

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 & verification
Project ID	2439
Project Name	Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 18
Program(s)	VCS
Verification Period	06 October 2012 - 05 October 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; v04
VVB	TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd
Assessment Criteria	VCS Version 4.1
Date of First Issue	30 November 2022
Review Conclusion	Approve
Date of Final Issue	3 January 2023

FINDINGS			
#	Description	Response	Status
1	Outdated VCS Standard version reference <u>Issue</u> The joint validation-verification report refers to the VCS Standard version 4.1. <u>Action item</u> The VVB must ensure that the gap validation and verification process is performed against the requirements of the latest VCS Standard version available. <u>Program rule</u> VCS Standard v.4.2	Round1: VVB Response: The latest VCS standard version 4.2 has now referred in Joint Validation and Verification Report. Verra Review: The documents were updated accordingly. The finding is closed and no further action is required.	Closed
2	Incorrect reference to carbon credits <u>Issue</u> The VVB refers to “CER” in section 1.4 whereas “VCU” applies. <u>Action item</u> The VVB must correct the report to reference the actual ERs product achieved under the VCS program. <u>Program rule</u> VCS-Project Description Template v.4.0	Round1: VVB Response: The typographical error has now been rectified and “CER” has now been updated to “VCU” in section 1.4 of the Joint Validation and Verification Report. Verra Review: The documents were updated accordingly. The finding is closed and no further action is required.	Closed

3	Incorrect reference to the methodology version	Round1:	Closed
<u>Issue</u>	The project description Section 1.13 refers to AMS II-G, Version 03, whereas the applied methodology is version 04. Furthermore, in the Joint Validation and Verification document, version 03 is mentioned throughout the report.	VVB Response: The typographical error has now been rectified and version 04 of the methodology has now been referred throughout the Joint validation and Verification Report, Monitoring Report and Project Design Document.	Verra Review:
<u>Action item</u>	The VVB must request the project proponent to ensure that the version number of the methodology applied is consistent in the project description document. Also, the VVB must correct the incorrect version mentioned in the Joint Validation and Verification Report.	The documents were updated accordingly. The finding is closed and no further action is required.	
<u>Program rule</u>	VCS-Project Description Template v.4.0		
4	Missing identification of other entities	Round1:	Closed
<u>Issue</u>	The joint validation and verification report does not identify the “other entities” involved in the project.	VVB Response: The other entities involved have now been mentioned in section 3.1 of the Joint Validation and Verification Report.	Verra Review:
<u>Action item</u>	The VVB must identify, in Section 3.1 of the joint validation and verification report, the “other entities” involved in the project.	The documents were updated accordingly. The finding is closed and no further action is required.	
<u>Program rule</u>	VCS Joint Validation Verification Report Template v.4.0, Section 3.1		

5	Missing ongoing communication with stakeholders	Round1: Closed
<u>Issue</u>	The monitoring report does not include information on the ongoing communication conducted with the local stakeholders (grievance mechanism in place).	VVB Response: The ongoing communication with stakeholders is being done via grievance mechanism.
<u>Action item</u>	The VVB must ensure that the project proponent includes all the required information related to the ongoing communication with local stakeholders in Section 2.2 of the monitoring report.	Details of the continuous grievance mechanism has now been incorporated in section 2.2 of the Monitoring Report.
<u>Program rule</u>	VCS Standard v.4.2, Section 3.17.9	The comments of the stakeholders are verified via grievance register. Although there have been no grievances received during the current monitoring period.
VCS Monitoring Report template v.4.0, Section 2.2	Verra Review:	The documents were updated accordingly. The finding is closed and no further action is required.
6	Missing information on Global Stakeholders Consultation	Round1: Closed
<u>Issue</u>	Section 2.4 of the project description does not include information related to the public comments.	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.
<u>Action item</u>	The VVB must request the project proponent to include the information related to the public comments period in the project description.	Verra Review:
<u>Program rule</u>	VCS Standard v.4.2, Section 3.4	The documents were updated accordingly. The finding is closed and no further action is required.
VCS Project Description Template v.4.0, Section 2.4		

7 Missing information on the interviews conducted Issue: Detailed steps regarding how the interview process was carried out is not provided in Section 2.3 of the Joint VVR. Action required: The VVB must provide clarification on which users were interviewed and whether they participated in the usage rate survey. Furthermore, the VVB must provide clarification on how it assessed the efficiency tests via the interviews. Program rules: Joint Validation and Verification Report Template, v4.0 Section 2.3	Round1: Closed VVB Response: Information regarding the Interviews process has now been incorporated in section 2.3 of the Joint Validation and Verification Report. Verra Review: The documents were updated accordingly. The finding is closed and no further action is required.
8 Unclear sampling approach for interviews Issue: 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. Action required: 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. Furthermore, 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.	Round1: Closed 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. 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

Program rule:

Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 2.3

and the PP data. Team verified 22 samples as per “Standard for sampling and survey for CDM project activities and programme of activities” 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 4.1 and 2.3 of the VVR.

The acceptance number is the number of acceptable discrepancies. There have been no discrepancies observed in PP’s data and the same is found to be valid.

Moreover, the interview notes have been verified by the assessment team and found accurate.

Verra Review:

The VVB clarified the approach it used to verify the sampling process. The finding is closed and no further action is required.

9 Missing assessment on the operational lifetime of the cook stoves

Issue:

It is unclear how the VVB assessed the “operational lifetime” of the cook stoves.

Action required:

The VVB must include appropriate evidence of how it checked the “operational lifetime” of the cookstoves. Furthermore, the VVB must update section 4.2 of the Joint VVR and confirm how

Round1:

Closed

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.

There has been no cookstove replaced in 5-years monitoring period.

Verra Review:

it checked that no stoves were replaced during the 5-year monitoring period

Program rule:

Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 2.2 & 4.2

The VVB explained how it verified the operational lifetime of the project cookstove. The finding is closed and no further action is required.

10 Incorrect sampling equation

Issue:

The sampling equation in the MR is not correct.

Action required:

The VVB must ensure that the project proponent uses the correct sampling equation (page 42), see equation 1 of the CDM sampling guidelines v4.0.

Program rule:

CDM "Guidelines for Sampling and Surveys for Project Activities and Programme of Activities"

Round1:

Closed

VVB Response: The sampling equation in the Monitoring Report has now been rectified and updated.

Verra Review:

The documents were updated accordingly. The finding is closed and no further action is required.

11 Missing assessment on uniqueness and double counting

Issue:

The VVB has not provided an assessment on how it has verified the uniqueness of the cookstoves and that there is no double counting.

Action required:

The VVB must describe how it has verified the uniqueness of the cookstoves and ensured that no double counting occurs.

Program rule:

VCS Standard v4.2, Section 3.21.1

Round1:

Closed

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.

No double accounting certificate submitted by the PP has also been reviewed and found correct.

Verra Review:

The VVB confirmed how it assessed that there is no double counting.. The finding is closed and no further action is required.

Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 4.1

12	Missing reference of verification period in the verification conclusion <u>Issue</u> The verification conclusion does not include a reference to the verification period. <u>Action Item</u> The VVB must include the reference to the verification period in its verification conclusion. <u>Program rule</u> VCS Joint Validation Verification Report Template v.4.0, Section 5	Round1: VVB Response: The verification period and the verification conclusion has now been incorporated in section 5 of the Joint Validation and Verification Report. Verra Review: The documents were updated accordingly. The finding is closed and no further action is required.	Closed
----	---	---	--------