

# 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.*

<b>Review Type</b>	Registration
<b>Project ID</b>	2437
<b>Project Name</b>	Distribution Of Improved Cook Stove - Phase 9
<b>Program(s)</b>	VCS
<b>Verification Period</b>	08 November 2012 to 07 November 2017
<b>Project Proponent</b>	M/s G K Energy Marketers Pvt. Ltd
<b>Methodology</b>	AMS-II G. Ver.3 – Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non- renewable biomass
<b>VVB</b>	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH.
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	VCS Version 4.2
<b>Date of First Issue</b>	24 May 2022
<b>Date of Second Issue</b>	22 August 2022
<b>Date of Third Issue</b>	29 August 2022
<b>Review Conclusion</b>	04 August 2022
<b>Date of Final Issue</b>	04 August 2022

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS			
#	Description	Response	Status
1.	<p><b>Public comments</b></p> <p>The project proponent is requested to complete Section 2.4 of the project description to reflect the outcomes of the project’s public comment period. The project has completed its public comment period. However, the project proponent mentions that “the project Description has been web-hosted. Public comments will be incorporated once the commenting period is over.”.</p> <p><b>Program rule:</b></p> <p>VCS <i>standard v4.2</i>, Section 3.17.6</p>	<p><b>Round1:</b></p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <p>Project explanation regarding the public commenting period has now been incorporated in section 2.4 of the Project Design Document version 03.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>Section 2.4 of the VCS project description has been updated and now, incorporates information on the public comment period. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.</p>	Closed
2.	<p><b>Crediting period start date</b></p> <p>The project proponent is requested to update that project description such that the crediting period start date meets the definition set out in the VCS Program Definitions, v4.1. The VVB is requested to corroborate these changes in the validation report plus other related documents.</p> <p>VCS Program Definitions, v4.1 define the crediting period start date as the date on which the project began generating GHG emission reductions or removals; equal to “Project Start Date.” However, the crediting period start date under Section 1.9 of the project description is not the same as the project start date under Section 1.8 of the project description.</p> <p><b>Program rule:</b></p> <p>VCS <i>standard v4.2</i>, <a href="#">Program rules Clarification</a>, Clarification 2</p>	<p><b>Round1:</b></p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <p>The date on which the project began to generate emission reductions is 08-November-2012. The start date of the project activity has now been made consistent to the start date of the crediting period i.e. 08-November-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 08-November-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 emission reductions have also been updated accordingly.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p>	Closed

The crediting period start date has been updated and is the same as the project start date. This update has been made throughout the document. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.

**3. Project ownership**

The project proponent is requested to complete Section 1.7 of the project description in line with standard requirements and furnish the VVB with the appropriate supporting documentation. In completing Section 1.7 of the project description, it is stated that “.... *project activity GKEMPL (Project Participant) along with Vikram Stoves has entered into a contractual agreement with each beneficiary by virtue of which the end-user will confirm the use of cookstove as well as transfer the CER right to the Project Participant.*”

**Program rule:**

VCS Standard v4.1, Section 3.4.1, 3.6

**Round1:**

Closed

**VVB Response:**

Section 1.7 has now been completed in line with the standard requirements. 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 VVB indicates that the project proponent and the end party user have signed a tripartite agreement stating that the rights of the VCUs rests with G K Energy Marketers Private Limited. However, there is no evidence of the agreement.

**Action Item:**

The VVB must ensure that the project proponent has provided a copy of the tripartite agreement stating that the rights of the VCUs rests with G K Energy Marketers Private Limited to Verra for review.

**Round1:**

**VVB Response:**

Sample tripartite agreements have now been submitted to the verra team.

**Verra Review:**

The VVB has provided sample tripartite agreements Verra. However, the agreement demonstrates ownership of the CERs, not VCUs.

**Action item:**

The VVB must assess how the tripartite agreements apply to the ownership of the VCUs in the joint validation and verification report.

**VVB Response:**

Initially, the project got registered under CDM mechanism as mentioned in Project Description and Joint VVR. The tripartite agreements were signed at the time of CDM registration of the project.

However, the Project proponent has submitted the “No Double Accounting Declaration” which demonstrates that there will be no double accounting of the credits claimed under VCS.

Hence, the ownership of the CERs stands for the ownership of the VCUs as there will be no double accounting of the VCUs.

The “No double accounting declaration” has now been submitted to Verra team.

**Verra Review:**

This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.

<p><b>4. Assessment findings</b></p> <p>The findings under Section 2.5 of the validation report exceed one page; therefore, the VVB is requested to put all the findings in an appendix.</p> <p><b>Program rule:</b></p> <p>VCS Standard v4.1, Section 3.4.1, 4.1.13</p>	<p><b>Round1:</b></p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <p>All the findings have now been put in Appendix -1.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>All the findings have now been put in Appendix -1. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.</p>	<p>Closed</p>
<p><b>5. Sustainable development goals</b></p> <p>The project proponent is requested to describe how the project contributes to achieving any nationally stated sustainable development priorities, including any provisions for monitoring, and reporting same, under Section 1.17 of the project description. The VVB is asked to corroborate these updates in the validation report.</p> <p><b>Program rule:</b></p> <p>VCS Standard v4.1, Section 3.4.1</p>	<p><b>Round1:</b></p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <p>The provision to monitor the sustainable development has now been incorporated in section 1.17 of the Project Design Document and the same has now been incorporated in Joint Validation and Verification Report.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>Updates on how the project will monitor and report sustainable development priorities have been added in both the VCS project description and validation report. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.</p>	<p>Closed</p>
<p><b>Minor findings:</b></p> <p>Under Section 2.2 of the Joint verification report and validation report, the VVB did not delete the section instructions, and is therefore requested to do so.</p> <p>Under section 2.5 of the Joint verification report and validation report, CL ID 3, the VVB states “Description of CAR” instead of “CL” and is therefore requested to update this information.</p> <p>In the Validation conclusion of the Joint verification report and validation report, the VVB states under Point 2, “the group project’s eligibility criteria...,” however, this is not a grouped project. The VVB is requested to clarify or update this statement.</p> <p>The VVB has not mentioned the verification period in the validation conclusion of the Joint verification report and validation report.</p>		

The project proponent states in several sections of the project description “GKEMPL (Project Participant)” instead of project proponent. The project proponent is requested to update this.

Under Section 1.3 of the project description, the project proponent is requested to specify the standard version.