

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	Joint Registration and Verification
Program(s)	VCS Program
Project Proponent	EKI Energy Services Limited
Methodology	VMR0006 “Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves”, ver 1.1
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Assessment Criteria	VCS Standard, v4.4
Date of First Issue	4 August 2023
Date of Second Issue	13 November 2023
Review Conclusion	Approve
Date of Final Issue	16 January 2024

FINDINGS

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
1	Incomplete and inconsistent project description		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 1.1 of the joint project description and monitoring report (JPD-MR) does not include the estimated number of ICSs to be distributed/installed. Further, it is not clear if the ICS will be distributed in rural households, urban households or both. <u>Action item</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent describes in Section 1.1 of the JPD-MR the estimated ICSs to be distributed by the project activity and the type of households (urban/rural). 2. The VVB must verify this information and update the Joint Validation and Verification Report (JVR-VR) as needed. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Joint Project Description and Monitoring Report Template v.4.2, Sections 1.1 VCS Joint Validation and Verification Report Template v4.2	Round 1 <u>PP Response</u> 1. PP has now updated Section 1.1 of the joint project description and monitoring report (JPD-MR), which now includes the estimated number of ICSs to be distributed/installed, it is now mentioned in Section 1.1 of the joint project description and monitoring report (JPD-MR) that the ICS will be distributed in rural households. <u>VVB Response</u> PP has revised section 1.1 of JPD-MR which was checked to confirm that it mentions the necessary information such as estimated number of ICSs and also type of distribution in households. JVR-VR section 3.1 is revised to include the same details now by VVB. <u>Verra Response</u> The JPD-MR was updated accordingly, however, the Joint V&V report mentions a different number of cookstoves to be distributed as part of the project. <u>Issue:</u> There is no consistency between the project documents on the number of cookstoves to be distributed by the project. <u>Action Required:</u> The VVB is required to ensure that all documents are consistent.	Closed

		The finding remains open.	
		Round 2	
		<u>PP Response</u> Inconsistency in FVR <u>VVB Response</u> Inconsistency is now removed which was present in the 'summary' page of Joint VR/VR.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> The inconsistency was corrected. The finding is closed.	

2	Missing Table in Section 1.1 of the JPD-MR		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 1.1 of the JPD-MR does not include the Table as per the applicable Template. <u>Action item</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent includes in Section 1.1 of the JPD-MR the Table required as per the applicable Template. <u>Program rule(s) or methodology section</u> VCS Joint Project Description and Monitoring Report Template v.4.2, Section 1.1	Round 1	Closed
		<u>PP Response</u> PP now included and filled the table as per the latest Template (Monitoring Report: VCS Version 4.2) in the Section 1.1 of the JPD-MR.	
		<u>VVB Response</u> Section 1.1 of revised JPD-MR was checked to confirm that the table is now provided and appropriate information is added to the same.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> The documents were updated as required. The finding is closed.	

3	Further information and assessment on cookstove thermal efficiency		
	<u>Issue</u> As per the information provided in the JPD-MR and JVR-VR, the thermal efficiency of the Agneekaa Eco Moni Stove Model4 SE is 36.42%. However, the same model is used under VCS project 2939 (also by EKI Energy Services Ltd) with a thermal efficiency of 32.19%. Further clarification is required. <u>Action item</u>	Round 1	Closed
		<u>PP Response</u> VCS project 2939 ICS were installed in 2021 which is having ICS model "Agneekaa Eco Moni Stove Model 4", (thermal efficiency of 32.19%)	
		The manufacturer upgraded the ICS model to the "Agneekaa Eco Moni Stove Model4 SE" with an efficiency of 36.42%, which is used in this project. This is due to the manufacturer's ongoing	

1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent further explains how the thermal efficiency has been determined in line with the applied methodology and clarify why it is different from the ICSs installed under VCS project 2939. 2. The VVB must further elaborate how it verified the thermal efficiency of the ‘Agneekaa Eco Moni Stove Model4 SE’ and provide a robust explanation on the differences with the value reported under VCS project 2939. <u>Program rule(s) or methodology section</u> <i>VCS Joint Project Description and Monitoring Report Template v.4.2, Section 1.11</i> <i>VCS Joint Validation and Verification Report Template v4.2, Section 3.1</i>	research and development efforts to increase the efficiency, quality, and design of the stove. Technical specifications and a certificate of efficiency had already been submitted to VVB. <u>VVB Response</u> PP response is accepted as VVB has checked and confirmed that JPD-MR and JVR-VR both mentions the same model name and matches with the submitted technical specifications. However, for clarity, JVR-VR section 1.4 is revised to include footnote regarding the same <u>Verra Response</u> The VVB confirmed that the thermal efficiency of the project stove was confirmed through the manufacturer technical specifications. The finding is closed.	
--	---	--

4 Incomplete information on on-going communication with local stakeholders		
<u>Issue</u> The following information is missing in Section 2.2 of the JPD-MR: (a) The results of the communication within the grievance register from distributors during this monitoring period; (b) The details related to the contact with end users on regular basis and site visits performed by EKI during the monitoring period. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent includes in Section 2.2 of the JPD-MR details on a and b above. 2. The VVB must verify this information and update the JVR-VR as needed.	Round 1 <u>PP Response</u> JPD-MR is updated with the results of the communication within the grievance register from distributors during this monitoring period. As a part of continuous feedback from stakeholders, during the current monitoring period, no comments/feedback were received. The details (Copy of register) related to the contact with end users on regular basis and site visits performed by EKI during the monitoring period was submitted to the VVB and same is mentioned in Section 2.2 of JPD-MR. <u>VVB Response</u> PP has revised section 2.2 to provide concerned information with respect to communication with the end users. VVB has confirmed that grievance registers are available to end users through	Closed

<u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Joint Project Description and Monitoring Report Template v4.2, Section 2.2. VCS Joint Validation and Verification Report Template v4.2, Section 3.3.2	distributors and regular communication is ensured by PP based on the interviews conducted. Since, regular visits are ensured by PP so stakeholders can raise their grievances to them directly too which was confirmed to VVB and same is now updated in the revised JVR-VR section 3.3.2 <u>Verra Response</u> The VVB confirmed the grievance mechanism is in place. The finding is closed.	
---	--	--

5 Missing information on baseline survey conducted and assessment of baseline scenario		
<u>Issue</u> Section 3.4 of the JPD-MR confirms that the baseline device is a three-stone fire using firewood (not charcoal) or a traditional device. In doing so, it refers to: (a) The baseline of another project which is already implemented in the same area of the proposed project, however there is no further information on such project and why it can be considered that the same baseline applies and; (b) Six baseline surveys that have been conducted, however there is no information on who conducted them, the samples taken, its results and how they have been considered representative. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent describes in the JPD-MR all the details related to the baseline surveys conducted and the other referenced project in order to demonstrate that the baseline device was a three-stone fire using firewood (not charcoal) or a conventional device. 2. The VVB must validate this information and update the validation report as needed.	Round 1 <u>PP Response</u> PP has submitted the information related to baseline survey to the VVB. <u>VVB Response</u> PP had submitted baseline survey datasheet to VVB. PP has a separate team which conducted this survey as confirmed during the interviews. VVB had confirmed that the baseline survey was conducted on simple random basis. The results of the survey are presented in the survey datasheet and supporting questionnaires. The VVB has checked and confirm the same. Section 3.4.4 of JVR-VR is revised accordingly to elaborate the assessment conducted. <u>Verra Response</u> The JPD-MR was updated, however, not all the information required was included. <u>Issue:</u> The JPD-MR states that “the results of the survey are presented in the survey datasheet and supporting questionnaires”. However, this information was not included in the Joint PD-MR. <u>Action required:</u>	Closed

	3. The VVB must further elaborate on how it verified the baseline scenario identified by the project proponent. In doing so it must: (a) confirm that the baseline scenario is justified appropriately and supported by evidence, (b) identify that the documentary evidence used is relevant, and correctly quoted and interpreted, and; (c) provide details (including sources of information) of any steps taken to cross-check data used in the identification of the baseline scenario. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>VCS Project Description and Monitoring Report Template v4.2, Section 3.4</i> <i>VCS Joint Validation Verification Report Template v.4.2, Section 3.4.4</i>	1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent describes in the JPD-MR all the details related to the baseline surveys conducted and the other referenced project in order to demonstrate that the baseline device was a three-stone fire using firewood (not charcoal) or a conventional device. 2. The VVB must validate this information and update the validation report as needed. 3. The VVB must further elaborate on how it verified the baseline scenario identified by the project proponent. In doing so it must: (a) confirm that the baseline scenario is justified appropriately and supported by evidence, (b) identify that the documentary evidence used is relevant, and correctly quoted and interpreted, and; (c) provide details (including sources of information) of any steps taken to cross-check data used in the identification of the baseline scenario. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>VCS Project Description and Monitoring Report Template v4.2, Section 3.4</i> <i>VCS Joint Validation Verification Report Template v.4.2, Section 3.4.4</i> The finding remains open.	
		<u>PP</u> <u>Response</u> 1. All the details related to the baseline surveys conducted and other referenced project is now mentioned in section 3.4 of JPD-MR in order to demonstrate that the baseline device was a three-stone fire using firewood (not charcoal) or a conventional device. Also, At the time of distribution each of the beneficiaries has to sign an end-user agreement wherein they need to confirm that they “does not currently own an improved cookstove and will use the	

		improved cookstove(s) voluntarily to replace a traditional stove” which conforms the eligibility for the baseline scenario set for the project. <u>VVB Response</u> 1. The VVB through on-site interviews, desk review of the baseline survey results and submitted questionnaires has ensured that the project proponent has describes in the JPD-MR all the details related to the baseline surveys conducted and the other referenced project in order to demonstrate that the baseline device was a three-stone fire using firewood (not charcoal) or a conventional device. The detailed assessment in included in section 3.4.4 of Joint VR/VR. 2. The VVB has validated this information and updated Joint VR/VR section 3.4.4 as needed. 3. The VVB has confirmed that the baseline scenario is justified appropriately and supported by evidence based on registered projects, baseline surveys and interviews during on-site visit. It further noted that the documentary evidence used is relevant, and correctly quoted and interpreted, and details (including sources of information) of steps taken to cross-check data through desk review, onsite interviews used in the identification of the baseline scenario is presented in section 3.4.4. of joint VR/VR. <u>Verra Response:</u> The information on similar projects was included in the revised PD. Further, the results of the baseline survey were provided and the VVB confirmed that the baseline was further checked at the time of distribution of ICS. The finding is closed.	
--	--	--	--

6	Lack of assessment and clarity on determination of fNRB		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 5.4 of the JPD-MR (pages 41-43): (a) does not indicate the source of each of the values used when calculating the fNRB of each of the five regions (and if the latest available data has been used); (b) does not explain why the value of 1.66 from the IPCC2019 Refinement for the MAIforest and MAIother is applicable to the project activity and; (c) lacks information on how para. 6(b) of the TOOL30, v.04.0 has been complied with. Finally, the calculation spreadsheet has not been provided. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent further elaborates how the fNRB has been calculated in line with the requirements of TOOL30, v.04.0 and addresses points a to c above. 2. The VVB must verify this information and update the JVR-VR as needed. 3. The calculation spreadsheet shall be provided for further reference. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> TOOL30, v.04.0. <u>Background information</u> TOOL30, v.04.0, para. 6 (b): <i>The project participants shall compare and analyse the calculated values against the values for fNRB reported in relevant scientific literature and justify any differences. This analysis shall be included in the appropriate section of the PDD. The relevant scientific literature should</i>	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> (a) PP has already been provided all the relevant sources in the fNRB calculation spreadsheet in line with the requirements of TOOL30, v.04.0. (b) PP has used the IPCC 2019 Refinement for the MAIforest and MAIother, where the value 1.66 is the average of the above-ground Biomass values specified in the fNRB spreadsheet. (c) In accordance with the para. 6(b) of the TOOL30, v.04.0, PP follows the procedure and requirements given in this tool. And the value given in the scientific Literature ((i) <i>Bailis, R.; Drigo, R.; Ghilardi, A. & Masera, O. (2015). The carbon footprint of traditional woodfuels. Nature Climate Change, 5(3), pp. 266 – 272.</i>) is given by the national level, i.e., India, but in this project, PP has taken fNRB value state-wise. Therefore, value can't be comparable to the literature given in tool 30v.04.0. A fNRB spreadsheet is now provided. <u>VVB Response</u> PP has now submitted fNRB sheet. The values considered for calculation of fNRB are found to be sourced from appropriate documents and were found relevant to the project activity. Assessment of fNRB value is presented in section 3.4.6 of JVR-VR. <u>Verra Response</u> The PP provided a document explaining the differences between the fNRB calculated as per the Tool and that based on published literature. However, the document was submitted as confidential, and there is no VVB assessment of it. Also, the values applied for the regional calculation of the fNRB do not seem to refer to regional values.	Closed

	include at least: (i) Bailis, R.; Drigo, R.; Ghilardi, A. & Masera, O. (2015). <i>The carbon footprint of traditional woodfuels</i>. <i>Nature Climate Change</i>, 5(3), pp. 266–272.	<u>Issue:</u> The VVB submitted the explanation required by Tool 30 in a separate document marked as confidential. However, the VCS Standard version 4.4 requires that the information in the project description related to the determination of the baseline scenario shall not be considered commercially sensitive and shall be provided in the public versions of the project description. Also, on the fNRB calculation, it is not clear how the VVB cross-checked the values of wood consumption and wood density at the regional level. Further, the VVB must provide its expert opinion on the information provided by the PP. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must provide a detailed explanation on how the values applied in the fNRB calculation were validated and provide its expert opinion on the sources of information used, and calculation results of the fNRB. 2. The VVB must ensure that all information provided as confidential complies with the VCS Standard requirements. 3. The VVB must update the JVR-VR as needed. <u>Background information</u> TOOL30, v.04.0 VCS Standard v.4.4 The finding remains open.	
		<u>PP Response</u> 1. The values of wood consumption at the regional(state) level are taken from the Socio-Economic Contribution of Forests: Production and consumption of Forests Resource	

		in India¹ & India State of Forest Report, 2019². For wood density, the top species found at regional (state) level are taken from India state of forest report 2021³ and the value of wood density is taken from FAO⁴ respectively. The fNRB spread sheet (tab: Consumption of Woody Biomass) can be referred for further details. 2. The PP now provided a document information explaining the differences between the fNRB calculated as per the Tool and that based on published literature in Appendix 2 of JPD&MR. <u>VVB Response</u> 1. The VVB has provided a detailed explanation on how the values applied in the fNRB calculation were validated and has provided its expert opinion on the sources of information used, and calculation results of the fNRB in section 3.4.6 of joint VR/VR. The section had mentioned that 'The analysis is presented to VVB and will be submitted to VERRA but is a confidential document'. This is not removed as PP has presented this analysis as a part of joint PDMR appendix 2 which since was already checked is found acceptable. 2. As mentioned above, the concerned information is now added in joint PDMR as appendix 2 and will not be confidential and its assessment is provided in section 3.4.6 of joint VR/VR by VVB.	
--	--	--	--

¹ https://fsi.nic.in/cover_2011/chapter7.pdf

² <https://fsi.nic.in/isfr19/vol1/chapter10.pdf>

³ <https://fsi.nic.in/isfr-2021/chapter-13.pdf>

⁴ <https://www.fao.org/3/w4095e/w4095e0c.htm>

		3. The Joint VR/VR is revised in line with the same. <u>Verra Response:</u> The VVB included the sources used in the fNRB calculation and an explanation of the differences with other literature reviews. All information was included in the public versions of the documents, as required. The finding is closed.	
--	--	--	--

7	Missing information on calibration of weighing scale(s)		
	<u>Issue</u> As per page 53 of the JPD-MR the calibration of the weighing scales is done in-house before start using on-site and page 48 of the JVR-VR states that the PP had carried out the calibration of the weighing scale prior to the measurement. It remains unclear: if there is only one weighing scale used under the project activity and which evidence the VVB checked in order to confirm such calibrations. <u>Action Required</u> 1.The VVB must ensure that the project proponent includes in Section 6.2 of the JPD-MR all the information related to the calibration of the weighing scale(s) used during the monitoring period. 2. The VVB must verify this information and indicate how it verified that the calibration was done. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Joint Project Description and Monitoring Report Template v.4.2, Section 6.2 VCS Joint Validation Verification Report Template v.4.2, Section 4.2	Round 1 <u>PP Response</u> PP Uses different newly purchased weighing scales for different States of India hence, PP has now provided the purchase order for each weighing scale used in monitoring survey. weighing scales used for the monitoring survey were purchased during --- and scales were pre calibrated by the manufacturers, however Survey team has calibrated the scales in house before start using. 1. PP has now included all the information related to calibration of the weighing scale(s) used during the monitoring period in the Section 6.2 of the JPD-MR and calibration record have been provided to VVB. <u>VVB Response</u> PP response is accepted and is found appropriate with the observations during the site visit. Section 6.2 of JPD-MR is now revised by PP to include details w.r.t. weighing scales under the parameter - $B_{y=1,new,I,J,survey}$. PP has provided purchase orders and calibration certificates of the same which were checked and found appropriate. JVR-VR is revised to add appendix 5 to provided checked and confirmed details about the weighing scales used.	Closed

		<u>Verra Response</u> The information on the calibration of the weighing scales was updated in the revised documents. The finding is closed.	
--	--	--	--