

# PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

<b>Project ID</b>	2422
<b>Project Name</b>	Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase I
<b>Program(s)</b>	VCS
<b>Verification Period</b>	28-October-2012 to 27-October 2017
<b>Project Proponent</b>	M/s G K Energy Marketers Pvt. Ltd
<b>Methodology</b>	AMS II-G, v3
<b>Sectoral Scope(s)</b>	3. Energy demand
<b>Validation/Verification Body (VVB)</b>	TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	VCS Standard, v4.1
<b>Date of First Issue</b>	2 May 2022
<b>Date of Final Issue</b>	7 December 2022

## Summary:

An accuracy review of the Project 2422, Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase I registration and verification approval request has been conducted by Verra in accordance with Section 4.3 of the *Registration and Issuance Process*.

The accuracy review has raised ten assessment findings and three minor findings, detailed below. The VVB, in coordination with the project proponent, is hereby required to provide a response to the assessment findings presented in Section 1. The assessment findings must be addressed to the satisfaction of Verra. The VVB need not address the minor findings during this review. Please note, however, that where Verra finds consistent minor findings by the VVB in future reviews, minor findings shall be escalated to assessment findings.

This project review report will be made publicly available. Confidential information may be provided as separate attachments.

## ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

### Finding 1

Section 3.4.1 and 3.4.3 of the *VCS Standard, v4.1* states that projects shall use the VCS Project Description Template and VCS Monitoring Report Template and adhere to all instructional text within the template.

Section 1.1 of the Project Description (PD) Template v4.0, requires the project proponent to provide a “brief description of the scenario existing prior to the implementation of the project.”

Section 1.1 of the PD states “The improved cook stoves through replacement of inefficient traditional cook stove will contribute towards reduction of greenhouse gas emission and by-products of incomplete combustion like black carbon, conservation of fuel wood and thereby preventing forest degradation. Successful operation of the project activity will encourage rural residents to shift from traditional cook stoves usage to the project improved and modern cook stove usage.”

Section 1.3 of the PD states “The improved cook stoves owing to its higher combustion efficiency of 29.88% in comparison to 10% efficiency of the traditional cook stoves results in efficiency improvement”

Section 1.1 of the PD should be updated to include the following information:

- Describe “the scenario existing prior to the implementation of the project.”
- Clearly define what is meant by “traditional cook stove” or “inefficient traditional cookstove”
- Justify that there is only one baseline stove found from the ‘research’ to justify the 10% (three-stone), or 20% (0.2) baseline efficiency ( $\eta_{old}$ ) as per methodology.

The VVB is requested to assess these changes and update the verification report as necessary. Specifically, the VVB is requested to update section 1.4 of the Joint Validation and Verification Report (Joint Val/Ver Report) to include a statement on how it checked that the replaced system is a three-stone fire, and not a conventional system with no improved combustion air supply.

#### VVB Response:

- Brief description of the scenario existing prior to the implementation of the project has now been incorporated in section 1.1 of the Project Description.
- 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 Response:

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

### Finding 2

The 19 April 2022 *Clarifications to the VCS Program Rules and Requirements* document clarifies that the crediting period start date is “the date on which the project began generating GHG emissions reductions or removals; equal to the Project Start Date”.

Section 1.8 of the PD states “The start date of the project activity is 27-October-2012.”

In the second table within Section 1.10 of the PD, the year 1 range for generating emission reductions is defined as 28-10-2012 to 27-10-2013.

Section 1.5 in the monitoring report states, “The start date of the project activity is 27-October-2012.” However, Section 3.1 of the Joint Val/Ver Report states the start date as 28-October-2012.

The VVB shall ensure:

- The project and the crediting period start date are aligned, so that the crediting period begins on the same day as the project start date (27-October-2012).
- The table of estimated ERRs in Section 1.10 of the PD is revised so that the year 1 range begins on the project and crediting period start date (27-October-2012).
- Confirm that the crediting period start date (27-October-2012) has been reported correctly and consistently across any relevant sections in the PD, MR, and Joint Val/Ver Report.

**VVB Response:**

- The date on which the project began to generate emission reductions is 26-October-2012. The start date of the project activity has now been made consistent to the start date of the crediting period i.e. 26-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. 26-October-2012.
- The start date of the project activity has now been updated through out the Project Design Document, Monitoring Report and Joint Val/Ver Report. The start date of the project activity is 26-October-2012. The emission reductions have also been updated accordingly.

**Verra Response:**

The PD section:

- 1.8 and 1.9 are updated so that the project start date and crediting period are aligned.
- 1.10 is updated so the first date range is aligned with the project start date
- The VVB confirms all start dates have been updated.

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

### Finding 3

Section 3.1 of the PD states that AMS II-G version 04 was used. However, the MR, Joint Val/Ver Report, and CDM PDD indicate that AMS II-G version 03 was used.

The VVB is requested to clarify the correct methodology version and update the project documents.

**VVB Response:** The methodology used is “AMS II-G version 03”. The same has now been updated and made consistent throughout the Project Design Document and Monitoring Report.

**Verra Response:**

The methodology version has been updated in the PD and MR.

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

### Finding 4

Section 3.10 in the VCS Standard v4.1 states “The project location shall be provided in order to accurately describe project characteristics and to demonstrate a project’s conformance with other requirements”

Section 1.7 of the monitoring report states “The project is located in state Maharashtra, India... Division: Pune Districts: Solapur”

Among other requirements, Section 3.1 of the Joint Val/Ver Report Template states “Identify, discuss and justify conclusions regarding the... Project Location.”

Section 3.1 states “The project location of the project activity is checked by the assessment via Google earth software and found correct in line with the CDM PDD.”

Section 1.7 of the PD should be updated with a district-wise list of villages involved in the project activity.

The VVB is requested to assess this update and confirm its accuracy. In Section 3.1 of the verification report, the VVB is requested to state the location of the project.

**VVB Response:**

- The exact map location has now been incorporated in section 1.12 of the Project Design Document and section 1.7 of the Monitoring Report.
- District-wise list of villages involved in the project activity has now been updated in section 1.12 of the Project Design Document and section 1.7 of the Monitoring Report.

**Verra Response:**

- Section 1.12 of the PD and section 1.7 of the MR have been updated to include a district-wise list of villages involved in the project activity.
- Section 3.1 in the Joint Val/Ver has been updated to include information about the project location.

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

### Finding 5

Section 4.1.14 in the *VCS Standard v4.1* states, “The verification report shall be accompanied by a verification representation, which shall be prepared using the VCS Verification Deed of Representation Template.”

A Verification Representation was not received. The VVB is requested to upload a Verification Representation to the Verra Registry.

**VVB Response:** The verification representation has now been submitted to the Verra registry.

**Verra Response:**

The Verification Representation has been provided.

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

### Finding 6

Section 2.3 in the *Joint Val/Ver Report Template* states “Describe the interview process and identify personnel, including their roles, who were interviewed and/or provided information additional to that provided in the project description, monitoring report and any supporting documents.”

The VVB is requested to update section 2.3 of the Joint Val/Ver Report to and clarify which interviewees participated in the usage rate survey and efficiency tests. Additionally, the VVB is requested to provide more information on topics discussed. The VVB is also requested to clarify 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’.

**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 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 Response:**

The VVB must report additional details for each interview (i.e., unique serial number, date of installation, and type of ICS) for the 22 households described in Section 2.3 of the Joint Val/Ver Report.

**VVB Response:**

Interview details for each interview such as unique serial number, date of installation, type of ICS for the 22 households have now been incorporated in Section 2.3 of the Joint Val/Ver Report.

**Verra Response:**

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

### Finding 7

Section 3.15.1 in the *VCS Standard v4.1* states “Data and parameters used for the quantification of GHG emission reductions and/or removals shall be provided in accordance with the methodology.”

Section 3.15.2 in the *VCS Standard v4.1* states “Quality management procedures to manage data and information shall be applied and established. Where applicable, procedures to account for uncertainty in data and parameters shall be applied in accordance with the requirements set out in the methodology”

In Section 4.1 & Section 4.2 of the Joint Val/Ver Report, the VVB is required to assess ALL fixed and monitored parameters. For each parameter the VVB is requested to:

- confirm which objective evidence (s) were checked
- whether the sampling plan prescribed in the monitoring plan was followed
- whether the confidence/precision level was achieved
- offer its opinion on the accuracy and reliability of the reported values in line with the VCS requirements

**VVB Response:**

Necessary confirmation statement has been incorporated in section 4.1 of the Joint Val/Ver Report

**Verra Response:**

Section 4.1 and 4.2 of the Joint Val/Ver Report has been updated.

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

### Finding 8

In Section 4.3 of the Monitoring report, the project proponent used an incorrect sampling equation. The project proponent is requested to use the correct sampling equation from 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](https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Guidclarif/meth/meth_guid48.pdf))

The VVB is requested to assess this update and confirm that calculations are correct.

**VVB Response:** The correct sampling equation has now been incorporated in section 4.3 of the monitoring report.

**Verra Response:**

Section 4.3 of the monitoring report has been updated with the correct sampling equation.

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

### Finding 9

In Section 5 of the Joint Val/Ver Report, the VVB is requested to add "Verification period: From [day-month-year] to [day-month-year]" per the Joint Val/Ver Report Template requirements.

**VVB Response:** The verification period has now been incorporated from [day-month-year] to [day-month-year] in section 5 of the Joint Val/Ver Report.

**Verra Response:**

Section 5 of the Joint Val/Ver has been updated with yearly vintages.

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

### Finding 10

The project proponent is requested to provide the ERR Calculation sheet(s) for review.

**VVB Response:** Emission Reduction Sheet has now been submitted to the registry.

**Verra Response:**

The ERR calculations sheet was provided.

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

## MINOR FINDINGS

### Finding 1

The Project Description Template has specific requirements with regards to font size, color and format. The project proponent and VVB should ensure that future documents are submitted according to these requirements.

### Finding 2

The project proponent is requested to fix the typo in Section 4.4 so the total "Estimated net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO<sub>2</sub>e)" reads 126,440 instead of 12,6440.

### Finding 3

In Section 1.4 of the Joint Val/Ver Report, the VVB is requested to use a ':' instead of a '-' to indicate lat/long (so that the '-' is not incorrectly interpreted as a negative number).

## ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

On 2 May 2022, Verra sent TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd, M/s G K Energy Marketers Pvt. Ltd, and EKI Energy Services Limited the project review report with ten assessment findings and three minor findings.

On 18 August 2022, Verra closed findings 1 - 5 and 7 - 10. Action is required for all findings not closed (6).

On 7 December 2022, Verra closed all findings.