# PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

| | |
|---|---|
| Project ID | 2424 |
| Project Name | Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase III |
| Program(s) | VCS |
| Verification Period | 20-November-2012 to 19-November-2017 |
| Project Proponent | M/s G K Energy Marketers Pvt. Ltd |
| Methodology | AMS II-G |
| Sectoral Scope(s) | 3. Energy demand |
| Validation/Verification Body (VVB) | TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd |

| | |
|---|---|
| Assessment Criteria | *VCS Standard, v4.1* |
| Date of First Issue | 2 May 2022 |
| Date of Second Issue | 28 Sep 2022 |
| Date of Final Issue | 08 Dec 2022 |

**Summary:**

An accuracy review of the Project 2424, Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase III 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 eight assessment findings and two 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.

## 1. 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:**

The response and revisions are sufficient.

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 20-November-2012."

Section 1.9 of the PD defines the crediting period start date as 01-December-2012, as does the table

within Section 1.10 of the PD.

Section 3.1 of the Joint Val/Ver Report presents the project start date as 22-October-2012 and the crediting period start date as 15-December-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 (20-Novemeber-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 (20-Novemeber-2012).
- the crediting period start date (20-Novemeber-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 20-November-2012. The start date of the project activity has now been made consistent to the start date of the crediting period i.e. 20-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 20-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 start date of the project activity is 20-November-2012. The emission reductions have also been updated accordingly.

**Verra Response:**

The response and revisions are sufficient.

No further action is required.

## Finding 3

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 table of telephonic interviews in Section 2.3 of the Val/Ver report was left blank.

The VVB is requested to include a table of telephonic interviews of households in section 2.3 of the Joint Val/Ver Report. The table shall identify which interviewees participated in the usage rate survey and efficiency tests and provide information on topics discussed. The VVB is also requested to clarify how they arrived at a sample number of 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.
The telephonic interviews have now been incorporated in section 2.3 of Val/Ver report.

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 submit the details for each interview (i.e., unique serial number, date of installation, type of ICS) for the 22 households in Section 2.3 of the Joint Val/Ver Report.

The finding remains open.

**VVB Response:** The details such has unique serial number, date of installation and type of ICS for each interview have now been incorporated in section 2.3 of Joint Validation and Verification Report.

**Verra Response:**
The response and revisions are sufficient.

No further action is required.

## Finding 4

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:**
The response and revisions are sufficient.

No further action is required.

## Finding 5

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)

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:**
The response and revisions are sufficient.

No further action is required.

## Finding 6

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:**
The verification period has not been reported (from [day-month-year] to [day-month-year]) in section 5 of the Joint Val/Ver Report.

The VVB must further discuss and give its objective opinion on any observed differences between the ex-ante and ex-post values.

The finding remains open.

**VVB Response:**

Verification period has now been incorporated in section 5 of the Joint Validation and Verification Report.

The comparison of ex-ante and ex-post values have now been incorporated in section 5 of the Joint Validation and Verification Report. Objective opinion has also been provided for the same.

**Verra Response:**
The response and revisions are sufficient.

No further action is required.

## Finding 7

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.

No further action is required.

| Finding 8 |
| --- |
| The monitoring period end date on the verification representation is incomplete. The VVB is requested to revise the representation accordingly. |
| **VVB Response:** The monitoring period end date on the verification representation has now been updated. |
| **Verra Response:**<br>The verification representation was updated accordingly.<br><br>No further action is required. |

## 2. MINOR FINDINGS

| Finding 1 |
| --- |
| The Project Description Template has specific requirements with regards to font size, color and format. The project proponent is requested to ensure that future documents are submitted according to these requirements. |

| Finding 2 |
| --- |
| In Section 2.2 of the Joint Val/Ver Report, the first paragraph contains instructions from the report template. The VVB is requested to ensure all template instructions are removed from the final version of the validation or verification reports. |

## 3. ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

On 02 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 eight assessment findings and two minor findings.

On 28 Sep 2022, Verra reviewed the VVB responses to the first round of findings. Additional action is required for Finding #3 and 6. The 2nd round of findings was sent to the VVB and PP on 28 Sep 2022.

On 08 Dec 2022, Verra closed all findings. No further action is required.