Standardized Crediting Framework (SCF): Article 6 Model for Energy Access Rwanda

Verification report template for improved cookstoves

*Guidance on how to complete this report template is provided in the document ‘Standardized Crediting Framework (SCF): Article 6 model for energy access Rwanda: Verification guidance for improved cookstoves’.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | 1.0 | **Date approved** | 06/04/2023 |
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# General activity[[1]](#footnote-2) information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Activity title |  |
| 2 | National activity lead institution |  |
| 3 | Activity ID# |  |
| 4 | SCF methodology and version |  |
| 5 | Listing date (DD/MM/YYYY) |  |
| 6 | Activity contact: Name |  |
| 7 | Activity contact: Email |  |
| 8 | Activity contact: Phone |  |
| 9 | Activity start date (DD/MM/YYY) |  |
| 10 | Crediting period start date (DD/MM/YYYY) |  |
| 11 | Crediting period end date (DD/MM/YYYY) |  |
| 12 | Date of submission of verification report |  |
| 13 | Version of submitted verification report |  |
| 14 | Current monitoring period start date (DD/MM/YYYY) |  |
| 15 | Current monitoring period end date (DD/MM/YYYY) |  |
| 16 | Date(s) of site visit (DD/MM/YYYY) |  |
| 17 | Location(s) of site visit |  |

# Designated operational entity (DOE)[[2]](#footnote-3) information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 18 | DOE name |  |
| 19 | Oversight body accrediting DOE |  |
| 20 | Expiration date of accreditation (if relevant) |  |
| 21 | DOE contact: Name |  |
| 22 | DOE contact: Email |  |
| 23 | DOE contact: Phone |  |

# Executive summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 24 | *(Please provide brief summary of the activity - including the purpose and general description and location - scope of the verification, verification process and conclusion)* |

# Conclusion of verification and level of assurance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 25 | Overall verification opinion | Positive  Negative |
| 26 | Verified emission reductions for current monitoring period | [XXXX] tCO2e |
| 27 | Unqualified opinion[[3]](#footnote-4) | Based on the process and procedure conducted, [*DOE name*] provides reasonable assurance that the emissions reductions for [*activity name*] are:   * free from material errors and are a fair representation of the greenhouse gas data and information, and * prepared in line with the related SCF program protocol, methodology and other relevant documents |
| 28 | (If overall verification is negative, please check below and state reasons)[[4]](#footnote-5)  Qualified opinion  Disclaimer  Adverse opinion | [*State reasons*] |

# Overview of verification results

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 29 | **Item** | **Verification requirements** | **No CAR or CL remaining** |
| 30 | Compliance with listing template and methodology | The DOE determines the compliance of the activity and its operation with the eligibility and other requirements of the listing template and applied methodology. | Yes  No |
| 31 | Implementation as per the Listing Template | The DOE assesses the status of the actual activity and its operation in relation to the approved listing template. | Yes  No |
| 32 | Compliance and correction of measured values with related requirements | The DOE determines the compliance and correction of measured values with related requirements. | Yes  No |
| 33 | Data and calculation of emission reductions | The DOE assesses the data and calculations of greenhouse gas emission reductions achieved by the activity by the application of the methodology, as well as the sampling approach, where relevant. | Yes  No |
| 34 | Avoiding double counting | The DOE confirms that the activity is not registered in another crediting activity, except in the case of the activity, which may be registered under the clean development mechanism. | Yes  No |
| 35 | Post-listing changes | The DOE confirms that any post-listing changes to the activity do not comprise the activity’s compliance with the requirements of the listing template or applied methodology. | Yes  No |

# Authorized signature

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Authorised signatory** | Title (Mr/Ms/Dr): | |
| Last name: | First name: | |
| Position/designation: | | |
| Signature | | Date (DD/MM/YYYY): |

# Verification team and other experts

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Company | Function | Technical competence | On-site visit |
| Mr  Ms |  |  | Lead DOE |  | Yes  No |
| Mr  Ms |  |  |  |  | Yes  No |
| Mr  Ms |  |  |  |  | Yes  No |
| Mr  Ms |  |  |  |  | Yes  No |
| Mr  Ms |  |  |  |  | Yes  No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: Function = role of personnel in the verification such as team leader, team member, technical expert, or internal reviewer; technical competence = confirm that personnel have sufficient technical competence related to the activity under verification. On-site visit = whether the expert participate in an on-site visit

# Objectives and scope of verification

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 36 | *(Please explain the objectives and scope, including the dates of monitoring period covered, and dates/versions of monitoring templates covered.* |

# Verification process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 37 | *(Please explain the process of verification, including any site visit conducted* |

# Means of verification, findings and conclusions based on reporting requirements

## Compliance of the activity implementation with requirements in the listing template and applied methodology

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 38 | **Means of verification** |
|  |  |
| 39 | **Findings** |
|  | *(Please state if corrective action requests (CARs), clarifications (CLs), or forward action requests (FARs) are raised and how they are resolved)* |
| 40 | **Conclusions based on reporting requirements** |
|  | *(Please state conclusion based on reporting requirements)* |

## Implementation as per the listing template

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 41 | **Means of verification** |
|  |  |
| 42 | **Findings** |
|  | *(Please state if CARs, CLs, or FARs are raised and how they are resolved)* |
| 43 | **Conclusions based on reporting requirements** |
|  | *(Please state conclusion based on reporting requirements)* |

## Compliance and correction of measured values with related requirements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 44 | **Means of verification** |
|  |  |
| 45 | **Findings** |
|  | *(Please state if CARs, CLs, or FARs are raised and how they are resolved)* |
| 46 | **Conclusions based on reporting requirements** |
|  | *(Please state conclusion based on reporting requirements)* |

## Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 47 | **Means of verification** |
| 48 | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Parameters | Monitored values and dates of monitoring | Method to check values in the monitoring template and/or monitoring calculation Tool with sources | |  |  |  | |  |  |  | |
| 49 | **Findings** |
|  | *(Please state if CARs, CLs, or FARs are raised and how they are resolved)* |
| 50 | **Conclusions based on reporting requirements** |
|  | *(Please state conclusion based on reporting requirements, including non-material errors identified)* |

## Assessment of avoidance of double registration

*[Note that during the SCF, registration of the activity under the CDM is allowed, as explained in the verification guidance and program protocol]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 51 | **Means of verification** |
|  |  |
| 52 | **Findings** |
|  | *(Please state if CARs, CLs, or FARs are raised and how they are resolved)* |
| 53 | **Conclusions based on reporting requirements** |
|  | *(Please state conclusion based on reporting requirements)* |

## Assessment of post-listing changes

[*Note: as per the verification guidance, this is only relevant if there are changes to the activity, but it still meets all of the requirements of the listing template and applied methodology. In that case, the revisions to the listing template may be noted here. If the activity no longer meets the requirements, then it cannot be positively verified.]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Means of verification** |
| 54 |  |
| 55 | **Findings** |
|  | *(Please state if CARs, CLs, or FARs are raised and how they are resolved)* |
| 56 | **Conclusions based on reporting requirements** |
|  | *(Please state conclusion based on reporting requirements)* |

# Assessment of response to remaining issues

An assessment of response to the remaining issues including FARs from the previous verification period, if appropriate

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 57 |  |

# Future improvements and other issues

Where relevant, recommendations for improvement in accuracy and transparency of reporting; and robustness of data accounting and control processes. In addition, any other relevant information that the DOE may want to bring to attention to the Administrator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 58 |  |

# Supporting references and documentation

List of documentation provided (as PDF attachments) to justify each of the responses above, where applicable. These documents shall be included as an Annex to the verification report. Add extra lines as necessary.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ref no** | **Description of documentation** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Version history

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Version* | *Date* | *Contents revised* |
| 1.0 | DD/MM/YYYY | Initial adoption |

1. The activity (i.e., projects or programs) described in the activity documentation under the CDM, SCF, Article 6.4 mechanism, or another crediting mechanism, capable of generating emission reductions under a crediting mechanism  [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. The accredited entity designated under the relevant crediting mechanism, which performs verification of the activity performance and eligibility.  [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. An unqualified opinion means that the DOE confirms that all outstanding concerns raised have been resolved. The final verification report should only be submitted after all concerns have been adequately addressed. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. (1) A **qualified opinion** means that the DOE finds potentially material concerns regarding the emission reductions calculations reported. DOEs write up a qualified opinion in much the same way as an unqualified opinion, with the exception that they state the reasons they are not able to present an unqualified opinion. A common for reason for auditors issuing a qualified opinion is that the project developer missed submitting one of the documents. (2) A **disclaimer opinion** is given when the DOE is distancing themselves from providing any opinion at all related to the integrity of the verification report. Some of the reasons that DOEs may issue a disclaimer of opinion are because they felt that the company limited their ability to conduct a thorough audit or they could not get satisfactory explanations for their questions. The DOE may not have been able to decipher the correct nature of some of the report’s contents or to secure enough evidence to support the results claimed by the activity. (3) An **adverse opinion** is issued when the DOE is not at all satisfied with the results claimed by the activity, or when the DOE discovers a high level of material misstatements or irregularities. An adverse opinion is a big red flag and it indicates that the verification report contains gross misstatements and is in all likelihood overestimating the results achieved. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)