

PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

This project review report includes findings raised during Verra's review of the project specified below. The VVB must address the findings before the project request can be considered for approval by Verra. The project review report will be made publicly available on the Verra Registry. Confidential information may be provided in separate attachments.

Project ID	2942
Project Name	Clean Cooking- Cook Stove for Rural India
Review Type	Validation and Verification Approval
Program(s)	SD VISta Program
Verification Period	16 June 2022 – 30 September 2022
Project Proponent	Vitol Asia Pte Ltd & EKI Energy Services Ltd.
VVB	RINA Services S.p.A (RINA)
Assessment Criteria	<i>Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0</i>
Date of First Issue	7 February 2024
Date of Second Issue	30 May 2024
Review Conclusion	Approved
Date of Final Issue	04 June 2024

FINDINGS

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
1	Indicator 1.4.1		
	<u>Issue</u> Row 1 in Section 1 of the project description uses indicator 1.4.1. The project proponent has not provided a baseline for this indicator. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent has provided baseline measurement for indicator 1.4.1. If no baseline can be provided, the project proponent must choose a more suitable indicator or create a self-defined indicator. 2. All relevant sections of the project description and monitoring report must be updated as necessary. 3. The VVB must assess the changes and update the relevant sections of the validation and/or verification reports as necessary. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0</i> <i>SD VISta Project Description Template, v1.0, Section 1</i> UN Metadata	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> PP has now revised the corresponding cell (row-1) of the section 1 of the updated Project Description v.3.0 and the monitoring report with a self-defined project-specific indicator. The assessment on the same is also revised accordingly in the revised validation report and verification report. The relevant changes have been updated in the revised validation report and verification report. <u>Verra Response</u> The indicator has been revised. This is sufficient to close the finding.	Closed
2	Indicator 5.4.1		
	<u>Issue</u> Row 4 in Section 1 of the project description uses indicator 5.4.1. The project proponent has not provided a baseline for this indicator.	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> PP has now revised the corresponding cell (row-4) of the section 1 of the updated Project Description v.3.0 with a self-defined project-specific indicator. The monitoring report is also	Closed

	<u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent has provided baseline measurement for indicator 5.4.1. If no baseline can be provided, the project proponent must choose a more suitable indicator or create a self-defined indicator. 2. All relevant sections of the project description and monitoring report must be updated as necessary. 3. The VVB must assess the changes and update the relevant sections of the validation and/or verification reports as necessary. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0 SD VSta Project Description Template, v1.0, Section 1 UN Metadata	revised to address the revision done in the project description. The baseline survey questionnaire has been furnished to support the pre-project scenario of higher time spent to collect the firewood. The relevant changes have been updated in the revised validation report and verification report.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> The indicator has been revised. This is sufficient to close the finding.	

3 Indicator 8.3.1			
	<u>Issue</u> Row 6 in Section 1 of the project description uses indicator 8.3.1. The project proponent has not provided a baseline for this indicator.	Round 1	Closed
	<u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent has provided baseline measurement for indicator 8.3.1. If no baseline can be provided, the project proponent must choose a more suitable indicator	<u>VVB Response-</u> Direct and indirect employment has been generated due to the implementation of the project in the rural villages of India. The project proponent has already defined a project specific indicator for the project which is "Proportion of informal employment in non-agriculture employment, by sex." The	

	or create a self-defined indicator. 2. All relevant sections of the project description and monitoring report must be updated as necessary. 3. The VVB must assess the changes and update the relevant sections of the validation and/or verification reports as necessary. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0</i> <i>SD VSta Project Description Template, v1.0, Section 1</i> UN Metadata	project proponent has now elaborated the description in the revised PD in the corresponding cell (row-6). The relevant changes have been updated in the Validation report and verification report. <u>Verra Response</u> The finding cannot be closed. <u>Issue</u> 1. The indicator is labled 8.3.1 but is a self-defined indicator. 2. It is unclear whether project employees (who will be considered non-agriculture employees in the informal sector) may have already been employed or had the opportunity to become employed in other informal sector positions in the baseline scenario. <u>Action required</u> 1. The indicator number must be removed from the indicator column. 2. The VVB must either: a. Clarify how the project has ensured project employees have not already been employed, or had the opportunity to become employed in other informal sector positions in the baseline scenario or; b. Provide a baseline measurement of informal, non-agricultural employment. Round 2 <u>VVB Response</u> 1. The indicator number has been removed from the indicator column in both revised PD and MR by the PP. Necessary	
--	---	--	--

		changes are carried out in the revised validation report and verification report. 2. The PP has now revised the indicator suitably to make it project specific.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> The PP has provided a project specific indicator. This is sufficient to close the finding.	

4	SDG Indicator 9.3		
	<u>Issue</u> Row 7 uses a self-defined indicator under SDG target 9.3. It is unclear how employment created by the project contributes to this target. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent justifies how this is an appropriate indicator for this target. 2. All relevant sections of the project description and monitoring report must be updated as necessary. 3. The VVB must assess the changes and update the relevant sections of the validation and/or verification reports as necessary. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0</i> <i>SD VSta Project Description Template, v1.0, Section 1</i> UN Metadata	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> The employment created in the manufacturing sector through the project activity would lead to increased man-hours in the industry, facilitating the growth of the small-scale industries. PP has duly presented the corresponding justification for how the creation of man-hours would lead to the contribution in target 9.3. Additionally, PP has submitted the employment records for the manufacturing unit, as well as the purchase orders initiated by the PP to the manufacturing unit for the same. The relevant changes have been updated in the revised validation report and verification report. <u>Verra Response</u> This finding cannot be closed. <u>Issue</u> Target 9.3 is aimed increasing access of small-scale enterprises to financial services and markets. Man hours worked is an employment based target, therefore relevant under SDG 8, not 9.	Closed

		<u>Action required</u> The VVB must ensure the project either: - Includes an appropriate contribution under target 9.3 OR - Removes this contribution.	
		Round 2	
		<u>VVB Response</u> As mentioned in the VERRA response, 'man hours worked' is an employment-based target. Therefore, in the revised PD & MR, the project proponent has now shifted it to SDG 8, as number of jobs created, which focuses on employment and economic growth, So, the SDG 9 is now removed by the project proponent in the revised PD and MR. Necessary changes are carried out in the revised validation report and verification report.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> The SDG target has been revised. This is sufficient to close the finding.	

5	SDG Indicator 11.1		
	<u>Issue</u> Row 8 uses a self-defined indicator under SDG target 11.1. The project proponent has not provided a baseline for this indicator. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must ensure the project proponent has provided baseline measurement for indicator under target 11.1. If no baseline can be provided, the project proponent must choose a	Round 1	Closed
		<u>VVB Response</u> The project proponent has revised the PD and monitoring report to describe elaborately about the baseline scenario for the indicator. The relevant changes have been updated in the revised validation report and verification report.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> The indicator has been revised. This is sufficient to close the	

	more suitable indicator or create a self-defined indicator. 2. All relevant sections of the project description and monitoring report must be updated as necessary. 3. The VVB must assess the changes and update the relevant sections of the validation and/or verification reports as necessary. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0 SD VISta Project Description Template, v1.0, Section 1 UN Metadata	finding.	
--	---	----------	--

6 Indicator 13.0			
	<u>Issue</u> The project proponent has not used the required indicator to account for ERs (Tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions avoided or removed). <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent uses the required indicator for SDG 13. 2. All relevant sections of the project description and monitoring report must be updated as necessary. 3. The VVB must assess the changes and update the relevant sections of the validation and/or verification reports as necessary. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> The project proponent has now revised the VCS PD and MR with the correct indicator of SDG 13. The relevant changes have been updated in the revised validation report and verification report. <u>Verra Response</u> This finding cannot be closed. <u>Issue</u> The SD VISta PD and MR have not been updated and still contain indicator 13.2.2 which is not the correct indicator for accounting for ERs. <u>Action required</u>	Closed

	SD VSta Project Description Template, v1.0, Section 1	The VVB must ensure the project proponent uses the required indicator for SDG 13 as described in the template instructions.	
		Round 2	
		<u>VVB Response</u> The project proponent has revised the PD & MR to use the required indicator for SDG 13 as described in the template instructions. Necessary changes are carried out in the revised validation and verification report.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> The indicator has been revised. This is sufficient to close the finding.	

7 Dates of Stakeholder Consultations			
	<u>Issue</u> Section 2.1.3 of the project description does not include the dates of stakeholder consultations. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent updates Section 2.1.3 to include the dates of all key project implementation activities, including stakeholder consultations. 2. All relevant sections of the project description and monitoring report must be updated as necessary. 3. The VVB must assess the changes and update the relevant sections of the validation and/or verification reports as necessary. <u>Program Rule(s)</u>	Round 1	Closed
		<u>VVB Response-</u> The project proponent has now revised the section 2.1.3 of the PD and monitoring report to include the relevant information regarding the stakeholders' consultation date, and other key project implementation activities.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> The implementation schedule has been revised to contain the dates of stakeholder consultations. This is sufficient to close the finding.	

	Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0, Section 2.1.4		
--	---	--	--

8	Other entities not disclosed		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 2.1.5 of the project description does not list any other entities involved in the project. Section 2.1.2 and 2.1.10 of the project description mention implementing partners. It is unclear who these implementing partners are and what their relation is to the project. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent describes any entities involved with the project and fully discloses their roles/responsibilities. 2. The VVB must assess the changes and update the relevant sections of the validation and/or verification reports. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0; Section 2.2.4 SD VSta Project Description Template, v1.0, Section 2.1.5	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> The project proponent has now updated the entities (distributors and manufacturer) involved in the project in the revised PD submitted. The assessment on the same is also included in section 2.2.4 of the revised validation report.	Closed
		<u>Verra Response</u> The PD has been updated to include the implementing partners. This is sufficient to close the finding.	

9	End-user Identification		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 2.2.2 of the project description describes how the regions that constitute the project zone are chosen, but it is unclear how individual end users are chosen to receive an ICS.	Round 1 <u>VVB Response-</u> The project proponent has now revised the section 2.2.2 of the revised VCS to include information on how the individual end users were selected as beneficiaries. The households living below poverty line, and using only their traditional cook stoves	Closed

	<u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent clarifies how end users are identified to participate in the project. 2. The VVB must assess the changes and update the relevant sections of the validation and/or verification reports. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0, Section 2.2.2	(mud or three-stone cook stoves), were selected as the end-users. The assessment on the same is now included in section 2.2.7 of the revised validation report.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> Section 2.2.2 has been updated to include the eligibility criteria for new end-users. This is sufficient to close the finding.	

10 Stakeholder and Natural Capital Monitoring Plan			
	<u>Issue</u> The monitoring plans for stakeholders and natural capital do not include the following required elements: • Measurable indicators • Sampling methods used to conduct measurements of the stated indicators • Frequency of monitoring and reporting	Round 1 <u>VVB Response-</u> The project proponent has done the required changes to include the details of the monitoring parameters in sections 3.3 and 4.3 of the PD and sections 3.2 and 4.2 of revised MR. Necessary assessment on the same is included in the revised validation report and verification report.	Closed
	<u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent updates Sections 3.3. & 4.3 of the project description and 3.2 & 4.2 of the monitoring report to include the information required by the template. 2. The VVB must assess the changes and update the relevant sections of the validation and/or verification reports.	<u>Verra Response</u> The monitoring plan has been updated. This is sufficient to close the finding.	

	<u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0, Sections 3.1.3 & 3.2.3</i>		
--	---	--	--

11	Impartiality of VVB Interviews		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 2.3.13 of the validation report states that the project proponent was present during all site visit activities, including stakeholder interviews. It is understood that this was done to ensure stakeholders fully understood the auditors' purpose and relation to the project. However, it is unclear what steps the VVB took to ensure impartiality given the physical presence of the project proponent. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must clarify how they ensured the stakeholder interviews and other activities conducted during the onsite audit remained impartial. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0, Section 2.2.17</i>	<u>Round 1</u> <u>VVB Response-</u> The audit team while doing the validation and verification of the project has employed a standardized interview protocol to ensure consistency and avoid leading questions. The focus of the protocol was on gathering objective information and stakeholder perspectives, rather than promoting the project. The presence of the representatives of the project proponent was just for logistical and site access purpose and also in some cases to interpret the local dialect. Further, the local beneficiaries in the rural community of interior parts of the country are observed to be from the humble background with very less or zero educational qualification that they didn't look to be so manipulative in responding to the queries and cross-questions of the audit team or influenced with the presence of the representatives of the project proponent. Apart from the verbal interaction, the visual inspection of the improved cookstoves distributed to them and the nearby surroundings convey the actual project conditions and satisfactory enough for the assessment of the contribution of the project to the SDGs claimed.	Closed

		Moreover, the findings from stakeholder interviews were cross-checked with other evidence, such as monitoring survey results and VCS validation and verification reports., end users' agreements, ICS database and beneficiary ID cards etc to verify information and mitigate any potential bias.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> This finding cannot be closed. <u>Issue</u> 1. It is unclear how the VVB validated the information obtained during interviews where the project proponent provided translation. 2. It is unclear what steps were taken to minimize risk of inaccurate translations provided by the project proponent. <u>Action required</u> 1. The VVB must provide evidence that the information obtained during any interviews where the project proponent provided translation was adequately crosschecked with independent sources. 2. The VVB must describe how they minimized the risk of inaccurate translations provided by the project proponent during stakeholder interviews.	
		Round 2 <u>VVB Response</u> This is to be noted that all the six states where the ICS are distributed are Hindi speaking states including Gujarat and Maharashtra where through the predominant vernacular languages are Gujarati and Marathi respectively, the local	

		population is able to speak and understand the national language Hindi. The audit team conducted physical site visit was very conversant in Hindi. Therefore, the assistance in translation was hardly sought by the audit team during interview with the beneficiaries. As mentioned in the previous VVB response to this issue, the assistance of translation was required in very few rare instances where the local dialect was not clearly interpretable by the audit team due to local accent. Moreover, in the rare case where the local language was not distinct enough to interpret fully, the audit team was able to comprehend it partially. Thus, this is highly unlikely the assistance provide would entirely alter the meaning of sentence or information. <u>Verra Response</u> The VVB has provided adequate justification for the independence of VVB interviews. This is sufficient to close the finding.	
--	--	--	--

12	Monitored Contributions		
	<u>Issue</u> - Row 3 of the Section 1 table in the monitoring report does not report a quantitative contribution for this monitoring period. - Row 8 of the Section 1 table in the monitoring report do not report the monitored values via the method stated in the indicator. See background. <u>Action Required</u> - The VVB must ensure the project proponent updates Rows 3 & 8 of Section 1 of the monitoring report to	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> The project proponent has now included the required information regarding the quantified contribution of the project activity for the current monitoring period has now been updated in row 3, and row 8 of section 1 of the revised MR. <u>Verra Response</u> The MR has been updated. This is sufficient to close the finding.	Closed

	provide quantitative monitored contributions that align with the given indicators. 2. The VVB must assess the changes and update the relevant sections of the validation and/or verification reports. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> SD VSta Monitoring Report Template, v1.0, Section 1 <u>Background</u> The indicator is the number of households <i>reporting</i> a decrease. The contribution, as stated, does not appear to be based on surveys or reports from the end users.		
--	--	--	--

13 End-user training			
	<u>Issue</u> Section 2.2.13 states that end users are required to track key data, including money spent on wood fuel. It is unclear how end-users are trained to collect this data. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent clarifies how end-users are trained to collect the data needed to report on project contributions. 2. The VVB must assess the changes and update the relevant sections of the validation and/or verification reports. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0, Section 2.2.6	Round 1	Closed
		<u>PP's Response</u> The project proponent has now revised the sentence in the revised PD submitted as no such data is defined to be required to be maintained by the beneficiaries.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> The VVB has clarified that data collection is not required. This is sufficient to close the finding.	

--	--	--	--

14	Monitored Contributions		
	<u>Issue</u> Various rows in the table in Section 1 of the monitoring report contain additional information unrelated to the contribution being monitored. For example, Row 4 contains the avoided loss of woody biomass value when all that is needed by the indicator is the # of households reporting a reduction in time spent. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent revises Section 1 of the monitoring report to only include the value needed to report on the indicator. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> SD VSta Monitoring Report Template, v1.0, Section 1	Round 1	Closed
		<u>PP Response</u> The revised monitoring report submitted by the project proponent has been found to be appropriately revised to include only the necessary information regarding the indicators.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> The monitoring report has been revised. This is sufficient to close the finding.	
		Round 2	
		<u>VVB Response</u> (Pending)	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending)	
		Round 3	
		<u>VVB Response</u> (Pending)	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending)	

15	Public Comment		
	<u>Issue</u> The project received a public comment during the SD VSta validation & verification public comment period. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The project proponent must address the public comment and make any required changes to project design, updating the project description and/or monitoring report where necessary. 2. The VVB must assess the project proponent's	Round 1	Closed
		<u>VVB Response</u> The comments received during the global stake holder consultation process are incorporated in the revised monitoring report by the project proponent with adequate response to the comments. The verification team assessed that the comments are not of adverse nature and suitably addressed by the project proponent. The assessment on the same is also included in the revised verification report.	
		<u>Verra Response</u>	

	response any changes made to project design, updating the validation and/or verification reports where necessary. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> SD VSta Program Guide, v1.0, Sections 3.2.4 & 3.2.5	The VVB has provided an assessment of the public comments. This is sufficient to close the finding.	
--	--	--	--