# PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Review Type** | Registration and Verification |
| **Project ID** | 2429 |
| **Project Name** | Distribution of Improved cook stove- Phase 15 |
| **Program(s)** | VCS |
| **Verification Period** | 01-October-2012 to 30-September-2017 |
| **Project Proponent** | M/s G K Energy Marketers Pvt. Ltd |
| **Methodology** | AMS II G., Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass, Version 03.0. |
| **VVB** | TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd |
| **Assessment Criteria** | VCS Standard, v4.2, VCS Standard V4.1 AMS-II.G v3.0 |
| **Date of First Issue** | 04 September 2022 |
| **Review Conclusion** | Closed |
| **Date of Final Issue** | 28 June 2023 |

| FINDINGS | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **#** | **Description** | **Response** | **Status** |
| 1 | **Incomplete information on eligibility under VCS**<br><br>**Issue**<br><br>Section 1.3 of the PD does not demonstrate the eligibility of the project under the scope of the VCS program in line with section 2.1.1 of the VCS Standard v4.2<br><br>**Action item**<br><br>The VVB must ensure that section 1.3 of the PD is updated in line with the requirements of the applied VCS PD template. All relevant sections of the Joint VCS VVR shall also be updated accordingly.<br><br>**Program rule(s) or methodology section**<br><br>*VCS Standard v4.2, Section 2.1.1*<br><br>*VCS Project Description Template, v4.0, Section 1.3*<br><br>*VCS Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0* | **Round1:**<br><br>VVB Response: Section 1.3 has now been updated as per the applied Project Description Template. The same has now been updated in Joint Validation and Verification Report.<br><br>Verra Review: Section 1.3 of the PD still does not explain project eligibility in line with section 2.1.1 of VCS.<br><br>**Round 2:**<br><br>VVB Response: Section 1.3 of the Project Description has now been updated as per section 2.1.1 of VCS standard v4.2.<br><br>Verra Review:<br><br>No further action is required. | Closed |
| 2 | **Missing reference to the VCS Standard v4.2**<br><br>**Issue**<br><br>The VVB has not referred to VCS Standard v4.2 while performing the validation/verification process.<br><br>**Action item**<br><br>The VVB must ensure that they also refer to VCS Standard v4.2 during the validation/verification process.<br><br>**Program rule(s) or methodology section** | **Round1:**<br><br>VVB Response: VCS Standard v4.2 has now been referred for Validation/Verification process. The reference for the same has also been mentioned in Joint Validation/Verification Report.<br><br>Verra Review: No further action is required<br><br>**Round 2:** | Closed |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *VCS Standard v4.2*<br><br>*VCS Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0* | | |
| 3 | **Unclear projects start date and crediting period start date**<br><br>**Issue:**<br><br>The project starts date and the crediting period start date are not consistent.<br><br>**Action required:**<br><br>• The VVB must ensure that the project proponent provides a clarification on the start date according to the VCS definition of project start date and revise the calculations and the crediting period start date accordingly.<br>• The VVB must assess the updated PD and update Section 3.1 of the Joint VVR as needed.<br><br>**Program rules:**<br><br>*VCS Standard, v4.2, Section 3.7*<br><br>*Project Description Template, v4.0 Section 1.8 & 1.9*<br><br>*Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 3.1* | **Round1**:<br><br>VVB Response: The start date of the crediting period has now been updated as per the definition of start date. The crediting period has now been made consistent throughout the Project Description, Monitoring Report and the Joint Validation/Verification Report. Section 3.1 of the Project Description has also been updated accordingly.<br><br>Verra Review:<br><br>• The end-date of the crediting period mentioned in section 1.6 of the MR is incorrect.<br>• The VVB must ensure that the PP states the correct MP dates in the title page of the MR.<br>• The VVB must ensure that the PP states the correct CDM crediting period dates in section 1.9 of the MR.<br>• The VVB must ensure that they state the correct and consistent information in all project documents.<br><br>**Round 2:**<br><br>VVB Response:<br><br>• The end-date of the crediting period has now been rectified in section 1.6 of the monitoring report.<br>• The monitoring period has now been rectified and updated in the title page of the Monitoring Report.<br>• The CDM crediting period has now been rectified and updated in section 1.9 of the monitoring report.<br>• The crediting period dates and the monitoring period dates have now been made consistent in all the project documents.<br><br>Verra Review: | Closed |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | No further action is required. | |
| <u>4</u> | **Missing details on grievance mechanism**<br><br>**<u>Issue</u>**<br><br>• Section 2.2 of the MR does not include details on the continuous grievance mechanism in place for the project.<br>• Section 2.2 of the Joint VVR does not include grievance register under the list of documents reviewed.<br><br>**<u>Action item</u>**<br><br>• The VVB must ensure that section 2.2 of the MR includes details of the continuous grievance mechanism in place<br>• The VVB must describe how were the comments of the stakeholders verified without checking the grievance register.<br><br>**<u>Program rule(s) or methodology section</u>**<br><br>VCS Standard v4.2, Section 3.17.18<br><br>*VCS Project Description Template, v4.0, Section 1.4*<br><br>*Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 2.2* | **Round1**:<br><br>VVB Response: Details of the continuous grievance mechanism has now been incorporated in section 2.2 of the Monitoring Report.<br><br>The comments of the stakeholders are verified via grievance register. Although there have been no grievances received during the current monitoring period.<br><br>Verra Review: No further action is required<br><br>**Round 2:** | Closed |
| <u>5</u> | **Missing information on public comments**<br><br>**Issue:**<br><br>Section 2.4 of the PD does not include any information regarding the public comment period posting on the VCS registry and the comments received. | **Round1**:<br><br>VVB Response: Information regarding the public commenting period has now been incorporated in section 2.4 of the Project Description. The same has also been incorporated in section 3.3.4 of the Joint Validation and Verification Report.<br><br>Verra Review: No further action is required | Closed |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Action required:**<br>• The VVB must ensure that the project proponent include information on whether the project was posted for public comment and whether there were comments received in Section 2.4 of the PD.<br>• The VVB must assess the updated PD and update Section 3.3.4 of the Joint VVR as needed.<br>**Program rules:**<br>*VCS Standard, v4.2, Section 3.17.6*<br>*Project Description Template, v4.0 Section 2.4*<br>*Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 3.1* | **Round 2:** | |
| 6 | **Missing details on site visit**<br>**Issue:**<br>• Section 2.4 does not provide information about the mode of the remote site visit.<br>**Action required:**<br>• The VVB must describe in section 2.1 of the Joint VVR, if site-visit/ remote site visit was a part of the validation/verification process.<br>• The VVB must describe the mode of the remote site visit in section 2.4 of the Joint VVR.<br>**Program rules:**<br>Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 2.3 | **Round1**:<br>VVB Response: Information regarding the remote site visit as the method of Validation/Verification has now been incorporated in section 2.1 and mode of remote site visit has been incorporated in section 2.4 of the Joint Validation/Verification Report along with the<br>Verra Review: No further action is required.<br>**Round 2:** | Closed |
| 7 | **Missing information on the interviews conducted**<br>**Issue:**<br>Detailed steps regarding how the interview process was carried out is not provided in Section 2.3 of the Joint VVR. | **Round1**:<br>VVB Response: Information regarding the Interviews process has now been incorporated in section 2.3 of the Joint Validation and Verification Report.<br>Verra Review: No further action is required | Closed |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Action required:**<br><br>• The VVB must provide clarification on which users were interviewed and whether they participated in the usage rate survey.<br>• The VVB must provide clarification on how it assessed efficiency tests via the interviews.<br><br>**Program rules:**<br><br>Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 2.3 | **Round 2:** | |
| 8 | **Unclear sampling approach for interviews**<br><br>**Issue:**<br><br>It is not clear how the VVB arrived at a sample size of 7 for the interviews in section 2.3 of the Joint VVR.<br><br>**Action required:**<br><br>• The VVB must provide clarification on how it arrived at a sample of 7 for interviews and whether it was an acceptance sample from PP's own sample.<br>• Further, the VVB must update Section 2.3 of the Joint VVR to include information on how it ensured the validity and/or the appropriateness of a sample size of 7.<br><br>**Program rule:**<br><br>*Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 2.3* | **Round1**:<br><br>VVB Response: The verification team decided to draw samples mainly from the project samples selected by CME. Acceptance Sampling approach was employed by verification team, which follows the "Standard for sampling and survey for CDM project activities and programme of activities", version 9.0.<br><br>TUV SUD has taken the paragraph 39 "Table 2 Sample Size and Acceptance Number" of the "Standard for sampling and survey for CDM project activities and programme of activities", version 9.0. into consideration in order to select a random sample from the PP based on the AQL of 0.5%, the UQL of 20%, and the producer's and consumer's risk both at 5% were selected. Therefore, a sample size (n) of 22 should have been verified at least, and accordingly with 1 as the maximum number of discrepancies (acceptance number) between the verified data and the PP data. Team verified 22 samples on conservative side to validate and verify the project activity. The verification team selected random samples from the list of cookstoves installation database. Team has assessed (by remote verification, & desk review of contract document between PO & user) a total of 22 samples (randomly selected) selected from different district. The presence of project stoves was checked during the remote visit on video call. The stoves details (unique serial number, date of installation, type of ICS, name of user and address) were also checked and found to be consistent with that reported in the installation database. No inconsistency was observed for any of the 22 samples with respect to the observations in the field. Same has been incorporated in section 4.2 and 2.3 of the VVR. | Closed |

Verra Review: The VVB states the presence of stoves was checked during remote site visit on video call whereas, section 2.3 of the VR indicates that these users were interviewed on telephone. The VVB is required to adhere to consistent reporting, and furnish Verra with the 22 interview notes, and to explain why 22 is conservative.

**Round 2:**

VVB Response: The end users were interviewed on telephone. The same has been mentioned in section 2.3 of the Joint Validation and Verification Report.

The interview notes of the 22 interviews have now been submitted to Verra.

Team verified 22 samples as per paragraph 39 table 2 of "Standard for sampling and survey for CDM project activities and programmes of activities" to validate and verify the project activity and not as a conservative approach. The link for the same is given below:

Web-link: https://cdm.unfccc.int/filestorage/e/x/t/extfile-20210531160756474-Meth_Stan05.pdf/Meth_Stan05.pdf?t=OTd8cm14NTV3fDCpE7EGnn7ZQ42JvbPzUTVf

The verification team selected random samples from the list of cookstoves installation database. Team has assessed (by remote verification, & desk review of contract document between PO & user) a total of 22 samples (randomly selected) selected from different district

Verra Review:

The date of the interview mentioned in the interview notes does not match the date mentioned in section 2.3 of the VR. The VVB must ensure that they present the most accurate and consistent information in the VR.

**Round 3**:

VVB Response: The date of the interview mentioned in section 2.3 of the Validation Report have now been made consistent to the dates mentioned the interview notes. Moreover, the date of distribution of Improved Cookstove have also been incorporated in section 2.3 of the Validation Report.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Verra Review:<br><br>No further action is required. | |
| 9 | **Missing assessment on the operational lifetime of the cook stoves**<br><br>**Issue:**<br><br>It is unclear how the VVB assessed the "operational lifetime" of the cook stoves.<br><br>**Action required:**<br><br>• The VVB must include appropriate evidence of how it checked the "operational lifetime" of the cook stoves.<br>• Further, the VVB must update section 4.2 of the Joint VVR and confirm how it checked that no stoves were replaced during the 5-year monitoring period<br><br>**Program rule:**<br><br>*Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 2.2 & 4.2* | **Round1**:<br><br>VVB Response: Maintenance log book has been checked by the third-party agency for the number of days of operation. The same has been verified by the VVB. The audit team has also cross verified the log books regarding the number of days of operation.<br><br>There has been no cookstove replaced in 5-years monitoring period.<br><br>Verra Review: The maintenance logbook is missing from the list of reference documents reviewed by the VVB.<br><br>The VVB shall explain how it verified the cookstove lifetime and explain in detail in the VR how maintenance logbook, if applicable, confirms the cookstove useful lifetime.<br><br>**Round 2:**<br><br>VVB Response: The maintenance logbook has now been incorporated in the list of reference documents in Joint Validation and Verification Report.<br><br>Verification of the cookstove lifetime has been done with the manufacturer's operation certificate and has been crosschecked with the maintenance logbook. The information regarding the same has now been incorporated in the Joint validation and Verification Report.<br><br>Verra Review: No further action is required. | Closed |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | **Incorrect sampling equation**<br><br>**Issue:**<br><br>The sampling equation in the MR (page 34) is not correct.<br><br>**Action required:**<br><br>• The VVB must ensure that the project proponent uses the correct sampling equation (page 34), see equation 1 of the CDM sampling guidelines v4.0. The '2' has to be 'power 2' and not '1.6452.<br>• The VVB must provide and assessment of the same.<br><br>**Program rule:**<br><br>*Monitoring Report Template, v4.0 Section 4.3* | **Round1**:<br><br>VVB Response: The sampling equation in the Monitoring Report has now been rectified and updated.<br><br>Verra Review: No further action is required<br><br>**Round 2:** | Closed |
| 11 | **Missing assessment on the BPL status**<br><br>**Issue:**<br><br>The VVB does not provide an assessment on the BPL status of the end users.<br><br>**Action required:**<br><br>• The VVB must describe how they verified that the end users of the project activity still fell below the BPL status in section 4.1 of the Joint VVR.<br><br>**Program rule:**<br><br>*Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 4.1* | **Round1**:<br><br>VVB Response: The identification of the end users has been identified based on the Ration cards allotted to them.<br><br>Verra Review: The VVB must describe how did they verify that the BPL status was actually allotted to the end-users based on the ration cards allotted to them without checking any relevant end user documents.<br><br>**Round 2:**<br><br>VVB Response: As per the program design, The Rural Development and Water Conservation (RDWC) Department, Government of Maharashtra is involved in promoting betterment of living standard for the tribal household (ST) and families living Below Poverty Line (BPL) in villages of Maharashtra. The department as a part of its aforesaid programme selects households from amongst the ST and BPL category depending upon level of vulnerability (assessed on basis of 13 parameters: Category and size of usable land, Type of house, Availability of regular usable clothes, Protection of food or food security, Cleanliness, Ownership of required goods, Heights /Level of literacy, Family working capacity, Source of livelihood goods, Number of children in age group (5 to 14), Type of bankruptcy, Reason for | Closed |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | staying away from family of earning member, Choice of help /Yojana) 12 and provide financial assistance to facilitate better and hygienic living standard. The household selected for financial assistance under the programme is provided with an improved cook stove system.<br><br>Hence, the parameters mentioned above has been crosscheck as well along with the ration cards to identify the families below Poverty line.<br><br>Verra Review:<br><br>No further action is required. | |
| 12 | **Missing assessment on uniqueness and double counting**<br><br>**Issue:**<br><br>The VVB does not provide an assessment on how they verified that each cookstove can be uniquely identified and that there will be no double counting.<br><br>**Action required:**<br><br>The VVB must describe how they verified uniqueness of the stoves and ensured that no double counting was taking place.<br><br>**Program rule:**<br>*VCS Standard v4.2, Section 3.21.1*<br><br>*Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 4.1* | **Round1**:<br><br>VVB Response: Each Cookstove has a Unique Identification Number. The same can be confirmed from the monitoring database and the Emission Reduction sheet. Hence there has been no double accounting of the cookstoves.<br><br>No double accounting certificate submitted by the PP has also been reviewed and found correct.<br><br>Verra Review: The VVB must describe if they also cross-checked the unique ID in the database with the cookstove photographs and the videos obtained as secondary evidence during the remote audit to achieve an objective and reasonable level of assurance.<br><br>**Round 2:**<br><br>VVB Response: The unique identification number were crosschecked with the secondary evidence obtained during the remote site audit.<br><br>The interview notes have also been submitted to the Verra team to verify the same.<br><br>Verra Review:<br><br>The VVB still does not specify the kind of secondary evidence it relied on to confirm the unique cookstove IDs.<br><br>**Round 3:** | Closed |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | VVB Response: As per section 2.3 of the Validation Report "The telephonic interviews and video calls has been conducted to discuss with the client regarding the data and documents pertaining to the current validation and verification period."<br><br>The secondary documentary evidence referred here are the 22 interview notes (Randomly Selected) that has been submitted to Verra team.<br><br>Verra Review:<br><br>No further action is required. | |
| 13 | **Incorrect CDM reference number**<br><br>**Issue:**<br><br>Summary section of the joint VVR reports incorrect CDM reference number.<br><br>**Action required:**<br><br>The VVB must ensure that the correct CDM reference number is reported across all sections of the Joint VVR.<br><br>Program rule:<br><br>*Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0* | **Round1**:<br><br>VVB Response: The CDM reference number of the project activity is 8810. The same has now been updated in the Joint Validation and Verification Report.<br><br>Verra Review: No further action is required<br><br>**Round 2:** | Closed |
| 14 | **Missing verification period and verification conclusion**<br><br>**Issue:**<br><br>Section 5 of the VR does not include the verification period and lacks a verification statement and conclusion on the realized emission reductions.<br><br>**Action required:**<br><br>The VVB must ensure that section 5 of the VR is updated in line with the Joint VVR template. | **Round1**:<br><br>VVB Response: The verification period and the verification conclusion has now been incorporated in section 5 of the Joint Validation and Verification Report.<br><br>Verra Review: There are typos in the verification period stated in section 5 of the VR, and therefore, the indicated verification period is incorrect.<br><br>**Round 2:** | Closed |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Program rule:**<br>*Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0, Section 5* | VVB Response: The typographical error in the verification period has now been rectified and updated in section 5 of Joint Validation and Verification Report.<br>Verra Review:<br>No further action is required. | |
| 15 | **Missing Calculation Sheet**<br>**Issue:**<br>The table ERR Calculation sheet(s) and the excel database were not provided.<br>**Action required:**<br>The VVB must ensure that the project proponent provides the ERR Calculation sheet(s) and the excel database for review.<br>**Program rule:**<br>*Monitoring Report Template, v4.0* | **Round1**:<br>VVB Response: Monitoring Database and the Emission Reduction Sheet have now been submitted to Verra.<br>Verra Review: No further action is required<br>**Round 2:** | Closed |