

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	Verification Approval
Program(s)	VCS Program
Verification Period	01 October 2022 – 31 December 2023
Project Proponent	Vitol Asia Pte Ltd
Methodology	VMR0006, Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves, v1.1
VVB	RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA
Assessment Criteria	VCS Standard, v4.5
Date of First Issue	18 July 2024
Date of Second Issue	26 September 2024
Review Conclusion	Closed
Date of Final Issue	04 October 2024

FINDINGS

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
1	KML - Location of initial and new instances		
	<u>Issue</u> No KML file has been submitted to Verra to review in line with Section 3.11.1 (3) of the <i>VCS Standard</i>; the general coordinates for India is insufficient. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the PP updates Section 1.8 of the MR and include the coordinates for each instance implemented in this project or a KML file in line with Section 3.11.1 (3) of the <i>VCS Standard</i> must be submitted for Verra to review. 2. The VVB must clarify and demonstrate how the location of each instance was verified during this monitoring period. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>VCS Standard, v4.5, Section 3.11.1(3)</i>	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> 1. The KML file of the project is enclosed herewith. 2. The assessment on the location is now included in section 1.4 and section 3.3 of the revised monitoring report. <u>Verra Response</u> The VVB has shared the project's KML file and assessed how the location of each instance was verified. This finding is now closed.	Closed
2	Insufficient demonstration of SD contributions		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 1.12 (Table 1) of the MR does not demonstrate the SD contributions sufficiently. Specifically, no description and demonstration of how contributions to SDG 1.1 and 3.9 (rows 1 and 2) were monitored. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the PP demonstrates with	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> 1. The revised monitoring report submitted by the project proponent has been found to have demonstrated the SDG contribution more elaborately by including the evidence. 2. The assessment in also now elaborated in section 1.12 of the verification report to include the same.	Closed

	sufficient evidence how SD contributions, 1.1 and 3.9 were monitored; Section 1.12 of the PD must be updated. 2. The VVB must assess the revisions accordingly and update the VR as needed. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Monitoring Report Template, v4.3, Section 1.12	<u>Verra Response</u> Section 1.12 of the MR has been updated to describe how SDGs 1.1 and 3.9 have been monitored. The VR has also been updated with an assessment. This finding is now closed.	
--	--	--	--

3 Insufficient justification and assessment of new instances eligibility			
	<u>Issue</u> The PD has not sufficiently justified how each new instance implemented meets the eligibility criteria set out in the project description, in line with the VCS Standard; the generalized discussion is insufficient. Specifically: 1. Incomplete demonstration of criteria 1 on applicability conditions. 2. No start date has been provided in the MR; the date each instance was implemented is unclear. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the PP updates Section 3.3 of the MR to indicated how each new instance implemented across the 9 states meet the eligibility criteria defined in the PD is in line with the VCS Standard. 2. The VVB must ensure the PP includes the implementation dates of each instance implemented during this monitoring period. 3. The VVB must ensure to assess the revisions and update the VR accordingly.	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> 1. The applicability conditions are now added in updated MR. 2. Start date of the 1st instance is provided in the section 1.6 of the MR. The start date of all other ICS is available in the ER sheet which has also been used to calculate the emission reduction achieved by each of them in the current monitoring period. 3. The assessment on the same is now elaborated in section 3.3 of the revised verification report. <u>Verra Response</u> Section 3.3 of the MR has been updated to include a description on how the new instances meet eligibility criteria 1 on applicability conditions. The project has also demonstrated that no cookstoves have an earlier start date than 16 June 2022 via the data in the spreadsheet. The VVB assessed this in Section 3.3 of the VR. This finding is now closed.	Closed

<u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Standard, v4.5, Section 3.6.17, VCS Monitoring Report Template, v4.3, Section 3.3		
---	--	--

4 Incomplete description and assessment of safeguards		
<u>Issue</u> - Section 2.3.4 of the MR described disputes over rights to territories and resources as “N/A”, but no explanation has been provided. - Sections 4.2.6 and 4.2.7.5 of the VR does not have any assessment. <u>Action Required</u> - The VVB must ensure the PP updates Section 2.3.4 of the MR and provide an explanation to why disputes over rights to territories and resources are not applicable to this project. - The VVB must provide a clear assessment opinion on whether there are any disputes over rights to territories and resources in the project area(s). <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Standard, v4.5, Section 3.18.1(2), VCS Monitoring Report Template, v4.3, Section 2.3.4	Round 1	
	<u>VVB Response</u> - Section 2.3.4 of MR is now updated by the project proponent. - The assessment on the same is revised in section 4.2 of the revised verification report. The assessment is also now included in section 4.2.6 and 4.2.7.5 of the revised verification report.	Closed
	<u>Verra Response</u> Section 2.3.4 of the MR now describes no disputes over rights to territories and resources occurred during the monitoring period. Further, Sections 4.2.6 and 4.2.7.5 of the VR have been updated to include assessments. This finding is now closed.	

5 Unreported PD deviation: Monitoring Plan		
<u>Issue</u> Section 4.3 of the MR does not include how the stove user information outlined in Section 6.3 of the PDMR was collected during the monitoring period in Section 4.3 of the MR.	Round 1	
	<u>VVB Response</u> The project proponent has now included the details of user data collected in section 4.3 of the revised monitoring report. Assessment on the same is elaborated in section 4.3 of the revised verification report.	Closed

2. No description on how the monitoring survey accounted for the monitoring frequency of Ny,l,j, for all cookstoves distributed since the project start date. 3. Section 4.3 of the MR does not indicate whether the sampling was random and whether stratification by location and distribution year (i.e., batch) was carried out. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the PP updates Section 4.3 of the MR to include information about the stove user information outlined in Section 6.3 of the registered PDMR (see page 61). 2. The VVB must assess the PD deviation the same. 3. The VVB must ensure Section 4.3 of the MR is updated to address Issue 1. Further, the VVB must ensure the PP describes how the monitoring survey has accounted for the monitoring frequency of Ny,l,j, for all cookstoves distributed since the project start date. 4. The VVB must ensure the PP indicates whether the sampling was random and clarify whether stratification was by location and/or distribution year (i.e., batch) <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Standard, v4.5, Section 3.21	2. The project proponent has now included the details of the monitoring survey frequency in section 4.3 of the revised monitoring report. Assessment on the same is included in section 1.4 of the revised verification report. 3. The project proponent has now elaborated the sampling approach in section 4.3 of the revised monitoring report. The assessment on the same was already included in section 4.3 of the verification report.	
	<u>Verra Response</u> Section 4.3 of the MR has been updated to include more information of the monitoring plan per Section 6.3 of the registered PDMR. The updates address Issues 1 – 3. The VVB also updated Section 4.3 of the VR to assess the updates. This finding is now closed.	

6	Insufficient information on VVB's sampling approach		
	<u>Issue</u>	Round 1	Closed

	- Section 2.1 of the VR does not provide sufficient information to justify the VVB's sampling approach conducted for this monitoring period. - There is no information on the verification schedule, including key milestones (e.g., kick-off meeting, desk review, etc); the dates were not included in the VR.	<u>VVB Response</u> - The verification team had selected 90 sample i.e. 10 form each of the 9 states for physical audit. The assessment is now elaborated in section 2.1 of the verification report. - The information on verification schedule is now included in section 2.1 of the verification report.	
	<u>Action Required</u> - The VVB must ensure to update Section 2.1 of the VR to discuss the appropriateness of assessing only 10 samples from the monitoring survey given 337,346 cookstoves were distributed during this monitoring period. Further, the VVB must clarify whether any stratification based on location and batch was done, and if the sampling was random. The VVB must justify the sampling decisions made. - The VVB must ensure to include the verification schedule, including key milestones (e.g., kick-off meeting, desk review, etc); the dates must be provided in the report. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Standard, v4.5, Section 4.1.30	<u>Verra Response</u> Section 2.1 of the VR has been updated to provide more information on the VVB's sampling approach and the verification schedule. This finding is now closed.	

7	Eligibility: baseline scenario of new instances		
	<u>Issue</u> The assessment by the VVB in Section 3.3 of the VR is insufficient; there's no information on how the VVB validated that the new instances share the same baseline scenario as the initial instances.	<u>Round 1</u>	Closed
		<u>VVB Response</u> The assessment of the baseline of the newly added states is incorporated in appendix-6 of the verification report.	

2. Further, the cookstoves were added in 3 new states, i.e., Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand and Dadra and Nagar Haveli but only Dadra & Nagar Haveli was discussed in Appendix 6. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must update Section 3.3 of the VR and describe how the new instances were assessed and validated, and what evidence was checked, to ensure the new instances have the same baseline scenario as the initial instances. 2. The VVB must update Appendix 6 to include sufficient details regarding all 3 new states/instances added to the project. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Standard, v4.5, Section 3.6.16(4), 3.6.17(2,3)	Therefore, the detailed assessment is not included again in section 3.3 to avoid duplication. 2. For the states of Jharkhand and Uttar Pradesh, the reference of the registered project, VCS 3160 is used whereas for Dadra Nagar Haveli, the baseline scenario for Gujarat as per the candidate project (VCS 2942) is referred. The assessment in appendix-6 is now elaborated suitably to bring clarity on the same. <u>Verra Response</u> Appendix 6 has been updated. Issue 1 is closed. However, the updates are insufficient to close the Issue 2. This finding remains open. <u>Issue</u> 1. Appendix 2 refers to a different VCS project to establish the baseline scenario for instances located in Uttar Pradesh and Jharkhand, which other VCS projects with similar project activities take place. VCS projects are independent of each other and do not set precedence for other projects. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must clarify how the project proponent established the baseline scenarios for the new project areas (i.e., Uttar Pradesh and Jharkhand) for Project 2942, independent of other projects, in line with VMR0006 requirements. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VMR0006, 1.1, Sections 6 and 8.2	
--	---	--

		VCS Standard, v4.5, Section 3.6.10, 3.6.11, 3.6.16(4)	
		<u>Background</u> Appendix 2 of the MR and Appendix 6 of the VR states that the baseline survey for the Jharkhand, Uttar Pradesh and Dadra & Nagar Haveli demonstrate that three-stone fire using firewood is the baseline scenario, which is same as the initial activity instances included in the registered PDMR. This is accepted. However, it is unclear why the other projects have been referenced in establishing the baseline.	
		Round 2	
		VVB Response The reference of the registered projects has now been removed in the appendix-2 of the revised MR submitted by the project proponent. Necessary revisions are also carried out in appendix-6 of the verification report.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> Appendix 2 of the PD has been updated to show that baseline surveys were conducted in Uttar Pradesh and Jharkhand, which demonstrates the new project areas have same baseline scenario as the initial project activity instances. The VVB assessed this in Appendix 6 of the VR. This finding is now closed.	

8 fNRB values: more information needed			
	<u>Issue</u>	Round 1	Closed
		<u>VVB Response</u> 1. The wood consumption data has been referred from socio-	
	1. In Appendix 3 of the MR, it is unclear whether the		

latest wood consumption data has been used; the reports reference data obtained from 2011 or earlier. - Footnote 10 is not accessible. - No fNRB sheet has been provided per footnotes. <u>Action Required</u> - The VVB must ensure the PP clarifies in Appendix 3 of the MR whether the latest wood consumption data was used to determine the fNRB values. - The VVB must assess the updates accordingly and ensure the latest data is used as required per Tool30. - The VVB must ensure all footnotes included in the MR and VR are accessible to review. - The VVB must ensure that the fNRB sheet is submitted to Verra to review. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> Tool30, v4.0, Section 3	Economic Contribution of Forests: Production and consumption of Forests Resource in India, 2011. The same is now mentioned clearly by the project proponent in section 5.4 and appendix 3 of the revised monitoring report. Please note the calculation procedure of fNRB is included in section 5.4 and comparative analysis of the estimated fNRB with the literature referred by TOOL 30 is provided in appendix-3 of the MR. - The assessment on the appropriateness of publication of wood demand by the Forests Resource in India, 2011 is now incorporated in appendix-5 of the revised verification report. - The footnotes in the entire MR are checked and found to be working. Please note that the link¹ (which has now become footnote no. 13 from footnote no.10) of the project report "Yield table for few tree species grown in farm settings" which was used as the source for the MAI and also mentioned in the MR and fNRB sheet is not accessible currently. Thus, project proponent has submitted the PDF file which is attached herewith. The value sourced from the document has been verified by the verification team to be correct. - The fNRB sheet is submitted herewith. <u>Verra Response</u> Appendix 3 of the MR and Appendix 5 of the VR have been updated to include justification for the data source. Further, the fNRB calculation spreadsheets are shared and footnotes updated. This finding is now closed.	
--	---	--

¹ <https://www.forests.tn.gov.in/app/webroot/img/Yield table for few tree species grown in farm settings.pdf>

--	--	--	--