PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

Project ID	2425
Project Name	Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase IV
Program(s)	VCS
Verification Period	11-October-2012 to 10-October 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	03 May 2022
Date of Final Issue	*30 September 2022*

Summary:

An accuracy review of the Project 2425, Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase IV 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 nine 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 (ηold) 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:

Section 1.1 of the PD has been updated and no further action is required. Therefore, this finding is closed. The VVB has carried out the necessary revisions in the Joint validation/Verification Report.

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 04-October-2012."

In the second table within Section 1.10 of the PD, the year 1 range for generating emission reductions

is defined as 10-11-2012 to 09-11-2013.

Section 1.5 in the monitoring report states, "The start date of the project activity is 04-October-2012." However, Section 3.1 of the Joint Val/Ver Report states the start date as 04-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 (04-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 (04-October-2012).
- Confirm that the crediting period start date (04-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 04-November-2012. The start date of the project activity has now been made consistent to the start date of the crediting period i.e. 04-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 04-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 04-November-2012. The emission reductions have also been updated accordingly.

Verra Response:
The crediting period start date in the MR is not aligned to the crediting period start date in the PD and Joint Val/Ver Report. The VVB must ensure that the crediting period start date is the same throughout the PD, MR and Joint Val/Ver Report.
Finding remains open.

VVB Response:
The crediting period start date has now been made consistent throughout the Project Description document and the Joint Val/Ver report.

Verra Response:
The crediting period start date is now aligned. This finding is closed.

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:
Section 3.1 (page #32) shows that "AMS II-G version 04.0" was used. The VVB must ensure that the correct version of the methodology is provided throughout the PD and MR.
The finding remains open.

VVB Response:
The Version number of the methodology has now been made consistent throughout the Project Description, Monitoring Report and Joint Val/Ver report.

Verra Response:
Section 3.1 (page #32) has now been corrected. This finding is closed.

Finding 4

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 and Issuance Representation were completed using old templates. The VVB is requested to upload a Verification Representation using the latest version to the Verra Registry.

VVB Response: Verification representation and Issuance representation have now been updated in the latest template.

Verra Response:
Verification Representation and Issuance Representation have now been provided, therefore this finding is closed and no further action is required.

Finding 5

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:

Section 2.3 of the Joint Val/Ver Report has now been updated to include information of the interview process. The VVB is required to submit the interview notes for the 22 HHs, and respective evidences gathered during the remote site visit to determine the presence of the cookstoves, including any screenshots of meetings, consistent with the names in Section 2.3 of the VR for Verra review.
The finding remain open.

VVB Response:
The interview recordings along with the questionnaire have now been submitted to Verra for the review.

Verra Response:
Section 2.3 of the Joint Val/Ver Report has now been updated. This finding is closed.

Finding 6

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 for each monitored parameter.
- 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 & Section 4.2 of the Joint Val/Ver Report has been updated to include information on how the VVB assessed the monitored parameters. Therefore, this finding is closed.

Finding 7

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 correct sampling equation has been provided. Therefore, this finding is closed.

Finding 8
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 incorporated (from [day-month-year] to [day-month-year]) in section 5 of the Joint Val/Ver Report. The VVB shall 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: The format of the dates has now been rectified and incorporated in (from [day-month-year] to [day-month-year]) in section 5 of the joint val/ver report. The comparison of the ex-ante and the ex-post values have also been incorporated in section 5 of the Joint val/ver report.
Verra Response: Section 5 of the Joint Val/Ver Report has now been updated. This finding is closed.

Finding 9
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 emission Reduction Sheet have now been submitted. Therefore, this finding is closed, and no further action is required.

2. MINOR FINDINGS

Finding 1
The Project Description Template has specific requirements with regards to font size, colour and format. The project proponent and VVB should ensure that future documents are submitted according to these requirements.
Closed

Finding 2
In Contents Section of the PD, the project proponent is requested to removed the edited/track changes.
Closed

3. ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

On 03 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 nine assessment findings and two minor findings.

On 28 July 2022, Verra reviewed the written responses send by the VVB TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd. While the explanation provided was sufficient to close all other findings, findings #2, 3, 5 and 8 remain open.

On 30 September 2022, Verra closed all the findings and no further action is required.