ex-ante calculation values for monitoring parameters (as defined per chapter B.7.1) reasonable? (VVS, § 98) <i>Describe clearly the steps taken to assess whether the values used for the monitoring parameters are considered reasonable, applicable and conservative in the context of the project activity</i>	/PoA-DD/	<input type="checkbox"/> All “Values of data to be applied for the purpose of calculating expected emissions reductions” are considered to be reasonable, applicable and conservative. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following mistakes have been identified in this context: Ref: CAR A6	CAR B1	OK
B.6.6. Are the emission reductions real, measurable and give long-term benefits related to the mitigation of climate change. <i>Describe the steps taken to validate this issue.</i>	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> The emission reductions real, measurable and give long-term benefits related to the mitigation of climate change. <i>Validator’s action:</i> The PoA-DD has been checked <i>Conclusion:</i> The emission reductions are real and measurable	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
B.7. Operational, Management and Monitoring Plan of the PoA <i>It is assessed whether the operational, management and monitoring plan is appropriate for the project activity and in line with the applied methodology.</i>				
B.7.1. Operational and Management Plan				
B.7.1.1. Has the coordinating/managing entity established the operational and management arrangements for the implementation of the PoA, which includes a clear definition of roles and responsibilities of personnel involved in the CPA inclusion (i.a. their competencies) as well as records of arrangements for training and capacity development? (EB 74, Annex 05, §§ 19 (a,b), 20)	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The management System is not described as per requirements of §19 of the PoA standard (EB 65, Annex 03), and §200 of the CDM PS version 07</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD was checked</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>CL B2 has been raised</p>	CL B2	OK
B.7.1.2. Are procedures for technical review of the CPA inclusion part of the management system? (EB 74, Annex 05, §§ 19 (c), 20)	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The management System is not described as per requirements of §19 of the PoA standard (EB 65, Annex 03), and §200 of the CDM PS version 07</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD was checked</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	CL B2	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		CL B2 has been raised		
B.7.1.3. Do the arrangements include a system/ procedure to avoid double accounting, e.g., to avoid the case of including a new CPA that has been already registered either as CDM project activity or as a CPA of another PoA? (EB 74, Annex 05, §§19 (d), 20)	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The management System is not described as per requirements of §19 of the PoA standard (EB 65, Annex 03), and §200 of the CDM PS version 07</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD was checked</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>CL B2 has been raised</p>	CL B2	OK
B.7.1.4. Does the management system include a records and documentation control process for each CPA under the PoA? (EB 74, Annex 05, §§ 19 (e), 20)	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The management System is not described as per requirements of §19 of the PoA standard (EB 65, Annex 03), and §200 of the CDM PS version 07</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD was checked</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>CL B2 has been raised</p>	CL B2	OK
B.7.1.5. Do the arrangements include measures for continuous improvement of the PoA management system? (EB 74, Annex 05, §§ 19 (f), 20)	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The management System is not described as per requirements of §19 of the PoA standard (EB 65, Annex 03), and §200 of the CDM PS version 07</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p>	CL B2	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		The PoA-DD was checked <i>Conclusion:</i> CL B2 has been raised		
B.7.1.6. Are all other relevant elements to ensure the CME's competency to check the features of potential CPAs and ensure that each CPA meets all requirements and eligibility criteria before inclusion in the registered PoA taken into account? (EB 74, Annex 05, §§ 19 (g), 20)	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> The management System is not described as per requirements of §19 of the PoA standard (EB 65, Annex 03), and §200 of the CDM PS version 07 <i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD was checked <i>Conclusion:</i> CL B2 has been raised	CL B2	OK
B.7.2. Monitoring Plan				
B.7.2.1. Are all monitoring parameters required by the applied methodology contained in the monitoring plan? (VVS, §§ 72 (e), 131, 132 (a) (i)) <i>Assess whether all applicable parameters listed in the methodology are included in the monitoring plan.</i> <i>Pl. check further whether the selection of parameters not to be monitored (section B.6.2) is appropriate and in line with the applied methodology.</i> <i>In case of different approaches can be chosen acc. to the methodology assess whether the selection of parameters is</i>	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> The F-CDM-SSC-PoA-DD template version 02 has been used and does not include a provision to include monitored parameters. However, the real case CPAs availed at validation stage do not contain all monitoring parameters required by the new methodology AMS-II.G version 06. <i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD was checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> CAR B1 has been raised.	CAR B1	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.																																				
<i>justified and correct.</i>																																								
<p>B.7.2.2. Are the means of monitoring of all parameters contained in the monitoring plan feasible within the PoA design?</p> <p>(VVS, §§ 132 (b) (i), 133(b))</p> <p><i>Describe the steps undertaken to assess whether the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the project design.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The F-CDM-SSC-PoA-DD template version 02 has been used and does not include a provision to include monitored parameters. However, the real case CPAs availed at validation stage do not contain all monitoring parameters required by the new methodology AMS-II.G version 06</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD was checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>CAR B1 has been raised.</p>	CAR B1	OK																																				
<p>B.7.2.3. [N_{y,i,a}]</p> <p>(VVS, § 132 (a)– (ii))</p> <p><i>Indicate whether the provided information for the monitoring parameter complies with the approved methodology including applicable tool(s) in the aspects listed.</i></p> <p><i>For checking the use of international standards in the nomenclature, consider:</i></p> <p>a) <i>Standard format (e.g. 1,000 representing one thousand and 1.0 representing one).</i></p> <p>b) <i>Values shall be directly given in SI units – or additionally to original units transferred to SI.</i></p> <p>c) <i>Short scale naming system: (Only) million = 10⁶ and billion 10⁹ shall be used.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<table><tr><th>Requirement</th><th>OK</th><th>Not OK</th><th>N/A</th></tr><tr><td>Label</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr><tr><td>Data Unit</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr><tr><td>Description</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr><tr><td>Source of data</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr><tr><td>Measurement equipment / measure method</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr><tr><td>Monitoring frequency</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr><tr><td>Purpose of data</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr></table>	Requirement	OK	Not OK	N/A	Label	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Data Unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Description	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Source of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Measurement equipment / measure method	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Monitoring frequency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	QA/QC procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Purpose of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CAR A6	OK
Requirement	OK	Not OK	N/A																																					
Label	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																					
Data Unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																					
Description	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																					
Source of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																					
Measurement equipment / measure method	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																					
Monitoring frequency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																					
QA/QC procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																					
Purpose of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																					

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)			Draft Concl.	Final Concl.	
		Standard format	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		SI units	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Short scale naming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
B.7.2.4. [B _{a,i,KPT}] (VVS, § 132 (a)– (ii)) <i>Indicate whether the provided information for the monitoring parameter complies with the approved methodology including applicable tool(s) in the aspects listed.</i> <i>For checking the use of international standards in the nomenclature, consider:</i> d) <i>Standard format (e.g. 1,000 representing one thousand and 1.0 representing one).</i> e) <i>Values shall be directly given in SI units – or additionally to original units transferred to SI.</i> f) <i>Short scale naming system: (Only) million = 10⁶ and billion 10⁹ shall be used.</i>	/PoA-DD/	Requirement	OK	Not OK	N/A	GAR A6	OK
		Label	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Data Unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Description	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Source of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Measurement equipment / measure method	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Monitoring frequency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		QA/QC procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Purpose of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Standard format	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		SI units	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Short scale naming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
B.7.2.5. [B _{y=1,new,i,survey}] (VVS, § 132 (a)– (ii)) <i>Indicate whether the provided information for the monitoring parameter complies with the approved methodology</i>	/PoA-DD/	Requirement	OK	Not OK	N/A	GAR A6	OK
		Label	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Data Unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)			Draft Concl.	Final Concl.	
<i>including applicable tool(s) in the aspects listed.</i> <i>For checking the use of international standards in the nomenclature, consider:</i> <i>g) Standard format (e.g. 1,000 representing one thousand and 1.0 representing one).</i> <i>h) Values shall be directly given in SI units – or additionally to original units transferred to SI.</i> <i>i) Short scale naming system: (Only) million = 10⁶ and billion 10⁹ shall be used.</i>		Description	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Source of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Measurement equipment / measure method	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Monitoring frequency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		QA/QC procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Purpose of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Standard format	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		SI units	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Short scale naming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
B.7.2.6. [HG_{p,y}] (VVS, § 132 (a)– (ii)) <i>Indicate whether the provided information for the monitoring parameter complies with the approved methodology including applicable tool(s) in the aspects listed.</i> <i>For checking the use of international standards in the nomenclature, consider:</i> <i>j) Standard format (e.g. 1,000 representing one thousand and 1.0 representing one).</i> <i>k) Values shall be directly given in SI units – or additionally to original units transferred to SI.</i> <i>l) Short scale naming system: (Only) million = 10⁶ and</i>	/PoA-DD/	Requirement	OK	Not OK	N/A	CAR A6	OK
		Label	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Data Unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Description	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Source of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Measurement equipment / measure method	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Monitoring frequency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		QA/QC procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>billion 10⁹ shall be used.</i>		<div>Purpose of data <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Standard format <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>SI units <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Short scale naming <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div>		
<p>B.7.2.7. [<input type="checkbox"/>_{new,i,a}]</p> <p>(VVS, § 132 (a)– (ii))</p> <p><i>Indicate whether the provided information for the monitoring parameter complies with the approved methodology including applicable tool(s) in the aspects listed.</i></p> <p><i>For checking the use of international standards in the nomenclature, consider:</i></p> <p><i>m) Standard format (e.g. 1,000 representing one thousand and 1.0 representing one).</i></p> <p><i>n) Values shall be directly given in SI units – or additionally to original units transferred to SI.</i></p> <p><i>o) Short scale naming system: (Only) million = 10⁶ and billion 10⁹ shall be used.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<div>Requirement OK Not OK N/A</div> <div>Label <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Data Unit <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Description <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Source of data <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Measurement equipment / measure method <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Monitoring frequency <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>QA/QC procedures <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Purpose of data <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Standard format <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>SI units <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Short scale naming <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div>	CAR A6	OK
<p>B.7.2.8. [<input type="checkbox"/>_{new,i,a}]</p> <p>(VVS, § 132 (a)– (ii))</p>	/PoA-DD/	<div>Requirement OK Not OK N/A</div> <div>Label <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div>	CAR A6	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)			Draft Concl.	Final Concl.	
<p><i>Indicate whether the provided information for the monitoring parameter complies with the approved methodology including applicable tool(s) in the aspects listed.</i></p> <p><i>For checking the use of international standards in the nomenclature, consider:</i></p> <p><i>p) Standard format (e.g. 1,000 representing one thousand and 1.0 representing one).</i></p> <p><i>q) Values shall be directly given in SI units – or additionally to original units transferred to SI.</i></p> <p><i>r) Short scale naming system: (Only) million = 10⁶ and billion 10⁹ shall be used.</i></p>		Data Unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Description	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Source of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Measurement equipment / measure method	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Monitoring frequency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		QA/QC procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Purpose of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Standard format	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		SI units	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Short scale naming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
<p>B.7.2.9. [f_{NRB,y}]</p> <p>(VVS, § 132 (a)– (ii))</p> <p><i>Indicate whether the provided information for the monitoring parameter complies with the approved methodology including applicable tool(s) in the aspects listed.</i></p> <p><i>For checking the use of international standards in the nomenclature, consider:</i></p> <p><i>s) Standard format (e.g. 1,000 representing one thousand and 1.0 representing one).</i></p> <p><i>t) Values shall be directly given in SI units – or</i></p>	<p>/PoA-DD/</p>	Requirement	OK	Not OK	N/A	<p>CAR A6</p>	<p>OK</p>
		Label	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Data Unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Description	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Source of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Measurement equipment / measure method	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Monitoring frequency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)			Draft Concl.	Final Concl.	
<i>additionally to original units transferred to SI.</i> <i>u) Short scale naming system: (Only) million = 10⁶ and billion 10⁹ shall be used.</i>		QA/QC procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Purpose of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Standard format	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		SI units	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Short scale naming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
B.7.2.10. [B_{y,i,a} or <input type="checkbox"/>_{y,i,a} or SC_{y,i,a}] (VVS, § 132 (a)– (ii)) <i>Indicate whether the provided information for the monitoring parameter complies with the approved methodology including applicable tool(s) in the aspects listed.</i> <i>For checking the use of international standards in the nomenclature, consider:</i> <i>v) Standard format (e.g. 1,000 representing one thousand and 1.0 representing one).</i> <i>w) Values shall be directly given in SI units – or additionally to original units transferred to SI.</i> <i>x) Short scale naming system: (Only) million = 10⁶ and billion 10⁹ shall be used.</i>	/PoA-DD/	Requirement	OK	Not OK	N/A	CAR A6	OK
		Label	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Data Unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Description	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Source of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Measurement equipment / measure method	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Monitoring frequency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		QA/QC procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Purpose of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Standard format	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		SI units	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Short scale naming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
B.7.2.11. Has a monitoring plan for all types of CPA	/PoA-	Description:				CL-B2	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>been developed in accordance with the approved monitoring methodology, and identified the monitoring provisions and data parameters a CPA has to apply/monitor?</p> <p>(VVS, § 233)</p>	DD/	<p>The monitoring plan prescribed for CPAs under this PoA has not been developed in accordance with the approved monitoring methodology, AMS-II.G version 06.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>CL B2</p>		
<p>B.7.2.12. Have all means of implementing the monitoring plan, e.g. equations necessary for ex-post emission reduction calculation, been described clearly and in line with the methodology?</p> <p>(VVS, § 131, 132)</p> <p><i>Check whether all necessary equations have been provided in the POA-DD/CPA-DD. Pl. consider that ex-post and ex-ante calculations might be different.</i></p> <p><i>Please consider that additional equations might be necessary to calculate auxiliary parameters.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>An outdated version of the methodology has been used. Revisions are necessary</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD was checked</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>CL B2 has been raised</p>	CL-B2	OK
<p>B.7.2.13. Is it likely that the monitoring arrangements described in the POA-DD/CPA-DD can properly be implemented in the context of the project activity?</p> <p>(VVS, § 132 (b) (i))</p> <p><i>Assess whether the described monitoring arrangements are sufficient and realistic to enable a thorough monitoring. Pl. consider also special monitoring conditions, e.g. downtimes</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>An outdated version of the methodology has been used. Revisions are necessary.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD was checked</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	CL-B2	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>of monitoring equipment etc.</i>		CL B2 has been raised		
<p>B.7.2.14. Are the QA/QC procedures appropriate and sufficient to ensure the emission reductions achieved from the programme activity can be reported ex-post and verified?</p> <p>(VVS, § 132 (b) (ii)) <i>Please consider the description given in the relevant section of the PoA-DD and the CPA-DD. Describe which QA/QC provisions are considered. Address Quality Management System provisions, calibration and maintenance of equipment. Address further any review procedures.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i> An outdated version of the methodology has been used. Revisions are necessary.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD was checked</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CL B2 has been raised</p>	CL B2	OK
<p>B.7.2.15. Are procedures identified for data management?</p> <p>(VVS, § 132 (b) (ii)) <i>Check whether appropriate provisions are considered for data management including responsibilities, what records to keep, storage area of records and how to process performance documentation</i></p> <p><i>Check further the data archiving provisions for the project activity and ensure that provisions are made to archive data for the whole crediting period + 2 years.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i> An outdated version of the methodology has been used. Revisions are necessary.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD was checked</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CL B2 was raised</p>	CL B2	OK
<p>C. Duration and Crediting Period</p> <p><i>It is assessed whether the temporary boundaries of the</i></p>				

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>programme are clearly defined.</i>				
<p>C.1.1. Is the starting date of the PoA determined correctly (date of publication for GSCP or date of notification to the secretariat and the DNA)?</p> <p>(PS, § 205)</p> <p><i>Check in case the date of GSCP publication whether the date given in PoA-DD section D.1 is consistent with the first day of the GSCP as per UNFCCC webpage.</i></p> <p><i>The notification to the secretariat and the DNA shall be justified by supporting evidence e.g. Emails, letters etc.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i> The start date of the PoA is 2014/02/17,</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the date of publishing the PoA-DD for GSCP.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the date of notification to the secretariat and the DNA.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD and UNFCCC were checked</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>CAR C1 was raised for a proper definition of the PoA starting date</p>	CAR C1	OK
<p>C.1.2. Is the starting date of any CPA on or after the start date of the PoA?</p> <p>(VVS, § 228)</p>	/PoA-DD/ /CPA-DD/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The starting dates of the Malawi Biomass Energy Conservation Programme CPA 1 and the Rwanda Biomass Energy Conservation Programme CPA 1 are assigned as 2014-02-15, same date as the starting date of the proposed PoA. This is as per the PoA standard and the CDM PS version 07. Nonetheless, the start date of the PoA is still not defined as per the CDM PS.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD and respective CPA-DDs were consulted</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>CAR C1 has been raised</p>	CAR C1	OK
C.1.3. Is the project's operational lifetime clearly	/PoA-	<i>Description:</i>	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
defined and evidenced? <i>Check whether the project lifetime is correctly defined. Consider the latest "Guidance on the assessment of investment analysis".</i> <i>Check in case of phased implementation this has been reflected throughout the whole PoA-DD incl. the financial assessment, if applicable.</i>	DD/	In Part V section A.2 of the draft PoA-DD, dated 2014-02-12, the length of the PoA is given as 28 years <i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD was checked <i>Conclusion:</i> The length of the PoA conforms to CDM guidelines		
C.1.4. Does the length of the PoA not exceed 28 years? (VVS, § 232)	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> In Part V section A.2 of the draft PoA-DD, dated 2014-02-12, the length of the PoA is given as 28 years <i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD was checked <i>Conclusion:</i> The length of the PoA conforms to CDM guidelines	OK	OK
D. Environmental Impacts <i>Documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts will be assessed, and if deemed significant, an EIA should be provided to the DOE.</i>				
D.1.1. Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) on PoA and/or typical CPA level? (VVS, §§ 134-135, 234) <i>Check the host party regulations regarding EIA. If no</i>	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> As per the draft PoA-DD, an EIA is to be performed at PoA-level. However, at the draft validation stage it is unclear whether the host countries require an EIA and whether PP has conducted the same. <i>Validator's action:</i>	CL-E1	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>requirements for an EIA exist, discuss whether the project participants conducted an analysis for the environmental impacts of the project activity.</i>		The PoA-DD has been checked and onsite assessments of production areas conducted. <i>Conclusion:</i> It is unclear whether an EIA is required, and what measures shall be applied to degraded land as a result of soil harvesting. CL E1 has been raised		
D.1.2. In case an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is requested by the host party, has it been carried out and if applicable duly approved in accordance with the host Party procedures? (VVS, §§ 135, 234) <i>Check the EIA and its approval, if applicable. If the EIA is conducted at CPA level, please assess if the EIA was conducted according to the description in the CPA-DD and the PoA-DD.</i>	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> <i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD has been checked <i>Conclusion:</i> CL E1 has been raised	CL E1	OK
D.1.3. Has it been clearly indicated on which level i.e. PoA level or CPA level, an environmental analysis has been carried out or will be carried out? (VVS, § 235) <i>Please check whether the indication is in line with the provided documentation.</i>	/PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part VI section A.1 has indicated that environmental analysis would be done at PoA level. <i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD has been checked <i>Conclusion:</i> Environmental analysis would be done at PoA level.	OK	OK
D.1.4. Does the PoA-DD contain a sufficiently	/PoA-	<i>Description:</i>	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
described justification on the choice of level at which the EIA is undertaken?	DD/	Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part VI section A.1 has included a justification why environmental analysis is to be pursued at PoA level. <i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD has been checked <i>Conclusion:</i> CL E1 has been raised		
D.1.5. Are transboundary environmental impacts considered in the analysis? (VVS, § 134) <i>Check the documents and local official sources / expertise regarding transboundary environmental impacts.</i>	/PoA-DD/ /EIA/	<i>Description:</i> At the draft validation stage (desk review), it is unclear whether trans-boundary environmental impacts have been considered. Nonetheless, no significant trans-boundary effects are expected <i>Validator's action:</i> PoA-DD has been checked, similar projects, sector knowledge <i>Conclusion:</i> CL E1 has been raised	CL E1	OK
E. Stakeholder Comments <i>The DOE should ensure that stakeholder comments have been invited with appropriate media and that due account has been taken of any comments received.</i>				

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>E.1.1. With regard to the PoA, how have relevant local stakeholders' comments been invited to consultation prior to the publication of the POA-DD/CPA-DD?</p> <p>(VVS, §§ 138-140, 236, 237)</p> <p><i>Determine whether the local stakeholder consultation process was carried out for a) the whole PoA or b) at the CPA level. In case b) the assessment will be carried out in the CPA validation report.</i></p> <p><i>If such comments are to be sought at the CPA level this shall be described and reflected in the POA-DD and the CPA-DD.</i></p> <p><i>Check by means of document review and interviews with local stakeholders if and when a local stakeholder consultation process has been carried out.</i></p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /VVS/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> According to the Draft PoA-DD version 01, Part VII section A.1, the relevant local stakeholders' comments been invited to consultation prior to the publication of the POA-DD/CPA-DD (2008, 2012)</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i> PoA-DD has been checked and onsite visit</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CL F1 has been raised</p>	<p>CL F1</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>E.1.2. How have the comments received been compiled and can the summary be assessed as complete and adequate?</p> <p>(VVS, §§ 236)</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /VVS</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> At the draft validation stage it is impossible to confirm whether the stakeholder consultation process has been carried out as per relevant provisions of the VVS and CDM PS.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD has been checked</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CL F1 has been raised</p>	<p>CL F1</p>	<p>OK</p>

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>E.1.3. With regard to the PoA, can the local stakeholder consultation process be assessed as adequate? (VVS, §§ 138-140, 236)</p> <p><i>Describe what assessment steps have been undertaken to assess the adequacy of the stakeholder consultation process. Give a final opinion on the adequacy.</i></p> <p><i>Please consider the following requirements in this context:</i></p> <p><i>(a) Comments by local stakeholders that can reasonably be considered relevant for the proposed CDM project activity, have been invited;</i></p> <p><i>(b) The summary of the comments received as provided in the PoA-DD is complete;</i></p> <p><i>(c) The project participants have taken due account of any comments received and have described this process in the PoA-DD.</i></p>	/PoA-DD/ /VVS/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>At the draft validation stage it is impossible to confirm whether the stakeholder consultation process has been carried out as per relevant provisions of the VVS and CDM PS.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD has been checked</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>CL F1 has been raised</p>	CL F1	OK
F. Others				
F.1. Definition of Roles				
<p>F.1.1. Does the section A.3 of the POA-DD include an identification of the coordinating/ managing entity (a private or public entity), Host Party(ies) and PoA participants?</p>	/PoA-DD/ /IM01/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Part II section A.3 & A.4 of the Draft PoA-DD version 1 contains CME as Hestian Ltd, and host country PPs as Hestian Ltd (Malawi), and Hestian Ltd (Rwanda). Both PPs are private entities. There are no Annex 1 project participants.</p>	CL B1 CL G1	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>Project participants may or may not be involved in one of the CPAs related to the PoA. The operators of individual CPAs are not required to be project participants. CDM programme participation is only recorded at the PoA level.</i>		<p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD has been checked and interviews carried onsite</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>The LoA has not been availed for validation, and the PP concedes that the private entities are not officially registered in the host nations. CL B2 & CL G1 have been duly raised</p>		
F.1.2. Is there any Party directly involved as project participant, and if yes, is that Party's contact details included in annex 1 of the PoA-DD and is the information provided internally consistent with section A.3 of the PoA-DD?	/PoA-DD/ /LoA/ /MoC/ /IM01/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>As per Part II section A.4 of the Draft PoA-DD version 1, no Party is involved</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>The PoA-DD has been checked</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>No issues have been raised</p>	OK	OK
<p>F.2. Approval - Contribution to Sustainable Development</p> <p><i>The written approval of the parties involved is a mandatory requirement.</i></p>				
<p>F.2.1. Have written approvals of all parties involved (incl. the CME) been provided to the validation team?</p> <p>(VVS, § 38)</p> <p><i>Indicate whether a letter of approval has been received, with</i></p>	/PoA-DD/ /IM01/ /LoA/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>At the draft validation stage, Letters of Approval from the DNAs of the Republic of Malawi and the Republic of Rwanda have not been availed to DOE.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p>	CL G1	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>a clear reference to the supporting documentation.</i> <i>Indicate whether this letter was provided to the DOE by the project participants or directly by the DNA</i>		N/A <i>Conclusion:</i> LoAs are pending. CL G1 has been raised		
F.2.2. Are the approvals issued from organisations listed as DNAs on the UNFCCC CDM website? (VVS, §§ 41) <i>Indicate the means of validation employed to assess the authenticity, i.e. in case of doubt whether LoA has been verified with the DNA. Further describe which entity submitted the LoA for validation.</i>	/PoA-DD/ /IM01/ /LoA/ /MoC/	<i>Description:</i> At the draft validation stage, Letters of Approval from the DNAs of the Republic of Malawi and the Republic of Rwanda have not been availed to DOE. <i>Validator's action:</i> N/A <i>Conclusion:</i> LoAs are pending. CL G1 has been raised	CL G1	OK
F.2.3. Do the written approvals confirm that the corresponding party is a Party to the Kyoto Protocol? (VVS, § 39 (a))	/PoA-DD/ /IM01/ /LoA/	<i>Description:</i> At the draft validation stage, Letters of Approval from the DNAs of the Republic of Malawi and the Republic of Rwanda have not been availed to DOE. <i>Validator's action:</i> N/A <i>Conclusion:</i> LoAs are pending. CL G1 has been raised	CL G1	OK
F.2.4. Do the written approvals confirm that the participation is voluntary? (VVS, § 39 (b))	/PoA-DD/ /LoA/	<i>Description:</i> At the draft validation stage, Letters of Approval from the DNAs of the Republic of Malawi and the Republic of Rwanda have not been	CL G1	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
	/IM01/	<p>availed to DOE.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>LoAs are pending. CL G1 has been raised</p>		
<p>F.2.5. Does the written approval from the host country confirm that the project contributes to the sustainable development in the country?</p> <p>(VVS, § 39 (c))</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /LoA/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>At the draft validation stage, Letters of Approval from the DNAs of the Republic of Malawi and the Republic of Rwanda have not been availed to DOE.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>LoAs are pending. CL G1 has been raised</p>	CL G1	OK
<p>F.2.6. Do the written approvals refer to the precise project title in the PoA-DD submitted for registration or an additional specification of the project activity, e.g. PoA-DD version number?</p> <p>(VVS, §§ 39 (d))</p>	<p>/LoA/ /PoA-DD/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>At the draft validation stage, Letters of Approval from the DNAs of the Republic of Malawi and the Republic of Rwanda have not been availed to DOE.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>LoAs are pending. CL G1 has been raised</p>	CL G1	OK
<p>F.2.7. Are the written approvals unconditional with</p>	/LoA/	<p><i>Description:</i></p>	CL G1	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
regard to F.2.3 to F.2.6? (VVS, § 40)		At the draft validation stage, Letters of Approval from the DNAs of the Republic of Malawi and the Republic of Rwanda have not been availed to DOE. <i>Validator's action:</i> N/A <i>Conclusion:</i> LoAs are pending. CL G1 has been raised		
F.2.8. Is the information regarding the project participants listed in tabular form in the PoA-DD and is internally consistent with the information provided in the section that contains the contact information of the project participants? (VVS, § 46)	/LoA/ /PoA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> At the draft validation stage, Letters of Approval from the DNAs of the Republic of Malawi and the Republic of Rwanda have not been availed to DOE. <i>Validator's action:</i> N/A <i>Conclusion:</i> LoAs are pending. CL G1 has been raised	CL G1	OK
F.2.9. Are all project participants listed in the PoA-DD approved at least by one Party involved? (VVS, § 45) <i>Indicate whether the participation of the project participant(s) has been approved by a Party to the Kyoto Protocol.</i> <i>Describe the means of validation employed to draw this conclusion.</i>	/PoA-DD/ /LoA/	<i>Description:</i> At the draft validation stage, Letters of Approval from the DNAs of the Republic of Malawi and the Republic of Rwanda have not been availed to DOE. <i>Validator's action:</i> N/A <i>Conclusion:</i>	CL G1	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		LoAs are pending. CL G1 has been raised		
F.2.10. Are any other project participants than those authorized as project participants listed in the PoA-DD? (VVS, § 47)	/PoA-DD/ /LoA/ /MoC/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>At the draft validation stage, Letters of Approval from the DNAs of the Republic of Malawi and the Republic of Rwanda have not been availed to DOE.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>LoAs are pending. CL G1 has been raised</p>	CL G1	OK
<p>F.3. Modalities of Communication Statement</p> <p><i>A due diligence on the Modalities of Communication statement in accordance with the requirements established in the VVS is mandatory.</i></p>				
F.3.1. Has a valid Modalities of Communication (MoC) been provided to the validation team from the coordinating/managing entity? (VVS, § 55)	/IM01/ /MoC/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>At the draft validation stage, Modalities of Communication (MoC) has not been provided by the CME</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>The MoC is pending. CL G2 has been raised</p>	CL G2	OK
F.3.2. Has the MoC been signed by a duly authorized person on behalf of the	/MoC/	The personal and corporate identities of all project participants and focal points included in the MoC were validated by:	CL G2	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>coordinating/managing entity? (VVS, §§ 54, 56)</p> <p><i>Please Indicate how the personal and corporate identities of all project participants and focal points included in the MoC statement have been validated,:</i></p>		<input type="checkbox"/> Directly checking evidence for corporate and personal entity <input type="checkbox"/> Notarized documentation <input type="checkbox"/> Written confirmation from the coordinating/managing entity that all corporate and personal details, including specimen signatures, are accurate and valid		
<p>F.3.3. Has the MoC statement correctly been completed? (VVS, §§ 59, 60)</p>	/MoC/	<input type="checkbox"/> The latest version of the form (F-CDM-MOC) has been used <input type="checkbox"/> Annex 1 of the MoC is correctly completed <input type="checkbox"/> The project participants' authorized signatories signing the MoC are also listed in Annex 1 of the MoC. CL G2 has been raised	CL G2	OK
<p>F.3.4. Does the MOC confirm that the Coordinating/managing entity of the PoA communicates with the Board, and is the information in the MoC on all Project participants consistent with the PoA-DD?</p> <p><i>Procedures for modalities of communication between project participants and the Executive Board. shall apply, with the exception that the coordinating/managing entity shall be either sole or joint focal point for each area of communication. The limit of joint focal points for the programme shall be 5, or equal to the number of host Parties if greater than 5.</i></p>	/MoC/	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>At the draft validation stage, Modalities of Communication (MoC) has not been provided by the CME</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>The MoC is pending. CL G2 has been raised</p>	CL G2	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
F.4. Project documentation editorial aspects <i>The POA-DD and the CPA-DD used as a basis for validation shall be prepared in accordance with the latest template and guidance from the CDM Executive Board available on the UNFCCC CDM website.</i>				
F.4.1. Have the latest versions of the PoA-DD and the CPA-DD form been applied? (VVS, § 62)	/PoA-DD/ /CPA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> The draft PoA-DD version 01 and the CPA-DD have been field out using template version 02 and not the latest template forms version 03 <i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD and CPA-DD have been checked <i>Conclusion:</i> CAR G3 has been raised	CAR G3	OK
F.4.2. Have the PoA-DD and the generic CPA-DD been duly filled in accordance with the latest guidance(s)? (VVS, § 63)	/PoA-DD/ /CPA-DD/	<i>Description:</i> The draft PoA-DD version 01 and the generic CPA-DD have been field out using template version 02 and not the latest template forms version 03 <i>Validator's action:</i> The PoA-DD and CPA-DD have been checked <i>Conclusion:</i> CAR G3 has been raised	CAR G3	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Reference	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidence)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>F.4.3. Does Section G of the PoA-DD provide an indication that the letter(s) of approval from Party(ies) which wishes to be in the PoA involved are available and Party(ies) involved in the proposed PoA as well as CME letters of authorization of its coordination of the PoA from each Party?</p> <p>(CDM-PoA-DD-FORM)</p> <p><i>Ensure that section G of the final PoA-DD reflects the latest status of LoA.</i></p>	<p>/PDD-T/ /PoA-DD/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>At the draft validation stage, Letters of Approval from the DNAs of the Republic of Malawi and the Republic of Rwanda have not been availed to DOE.</p> <p><i>Validator's action:</i></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>LoAs are pending. CAR G3 has been raised</p>	<p>CAR G3</p>	<p>OK</p>

ANNEX 2: ASSESSMENT OF APPLICABILITY CRITERIA

Table A-2: Assessment of Applicability Criteria (VVS §§ 70 – 76)

Applicability Criteria	Evidence used	met	not met	N/A	Assessment of validation team (results and means of assessment)
This category comprises efficiency improvements in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass. Examples of applicable technologies and measures include the introduction of high efficiency biomass fired cook stoves or ovens or dryers to replace the existing devices and/or energy efficiency improvements in existing biomass fired cook stoves or ovens or dryers.	/PoA-DD/ /WBT/ /CMU/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The PoA's stated objective is to disseminate improved biomass-fired cookstoves to households in Malawi and Rwanda that are more efficient than the traditional used technologies in fuelwood consumption.
The methodology is applicable to single pot or multi pot portable or in-situ cook stoves with rated efficiency of at least 20 per cent. The efficiency of the project devices shall be based on certification by a national standards body or an appropriate certifying agent recognized by that body. Alternatively, manufacturer specifications on efficiency based on water boiling test (WBT) may be used. The sampling test of stoves by such certification bodies/agents or manufacturers shall be conducted following a 90/10 precision in accordance with the "Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities". However, the following simplified approach may be used, when the efficient cook-stoves are produced by a manufacturer with a	/PoA-DD/ /WBT/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The PoA distributes one pot or two pots cookstoves with a rated efficiency of 30.6%. This meets the minimum requirement of the applied methodology. An eligibility criterion has been established to ensure that all CPAs conform to this requirement. The water boiling test has been conducted for the first batch of stoves by a competent entity following the latest WBT protocol and sampling requirements. Efficiency loss is also monitored to establish trends and to adjust emission reductions in the crediting period. This also ensures minimum efficiency is obeyed. The sampling test has been conducted following a 90/10 precision in accordance with the "Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities"

P-No.: 8000449119 – 14/021

Applicability Criteria	Evidence used	met	not met	N/A	Assessment of validation team (results and means of assessment)
<p>good quality management system in place to ensure that the individual equipment produced do not vary beyond the range of acceptance limits (e.g. characteristics such as materials, critical dimensions):</p> <p>a) Conduct a sample test on three cook stoves with three tests conducted for each stove;</p> <p>b) If the standard deviation of the nine test results indicated above is very small and 90/10 precision requirement is met (in this case, the value of the t-distribution for 90 per cent confidence shall be used instead of Z value), the efficiency determined is acceptable, otherwise more sample tests would be required until 90/10 precision is met.</p>					
<p>Project participants shall be able to show that non-renewable biomass has been used in the project region since 31 December 1989, using survey methods or referring to published literature, official reports or statistics.</p>	/PoA-DD/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>PP has demonstrated that non-renewable biomass has been used in the host countries since 1989 using published literature (PoA-DD section B.3). Examples include, State of the State of the Environment Report, Malawi, 2010, Global Forest Resources Assessment 2010, Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, Rwanda Market Assessment, Sector Mapping, Accenture Development Partnerships, 2012, FAO, and the Global Forest Resources Assessment 2010, Country Reports, Rwanda indicating that forest cover has been declining since before 1989. The sources are deemed reliable and therefore this applicability condition is met.</p>
<p>The aggregate energy savings of a single project activity shall not exceed the equivalent of 60 GWh per year or 180 GWh thermal per year in fuel input.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /XLS/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Each component project activity (CPA) will ensure that aggregate energy savings does not exceed the equivalent of 60 GWh per year or 180 GWh thermal per year in fuel input.</p> <p>This criterion is been met through ensuring that the number of disseminated cookstoves remains within the SSC limit during the PoA lifetime.</p>

ANNEX 3: ASSESSMENT OF BASELINE IDENTIFICATION

Table A-3: Assessment of Baseline Identification (VVS §§ 88 – 95)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Baseline is pre-defined by the methodology
<input type="checkbox"/>	Assessment of baseline see below

Baseline Alternatives identified	In line with the Methodology?	Eliminated	Reasons for elimination / non-elimination from list of alternatives	Evidence used	DOE Assessment	
					Appropriateness of elimination	Assessment of validation team (results and means of assessment)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

ANNEX 4: ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL PARAMETERS

Table A-4: Assessment of Financial Parameters (VVS, §§ 120, 121 / in case financial parameters stem from FSR § 122)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No financial parameters are used for additionality justification					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Assessment of all financial parameters see below					
Parameter	Value applied	Unit	Source of Information (please indicate document and page)	Reference	DOE ASSESSMENT	
					Correctness of value applied	Comment
					<input type="checkbox"/>	
					<input type="checkbox"/>	
					<input type="checkbox"/>	

ANNEX 5: ASSESSMENT OF BARRIER ANALYSIS

Table A-5: Assessment of Barrier Analysis (VVS, §§ 124-127)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No barrier parameters are used for additionality justification			
<input type="checkbox"/>	As per additionality justification at CPA level			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Assessment of barriers see below			
Kind of Barrier (invest, tech, other)	Description of Barrier	Evidence used	Assessment of validation team	
			Appropriateness of information source	Explanation of final result
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

ANNEX 6: OUTCOME OF THE GSCP

Table A-6: Outcome of the Global Stakeholder Consultation Process
(VVS, §§ 34- 37)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No comments were received during the global stakeholder consultation period					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Comments were received during the global stakeholder consultation period. The comments (in unedited form) and the consideration/response of the validation team are presented below:					
Comment No.:	Comment by:	Inserted on:	Subject	Comment ^{*)}	Action taken by the validation team to take due account on the comment ^{*)}	Conclusion (incl. CARs CLs or FARs)

^{*)} In case clarifications have been requested by the validation team corresponding rows shall be added

ANNEX 7: ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA ASSESSMENT

Table A-7: Assessment on Eligibility Criteria for inclusion of CPAs under this PoA

A full list shall be included in section B.2 part I of the PoA-DD and B.5 part II of the PoA-DD.


PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
No.	Eligibility Criteria	Minimum expected Evidence during CPA inclusion	Appopr.+ sufficient	Explanation of final result
a.	CPAs shall be located within the geographical boundaries set in the PoA, i.e. the Republics of Malawi and Rwanda, unless otherwise discussed with and approved by the CDM;	The location of each individual CPA shall be specified in respective CPA-DDs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is appropriate specifying the CPA boundaries. The CPAs will be in Malawi and Rwanda
b.	CPA cookstoves will be assigned unique serial identification numbers to be etched into the stove and captured on Emission Reduction (ER) contracts together with end-user details (name, address, phone number – if available)	<p>This data shall be stored electronically and will be checked for double counting by comparing the serial numbers and user details.</p> <p>End-users are best traced through stove marketers / promoters, who normally know best where the end-user resides.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Appropriate and ensures adherence to UNFCCC requirements of no double counting of emission reductions.
c.	CPA cookstoves shall primarily target rural and peri-urban households using woody biomass for cooking and heating water. CPA stoves, whether single pot or multi pot, portable or in-situ, shall have a minimum rated efficiency of 20%.	<p>Target demographic shall be specified in respective CPA-DDs.</p> <p>Stove efficiency to be confirmed from independent reports on stove tests e.g. Water Boiling Test (WBT),</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is appropriate. Complies with paragraph 2 and 3 of the applied methodology. Non-renewable biomass is predominantly used in rural and peri-urban dwellings using inefficient three-stone fires with a default efficiency of 0.1. Methodology requires efficiency improves of not less than 20%

P-No.: 8000449119 – 14/021

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
No.	Eligibility Criteria	Minimum expected Evidence during CPA inclusion	Apppr.+ sufficient	Explanation of final result
		Kitchen Performance Test (KPT) or Controlled Cooking Test (CCT).		
d.	In addition to details in criterion (b), the date of sale shall be captured for improved household cookstoves, whereby date of commission is assumed to be (i) the day after the date of sale for retail sales or (ii) for stoves 'fixed' into cooking space the day after the date of installation or (iii) the last day of the month after the month of delivery for bulk sales.	This data shall be stored electronically in the total sales record.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is appropriately designed to ensure that project operational days are captured with accuracy.
e	Each CPA shall conform to applied methodology of the PoA – AMS-II.G. Version 06: Energy Efficiency Measures in Thermal Applications of Non-Renewable Biomass.	This applied methodology shall be referenced within respective CPA-DDs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is appropriate in order to ensure that the methodology and applicability conditions are adhered to.
f.	As per B.1, CPA stoves shall be isolated units to be used by households, communities or Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and shall be under 750 kW installed capacity or under 3,000 MWh of energy savings per year or 3,000 tonnes of emission reductions per year.	The size of each unit to be confirmed based on ex-ante emission reductions per year per household using a project stove (emission reductions per household per year shall not exceed 3,000 tCO ₂ e).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is appropriate. Ensures compliance with the small-scale methodology as well as the necessary thresholds to confirm the additionality of all CPAs
g.	LSCs and EIA for improved household cookstoves should be conducted at PoA level.	Please refer to Section F for details of stakeholder consultations in Malawi and Rwanda, and Section E.1 on Environmental impact analysis.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is appropriate as the populations targeted are not expected to vary significantly. Therefore, the practice of utilization of non-renewable biomass using inefficient three-stone fire in the baseline is the same.
h.	CPAs funded through official development assistance or diversion of such will not be eligible for inclusion in the PoA;	A confirmation that the CPA is not funded through official development assistance should be provided to the CME by each CPA.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is appropriate to ensure that CDM guidelines are followed in the utilization of official development assistance

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
No.	Eligibility Criteria	Minimum expected Evidence during CPA inclusion	Appopr.+ sufficient	Explanation of final result
i.	Improved household cookstove CPAs should target domestic users using solid biomass as their primary fuel, with initial emphasis on low income rural and peri-urban communities.	Target group and distribution mechanisms to be specified within respective CPA-DDs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is appropriate. Complies with paragraph 2 and 3 of the applied methodology. Non-renewable biomass is predominantly used in rural and peri-urban dwellings using inefficient three-stone fires with a default efficiency of 0.1. Methodology requires efficiency improves of not less than 20%
j.	CPAs shall follow the monitoring plan outlined in generic CPA-DD section B.7.2 (Description of the monitoring plan for a generic CPA) which adheres to applied methodology – AMS-II.G, Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities V 04.1 and Guidelines for Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programme of Activities V 3.0;	Monitoring plan in generic CPA-DD Section B.7.2 will be referenced in real case CPA-DDs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This eligibility criterion ensures that the methodology is followed by all CPAs and the prescribed sampling plan, in ex-post emission reduction calculations
k.	The ER target for each CPA shall not exceed the small-scale CPA aggregate energy savings limit of 60 GWh per year or 180 GWh thermal per year in fuel input.	This will be confirmed by multiplying the ER per household per year by the number of households in the total sales record.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Appropriate and ensures adherence to the methodology small-scale requirements
l.	CPAs shall not be a debundled component of a larger scale project activity.	As the project technologies are less than 1% of the small-scale thresholds defined by the methodology – described in PoA-DD Section B.1, or no more than 15 kW installed capacity or 0.6 GWh annual energy savings or 0.6 ktCO ₂ e annual emission reductions, the CPAs are exempted from performing a debundling check.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Appropriate and ensures adherence to UNFCCC requirements of no double counting of emission reductions.

ANNEX 8: STATEMENTS OF COMPETENCE OF INVOLVED PERSONNEL



Statement of Competence
Appointment and authorization according to the procedures
of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program

Mr. Grzegorz Kochaniewicz


SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Lead Assessor	2016-01-24
Validation/Verification	Technical Reviewer	
VCS / ISO 14064-2	Lead Assessor	2016-01-24

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA
1.2	Renewable Energies 1.2.1 Hydro 1.2.2 Wind 1.2.3 Geothermal 1.2.4 Solar
3.1	Energy Demand
14.1	Forestry

173 – Rev. 5, Date: 2014-12-12

173_S01-VA005-F20_2014-12-12_rev5.doc S01-VA005-F20_rev3 / 2012-10-25




Statement of Competence
Appointment and authorization according to the procedures
of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program

Mr. David Lubanga

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Assessor	2015-08-09
VCS / ISO 14064-2	Assessor	2015-08-09

251 - Rev. 1, Date: 2012-08-10

251_S01-F003_2012-08-10_rev1.doc S01-F003_rev2 / 2012-04-05



Statement of Competence
Appointment and authorization according to the procedures
of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program

Mr. Yongjun Li


SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification) Technical Reviewer	2016-08-26
VCS / ISO 14064-2	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification) Technical Reviewer	2016-08-26

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA	TR SUBCATEGORIES
1.2	Renewable Energies	1.2.1 Hydro 1.2.2 Wind 1.2.3 Geothermal 1.2.4 Solar 1.2.5 Total
13.1	Waste Handling and Disposal	

039 – Rev. 2, Date: 2014-09-22

039_S01-F003_2014-09-22_rev2.doc S01-F003_rev2 / 2012-04-05



Statement of Competence
Appointment and authorization according to the procedures
of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program

Mr. Stefan Winter

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification) Technical Reviewer	2017-07-27
VCS	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification) Technical Reviewer	2017-07-27


Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA	TR SUBCATEGORIES
1.1	Thermal energy generation	
1.2	Renewable Energy	1.2.1 Hydro 1.2.2 Wind 1.2.3 Geothermal 1.2.4 Solar 1.2.5 Tidal
2.2	Heat distribution	
3.1	Energy demand	
13.1	Waste handling and disposal	13.1.1 Waste management 13.1.2 Waste water management
13.2	Animal waste management	
15.2	Animal waste management	

163 – Rev. 3, Date: 2014-07-28

163_001-F003_2014-07-28_rev3.doc

001-F003 rev1 / 2011-08-02



Statement of Competence
Appointment and authorization according to the procedures
of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program

Mr. Rainer Winter

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification) Technical Reviewer	2013-07-03
JI	Senior Assessor Technical Reviewer	2013-07-03
VCS	Senior Assessor Technical Reviewer	2013-07-03

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA	TR SUBCATEGORIES
1.1	Thermal Energy Generation	
1.2	Renewable Energies	1.2.1 Hydro 1.2.2 Wind 1.2.3 Geothermal 1.2.4 Solar 1.2.5 Tidal
4.1	Cement Sector	
4.3	Iron and Steel	
4.5	Waste Heat Recovery	
5.1	Chemical Process Industries	
9.1	Metal Production	
11.1	Chemical Process Industries	
11.2	GHG Capture and Destruction	
12.1	Chemical Process Industries	
13.1	Waste Handling and Disposal	13.1.1 Waste Management

003 – Rev. 5, Date: 2011-08-01

003_001-F003_2011-08-01_rev5

001-F003 rev0 / 2010-04-19