

PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

Project ID	2616
Project Name	<i>BQS improved cookstoves for Burundi's schools</i>
Program(s)	VCS
Project Proponent	<i>Burundi Quality Stoves S.A.</i>
Methodology	<i>AMS-I.E., ver. 5 - Switch from non-renewable biomass for thermal applications by the user</i>
Sectoral Scope(s)	<i>Scope 1: "Energy Industry- Renewable/ Non-renewable Sources</i>
Validation/Verification Body (VVB)	<i>LGAI Technological Center S.A. (Applus+ Certification)</i>
Assessment Criteria	VCS Standard V4.2
Date of First Issue	10 th April 2022
Date of Final Issue	22 nd November 2022

Summary:

An accuracy review of the *BQS improved cookstoves for Burundi's schools* registration approval request has been conducted by Verra in accordance with Section 4.3 of the *Registration and Issuance Process*.

The accuracy review has raised 13 assessment findings and 5 minor findings, detailed below. The VVB, in coordination with the project proponent, is hereby required to provide a response to the assessment findings presented in Section 1. The 13 assessment findings must be addressed to the satisfaction of Verra. The VVB need not address the minor findings during this review. Please note, however, that where Verra finds consistent minor findings by the VVB in future reviews, minor findings shall be escalated to assessment findings.

This project review report will be made publicly available. Confidential information may be provided as separate attachments.

1. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

Finding 1

As per section 2.2.1 of the *VCS Standard V4.2*, Conservativeness is one of the principles that shall guide the application of, the VCS Program rules and requirements.

As per section *VCS Template V4.1*, section 4.4, should document how each equation is applied, in a manner that enables the reader to reproduce the calculation.

However, it is observed that the ex-ante estimated emission reductions in the VCS PD are significantly higher than the emissions reported under the CDM PD. No justification given in the PD regarding the same.

Therefore, the PP is required to justify the reason for this significant rise in the emissions reduction and the VVB is required to make a detailed assessment in the relevant section of its report

VVB Response:

PP had described the changes which led to higher emission reductions in the PDD submitted for Post Registration Changes to CDM which is available at [CDM: BOS improved cookstoves for Burundi's schools \(unfccc.int\)](#). Same has been now referred in section 1.4 of revised VCS PD.

VVB has verified the details which are now included in section 3.1 of revised validation report. The higher emission reductions are primarily due to change in the number of schools and students per school.

As initially envisaged in boarding schools only at project inception and initial registered version of the CDM PDD, the Government's schools canteen program has been extended to further schools including primary and secondary "non-boarding" schools (day schools), due to the lenders' growing interest in supporting food programmes for children and their families through the educative institutions and local agricultural production at the same time.

In initial submission, number of schools were 99 (boarding schools only) which is now revised to 284 (both boarding and non-boarding schools) with average number of students per school is changed from 612 to 653. The value is based on the data monitored during the verification of CDM project for the school year 2016-2017, hence this is considered acceptable by the VVB.

The VVB has cross-checked the Host Country Government's communication referred by the PP and found the same reflects the situation in which the PP is basing its decision of extending the PA to the non-boarding schools, hence the PRC regarding the extension of the PA to all type of schools along the host country instead of only adhering to the boarding schools was considered acceptable and well-founded by the VVB in its CDM's PRC assessment process, founding it also acceptable and well substantiated by institutional interest to extend the PA sustainable development contributions along other type of schools and areas of the host country.

This is the main reason behind significant rise in the emissions reductions against the initially considered by the CDM PDD.

Verra Response:

The above response is found to be OK. This finding is closed and requires no further action.

Finding 2

As per section 3.4.1 of the *VCS Standard V4.2*, “The project proponent shall use the VCS Project Description Template, an approved combined project description template available on the Verra website or an approved GHG program project description template where the project is registered under an approved GHG program, as appropriate. The project proponent shall adhere to all instructional text within the template.”

However, it was observed that the Project Name in the Project Description and Validation Report do not match the Project Name on the Verra Registry.

The PP is required to update the correct name on either on the registry or on the submitted documents.

VVB Response:

PP has updated correct name in the revised VCS PD as ‘BQS improved cookstoves for Burundi’s schools’ and same is revised in the Validation report.

Verra Response:

The project title has been corrected in the PD to be consistent with the title in the registry and the validation report.

The finding is closed.

Finding 3

As per *VCS Project Description template V4.1*, section 1.15.2 should indicate whether the project has been rejected by any other GHG programs. Where the project has been rejected, provide the relevant information, including the reason(s) for the rejection and justification of eligibility under the VCS Program.

As per *VCS Validation Report Template V4.1*, section 2.3 shall describe the individuals who were interviewed and provide additional information that provided in the project description and any supporting documents.

Although section 1.15.2 of the PD clearly states that the issuance was rejected at the time of issuance, it does not indicate the reason for the rejection. Further it was observed in section 2.3 of the VR that the interview topics covered during the remote audit did not include why the project’s first CDM issuance request was rejected.

Therefore, the PP is required to include the same and the VVB shall give its opinion regarding the same in the VR.

VVB Response:

PP has now revised section 1.15.2 of VCS PD and VVB has assessed and provided the assessment in section 3.1 of revised validation report.

Section 2.3 of validation report already provides details for the individuals who were interviewed and other necessary details as required.

Section 2.3 of validation report did not include interview topic about issuance request being rejected as same DOE has performed the assessment for the rejected verification and the additional PRC in the issuance track for CDM. Being known the reasons by the VVB (DOE for the CDM process), and considering the same during the assessment, the VVB has evaluated its previous responses to the CDM EB and now, it has incorporated the same to the Validation Report’s section 3.1. for the sake of clarity on the VVB’s opinion.

Verra Response:

The VVB must describe how was the ground truthing of the briquette consumption in the project scenario performed in the VR. Further they must ensure that the end users have a similar renewable energy consumption as claimed by the third-party tests.

The finding remains open.

VVB Response:

The VVB has cross-checked minutes of cookstove installations receipts and briquettes delivery notes (please refer to Section 3.1. of the Validation Report in which is specified that the VVB has conducted a site visit and checked this relevant documentation). The VVB as a part of CDM Verification and PRC had conducted site visit, checked the documents and had interviews with stakeholders, and has referred different third party reports (as described in Section 3.1 of the Validation Report), *inter alia*, the report by Ministry of Education of Burundi (Directorate of Region Ngozi), “*Rapport sur l’utilisation d’un nouveau combustible*” (Report about the use of a new fuel) which in conclusion summarizes stating that in average a 1,500 students school consumes 150 kg. of briquettes per day against 8 to 10 steres of wood, and that they recommend its utilization.

Considering the 350 kg/stere and the average from 8 to 10 steres per day, that leads to a result of a ratio between 18.6 and 23.3 times of higher efficiency of the briquettes. Considering these ranges can vary greatly from school to school (as shown by the aforementioned report plus those included already in the Section 3.1. of the Validation Report) depending on the baseline type of wood used, weather conditions, cooking practices, number of students, *inter alia*, the results shown in the survey efforts by the PP are deemed reasonable.

Also shall be taken into account that the parameter $M_{\text{woody_biomass_hist_pp,i}}$ is conservative. This has been evaluated by the VVB by comparison of two scenarios as provided by the PP, as follows:

Historical consumption of woody biomass per person dependant on the kitchen i (tonnes per person)
 ($M_{\text{woody_biomass_hist_pp,i}}$)

Historical data from Education ministry (28/06/2017) provides the following up-to-date figures in kg per day or stere per day based on records across 15 boarding schools around Bujumbura and 12 day schools in three different provinces of the country¹:

The average historical wood fuel consumption of the boarding schools over the last three years prior to project start (2009, 2010 and 2011) is 9.3 wood steres per day per school and the average historical wood fuel consumption of day schools in 2017 is **5 kg per student per day**. A comparison reveals that the latter value is more conservative.

The following ex-ante assumptions are used for converting the boarding school value into kg through dividing the mean historical woodfuel consumption by the historical number of persons per school:

¹ Kirundo, Ngozi and Muyinga.

The data available for the 12 day schools are representative of the historical woodfuel consumption per student for the following reasons:

- i. The same traditional food with same cooking practices is observed in all schools' kitchens requiring the same amount of energy.
- ii. Same woodfuel type (non-renewable biomass) is used in all schools' kitchens around Burundi.
- iii. Same climate can be observed around all the country thus not having any differential impacts over the energy consumption for cooking activities around the country.

- The average number of students per school is 653.
- The students are at school during 226 days over 365².
- A factor of 0.35 is used for converting stere into tonnes of woodfuel (GTZ-HERA, Manual for Programs and Projects to Implement Cooking Energy Interventions, 2012).

While boarding schools serve lunch and dinner, day schools provide for breakfast and lunch.

Calculation for one year:

The historical consumption per person per school per year will be obtained by multiplying the daily consumption by 226 days.

School's historical consumption per person of woodfuel in tonne/days/year

	$M_{\text{woody_biomass_hist_pp,i}}$	$M_{\text{woody_biomass_hist_pp,i}}$
SCHOOL	<i>tonnes per capita per day</i>	<i>tonnes per capita per year</i>
Conservative baseline consumption retained	0.005	1.13

The parameter $M_{\text{woody_biomass_hist_pp,i}}$ is hence conservative. This has been evaluated by the VVB and found to be acceptable and conservative for the determination of the parameter, which also influences the estimation of the substituted non-renewable biomass.

In conclusion, the ranges identified in the PP's calculations of substituted/displaced non-renewable woody biomass are considered likely to occur in the project's scenario, considering all the identified variables (hence reasonable to show very different ratios of substitution depending on the combinations of such variables), and between the expected ranges of efficiency if we take into account the experiments of using briquettes with traditional cooking stoves and the introduction of IICS with nearly 80% higher efficiency against the baseline ones.

Considering the above, and after the consultation of the different sources and evidences, plus the observations done during the onsite assessment, the VVB considers the calculations acceptable and conservative and likely to occur within the ranges of substitution of NRB in the project's scenario resulting from the different studies, circumstances and conservative assumptions.

Verra Response:

The supportive documents submitted by the VVB are found to be OK. However, a clear reference of the source of the baseline value **5kg/per student per day** is not available. Therefore, the VVB is required to provide the same.

Further, it is found that the baseline consumption in the CDM PD was 1.28 ton/capita/yr whereas under VCS baseline value is stated as 1.13 ton/capita/yr. Therefore, the VVB must include this as a PD deviation under VCS.

VVB response: PP has made necessary changes in the VCS PD and corresponding changes also made in the FVR.

² Three-year average. Student holiday calendar for 2016/17 to 2018/19 is provided to the VVB. The finally applicable value will be determined ex-post. See above.

The evidence of the baseline value for wood consumption of 5 kg/per student per day is provided along with this response and the reference has been included accordingly in the relevant provided documents.

Verra Response:

The above response is found to be OK. This finding is closed and requires no further action.

Finding 4

As per *VCS Project Description template V4.1*, section 1.18 should describe the leakage management plan and implementation of leakage and risk mitigation measures.

As per para 10 and 11 of the applied CDM Methodology, leakage consideration is required.

However, section 1.18 of the submitted PD states that no leakage is considered for the project activity whereas, the project has reported some leakage emissions in the subsequent sections of the PD.

Therefore, the PP is required to indicate the plan to manage and mitigate the same in the relevant section of the PD and the VVB is required to assess the same.

VVB Response:

PP has revised section 1.18. Since the current project is non AFOLU project this section is not applicable. VVB referred to VCS-Validation-Report-template version 4.1. In section 3.1 it is mentioned that; under Additional information relevant to the project, including:

- Leakage management for AFOLU projects
- Commercially sensitive information

Thus, the assessment has not been presented being this project not an AFOLU project and has been considered acceptable.

Verra Response:

The above response is found to be OK. This finding is closed and requires no further action.

Finding 5

As per section 3.18.2 of the *VCS Standard V4.2*, methodology deviations shall not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals, except where they result in increased accuracy of such quantification. Deviations relating to any other part of the methodology shall not be permitted.

In section 3.6 of the PD, the PP indicates a change in project design regarding replacement of ex-ante indicative Turkish manufactured cook stove by “Institutional Improved Cook Stove (IICS)” (price and design reasons) and focus on installation of new IICS (as opposed to refurbishment of masonry stoves for briquettes consumption) for technical-economic reasons.

The PP and the VVB are requested to justify and assess the impact of design change on baseline and additionality. In addition to this, it is noted that a PRC for this project was rejected by CDM and has not

been mentioned in validation report or PD. The VVB is required to justify how does this project meet the gap validation requirements, if the project design is not the same as registered CDM PD.

VVB Response:

The PP in the registered version of the CDM PDD had estimated a type of stove that finally has not been adopted. Hence the PP has corrected such information to adapt the CDM PDD version 2.0 i. e. latest PDD to the real circumstances of the PA.

The PA was initially designed to count with a stove with capacity from 2.49KW_{th} to 4.82 KW_{th} (page 8 of the registered version of the CDM PDD.) This initial design has been described in the registered version of the PDD as an indicative choice. Due to reasons related to price and capacity, the PP has finally adopted another model of stoves.

The initially considered type of stove was supposed to cover the necessities of around 50 students, while the adopted type of stove covers the necessities of around 197 students, which can be explained by its increased thermal power and efficiency.

The DOE has cross-checked the technical details of the Large IICS as provided in the CDM PDD version 2.0 (*inter alia*, Section A.3., Section B.6.2) founding that the thermal output capacity is 32.78 kW_{th} and the efficiency equals to 44.8%. The same has been found correct in light of the stove tests performed by CRUEA on April 2019.

The DOE has also cross-checked a technical document provided by the International Lifeline Fund Institutional Stove Construction Manual confirming the technical details of the IICS.

The changes applied also affect to the estimation of emission reductions of the project activity, and the consequential changes have been applied in the ER Calculation Sheet provided by the PP.

The applied change does not affect the additionality of the project activity as per the details in the VCS PD.

The calculations given the new technical parameters of the stove type currently deployed under the PA have been cross-checked by the DOE founding the project size limit calculations/ for the compliance with the SSC thresholds to be consistently determined under current PA circumstances.

The DOE, based on verification site visit observations as a part of CDM verification process, remote audit during current validation, provided technical details of the Large IICS and the information contained in both the CDM PDD version 2.0 and the ER Calculation Sheet found this change acceptable and in line with the current implementation status of the PA and the requirements for Project Design Changes. Further, PP has excluded from the project activity the possibility of including refurbished masonry stoves in the scope of the latter in the CDM PDD version 2.0 and also applied such change in the ER Calculation Sheet.

The DOE has found consistently applied this change along the aforementioned documents.

The DOE, during the process of CDM verification site visit had noticed that there were no refurbished masonry stoves in the project activity, hence this change in the project design is accepted and consistent with the actual project's implementation status, not adversely affecting its capability to operate and reduce emissions in the host country in comparison with the originally registered information and conception of the project activity. Same was further confirmed during remote audit conducted.

The reason of the PRC not being applied finally on the CDM PDD, leading to a difference between the estimations and design characteristics done at PDD level against those in this VCS PD, is that the PRC has been requested in Issuance Track of the CDM PRC procedures (as the type of changes were suitable to be submitted along with issuance request as per the PS for PAs and other UNFCCC CDM Regulatory documents, as applicable), so, being rejected the issuance, the PRC has neither been applied

Verra Response:

The VVB must describe how was the baseline, the SSC threshold assessed given that 1372 IICS with each rated thermal output of 32.78kWth will be installed. They must also depict continued additionality with this new IICS implemented and the project's continued applicability to the applied methodology.

VVB Response:

The applied changes as per PRC do not affect baseline, additionality and applicability of methodology. To maintain clarity regarding SSC threshold, VVB has now revised section 3.1 to add the assessment of the same.

The reason of the PRC not being applied finally on the CDM PDD, leading to difference between design characteristics at PDD level is because, PRC was requested in the issuance track request and being reject for issuance, the PRC has neither been applied.

Verra Response:

The above response is found to be OK.

This finding is closed.

Finding 6

The VVB has mentioned in section 2.2 of the VR, the documents were reviewed during the RCP validation and Verification process. Whereas this is a gap validation. The VVB is required to update the same with the correct information.

It was observed that the VVB mentions in section 2.3 that it verified the technical details & metering/monitoring arrangement verified through onsite photographs/name plates and calibration certificates shared by PP. All the documents were cross checked to ensure conservative estimation of emission reduction.

However, these documents may not be required in a project activity which involves distribution of cookstoves. Therefore, the VVB is required to remove or correct this irrelevance.

VVB Response:

Section 2.2 are now revised to provide correct information and irrelevant information is now deleted.

Verra Response:

The above response is found to be OK. This finding is closed and requires no further action.

Finding 7

As per VCS *Project Description Template V4.1*, section 2.5 should describe the process for the resolution of findings (corrective actions, clarifications or other findings) raised by the validation team during the validation.

However, it was observed that the same was missing from section 2.5 of the VR, the VVB is required to include the same.

VVB Response:

Section 2.5 of validation report provides the process for resolution of findings. Since a summary of each finding, including the issue raised, the response(s) provided by the project proponent, and the final conclusion and any resulting changes to project documents did not fit on one page, all findings are presented in the appendix 2 of the report.

Verra Response:

Section 2.5 of the VR still lacks information on the process of resolution of findings. The VVB must clearly include the process in this section.

The finding remains open.

VVB Response:

Section 2.5 of validation report provides the process for resolution of findings as follows,

*The objective of this phase of Validation was to resolve the requests for corrective actions and clarification and any other outstanding issues from previous validation which need to be clarified for Applus+ Certification's positive conclusion on the VCS PD. The Corrective Action Requests and Clarification Requests raised by Applus+ Certification **were resolved during communications between the Client and Applus+ Certification to guarantee the transparency of the validation process**, the concerns raised, and responses given are summarized below in the Appendix 2.*

Verra Response:

The above response is found to be OK. This finding is closed and requires no further action.

Finding 8

As per VCS Validation Report Template V4.1, section 3.3.7 should identify any methodology deviations applied to the project and describe the steps taken to validate each deviation. Include information with respect to how the following has been assessed, whether the deviation meets with the criteria and specifications for permitted methodology deviations. Whether the deviation negatively impacts the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals (except where they result in increased accuracy). Provide an overall conclusion regarding whether any methodology deviations applied to the project are valid.

However, the VVB has only inserted the instructional text of the template and has not reported its assessment in section 3.3.7.

Therefore, the VVB is require assessing section 3.6 of the VCS PD and provide its assessment in this section of the VR.

VVB Response:

VVB has confirmed that section 3.6 of the VCS PD does not identify any methodology deviation and hence section 3.3.7 of validation report is revised accordingly.

As the PD does not have a particular section for project design deviations and other kind of deviations that are not strictly related to the methodology, and considering the PRC in issuance track issue as commented in other findings and also in revised Validation Report, the VVB asked the project participant, for the sake of transparency, to include the deviations that were included in the CDM PRC in issuance

track in that section, at least to inform the VCS about the deviations with transparent description of the same. Being not methodology deviation, the Validation Report for in the section for its assessment, concluded that there were no methodology deviations applicable at this stage-

Verra Response:

The VVB must ensure that the information in section 3.6 of the VCS PD is moved to either section 1.1 or 1.11 to minimize any possible misinterpretation.

The finding remains open.

VVB Response:

Revised VCS PD version 3.2 was checked and it is confirmed that information in section 3.6 is now moved to section 1.1 and found appropriate.

Verra Response:

The above response is found to be OK. This finding is closed and requires no further action.

Finding 9

As per section 3.6 of the *VCS Standard V4.2*, “Project and jurisdictional proponents shall demonstrate that they have the legal right to control and operate project or program activities.”

It is to be noted that a host country DNA letter of approval alone does not constitute proof of ownership. The PP should establish the project ownership by presenting documents stated in section 3.6.1 of the *VCS Standard V4.2*.

Therefore, the PP is required to present this document and the VVB shall include an assessment on how it validated and accepted the same.

VVB Response:

PP has shared Emission Reduction Purchase Agreement between Burundi Quality Stoves S. A and AERA group dated 19-April-2020. VVB has gone through the copy of the document submitted and presented the assessment in section 3.1 of revised validation report.

Verra Response:

The above response is found to be OK.

The finding is closed.

Finding 10

As per *VCS Project Description Template V4.1*, section 1.8 should indicate, and provide justification for, the project start date, specifying the day, month and year.

As per section 3.7, *VCS Standard V4.2*, the project start date of a non-AFOLU project is the date on which the project began generating GHG emission reductions or removals.

However, it is observed that section 1.8 of the PD does not provide any justification on 25th January 2016 being the start date of the project. Further, the text of the VR does not provide any clear

justification on what basis was the project start date accepted.

The PP is required to provide a clear justification on the rationale behind reporting the stated project start date and the VVB shall include an assessment on how it validated the same.

VVB Response:

The project implementation start date is 25-January-2016. This is also crediting period start date which is evident on the CDM project webpage. Hence this date is accepted as Project start date.

Verra Response:

The above response is found to be OK. This finding is closed and requires no further action.

Finding 11

As per VCS *Validation Report Template V4.1*, section 2.2 should describe how the validation was performed as an audit where the project description and any supporting documents were reviewed, cross-checked and compared with identified and stated requirements.

It is observed that while the VVB has only provided the list of documents reviewed under this section and has not provided details in line with the template.

Therefore, the VVB is required to update this section as per the template instructions.

VVB Response:

Section 2.2 of the revised VALIDATION REPORT now describes how validation was performed as an audit.

Verra Response:

The above response is found to be OK. This finding is closed and requires no further action.

Finding 12

As per VCS *Validation Report Template V4.1*, section 3.2.2 should summarize any stakeholder input received during the local stakeholder consultation. Assess whether the project proponent has taken due account of all and any input and provide an overall conclusion regarding local stakeholder input.

Include the project proponent's response to all input, describe any resultant changes to the project design and provide an explanation of how the project proponent's responses are appropriate.

However, section 3.2.2 of the submitted VR does not contain information as per the latest VCS Validation Report Template. Therefore, the VVB is required to update the same.

VVB Response:

As per VCS standard 4.2, para 3.20.5 (1) For projects registered under the CDM, the cover page and sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15.1, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18 and 3.6 of the VCS Project Description Template shall be completed. A validation/verification body shall undertake a validation of same, which shall be accompanied by a validation representation, to provide a gap validation for the project's compliance with the VCS Program rules. Since local stakeholder consultation is not part of above-mentioned sections of VCS PD gap validation for the project's compliance with the VCS program rules is not undertaken.

Verra Response:

The above response is found to be OK. This finding is closed and requires no further action.

Finding 13

As per VCS *Project Description Template V4.1*, section 1.15.1 should Indicate whether the project has been registered or is seeking registration under any other GHG programs. Where the project has been registered under any other GHG program, provide the registration number and details.

The PP states in section 1.15.1 of the PD that the project was registered under the Clean Development Mechanism with Project ID 9791 on 21- September-2020. However, the actual project registration date was found to be 5th March 2014 as per the CDM website.

Therefore, the PP is required to include the correct registration date and the VVB shall include an assessment on how it validated and accepted the same.

VVB Response:

Section 1.15.1 of VCS PD mentions project registration date with CDM as 05-March-2014 and same is updated in the revised validation report section 3.1

Verra Response:

The above response is found to be OK. This finding is closed and requires no further action.

2. MINOR FINDINGS

Finding 1

Please adjust the following minor findings in the project description document:

- 1) The VVB is required to provide a sign off from the appropriate VVB office in the Validation Report.
- 2) The PP has referenced to VCS Standard V4.2 as per the PD. However, it is observed that the VVB is choosing to refer to VCS Standard V4.1 in several section of the VR. The VVB is requested to maintain consistency in the references made in both PD and VR.
- 3) The link of the CDM project page in section 1.4 of the PD is not accessible. The PP is required to update it.
- 4) The table heading under section 2.3 is stated as “Telephonic interviews of household users by validation team “whereas the project caters to schools as stated in the column heading of the table. The VVB is required to correct this.
- 5) Emission reductions calculation sheet and installation database shall be submitted to Verra for review

VVB response:

- 1) The VVB has provided the signed “VCS Verification Deed of Representation” like for any other VCS verification assessment, which is the VCS requirement in accordance with the VCS Standard Section 4.1.14. Likewise, the VR in its page 2 already provided who is the approval authority from the accredited VVB (signatory of the Deed in consequence).
- 2) VCS standard version 4.2 is now made consistent in the revised VR.
- 3) Section 1.4 of PD is revised accordingly.
- 4) The table heading is corrected as “Telephonic interviews of users by validation team “in section 2.3 of VR.

- 5) Both the documents are being submitted to VERRA for review.

3. ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

On 18th April 2022 Verra concluded a review of the validation approval request for project BQS improved cookstoves for Burundi's schools and raised the 13 assessment findings detailed above.

On 3rd May 2022 Verra submitted the review report to the VVB LGAI Technological Center S.A. (Applus+ Certification) and the project proponent Burundi Quality Stoves S.A.

On 22nd November 2022, Verra closed all findings.