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	Verification
Project ID	1859
Project Name	Heqing Solar Cooker Project II
Program(s)	VCS
Verification Period	01 August 2018 – 21 September 2021
Project Proponent	Clean Air Trade Inc.
Methodology	AMS-I.C v.18
VVB	SHENZHEN CTI INTERNATIONAL CERTIFICATION CO., LTD
Assessment Criteria	VCS Version 4.2
Date of First Issue	07 September 2022
Review Conclusion	Approved
Date of Final Issue	03-November-2022

FINDINGS			
#	**Description**	**Response**	**Status**
1	**Start date of project activity and crediting period** **Issue** The project start date is not in line with Section 3.7 of the applied VCS Program Standard v4.2. Further, the start date of crediting period does not match with the project start date. **Action item** 1. The VVB shall ensure that Section 1.1 includes relevant implementation dates, as required by the applied VCS MR Template v4.1 2. The VVB must explain the steps taken to validate the project start date and start date and duration of the crediting period in line with VCS requirements. **Background:** The start date of the project activity is as per the registered CDM PDD and VCS PD and per previous monitoring periods. However, the start date of the project under the *VCS program standard* is not defined as under the *CDM Glossary of Terms*. **Program rule(s) or methodology section** *VCS Standard* v.4.2, Section 3.7	**Round1:** VVB Response: The project start date has been revised in accordance with the definition of VCS standard V4.2. The project was a CDM project with the first crediting generated on 22 Sep 2011. It was confirmed from the records of CDM registry and the 1st CDM verification report. CDM: Heqing Solar Cooker Project II (unfccc.int) The MR has been revised by the PP regarding the project start date and the verification comment is updated accordingly. It is now confirmed that the project start date is aligning with the crediting period. Verra Review: The project start date has been revised correctly in Section 1.5, consistent with Section 1.6 of the MR. However, the revised date indicated in Section 1.1 is not correct. This typo shall be corrected in the next monitoring period	Closed

2	**Missing comparison between estimated and achieved GHG emission reductions** **Issue** a) The monitoring report does not include a comparison between the actual GHG emission reductions and the estimated ones as per the registered project description. b) The VR also does not contain an assessment of estimated versus achieved values. **Action item** a) The VVB must ensure that the MR includes a comparison between the ex-ante and ex-post values. b) The VVB shall further ensure an assessment and objective opinion is included in the verification report **Program rule(s) or methodology section** VCS Monitoring Report Template v.4.1, Section 5.4	**Round1:** VVB Response: The MR is revised by the PP to include the comparison between the estimated and the achieved GHG emissions reductions. The VVB has reviewed and provided the finding in verification report accordingly. Verra Review: Ex-ante and ex-post values have been compared in Section 5.4 of the MR. The VVB has offered an appropriate assessment of the same in Section 4.3 of the VR. The reasons are deemed acceptable	Closed
3	**Wrong project title in verification report** **Issue** The verification report (page 1) refers to the project title as Heqing Solar Cooker Project II *(Project 1859).* **Action item** The VVB must correct the project title in page 1 of the verification report, as the project title does not require inclusion of the project number.	**Round1:** VVB Response: The report has been revised from “Heqing Solar Cooker Project II (Project 1859)” to “Heqing Solar Cooker Project II” Verra Review: Corrected accordingly	Closed

	Program rule(s) or methodology section VCS Verification Report Template, v.1		
4	**Further explanation on site visits** **Issue** As per the verification report Section 2.4, 100 households have been visited in two days (23 and 24/02/2022) in 13 Townships. **Action item** The VVB is required to explain how it has been logistically possible to conduct site visits to 100 households by two auditors in two days in 13 different locations. In doing so, it must describe the detailed time-activity agenda followed, including the following information, inter alia: distances between locations, time spent for travelling, time spent in each interview and which site visits were conducted by which auditor during what times and dates. The VVB may also include the transport means of reaching those locations. **Program rule(s) or methodology section** VCS Verification Report Template, v.1, Section 2.4	**Round1**: VVB Response: Please see attached document for details breakdown of the audit itinerary. At first, in the stage of audit planning, there were 2 projects involved, "Heqing Solar Cooker Project I" and "Heqing Solar Cooker Project II". The on-site audit had planned 2 auditors to conduct the inspections separately for the same project, i.e. each share 50 sampling for "Heqing Solar Cooker Project II". However, in order to improve the efficiency of the visit considering the heavy workloads. The on-site audit team discussed with the PP and decided to conduct the inspections separately for "Heqing Solar Cooker Project I" and "Heqing Solar Cooker Project II" at the same time. One auditor handled one project. The actual on-site audit dates for this project were 21 -23/02/2022. The verification report has been updated accordingly. On every audit day, the auditor traveled to the first targeted township from the hotel by car together with the PP representative. At the entrance of the first township, the auditor met up with the local RES officer who are familiar with the distribution of the sampled household user. The RES officer led the way to the target household user per the request by auditor. The auditor selected the sampled household user (Parameter A) randomly. The selected households were for SP1, SP2, SP3 or SP4 within the same township. This could maximize the efficiency of the on-site visit by reducing the redundant travelling within the township. When the auditor arrived the household user's home, standardized inspection processes were carried out: 1. Identify the solar cooker against the sample record. Took pictures at the address plate, solar cooker, name tag, and the project logo 2. Evaluate if the solar cooker is in operation 3. Ask the household user questions related to operations of the solar cooker, including: a. Is it operational b. No. of years of use since first operation c. The applications of the sola cooker d. Average hours of use per day e. No. of people living in the household	Closed

		4. Get household user signature The above processes are standardized that the auditor could carry out efficiently. It took 3-5 mins for the auditor to complete the standardized process. Once completing the above inspection processes, the auditor would move on to the next sampled household user nearby. When all available sampled household users along the route within the first township had been visited, the auditor then traveled to the next township. At the end of each audit day, the auditor counted the no. of visited household user per sub-period. So that the no. of VVB sampling on household user can be ensured as per the VVB sampling plan. When 100 household users (25 samples per SP) were visited, the on-site audit for sampled household users (Parameter A) ended. It is clarified that totally 11 different townships were visited by the auditor from 21 to 23rd Feb 2022. Indeed, 2 townships were visited twice on different dates due to logistic arrangements. The verification report is revised to clarify the accurate no. of township coverage by the on-site inspections. Verra Review: The explanation is found to be credible and hence, the finding is closed	
5	**Inconsistent references in verification report** **<u>Issue</u>** The verification report states: a) that there are no findings in Summary Section, while as per Section 2.5 there are 5 CLs raised; b) that 1% AQL and *15% UQL* (Section 1.3), while in Section 2.1 it states 1% AQL and *10% UQL*; c) that the total amount of GHG emission reductions is sum up to 1,479,148 tons of CO_2 (in page 20) while the monitoring report states 1,472,102 tons of CO_2.	**Round1**: VVB Response: a) 5 CLs were raised during the verification process as per Section 2.5. The verification summary is revised for consistency. b) It is clarified that the applied sampling plan considered 1%AQL and 15% UQL for each SP. The verification report is revised for consistency. c) P.20 of the verification report has been revised accordingly. It is clarified that the total GHG emission reduction achieved for this project is 1,472,102 tCO_2e. Verra Review: All corrections have been effected accordingly in the VR	Closed

	Action item The VVB must correct the above references in the verification report. **Program rule(s) or methodology section** VCS Verification Report Template, v.1		
6	**Missing verification of on-going communication with local stakeholders** **Issue** The verification report Section 4.2.2 states that the Local Stakeholder Consultation is not applicable since *¨this is a registered CDM project which had conducted local stakeholder consultation in 2010¨.* **Action item** The VVB must verify the on-going communication with the local stakeholders conducted by the PP and provide an overall conclusion regarding its inputs, as required in Section 4.2.2 of the VCS Verification Template v.4.1. **Program rule(s) or methodology section** *VCS Standard* v.4.2, Sections 3.17.4 and 3.17.5. VCS Verification Template v.4.1., Section 4.2.2	**Round1**: VVB Response: Thanks for pointing this. Relevant verification opinions have been added in the verification report Section 4.2.2. Verra Review: The mechanism for ongoing stakeholder engagement has been included in the VR and explained how the VVB confirmed the existence and that there were no negative comments during the MP.	Closed
7	**Required calculation spreadsheet** **Issue** The emission reduction calculation spreadsheet has not been provided. **Action item**	**Round1**: VVB Response: The ER calculation spreadsheet is attached for review. Verra Review: The ERR spreadsheet has been availed and no issue has been raised	Closed

	The VVB is required to submit the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet for further reference. **<u>Program rule(s) or methodology section</u>** *VCS Standard* v.4.2, Section 3.14		
8	**VVB Rotation Rules not followed** **<u>Issue</u>** It is noted that CTI undertook the last two CDM verifications, and has now conducted three consecutive VCS Verifications for this PA. No exemption request was submitted or granted **<u>Action item</u>** The VVB is required to explain how it checked that the VVB rotation rules are adhered to. **<u>Program rule(s) or methodology section</u>** VCS Program Standard, v.2, Section 4.1.20	**Round1**: VVB Response: 4.1.20 (1) stipulated that validation and the first verification of a project can be undertaken by the same VVB. But the subsequent verification shall be undertaken by a different VVB. CTI has carried out the verifications for this project for the following periods: 1. CDM verification (15 Jun 2015 - 31 Oct 2015) 2. CDM verification (1 Nov 2015 - 30 Nov 2016) 3. gap validation (convert project from CDM to VCS) 4. VCS verification (1 Dec 2016 - 31 Jul 2018) 5. VCS verification (the current one, 1 Aug 2018 - 21 Sep 2021) It is noted that from the VCS standard that “The gap validation of a project registered under an approved GHG program may be disregarded when assessing adherence to these requirements.”. Therefore, the VVB is deemed in compliance with this rule. According to 4.1.20 (2), VVB may not verify more than six consecutive years of a project’s GHG emission reductions or removal. It is true that CTI is verifying the GHG emission reduction of this project since 15/06/2015 – 21/09/2021, i.e. 6 years 99days. The project proponent has successfully applied for exemption from Section 4.1.20 (2) of the VCS standard, V4.1. Therefore, CTI was exceptionally allowed to conduct the verification of GHG emission reduction that are beyond 6 years limit. Please see the attached exemption letter. The verification report section 2.6 is revised to provide the justification. Verra Review: An exemption was granted, and therefore, this finding is closed	Closed