

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	2442
Project Name	Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 24
Program(s)	VCS
Verification Period	09-October-2012 to 08-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, Version 03.0.0
VVB	TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd,
Assessment Criteria	VCS Version 4
Date of First Issue	15 August 2022
Review Conclusion	Approved
Date of Final Issue	7 December 2022

FINDINGS

#	Description	Response	Status
1	Start dates need clarification and alignment <u>Issue</u> It is unclear if the project start date aligns with the VCS definition and requirement Project crediting period does not align with the project start date <u>Action item</u> A1. The VVB must ensure that Section 1.8 of the Project Description (PD) and Section 1.5 of the Monitoring Report (MR) are updated to report the start date the date on which the project began generating GHG. While it is stated that 09 October 2012 is the date cookstoves were handed over to recipients, it is also stated that the actual handover of ICS to beneficiary was on 03 October 2012. Please confirm which is the correct date. A2. The VVB must assess the clarified start date for compliance with VCS rules and update all relevant sections of the joint validation and Verification (Joint Val/Ver). B1. The VVB must ensure that Section 1.9 of the PD and Section 1.6 of the MR are updated so that the start date of the crediting period aligns with the project start date. Currently they do not start on the same day. B2. The VVB must ensure that the Joint Val/Ver is updated to reflect this change. <u>Program rule(s) or methodology section</u> VCS Standard, v4.3, Section 3.7; Program Definitions, v4.2, 'Start Date' and 'Crediting Period Start Date'.	Round1: VVB Response: - The date on which the project began to generate emission reductions is 09-October-2012. The start date of the project activity has now been made consistent to the start date of the crediting period i.e. 09-October-2012. - The start date of the project activity has now been updated in section 1.10 of the Project Design Document. The table has now been updated in section 1.10 as per the updated start date i.e 09-October-2012. - The start date of the project activity has now been updated throughout the Project Design Document, Monitoring Report and Joint Val/Ver Report. The start date of the project activity is 09-October-2012. The emission reductions have also been updated accordingly. Verra Review: This finding is now closed.	Closed

2 Additional justification for baseline stove need <u>Issue</u> It is not clear what stove type is considered a ‘traditional cook stove’ or ‘inefficient traditional cookstove’ A more detailed description of evidence used to establish the baseline stove is needed <u>Action item</u> The VVB must ensure that Section 1.1, and any other relevant sections of the PD are updated to: A. clearly define what is meant by “traditional cook stove” or “inefficient traditional cookstove” B. justify how it was determined that there is only one baseline stove (three stone) found in the project area and that a 10% thermal efficiency is representative of this baseline stove. <u>Program rule(s) or methodology section</u> VCS Standard, v4.3, Section 3.12	Round1: VVB Response: • Inefficient traditional cook stoves are same as the traditional cook stoves. The term “inefficient” has been used to showcase that the traditional cook stoves ineffectual as compared to the improved cookstoves. • Traditional cookstove is being used among all households in the baseline as per the baseline survey, thus thermal efficiency is considered 10% for traditional stove according to the methodology. Same has been incorporated in the VCS PD • Necessary changes have been updated by the VVB in the joint VVR report. Verra Review: This finding is now closed.	Closed
3 Typo in sampling equation <u>Issue</u> The MR contains a typo that represents the sampling equation used incorrectly. <u>Action item</u> A. The VVB must ensure that Section 4.3 of the MR is updated to include the correct sampling equation. Currently squared number (^2) are not reported correctly. B. The VVB is requested to assess this update and confirm that calculations are correct. <u>Program rule(s) or methodology section</u> VCS Standard, v4.3, Section 3.15 and 4.1.23 <u>Background Information</u>	Round1: VVB Response: The correct sampling equation has now been incorporated in section 4.3 of the monitoring report. Verra Review: This finding is now closed.	Closed

The correct sampling equation can be checked via the UNFCCC Guidelines for Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Program of Activities.

https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Guidclarif/meth/meth_guid48.pdf

4 GHG ERR calculations are not reproducible

Issue

Calculations presented in Sections 5.1, 5.3 and 5.4 of the MR do not provide enough details for a reader to reproduce them or follow the math.

Action item

A. The VVB must provide a copy of the ERR calculations sheet.

B. The VVB must ensure that Sections 5.1, 5.3 and 5.4 of the MR are updated to provide all required equations and values for the calculations presented in the section. Calculations should be able to be reproducible for each vintage year.

Program rule(s) or methodology section

VCS Standard, v4.3, Section 3.4.1 and 3.4.3

Round 1:

VVB Response:

- Emission Reduction Sheet has now been submitted.
- Required calculations have now been incorporated in appendix – 1 of Monitoring Report.

Verra Review:

The VVB must ensure that Section 5.1 and 5.3 of the MR are updated to include a clear explanation, including all equations and calculations/work required to reach each vintage year baseline emission or removal and leakage emission value. Currently, only some equations are provided and, as such, the calculations are not reproducible. The VVB must ensure that it is clear how the yearly values were achieved.

Round 2:

VVB Response:

All required equations for the calculations have now been incorporated in section 5.1, and 5.3 of the Monitoring Report Version 04. The entire parameters along with the values have now been mentioned in Appendix-1 of the Monitoring Report.

Verra Review:

This finding is now closed.

Closed

5 VVB to confirm replacement of cookstoves after end of lifetime and provide additional detail on how they assessed all fixed and monitored parameters. Issue 1. The monitoring report indicates that no cookstoves were replaced or damaged during the 5-year monitoring period. However, the cookstove lifetime is only 5 years. 2. How the VVB assessed all fixed and monitored parameters is not clear. Action item A. The VVB must update Section 4.2 of the Joint Val/Ver to justify how they determined that zero damaged or broken cookstoves over the entire 5-year monitoring period and lifetime of the cookstove was an accurate and reliable report. The VVB must describe what evidence was checked. B. In Section 4.1 and 4.2 of the Joint Val/Ver the VVB must assess ALL fixed and monitored parameters. For each parameter the VVB is requested to: 1. confirm which objective evidence (s) were checked 2. whether the sampling plan prescribed in the monitoring plan was followed 3. whether the confidence/precision level was achieved 4. offer its opinion on the accuracy and reliability of the reported values in line with the VCS requirements Program rule(s) or methodology section VCS Standard, v4.3, Section 3.15 and 4.1.23	Closed Round1: VVB Response: It is confirmed that on signing the tri partite agreement, each ICS user is obliged to use the improved cookstove and refrain from using the traditional cookstoves. The agreement shall be terminated, if the user give away/rent/sub-let/sell the ICS to other users and, in case it is observed that the traditional stove is being used. Therefore, it is ensured that the ICS remains in operation throughout the year. Further, during the remote interview, households confirmed the removal of traditional stoves completely and confirmed the operation of ICS throughout the entire monitoring period. Verification team has also checked the <i>Third-party survey results carried out by CTRAN Consulting Ltd.</i> on an annual basis across the project locations to assess the number of days of functioning/usage of traditional cookstoves. Annual survey has been carried out in 160 households to confirm cooking practices, the operation of ICS and to check whether traditional stoves are still being used. During the remote inspection and through the review of grievance register, monitoring database it was confirmed that no complaints or grievances were received in the monitoring period. Hence, no replacement has been carried out. Further as confirmed through the results of the survey, there is no use of the traditional stoves, no ICS has been replaced and the ICS is operational for entire year (and the entire monitoring period) as there is no replacement or non-functional days. Verra Review: This finding is now closed.
---	---

6 Further justification for the interview process is needed	VVB Response:	Closed
<u>Issue</u> 1. It is not clear which interviewees participated in the usage rate survey and thermal efficiency tests. 2. A list of topics discussed for household user interviewees is missing. 3. The selection process for interviewees is not described. <u>Action item</u> The VVB must update section 2.3 of the Joint Val/Ver Report to: A. clarify which interviewees participated in the usage rate survey and efficiency tests. B. provide more information on topics discussed. C. describe how they arrived at a sample of 11 for interviews and whether it was an acceptance sample from PP's own sample, or a sample from the 'global database'. <u>Program rule(s) or methodology section</u> VCS Standard, v4.3, Section 4.1.2, 4.1.13, 4.1.14	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 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. Verra Review: This finding is now closed.	
7 Process for resolution of findings is sparse and section does not follow template directions	Round1:	Closed
<u>Issue</u> The VVB does not follow template formatting requirements for presenting resolution of findings raised.	VVB Response: Findings have now been incorporated in Appendix – 1 of Joint VVR.	

Action item

Since the summary of each finding does not fit on a single page, the VVB must move the findings to an appendix in the Joint Val/Ver.

Program rule(s) or methodology section

VCS Standard, v4.3, Section 4.1.13 and 4.1.14

Verra Review: This finding is now closed.

8 Missing or unclear information in the Joint Validation & Verification must be fixed

Issue

No statement was provided by the VVB indicating that the project is likely to achieve the estimated GHG ERRs reported in the PD.

The applied Methodology version is reported inconsistently.

Action item

A. The VVB must update section 5 of the Joint Val/Ver to include a statement regarding if the project is likely to achieve estimated ERR or not.

B. The VVB must clarify which methodology version is being applied by the project. The VVB must update Section 3.3.1 of the Joint Val/Ver and ensure that all project documents are updated to consistently reference the correct section. Currently, the Joint Val/Ver and MR states v3 is being used while the CDM PD and VCS PD states v4.

Program rule(s) or methodology section

VCS Standard, v4.3, Section 4.1.13 and 4.1.14

Round1:

VVB Response:

Information regarding the estimated emission reductions and actual emission reductions have now been incorporated in section 5 of Joint VVR.

The methodology used is AMS-II.G. ver. 4. The same has now been made consistent throughout the PD, MR and Joint VVR.

Verra Review: This finding is now closed.

Closed