

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	2436
Project Name	Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 8
Program(s)	VCS
Verification Period	01-November-2012 to 31-October-2017 (First and Last date included)
Project Proponent	M/s G K Energy Marketers Pvt. Ltd
Methodology	AMS-II-G Version 3.0
VVB	TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd
Assessment Criteria	VCS Version 4.2
Date of First Issue	21 July 2022
Review Conclusion	Approved
Date of Final Issue	06 October 2022

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

#	Description	Response	Status
1	<p>Lack of clarity on project start date and crediting period start date</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>The project start date and the crediting period start date do not match.</p> <p>Action required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. 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. B. The VVB must assess the updated PD and update Section 3.1 of the Joint VVR as needed. <p>Program rules:</p> <p>VCS <i>Standard</i>, v4.2, Section 3.7; Project Description Template, v4.0 Section 1.8 & 1.9; Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 3.1</p>	<p>Round1:</p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <p>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 01-November-2012. The emission reductions have also been updated accordingly.</p> <p>Joint VVR has also been updated accordingly.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>While the start date of the project activity has now been updated throughout the Project Design Document, Monitoring Report and Joint Val/Ver Report. However, Section 2.2 of the VR needs to be updated. This finding is still open.</p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <p>The start date has now been made consistent throughout the Joint VVR report. Section 2.2 of the joint VVR has now been updated accordingly.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>The start date has now been made consistent throughout the Joint VVR report. Section 2.2 of the joint VVR. This finding is closed.</p>	Closed

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

<p>2</p>	<p>Information missing regarding the public comment period</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>The project proponent did not include any information regarding the public comment period posting on the VCS registry.</p> <p>Action required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. 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. B. The VVB must assess the updated PD and update Section 3.3.4 of the Joint VVR as needed. <p>Program rules:</p> <p>VCS <i>Standard</i>, v4.2, Section 3.17.6; Project Description Template, v4.0 Section 2.4; Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 3.1</p>	<p>Round1:</p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <p>Information regarding the public commenting period has now been updated in section 2.4 of the Project Design Document.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>Information regarding the public commenting period has now been updated in section 2.4 of the Project Design Document. This finding is closed.</p>	<p>Closed</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>Lack of clarity on how the interviews were conducted</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>Detailed steps regarding how the interview process was carried out is not provided in Section 2.3 of the Joint VVR.</p> <p>Action required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The VVB must provide clarification on which users were interviewed and whether they participated in the usage rate survey. B. The VVB must provide clarification on how it assessed efficiency tests via the interviews. <p>Program rules:</p> <p>Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 2.3</p>	<p>Round1:</p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <p>Information regarding the Interviews process has now been incorporated in section 2.3 of the Joint Validation and Verification Report.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>Information regarding the Interviews process has now been incorporated in section 2.3 of the Joint Validation and Verification Report. This finding is closed.</p>	<p>Closed</p>

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

<p>4</p> <p>Lack of clarity on the interviews’ sampling approach</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>It is not clear how the VVB arrived at a sample of 7 for the interviews.</p> <p>Action required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. 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. B. 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. <p>Program rule:</p> <p>Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 2.3</p>	<p>VVB Response:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>Information on VVB sampling has now been provided. This finding is closed.</p>	<p>Closed</p>
<p>5</p> <p>Detailed assessment missing on the monitored parameters</p> <p>Issue:</p>	<p>Round1:</p> <p>VVB Response:</p>	<p>Closed</p>

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

It is unclear how the VVB assessed the monitored parameters against the objective evidence and whether confidence/precision level was achieved.

Action required:

- A. The VVB must update Section 4.1 of the Joint VVR and describe how it validated, against objective evidence all the monitored parameters: For example, for Parameter ‘No. of Cook Stoves in use’, the VVB does not confirm whether it checked distribution database, and whether the sampling plan was followed in line with the approved monitoring plan.
- B. Further, the VVB must provide its opinion on the accuracy and reliability of the reported values in line with the monitoring plan and the VCS requirements.

Program rule:

Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 4.1

Maintenance log book has been checked by the third-party agency for the number of cookstoves in use. The same has been verified by the VVB. The CDM audit team has also cross verified the log books regarding the number of cookstoves in operation.

Verra Review:

Section 4.1 of the Joint VVR has been updated to include how the VVB assessed the monitored parameters against the objective evidence and whether confidence/precision level was achieved.

6

Detailed assessment missing on the ‘end user agreements’

Issue:

It is unclear how the VVB assessed the consistency of the ‘end user agreements’.

Action required:

- A. The VVB must update Section 3.1 of the Joint VVR and describe how it checked that the ‘end user agreements’ were ‘consistent’, without specifying which ones.
- B. The VVB must and how many, and how it determined that the ‘end user agreements’ were ‘consistent.’

Program rules:

Round1:

VVB Response:

The tripartite agreement submitted by the PP is between the end party user, Vikram stoves and G K Energy Marketers Private Limited. The agreement clear states that the rights of the VCUs rests with G K energy marketers private limited. The agreement has been signed by all the parties.

Hence as per Section 3.6.1 of the VCS Standard v4.1, the project owner is G K Energy Marketers Private Limited.

Verra Review:

The explanation provided is sufficient to close this finding.

Closed

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 3.1

7

Detailed assessment missing 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:

- A. The VVB must include appropriate evidence of how it checked the “operational lifetime” of the cook stoves.
- B. 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

Program rule:

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

Round1:

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 CDM 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.

Round2:

Verra Review:

The explanation provided is not sufficient to close this finding.

Action required:

- A. The VVB must include appropriate evidence of how it checked the “operational lifetime” of the cook stoves.
- B. 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

VVB Response:

The operational lifetime of the cookstoves has been confirmed from the structural manual of the cookstove, the same information has now been incorporated in section 2.2 of the Joint VVR.

Relevant information has now been incorporated in section 4.2 of the Joint VVR.

Closed

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

	<p>Round3:</p> <p>Verra Response:</p> <p>On page #44 of the Joint VVR, the VVB states that “there has been no cookstove during the monitoring period of 5 years. The same has been confirmed from the survey reports and the interviews conducted during the remote audit.” Therefore, this finding remains open. The VVB must provide a clarification on this statement.</p> <p>VVB Response: The statement has now been updated to “there has been no replacement of cookstoves during the monitoring period of 5 years. The same has been confirmed from the survey reports and the interviews conducted during the remote audit”. The typographical error has now been rectified.</p> <p>Verra Response:</p> <p>The statement has now been updated and no further action is required. Therefore, this finding is closed.</p>
<p>8</p> <p>Lack of consistency in how the sectorial scope and project type is reported</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>The sectorial scope and project type in reported in the monitoring report is not consistent with what is in the PD.</p> <p>Action required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The VVB must ensure project proponent to provide the sectorial scope and project type that is consistent with what is reported in the monitoring report and PD. B. The VVB must provide an assessment of the same. 	<p style="text-align: right;">Closed</p> <p>Round1:</p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <p>The sectorial scope and project type has now been made consistent throughout the Project Design Document and the Monitoring Report.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>The sectorial scope and project type has been corrected. This finding is closed.</p>

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

<p>Program rule:</p> <p>Project Description Template, v4.0 Section 1.2, Monitoring Report Template, v4.0</p>		
<p>9</p> <p>Incorrect sampling equation</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>The sampling equation (page 34) is not correct.</p> <p>Action required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. 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. B. The VVB must provide and assessment of the same. <p>Program rule:</p> <p>Monitoring Report Template, v4.0 Section 4.3</p>	<p>Round1:</p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <p>The sampling equation has now been updated in section 4.3 of monitoring report version 03.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>The sampling equation has been corrected. However, it is not clear how the how PP arrived at sample size of 39.</p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <p>Relevant information regarding the sample size of 39 has now been incorporated in section 4.3 of the monitoring report and section 4.1 of the Joint VVR.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>Clarification has now been provided on how the PP arrived at sample size of 39 and therefore this finding is closed.</p>	<p>Closed</p>
<p>10</p> <p>Insufficient information to demonstrate project eligibility</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>The information provided in Section 1.3 of the PD is insufficient to demonstrate that the project is eligible under the VCS Program.</p> <p>Action required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent updates Section 1.3 of the PD and refer to the <i>VCS Standard v4.2</i>, Section 2.1.1 and indicate which gases are covered, under the VCS program. 	<p>Round1:</p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <p>All the relevant information regarding the project eligibility has now been updated in section 1.3 of the Project Design Document Version 03.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>Action required:</p>	<p>Closed</p>

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

B. The VVB must provide and assessment of the same.

Template rule:

VCS Standard v4.2, Section 2.1.1; Project Description Template, v4.0 Section 1.3

The information provided is not relevant to close this finding.

- A. The VVB must ensure project proponent updates Section 1.3 of the PD and refer to the list provided in Section 2.1.1 of the VCS Standard v4.3 and indicate which gases are covered, under the VCS program.
- B. The VVB must provide and assessment of the same.

Round2:

VVB Response:

Relevant information regarding the gases covered in the project activity and the eligibility of the project activity has now been incorporated in section 1.3 of the Project Description document.

The assessment of the same has now been incorporated in section 3.2 of the Joint VVR.

Verra Review:

Relevant information regarding the gases covered in the project activity and the eligibility of the project activity has now been provided. This finding is closed.

11

Lack of clarity on the documents included for document review

Issue:

The table provided in Section 2.2 of the Joint VVR is not clearly explained with regards to the documentation that was reviewed during the validation process.

Action required:

Round1:

VVB Response:

Reference for all the relevant documents have now been incorporated in section 2.2 of the Joint VVR version 03.

Clarification for all the documents have also been incorporated.

Verra Review:

Closed

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

- A. The VVB must provide an explanation of the difference between the ‘Tripartee agreement’ /6/, and ‘Ownership of the Project’ /7/. From the PDD and PD and finding CL 02, it appears to be the same thing.
- B. The VVB must provide clarification as to what “No double counting evidence” (#9) is in relation to the documentation reviewed during validation.
- C. The VVB must provide clarification as to why the CDM PDD and Validation Report is not included in the list of references.
- D. The VVB must provide clarification as to what the “Survey Report” is.

Template rule:

Joint Val/Ver Template, v4.0 Section 2.2

There are no updates that have been incorporated in section 2.2 of the Joint VVR version 03. This finding remains open.

Action required:

- A. The VVB must provide an explanation of the difference between the ‘Tripartee agreement’ /6/, and ‘Ownership of the Project’ /7/. From the PDD and PD and finding CL 02, it appears to be the same thing.
- B. The VVB must provide clarification as to what “No double counting evidence” (#9) is in relation to the documentation reviewed during validation.
- C. The VVB must provide clarification as to why the CDM PDD and Validation Report is not included in the list of references.
- D. The VVB must provide clarification as to what the “Survey Report” is.

Round2:

VVB Response:

The following updates have now been done in section 2.2 of the joint VVR.:

- A. Explanation regarding the ‘Tripartee agreement’ has now been incorporated.
- B. Clarification on “No double counting evidence” has now been incorporated.
- C. Reference for CDM PDD and validation has now been incorporated.
- D. Explanation regarding the “Survey Report” has now been incorporated.

Verra Review:

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

	<p>Section 2.2 of the Joint VVR has now been updated. This finding is closed.</p>	
<p>12</p> <p>Missing Calculation Sheet</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>The table ERR Calculation sheet(s) and the excel database were not provided.</p> <p>Action required:</p> <p>The VVB must ensure that the project proponent provides the ERR Calculation sheet(s) and the excel database for review.</p> <p>Program rule:</p>	<p>Round1:</p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <p>Emission Reduction calculation sheet and monitoring database have now been submitted.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>While the Emission Reduction calculation sheet and monitoring database have now been submitted, the VVB must ensure that the net total for this MP in Section 5.4 of the MR is corrected, that is, it should be 59,479 tCO2e and not 63, 135 tCO2e.</p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <p>Values for emission reduction in section 5.4 of MR has now been made consistent to emission reduction sheet.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>Values for emission reduction in section 5.4 of MR has now been made consistent to emission reduction sheet. This finding is closed.</p>	<p>Closed</p>