



**Verified Carbon
Standard**

IMPROVED COOKSTOVES FOR COMMUNITIES

Document Prepared By



Certification Pvt. Ltd.

VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.

Prakoshth Number No. 1-S, Leaf Tower, Second Floor, Plot No. 01, IRIS LEAF Gram Talawali Chanda, Indore 453771 (M.P.) India.

URL: <http://vkucertification.com> | e-mail: info@vkucertification.com

Report ID	VKU.VER.204.24_VCS_2922
Project title	Improved Cookstoves for Communities
Project ID	2922
Verification period	01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024 (start and end dates inclusive)

Original date of issue	07-July-2024
Most recent date of issue	22-October-2024
Version	1.1
VCS Standard Version	4.7
Client	Infinite Environmental Solutions Limited
Prepared by	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
Approved by	Dr. Vikas Kumar Aharwal (Founder and Director) vikas.aharwal@vkucertification.com
Work carried out by	Barun Kumar – Team Leader & Technical Expert (T.A.3.1) Vivek Kumar Ahirwar – Technical Reviewer & Technical Expert (T.A.3.1) KM Nisha Chauhan – Validator/Verifier Trainee Megha Modi – Project Trainee

Summary:

VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as VKU) was contracted by Infinite Environmental Solutions Limited (project representative) to conduct the second verification of the greenhouse emission reductions reported for the project activity “Improved Cookstoves for Communities” (VCS ID 2922) in India. Current verification covers the monitoring period: from **01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024 (start and end dates inclusive)**, within the first crediting period from 20-November-2021 to 19-November-2028 (Inclusive of start and dates),

Purpose and scope of the Verification:

The primary objective of this verification process is to obtain an impartial evaluation and ex-post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions. This verification aims to ensure that the monitoring methodology is implemented in strict accordance with the monitoring plan and that the monitoring data used to verify the reductions in anthropogenic emissions from sources is comprehensive, conclusive, and presented with utmost clarity and transparency.

The verification scope of the project is:

- To verify that the project is implemented as described in the registered VCS Joint PD & MR/03/.
- To evaluate the project's adherence to relevant regulations, including the legislation of the host country.
- To verify the implementation and functionality of the monitoring system, ensuring the generation of Verified Carbon Units without any instances of double counting.
- To verify the accuracy, completeness, consistency, transparency, and absence of significant errors or omissions in the reported data by examining monitoring records and emissions reduction calculations.
- To ensure that the actual monitoring systems and procedures align with those described in the registered monitoring plan.
- To assess the GHG emission reduction data and provide a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance regarding the absence of material misstatements.
- To verify that the reported GHG emission data is adequately supported by evidence.

VKU conducted the verification process in accordance with its own established procedures, aligning with the requirements set forth in the VCS Program Guide version 4.4/04/, VCS standard version 4.7/05/, VCS Validation and Verification Manual version 3.2/06/, CDM M&P, and CDM Validation &

Verification Standard 3.0/08/, and relevant decisions of the COP/MOP and the CDM EB and applying standard auditing techniques.

The verification process encompassed a desk review, onsite inspection, and resolution of outstanding matters. This culminated in the issuance of the final verification report, enabling the project to acquire certification.

VKU diligently adhered to a rule-based approach during the verification process, ensuring strict compliance with VCS requirements. The verification involved a comprehensive assessment of the project's operations, monitoring procedures, and GHG emission reduction calculations. As a result, a total of (08) findings have been raised, including **03 Corrective Action Requests (CARs), 05 Clarification Requests (CLs), and 00 Forward Action Required (FAR)**. All findings have been successfully resolved after the necessary corrections and clarifications by the client, as detailed in Appendix 04 of this report.

The assessment team ensured the reported emission reductions are complete and accurate by verifying 100% of the data and supporting evidence. The verification has been conducted in accordance with applicable VCS requirements, and no further uncertainties are detected.

Verification conclusion:

The GHG emission reductions have been calculated based on the approved methodology VMR0006 Methodology for Installation of High-Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves - version 1.1/12/ and Tool 30 for calculation of the fraction of non-renewable biomass; Version 04.0/13/ and the monitoring plan included in the registered VCS Joint PD&MR; version 1.3 dated 02-November-2023/03/.

To conclude, it is VKU's opinion that the project activity "Improved Cookstoves for Communities" (VCS ID 2922) is in full compliance with the applicable requirements of VCS Standard; version 4.7/05/ and associated guidelines. The monitoring system is in place ensuring reasonable level of measurement and precision level allowed by the methodology and the VCS standards without any significant discrepancies and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatement.

As a result, VKU is able to objectively state that the project has achieved an emission reduction of 66,258 tCO₂e under the current (2nd) verification of the project for the monitoring period 01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024 (start and end dates inclusive).

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	7
1.1	Objective.....	7
1.2	Scope and Criteria	8
1.3	Level of Assurance.....	9
1.4	Summary Description of the Project	10
2	VERIFICATION PROCESS	11
2.1	Method and Criteria.....	11
2.2	Document Review	13
2.3	Interviews.....	19
2.4	Site Visits.....	22
2.5	Resolution of Findings	38
2.6	Eligibility for Validation Activities	39
3	VALIDATION FINDINGS	39
3.1	Methodology Deviations.....	39
3.2	Project Description Deviations.....	40
3.3	New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects.....	40
3.4	Baseline Reassessment	40
4	VERIFICATION FINDINGS.....	41
4.1	Project Details	41
4.2	Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement	54
4.3	Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations.....	78
4.4	Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals.....	84
4.5	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis.....	100
5	VERIFICATION OPINION.....	101
5.1	Verification Summary	101
5.2	Verification Conclusion	102
5.3	Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison	104
	APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALY SENSITIVE INFORMATION	106
	APPENDIX 2: ABBREVIATIONS.....	107

APPENDIX 3: QUESTIONNAIRES FOR END USERS INTERVIEW	108
APPENDIX 4: AUDIT FINDINGS	110
APPENDIX 5: COMPETENCE STATEMENTS	130

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

Infinite Environmental Solutions Limited has contracted VKU certification Pvt. Ltd. (here after referred as VKU) to carry out the second verification of the project activity “Improved Cookstoves for Communities” (VCS 2922). The verification covers the monitoring period starting from 01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024 (start and end dates inclusive).

The objective of the verification is to have an independent evaluation of a project activity by an accredited validation and verification body. This evaluation is conducted in accordance with the stipulations outlines in the VCS Program Guide; version 4.4/04/, VCS Standard; version 4.7/05/ and the applicable GHG program. The verification is based on registered VCS Joint PD&MR; version 1.3 dated 02-November-2023/03/.

The report provides a complete and concise overview of the verification results carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Verified Carbon Standard and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) criteria for Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). VKU adhered to the verification process which is in accordance with VCS Standard; version 4.7/05/ and guarantees the uniformity of project operations, monitoring, and reporting.

The project adopts 07 years crediting period which can be renewed twice, in-line with paragraph 3.9.1 of VCS Standard; version 4.7, which specifies that “The total project crediting period shall be either seven years (twice renewable for a total of up to 21 years) or ten years fixed, except for AFOLU and GCS projects as defined below and in the GCS Requirements respectively”.

Table No. 01: Summary of audit history of project within first crediting period 20-November-2021 to 19-November-2028

Audit type	Monitoring Period (inclusive of both dates)	Validation/Verification Body name	Number of years
Joint Validation and Verification (1 st Verification)	20-November-2021 to 31-December-2022	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+)	01 years, 01 month, 11 days
2 nd verification	1-January 2023 to 31-May-2024	VKU Certifications Pvt. Ltd.,	01 year, 05 months, 00 days

The objectives of this verification exercise are, by review of objective evidence, to establish that:

The monitoring system is operational and capable of generating Verified Carbon Units (VCUs), without any instance of double counting/27/. It also carefully checks monitoring records and emission reduction calculations to guarantee accuracy, completeness, transparency, and absence of errors, making the data reliable and trustworthy.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of this verification was the independent objective review of the current monitoring report; version 1.2 dated 16-October-2024/01/ and ex-post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emission from the project activity “Improved Cookstoves for Communities”. The verification of this project was based on the validated and registered VCS Joint PD&MR; Version 1.3, dated 02-November-2023/03/ along with supporting documents submitted by the project proponent to the VKU assessment team. The documents thus submitted to the VKU Assessment Team have reviewed against the following guidance & protocols:

- VCS Program Guide; Version 4.4/04/
- VCS Standard Version; 4.7/05/
- VCS Program definitions; Version 4.5/07/
- VCS Registration and Issuance Process; Version 4.5/16/
- VCS Validation and Verification manual; Version 3.2/06/
- Applied methodology VMR0006: Methodology for Installation of High-Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves; Version 1.1/12/
- Tool 30 for calculation of the fraction of non-renewable biomass; Version 04.0/13/
- CDM Validation and Verification Standard; Version 3.0/08/

The method and criteria involved in the verification process includes the following:

- Desk review of registered VCS joint Project Description and monitoring report; Version 1.3, dated 02-November-2023/03/ and other supporting documents listed in table no. 05.
- Onsite interviews and focused group discussion with stakeholders and Project Proponent’s (PP’s) representatives involved in the project’s implementation.
- VKU’s completeness/quality check and
- The final issuance of the verification report

Outstanding issues have been resolved, leading to the issuance of the final verification report and the relevant VCS Verification Deed of Representation.

It is important to note that the verification process does not involve providing consultancy to the project proponents. However, requests for clarifications and corrective actions may have contributed to improvements in the monitoring processes.

1.3 Level of Assurance

All the revisions of the verification report before being submitted to the client have been subjected to an independent internal technical review to confirm that all verification activities had been completed with adherence to VKU’s procedure with a Reasonable level of assurance, as per section 4, clause 4.1.2, 4.1.10 and clause 4.1.24 of the VCS Standard; version 4.7/05/.

The verification report is based on the Monitoring report/01/, registered VCS Joint PD&MR/03/ and the supporting documents (table no. 05) that are made available to the VKU’s assessment team and information gathered through performing interviews with PP’s representatives/local stakeholders during onsite assessment of the project/45/. The technical review was performed by a technical reviewer(s) qualified in accordance with VKU’s qualification procedure. The verification/assessment team and the technical reviewers consist of the following:

Table No.02: The assessment team is as follows:

Role/Qualification of assessment team	Last Name	Middle Name	First Name
VCS Team Leader & Technical Expert T.A. 3.1	Kumar	N/A	Barun
Validator/ Verifier-Trainee	Chauhan	N/A	Nisha
Project Trainee	Modi	NA	Megha

Table No 03: The Technical Team is as follows:

Role/Qualification	Last Name	Middle Name	First Name
Technical Reviewer & Technical Expert T.A. 3.1	Ahirwar	Kumar	Vivek

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The grouped project activity “Improved Cookstoves for Communities” involves the distribution of improved cooking stoves (ICS) by local community in the various states across India. As per the registered VCS Joint PD&MR, the project distributes improved cookstoves to users who rely heavily on traditional cookstoves and forged fuelwood directly from the forest, without combustion air supply, flue gas ventilation, chimney, or grate. The aim of this grouped project activity is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, conservation of forests and improvement in health conditions of ICS beneficiaries.

As per the registered Joint PD & MR/03/, the project activity would be distributed in multiple states of India. Thus, the geographical area of project activity is considered as India. In the first instance, the project proponent “Outreach Projects Private Limited has distributed the batch 1 of ICS in various districts of Madhya Pradesh (India). In the batch 2, improved cookstoves have been distributed in the state of Maharashtra (India). The project locations have been verified with the help of GPS Map camera/35/ during onsite visit. Project Proponent has distributed a total of 11,522 ICS so far in the first instance and plans to distribute 100,000 ICS (in the first instance) as per the registered joint PD & MR/03/. The distribution summary of the improved cookstove has been provided in the table below:

Table No: 4: Distribution of ICS in Batch 1 and 2

InstanceNo.	Batch	Distributed	StartDate	District	State
Instance-1	Batch- 1	9,200	20-November-2021	Harda Betul Dhar Dewas Niwari and Tikamgarh Chhatarpur Shajapur Hoshangabad Narmadapuram	Madhya Pradesh
	Batch - 2	2,322	06-February-2024	Jalna	Maharashtra

Under the first crediting period, starting from 20-November-2021 to 19-November-2028 (start and end dates inclusive), expected annual average emission reductions over a seven-year period are 449,956 tCO₂e per year. 3,149,689 tCO₂e in total emissions will be reduced during the course of the seven-year crediting period/03/. During the current (second) monitoring period, (i.e., from the grouped project activity has led to the reduction of 66,258 tCO₂e.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

The grouped project activity “Improved Cookstoves for Communities” (VCS ID 2922) is undergoing the second period verification with VKU Certification Pvt Ltd for the current monitoring range 01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024 (start and end dates inclusive). And the joint validation and verification process had been completed through the LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+) for duration of 20-November-2021 to 31-December-2022 (start and end dates inclusive).

2.1 Method and Criteria

Verification has been conducted using VKU’s procedures in line with the requirements specified in the VCS Requirements, i.e., VCS Program Guide Version 4.4/04/, VCS Standard version 4.7/05/.

Sampling methods have been employed by the assessment team for the verification of GHG emission reductions or removals generated by the project in accordance with the paragraph 26 of the Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, Version 09.0/10/.

The GHG emission reductions are based on:

- Requirements of VCS Program Rules for Grouped Project activity, as the project activity falls under the category of **Grouped Project**
- Approved Baseline and monitoring methodology **VMR0006**: Methodology for Installation of High-Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves; version 1.1/12/.
- CDM Tool 30: “Calculation of the fraction of non-renewable biomass”; version 04.0/13/
- Scope: 03 Energy Demand
- Project type: Type II – Energy Efficiency improvement project

Keeping in line with ISO (14064-3; 2019, clause 06 & 14065-2020, clause 09)/14/ Standard guidelines assessment team has framed down the process for completing the verification and has followed the same throughout the execution of audit of the said project i.e., VCS 2922.

The verification consisted of the following phases:

- 1. Planning and Intimation to VERRA about site visit:** The assessment team starts with a desk review then need for site visit is identified and site visit is planned. Assessment team shared a NOVS- Notice of Validation/Verification Services (NOVS) digitally to VERRA on 15 business days before the date of audit. The assessment team intimated Verra for this project activity on 17-June-2024.
- 2. Document Review:** Relevant documents, such as the registered VCS Joint PD&MR, registered Joint Validation and Verification report/3.1/, monitoring plan, monitoring methodology and QA/QC procedures are thoroughly reviewed.
- 3. Strategic Analysis:** Assessment team performed strategic analysis to understand the activities and complexity of the project, and to determine the nature and extent of the verification activities. The results of the strategic analysis shall be used in the risk assessment.
- 4. Risk Assessment;** Assessment team performed risk assessment of the GHG statement to identify the risk of a material misstatement or nonconformity with the criteria.
- 5. Evidence Gathering Activities:** Using a risk-based approach, assessment team prepared evidence gathering activities, to collect sufficient and appropriate evidence upon which to base the conclusion & determine whether the GHG statement conforms to the criteria, taking into account the principles of the standards or GHG programme that apply to the GHG statement.
- 6. Audit and Sampling Plan:** An audit plan is prepared, including all sub-elements required for an integrated verification process aligned with the contract, scope, objectives, level of assurance and materiality, the same was documented in VKU.F24W. Audit and Sampling Plan_VKU.VER.204.24_VCS_2922/40/.
- 7. Evidence Gathering Plan:** The evidence-gathering plan is prepared based on the results of the VKU's Assessment Team's risk assessment. It was designed to lower the verification risk to an acceptable level. The evidence-gathering plan thus specify the type and extent of evidence-gathering activities.
- 8. Client Confirmation and Approval:** The site visit audit plan is sent to the client for review and confirmation/approval via email.

- 9. On-Site Assessment:** This includes interviews and evaluation of the actual project scenario.
- 10. Resolution of Discrepancies:** Any non-conformities identified during the assessment are addressed and resolved.
- 11. Independent Review:** A technical reviewer provides an independent assessment.
- 12. Final Verification:** After completeness checks, the verification report and certification are issued.

Dates of key milestones of the project activity are mentioned in the following table:

S. No.	Key milestones Description	Dates
1.	Date of contract signing with VVB	17-June-2024
2.	Initial documents submission to VVB	01-July-2024
3.	Onsite Audit and interviews	05-July-2024 to 07-July-2024
4.	Draft Verification Report	08-October-2024
5.	Final Verification Report	22-October-2024

Further sections of this report outline each step in more detail.

2.2 Document Review

During the document review, VKU has applied standard auditing techniques to assess the quality of information provided. The verification was performed primarily based on the review of VCS monitoring report for “Improved Cookstoves for Communities”; version 01 dated 18-June-2024 Version 1.1 dated 09-September-2024 and version 1.2 dated 16-October-2024/01/ and emission reduction calculation spreadsheet; version 01 dated 18-June-2024, Version 1.1 dated 09-September-2024 and version 1.2 dated 16-October-2024/02/. Assessment team has reviewed the registered and validated project documents including the Joint PD&MR/03/ and registered Joint validation and verification report/3.1/.

In accordance with section 3.26 and clause 3.26.3 of the VCS Standard version 4.7/05/, the project proponent is obligated to provide the assessment team with the necessary supporting documents and data to substantiate statements and data outlined in the monitoring report/01/. Consequently, the PP has submitted these documents, which have been subsequently reviewed by the assessment team during the verification process.

The following **Table-05** lists the documentation that was reviewed during the verification.

Current Verification Reference Documents			
S. No	Title	Reference to the document	Provider
01	VCS Monitoring Report for “Improved Cookstoves for Communities” for current monitoring period from 01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024 (inclusive of start and end dates)	Version 01 dated 18-June-2024 Version 1.1 dated 09-September-2024 version 1.2 dated 16-October-2024	Project Representative
02	Emission Reduction calculation spreadsheet for “Improved Cookstoves for Communities” for current monitoring period from 01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024 (inclusive of start and end dates)	Version 01 dated 18-June-2024 Version 1.1 dated 09-September-2024 version 1.2 dated 16-October-2024	Project Representative
Background documents/weblinks			
03	<u>Registered VCS Joint PD&MR for the project “Cookstoves for Communities”</u>	Version 1.3 dated 02-Novemver-2023	VERRA project webpage
3.1	<u>Registered VCS Joint Validation & Verification Report for project “Improved Cookstoves for Communities”</u>	Version 03 dated 02-Novemver-2023	VERRA project webpage
04	<u>VCS: VCS Program Guide</u>	Version: 4.4 dated: 29/08/2023	VCS Website
05	<u>VCS: VCS Standard</u>	Version 4.7 dated 11/12/2023	VCS Website

06	<u>VCS: VCS Validation & Verification Manual</u>	Version 3.2 Dated: 19/10/2016	VCS Website
07	<u>VCS: VCS Program Definitions</u>	Version 4.5 dated 16/04/2024	VCS Website
08	<u>CDM Validation & Verification Standard</u>	Version 3.0 dated 09-September- 2021	CDM Website
09	<u>UNFCCC: Guidelines for Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project activities and Programme of Activities</u>	Version 04.0, dated: 16-October- 2015	CDM Website
10	<u>UNFCCC: Standard for Sampling and surveys for CDM Project activities and Program of Activities</u>	Version 09.0 dated: 27-May-2021	CDM Website
11	<u>VERRA: Project Details, ID 2922</u>	N/A	VCS Website
12	<u>VMR0006: Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves</u>	Version 1.1	CDM Website
13	<u>Tool30: Calculation of the fraction of non-renewable biomass</u>	Version 04.0	CDM Website
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISO 14064-1;2018 • ISO 14064-2;2019 • ISO 14064-3;2019 • ISO 14065;2020 • ISO 17029;2019 	N/A	ISO Website
15	VKU Certification: SOP 4 (Process Requirements)	Version:03.0 Dated: 24/11/2023	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
16	<u>VCS: Registration and Issuance Process</u>	Version: 4.5 16/04/2024	VERRA Website
Supporting documents Submitted by PP to VVB			

17	ICS implementation database	N/A	Project Representative
18	Technical details of improved cookstove for batch 1 and batch 2	N/A	Project Representative
19	Sample Monitoring Survey questionnaire form	N/A	Project Representative
20	Monitoring survey report	From 01-June-2024 to 28-June-2024, (including both dates)	Project Representative
21	Local Stakeholder Consultation Records (meeting agenda and Minutes of Meeting)	07-October-2021 (date of LSC)	Project Representative
22	KML file depicting the project boundary of the grouped project	N/A	Project Representative
23	Third party Efficiency test report of Agneeka Eco Mini Model 4 SE	09-July-2022	Project Representative
24	Training records: - Training Attendance & Training MoM (Batch 1)	20-January-2023	Project Representative
25	Affidavit of Warranty for ICS (Batch 1 & Batch 2)	15-February-2023 (Batch1), 29-April-2024 (Batch 2).	Project Representative
26	No Double counting declaration certificate to claim that the project activity has not been registered and is not seeking registration under any other GHG emission program	01-May-2022	Project Representative
27	No Double counting declaration certificate to claim that the project involves installation and distribution of 1,00,000 ICS in different states of India.	31-October-2021	Project Representative

28	(Batch 1) No Double Counting Declaration certificate to claim that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no use of ODA • The project is not rejected by any other GHG program • The project activity doesn't affect the emission footprint of any other product. 	01-May-2022	Project Representative
29	Anti-discrimination declaration Certificate	01-May-2022	Project Representative
30	Grievance Register (Batch 1 & Batch 2)	N/A	Project Representative
31	Baseline Survey Report (Batch 2)	N/A	Project Representative
32	Third Party Inspection Report on testing of Solid Biomass ICS (Batch2)	11-January-2024	Project Representative
33	(Batch 2) Declaration Certificate to claim that the project doesn't use ODA, it is not seeking nor rejected by any other GHG program and that Outreach projects can claim the benefits of Carbon credits.	29-July-2024	Project Representative
34	Local Stakeholder Consultation Attendance sheet and Meeting Evaluation form (Batch 2)	06-February-2024	Project Representative
35	GPS map camera	N/A	N/A
36	Google Earth Software	N/A	N/A

37	VKU.F64W.Field Assessment Checklist_VKU.VER.204.24_VCS_2922	From 05-July-2024 to 07-July-2024	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
38	VKU.F46W. Attendance Sheet for Onsite Audit_ VKU.VER.204.24_VCS_2922 and site visit from 05-July-2024 to 07-July-2024	From 05-July-2024 to 07-July-2024	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
39	VKU.F56W.Risk Assessment_ VKU.VER.204.24_VCS_2922	03-July-2024	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
40	VKU.F24W. Audit and Sampling Plan_ VKU.VER.204.24_VCS_2922	03-July-2024	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
41	VKU.F60W.List of Documents_ VKU.VER.204.24_VCS_2922	02-July-2024	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
42	VKU Certification Pvt Ltd: VKU.F72W.Evidence Gathering Plan_ VKU.VER.204.24_VCS_2922	03-July-2024	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
43	VKU Certification Pvt Ltd: Evidence Gathering Activities_ VKU.VER.204.24_VCS_2922	03-July-2024	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
44	VKU Certification Pvt Ltd: VKU.F70W. Strategic Analysis Plan VKU.VER.204.24_VCS_2922	02-July-2024	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
45	Onsite Assessment photographs and interviews with local stakeholders/ PP's Representative/ End users	From 05-July-2024 to 07-July-2024	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.

2.3 Interviews

Assessment team performed onsite interviews/45/ during onsite visit (from 05-July-2024 to 07-July-2024) for the grouped project “Improved Cookstoves for Communities”. Comprehensive interviews have been conducted with PP’s representatives including ground team and implementation partners involved in cookstove distributions.

The interview covered a wide array of topics, from the project's overall characteristics and implementation to its technical aspects, such as design and specifications. Discussions included the project's implementation status, start date, location, monitoring surveys, data recording and archiving procedures, quality control and quality assurance procedure and baseline stove usage. The evaluation was developed based on the information gathered from the interview, along with supporting documentation (Refer the table No. 05 of this report) and observations.

Table 06; Details of Personnel Interview/Focussed Group Discussion

S. No.	Date	Name and Gender	Organization	Topic
1	05-July-2024 to 07-July-2024	Shyam Belvansh (Male)	Gramin Vikas Sanstha (NGO team member, Betul, M.P.)	
2		Anil Bhusari (Male)	Gramin Vikas Sanstha (NGO team member, Betul, M.P.)	
3		Santosh Ivane (Male)	Gramin Vikas Sanstha (NGO team member, Betul, M.P.)	

4	Sandeep Bhagel (Male)	Team Leader (SRIJAN, Chhindwara, M.P.)	<p>Description of the project activity, ownership, avoidance of double counting, project investments, benefits of the project</p> <p>Emission reductions calculations Monitoring plan and monitoring arrangements Data recording, QA/QC procedures, overall monitoring and ongoing communication with end users.</p> <p>Spot Audit procedures, Training of field staff ICS operational status, commissioning details, project investment etc.</p> <p>Implementation Status, Documentation, grievance redress procedure etc.</p>
5	Rambhajan Dehariya (Male)	Project Executive (SRIJAN, Chhindwara, M.P.)	
6	Aashish Hambasta (Male)	Regional NGO Head (SRIJAN, Niwari, M.P.)	
7	Sushant Sourabh (Male)	NGO team member (SRIJAN, Niwari, M.P.)	
8	Kiran (Female)	Local villager (Dhar, M.P.)	
9	Mukesh Maran (Male)	Local Agent (Moyakheda, Dhar, M.P.)	
10	Gopal Girwal (Male)	Local agent (Dhar, M.P.)	
11	Jagdish (Male)	Local villager (Dhar, M.P.)	
12	Vitthal Bhapkar (Male)	Manager (Jalna, Maharashtra)	

Assessment team and the concerned personnel got engaged in several topics ranging from the description and implementation of project activity to technical details of project, distribution of cookstoves, monitoring survey, recording of grievances, training sessions, grievance resolution procedure etc.

The assessment was based on the feedback received during onsite audit while interviewing /45/ the concerned personnel which is coupled with the documentation in VKU.F62W.Field Assessment Checklist for Sample Selected by VVB for Energy Demand & Distribution Projects/37/. During the onsite audit, assessment team also interviewed the end users or the beneficiaries/45/ involved in the projects to verify the implementation of grievance mechanism and process of grievance resolution mentioned in the Monitoring Report/01/ submitted by the PP. The assessment team confirmed the sustainable development claims and assessed the socio-economic impact of the project on the local community. Assessment Team also checked the records and observed that the PP provided opportunities for the locals to express their opinions and grievances, with efforts to resolve any issues through consultation with stakeholders. Assessment team thus verified all the above statements via focused group discussions and personal interview/45/ with stakeholders and with end users as tabulated below.

Table no: 07: Details of Personnel Interview/Focussed Group Discussion with end users/beneficiaries

S. No.	Date	Name and Gender	Stove ID and Model
1.		End User: Raju (Male)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stove ID; 1H0080 (Eco-mini)
2.		End User: Sumitra (Female)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stove ID; 1H0928 (Eco-mini)
3.		End User: Manisha Vandhe (Female)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stove ID; 1J0007 (Eco-mini)
4.		End User: Sarita Pandrum (Female)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stove ID: 1J0891 (Eco-mini)
5.		End User: Sarla Yaduwanshi (Female)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stove ID: 1J0648 (Eco-mini)

6.	05-July-2024 to 07-July-2024	End User: Ganga Bai (Female)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stove ID: C0882 (FE01)
7.		End User: Mira Mahadev Aamte (Female)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stove ID: C2225 (FE01)
8.		End User: Sukhwati (Female)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stove ID: 1F0604 (Eco-mini)
9.		End User: Motan Adivasi (Male)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stove ID: 1F0722 (Eco-mini)
10.		End User: Ditu Bai (Female)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stove ID: 1D0935 (Eco-mini)
11.		End User: Guddi Bai (Female)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stove ID: 1D0322 (Eco-mini)

Assessment team diligently documented the information obtained during the onsite interviews with site personnel/45/. To gather the data and keep the records, assessment team used VKU's dedicated forms for onsite audit, which include VKU.F46W, known as the Attendance Sheet of Onsite Audit/38/ and VKU.F62W: Appendix-1 of Field Assessment Checklist for Sample Selected by VVB for Energy Demand & Distribution Projects/37/. Through a comprehensive process involving documentation, desk review, document verification, and interviews with site personnel and end-users of the distributed cookstoves, the VKU Assessment Team affirms that beneficiaries gave a positive response regarding the project ICS and no negative comments are received during the on-site interviews conducted by the team.

2.4 Site Visits

VKU's assessment team conducted an onsite visit for the 2nd verification of the grouped project activity "Improved Cookstoves for Communities" from 05-July-2024 to 07-July-2024. The sampling approach employed by the assessment team for selecting the samples for the onsite visit is explained below:

PP's sampling approach:

Due to large number of ICS distribution, it is not economically feasible to monitor each individual ICS unit. Hence, PP has undertaken representative sampling, which is in line with the requirements of “Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”, version 04/09/. PP has applied Simple Random Sampling approach for the monitoring of three monitored parameters: $N_{y,i,k}$, $B_{y=1,new,l,j,survey}$ and $\mu_{y,i,j}$. Under the grouped project activity, the project ICS is distributed among a homogenous population. Therefore, the approach of simple random sampling is applied. Samples have been drawn randomly using excel properties for generating random results.

To determine the parameters, sampling will involve the following approaches (outcome in brackets):

$N_{y,i,k}$: Visual inspection of the premises to see if ICS is operational and in use. Interview with the end user if required to verify that ICS is still in use (Yes/No)

$\mu_{y,i,j}$: Pre-project device only is in use then fraction to be used to calculate the total number, however, if -the pre-project device is used along with project improved cookstove, the proportion of usage of each will be determined by cooking habits evaluated by survey questionnaire during the monitoring period.

$B_{y=1,new,l,j,survey}$: Quantity of woody biomass used by improved cookstoves devices in tonnes per device (first year of installation). This parameter has been determined during the first monitoring period of the project. The samples have been taken for the calculations of the wood consumption the improved cookstoves.

Sample size:

The project proponent uses the same sample to monitor each parameters mentioned above. As per CDM Methodology AMS II. G version 13.0, 90/10 confidence/precision shall be applied for the annual sampling requirement and 95/10 for biennial sampling inspection. As per Standard for Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programme of Activities version 09, 90/10 confidence/precision to be adopted for the small-scale project and 95/10 for the large-scale project. PP has applied 90/10 confidence/ precision.

Development of the Verification/Sampling Plan:

The audit team has diligently documented its verification and sampling plan, ensuring a comprehensive approach to gathering evidence. The verification plan has been formulated by

considering crucial elements of the verification process, aligning with the criteria of engagement. The plan takes into account and effectively addresses the following aspects:

- a) Level of Assurance
- b) Materiality
- c) Standards of evaluation & reporting for the verification including the assessment criteria
- d) Scope and objectives
- e) Assessment team and the roles of team members
- f) Schedule of verification activities

Verification Approaches

- a) ASP: Acceptance Sampling
- b) SPL: Sampling Approach (all data available)
- c) CDC: Complete data check of data including all data aggregation steps
- d) COM: Full data check at higher data aggregation levels and sampling at original data levels document the rationale for the decision.

Sampling/Verification Plan-

To ensure a comprehensive, transparent, and timely execution of the assessment task, the team leader has carefully crafted a detailed sequence of events that encompasses all the necessary steps to arrive at a substantiated final opinion. This meticulous planning allows for a systematic and organized approach to the assessment, ensuring that no crucial aspects are overlooked or neglected. In addition to the structured sequence of events, the team has implemented various tools and methodologies to facilitate the assessment planning process. These tools serve as aids in gathering and analysing the required information, ensuring the effectiveness and accuracy of the assessment. This approach guarantees that all relevant factors are taken into consideration and that the assessment is conducted in a rigorous and objective manner.

Table 8: Step 1- Identification of Materiality threshold

Check the relevant box against applicable threshold level	Threshold as per Section 4.1.10 of VCS Standard v4.7/05/	Related to
☒	1%	Quantitative materiality, as per reporting standards, dictates that the threshold for

		<p>materiality concerning the aggregate of errors, omissions, and misrepresentations, either individually or in combination, for any reported value in relation to total reported GHG emission reductions and/or removals assets, should not exceed one percent. In other words, discrepancies below this one percent threshold are considered immaterial and do not significantly impact the overall reporting accuracy.</p> <p>The verification of the stated materiality threshold is conducted through the PP's sampling survey (referenced as /09//10/) and the acceptance sampling performed by the assessment team. These assessments revealed that the proportion of non-working stoves observed was lower than anticipated, leading to a reduction in uncertainty. Based on these findings, the reported results are accepted as valid and in compliance with the established materiality criteria.</p>
--	--	--

Table 09 Step 2- Identification of risks, their level and assessment

S.No	Risk that could lead to material errors, omissions or misstatements	Assessment of the potential risk		Assessment of the records/information/interview with personnel to check controls/ mitigation measures
		Risk level	Potential actions causing risk	
1.	For Monitoring parameters			
	N _{y,i,k} (Number of project devices of type I and batch j operating during year k)	Medium	Errors in data collection, entries, incomplete surveys	For N _{y,i,k} Records Review: Verified data accuracy by cross-checking with Monitoring Survey /20/ and registered Joint Project

				<p>Description and Monitoring Report (Joint PD & MR)/03/.</p> <p>Assessment team conducted extensive interviews with relevant stakeholders such as end users during the Onsite audit of the project and a thorough review of monitoring survey results.</p> <p>Assessment team interviews 11 randomly selected project ICS beneficiaries from the PP's monitored samples (acceptance sampling approach was followed) during the onsite audit (refer section 2.3 of this report for the details of end-user's interview). All the end-users interviewed confirmed that the ICS are operational and no issue is found regarding the working of ICS. End users gave positive feedback for the use of project device and confirmed that the project devices are operational and efficient in terms of fuel saving. Assessment team also verified the monitoring survey records/20/ provided by PP and found that the cookstoves of all the end users interviewed have been found operation during the survey.</p> <p>Based on the insights provided by stakeholders/end users during the assessment process including audit and their feedback on project's effectiveness, and also based on sectoral and local expertise of the assessment team mitigates any</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>potential risks and ensures the accuracy and reliability of the reported data and related claims for the applied monitoring period.</p>
	<p>$\eta_{new,i,j}$ (Efficiency of the device of each type i and batch j implemented as part of the project activity)</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Use of incorrect specifications, certification inaccuracies</p>	<p>To mitigate the associated risks with the parameter, a thorough review of the VCS Joint project description & monitoring report (Joint PD & MR) and Monitoring Plan, in alignment with VCS requirements, conducted.</p> <p>Assessment team confirmed checked the compliance of the parameter with applied methodology /12/ and the appropriateness of ER Calculation sheet/02/. The background documents such as the manufacturer's specifications/18/ both the batches have been cross checked. It is confirmed by the assessment team that the efficiency of the implemented project device is calculated as per the Equation 5 given in the methodology/12/.</p> <p>Additionally, discussions with key stakeholders (referenced as /45/) are held to gather insights and perspectives from those connected to or impacted by the project.</p> <p>By utilizing these stringent review processes and verification activities, the project can manage and mitigate potential risks, thereby ensuring the accuracy and reliability of the data reported.</p>

	<p>$B_{y=1, new, i, j, survey}$</p> <p>(Annual quantity of wood biomass used by improved cookstoves in tones per device of type i and batch j, determined in the first year of the implementation of the project through a sample survey)</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Inaccurate wood consumption measurement, sampling errors, calculation errors</p>	<p>A thorough review of the VCS Joint project description & monitoring report (Joint PD & MR) and Monitoring Plan/03/, in alignment with VCS requirements, was be conducted. This review ensured that the claims are consistent and compliant with the established VCS guidelines as stated in VCS standard version 4.7/05/ and adopted methodology for the project i.e., VMR0006, version 1.1/12/. Due to the thorough assessment of the systems in place through extensive interviews/45/, documentation review, the Assessment Team ensured that the risk associated with the parameter is reduced.</p> <p>This also included interviews with relevant stakeholders such as end-users and beneficiaries, who can provide valuable insights and feedback on the project's effectiveness.</p>
	<p>Life Span</p> <p>(The operating lifetime of the project device. The life span should be reported if the methodology equation 5 is adopted to determine the project stove efficiency)</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Incorrect reporting of lifespan, use of incorrect specifications, variability in actual lifespan</p>	<p>For Life Span</p> <p>A thorough review of the VCS Joint project description & monitoring report (Joint PD & MR) and Monitoring Plan/03/, in alignment with VCS requirements, was be conducted.</p> <p>VVB also ensured that the reported lifespan is consistent with manufacturer specifications/18/ by requiring verified documentation from the stove manufacturer. This reduced the risk of</p>

				incorrect reporting due to unsupported claims.
	η_{old} (The efficiency of baseline cookstove)	Low	Errors in data collection prior to project implementation	For η_{old} : VVB conducted a thorough documentation review of the registered project documents including Joint PD MR/03/ and the Joint Validation and Verification report/3.1/ to ensure baseline data collection processes, such as fuel consumption are thoroughly documented and reviewed. VVB assessed the compliance of data with applied methodology/12/. The training records of field staff involved in data collection have also been assessed to reduce the risk associated with the parameter.
2.	Project design: Information on project design without adequate controls related to data, evidences (project/sector related)	High	Project design incorrectly described thus leading to incorrect delineation of the baseline scenario, causal change, threats to the project	To mitigate the associated risks, a comprehensive review of the project claims stated in the VCS Joint project description & monitoring report (referenced as 03) have been conducted. This review helped in assessing the claims against VCS requirements to ensure compliance and accuracy. The Verification Team has performed a detailed assessment of baseline delineation as per the requirements of methodology and registered Joint PD & MR/03/.

				<p>Furthermore, background documents such as the monitoring survey report/03/, baseline survey reports/31/ are cross-checked. This process helped verify the claims made in the project documentation.</p> <p>Additionally, interviews with relevant stakeholders (referenced as /45/) have been conducted to gather insights and perspectives from those involved in or impacted by the project. These interviews help provided valuable information to further assess the validity of the claims and ensure a comprehensive understanding of the project's performance.</p> <p>Regarding leakage, the default value of 0.95, as outlined in the specified methodology/12/, considered. This default value accounts for any potential leakage and ensures accurate calculations and assessments.</p> <p>By undertaking these measures, the project can effectively mitigate risks, enhance transparency, and ensure the reliability and credibility of the reported claims.</p>
3.	Accuracy of the monitoring survey	High	Inadequately delineated monitoring plan may lead non-compliance	<p>To mitigate the risk associated with the accuracy of the monitoring plan, several measures have been taken. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reviewing the monitoring survey report /20/ and the VCS Joint

				<p>project description & monitoring report (Joint PD & MR) /03/. This review will assess the alignment of the monitoring plan with the reported data and claims, ensuring consistency and accuracy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Ensuring compliance with VCS requirements. The monitoring plan was evaluated to ensure it meets the standards and guidelines set by VCS. 3. Assessing the sampling tool applied. The appropriateness and effectiveness of the sampling methodology used in the monitoring plan was examined to ensure reliable and representative data collection. 4. Conducting onsite interviews/45/ with the Project Proponent (PP), their associates, and end-users. These interviews provided an opportunity to verify the feasibility and appropriateness of the monitoring plan. Feedback from stakeholders involved in the project helped validate the accuracy of the data collected and the effectiveness of the monitoring procedures. <p>By implementing these measures, the project can mitigate the risk associated with the accuracy of the monitoring plan and ensure that the reported data and claims are reliable and consistent with</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				the established guidelines and requirements.
4.	Competence of personnel involved in conducting monitoring like surveys	Medium	Interview of the personnel involved in monitoring and check the training records of training conducting for such monitoring Procedures.	<p>To mitigate the risk associated with monitoring surveys, the following steps have been taken:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reviewing the training records /24/ of the personnel responsible for conducting the surveys. This review ensured that the individuals involved in the monitoring process have received appropriate training and possess the necessary skills and knowledge to carry out accurate and reliable surveys. 2. Following the defined monitoring responsibilities. The roles and responsibilities of the monitoring team be clearly defined and adhered to throughout the survey process. This includes ensuring that all required data is collected, recorded, and analysed in a consistent and systematic manner. 3. Verifying the training records with relevant stakeholders by interviewing them about the monitoring survey procedures carried out by the survey team at their households /20/. By conducting interviews, the validity of the training records was confirmed, and any discrepancies or concerns can be addressed.

				<p>By conducting a thorough review of the training records/24/ and verifying them through interviews, the project can mitigate the risk associated with monitoring surveys. This approach ensures that trained personnel are involved in the survey process and that they follow the established monitoring responsibilities, thereby enhancing the reliability and accuracy of the collected data.</p>
5	Sampling	High	<p>The major risk associated with sampling in a large-scale cookstove project is the potential for sampling bias, where the selected sample does not accurately represent the entire population. This can lead to incorrect conclusions about the project's performance.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Measurement Errors: Errors in measuring emissions reductions from cookstoves can lead to inaccurate results. This risk can be mitigated by ensuring that the validation and verification body (VVB) follows standardized measurement procedures. 2. Data Accuracy: Inaccurate data collection or reporting can impact the credibility of emission reductions. The VVB can mitigate this risk by conducting data validation and verification checks by interviewing the relevant end users and cross verifying the sampling sheet and sample records. 3. Non-compliance: Failure to comply with project requirements or methodologies can lead to invalidation of emission reductions. The VVB can mitigate this risk by ensuring that the project adheres to

				<p>all relevant standards and guidelines.</p> <p>To mitigate this risk, the VVB must use random sampling techniques and ensure that the sample is representative of the entire population. Regular audits and spot checks can also help identify and correct any sampling biases.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Sampling Plan:

Due to a large number of project activity instances in state Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra (India), it is impractical to assess each one individually. To overcome this, the verification team used appropriate sampling methods for assessment. These methods are carefully selected to ensure statistical validity and reliability. The team documents and explains the chosen sampling methods in detail, providing transparency and clarity to the verification process. The number of instances included in the project, eligible for monitoring, and the generation of Verified Carbon Units (VCUs) is determined proportionally based on the compliance rate observed among the sampled instances. This approach allows for a representative assessment of the project activity while maintaining efficiency and accuracy in the verification process.

<input type="checkbox"/>	No sampling approach has been used by the VVB to verify the project's compliance with SD Vista requirements.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A sampling approach has been applied by the VVB to verify the project's compliance with VCS requirements for the aspects derived in step 2 above. The statistical approach of sample size (i.e., 11, acceptance number (c) = 0) calculation is provided below.

AS: Acceptance Sampling

VKU's Assessment Team has diligently employed an acceptance sampling methodology during the onsite interviews as an integral part of their assessment process, in strict accordance with the specifications outlined in paragraph 26 of the Standard for Sampling and Surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, Version 09.0/10/. The team has consciously opted for acceptance sampling, a well-established technique that facilitates a systematic and representative sampling of project instances. By attentively adhering to these sampling guidelines, VKU's Assessment Team ensures a robust, accurate, and comprehensive assessment of the project activities. thereby upholding the highest standards of evaluation.

From the PP's sampling survey sheet assessment team by acceptance sampling has opted for **AQL of 0.5% and UQL of 20%; producer risk of 10% and consumer risk of 10%** as per VVBs professional judgement (based on the experience for the similar kind of other verification projects in same Technical area 3.1) thus keeping in-line with the para 30 and para 31 of Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities version 09.0/10/ in determining the VVB's selected sample size of **11 with acceptance number (c) as 0**. Random samples from the sampling survey done by project participants have been selected as per the sampling standard version 09 & sampling guidelines version 4.0/09/. VVB has physically witnessed all 11 random samples (Each household as 01 Improved cookstove) and confirms that all the stoves are in operation as per the PP's data. This is also in line with VKU's internal procedure i.e., VKU.F74A.Sampling Plan Method and Guidance.

It must be noted that the samples are already taken from the samples of the PP. Under this grouped project activity PP has distributed 11,522 ICS in Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra, a sample survey of 400 household (300 in M.P and 100 in Maharashtra) has been collected keeping the survey larger and conservative. This has been done by PP as per guidelines/simplified approach stated in section 8.4 serial number (b) for the monitoring survey of the applied methodology VMR0006 version 1.1/12/.

The monitoring survey/20/ was performed by a field team between 01- June- 2024 to 28-June-2024 for both the batches, the survey households have been chosen from the potential ICS beneficiaries using simple random sampling approach.

As per registered Joint PD & MR/03/, the PP has chosen to conduct the monitoring survey of the said parameter i.e., $N_{y,i,k}$ and $B_{y=1,new,l,j,survey}$. The frequency of monitoring of each of the monitored parameters taken at validation & 1st verification has been kept in line with applied methodology VMR0006 version 1.1/12/ stated in guidelines for each for the monitored parameters.

The project involves distribution of ICS throughout the project area thereby replacing traditional cooking devices. The population is homogeneous in nature i.e., common technology with similar operating characteristics but dispersed i.e., distribution of ICS is spread across different districts

in State Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra of Host Country: India. Since the characteristics of the population (for example quantity of biomass consumed) are more similar due to distribution is carried out in a same state. Therefore, a simple random sampling technique is used to calculate the samples. Samples have been drawn by using the random number generator. The assessment team performed acceptance sampling based on the sampling guidance and picked 11 random ICS samples (Each household received 01 Improved cookstove) using randomiser that is representative of the sampling frame i.e., cookstoves distributed across the project location.

The sampling plan implemented by the PP is in accordance with the applied approved monitoring methodology /12/ and the VCS Joint PD & MR /03/. The PP has appropriately performed simple random sampling procedure in line with the applied methodology VMR0006 version 1.1/12/. Survey has been carried out. As the VCS Joint PD & MR /03/ mentions the option for simple random Sampling, so it was found appropriate to the verification team. The sampling surveys/09//10/ have been carried out by the well-trained personnel. Further, preparedness for conducting survey was adequate and survey plan was robust. Further a brief description has been provided in section 4.4 of this report.

Table 10 - Sample size and acceptance number based on AQL, UQL, and producer and consumer risks as per Sampling and Survey Standard v09.0

Producer Risk		5%		5%		5%		5%	
Consumer Risk		5%		10%		15%		20%	
AQL	UQL	Sample Size (n)	Acceptance Number (c)	Sample Size (n)	Acceptance Number (c)	Sample Size (n)	Acceptance Number (c)	Sample Size (n)	Acceptance Number (c)
0.5 %	10 %	46	1	38	1	33	1	29	1
0.5 %	15 %	30	1	25	1	22	1	10	0
0.5 %	20 %	22	1	18	1	9	0	8	0
1.0 %	10 %	61	2	52	2	33	1	29	1

%									
1.0 %	15 %	30	1	25	1	22	1	19	1
1.0 %	20 %	22	1	18	1	16	1	14	1
Producer Risk		10%		10%		10%		10%	
Consumer Risk		5%		10%		15%		20%	
AQL	UQL	Sample Size (n)	Acceptance Number (c)	Sample Size (n)	Acceptance Number (c)	Sample Size (n)	Acceptance Number (c)	Sample Size (n)	Acceptance Number (c)
0.5 %	10 %	46	1	38	1	19	0	16	0
0.5 %	15 %	19	0	15	0	12	0	10	0
0.5 %	20 %	14	0	11	0	9	0	8	0
1.0 %	10 %	46	1	38	1	33	1	29	1
1.0 %	15 %	30	1	25	1	22	1	10	0
1.0 %	20 %	22	1	18	1	9	0	8	0

The verification team has chosen an AQL (Acceptable Quality Level) of 0.5% and a UQL (Unacceptable Quality Level) of 20%, ensuring a producer risk of 10% and a consumer risk of 10%, based on the VVB's professional judgment in accordance with the guidelines outlined in para 30 of the Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programmes of Activities v09.0. Since the project is based out of India VVB applied para 31 (a) and (b) towards application of producer and consumer risk of the Standards on CDM Sampling, even though the ERs from

the project is less than 100,000 tCO₂ per year. This is done in order to determine conservative number (which means optimal number) than is allowed as per para 39 of the Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities Version 09.0. To determine the sample size, the VVB selected 18 household samples (each household received 01 ICS) with one-acceptance number (c), utilizing a random number generator software from the monitoring survey provided by the client.

2.5 Resolution of Findings

The objective of this phase of the verification is to resolve any outstanding issues which need to be clarified for VKU's positive conclusion on the joint project description & monitoring report. To guarantee transparency a verification protocol has been customized for the project. The protocol shows in a transparent manner the requirements, means of verification and the results from verifying the identified criteria. The verification protocol consists of three situations in tables; the different columns in these tables are described below.

A corrective action request (CAR) is raised if one of the following occurs:

- Non-conformities with the monitoring plan or methodology are found in monitoring and reporting, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;
- Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions that will impair the estimate of emission reductions;
- Issues identified in a FAR during previous assessment i.e., in validation or verification report to be cross verified during verification have not been resolved by the project participants.

A clarification request (CL) is raised if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable VCS requirements have been met. A forward action request (FAR) is also raised in cases where any required deviation/information is not fulfilled in current verification and thus needs to be taken up in consequent verification for better transparency thus holding the applicability of the methodology eligible to the project activity and there is no impact of the same on additionality, baseline scenario & emission reduction calculation of project.

Keeping in line with the Clauses 4.1.21 of the VCS Standard Version 4.7, Assessment team has documented a summary of total **08 findings** that include, **00 FAR, 05 CLs and 03 CARs** have been raised during this verification which are closed successfully and details are provided under Appendix 04 of this report.

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

Based on the review of the previous Joint VCS Validation/Verification Report/3.1/, VVB hereby confirms that no FAR was raised which needs to be closed during this verification and no FAR has been raised during current verification, (01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024; Inclusive of both start and end dates).

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

The grouped project “Improved Cookstoves for Communities” (VCS ID 2922), has undergone Joint Validation and Verification under the Validation Verification Body: LGAI Technological Center S.A. (Applus+ Certification). During the Joint Validation and Verification/3.1/ of the project, PP has implemented 9,200 ICS for the first instance. During the current verification (2nd M.P.), the Project Proponent has added 2,322 cookstoves (Batch 2) in the first instance.

For the batch 2, PP has conducted baseline survey/31/ and Local Stakeholder Consultation/34/ prior to implementation of batch 2 cookstoves.

Accreditation and Eligibility for Validation Activities

It is to confirm that during current verification there is no validation assessment undertaken either by VKU itself or parallelly by any other certification bodies, as the same was confirmed with focussed group discussions and interview with the PP during on site visit/45/.

Assessment team assessed the VERRA’s website at the time of submission of this report: <https://verra.org/validation-verification/vku-certification-pvt-ltd/#vcs> wherein the scope of services of VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd. is mentioned as verification as well as validation. Thus, ensuring that the accreditation details mentioned in FVR is consistent and correct. Thus, the accreditation details given in the Final Verification Report (FVR) by the verification team are confirmed to be accurate and consistent.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

3.1 Methodology Deviations

There is no methodology deviation identified or requested by PP during the current monitoring period from 01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024 (Inclusive of both start and end dates). Also, no methodology deviations identified during the previous Joint Validation & Verification which was confirmed from the previous VCS Joint Validation & Verification Report /3.1/ easily accessible to the assessment team on the Verra webpage.

3.2 Project Description Deviations

During the current monitoring period, no deviations in the project description have been identified. To ensure the consistency and accuracy, the assessment team cross-checked the registered VCS Joint PD&MR/03/ and no inconsistency was found.

3.3 New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects

Under the grouped project activity “Improved Cookstoves for Communities” (VCS ID 2922), PP has implemented 9,200 ICS for the first instance during the Joint Validation and Verification/3.1/. No new instance has been added during the current monitoring period.

Since there is no inclusion of a new project activity instance, this section is not applicable.

However, during the current monitoring period, another batch of 2,322 ICS have been added in the same instance. AT has thoroughly evaluated the newly added batch of 2,322 ICS, implemented in the state of Maharashtra (Jalna district) during the current monitoring period, to confirm consistency with the previously implemented batch 1. Batch 2 ICS are manufactured by FabEarth Manufacturing and this was verified by AT via conducting an in-depth review of the manufacture specifications/18/ of the FE-01 model of batch 2 provided by the project proponent (PP).

The technical specifications (provided in [section 4.1](#) of this report) clearly outline that the FE-01 model shares similar efficiency characteristics with the ICS model from batch 1, with an initial efficiency of 36.42%, as confirmed by an independent third-party efficiency test report/23/.

The assessment team has evaluated and validated batch 2 ICS implementation based on the onsite assessment/45/ and supporting evidence such as baseline survey report/31/ and local stakeholder consultation report/21/. The assessment team confirms that the introduction of a different manufacturer did not impact the technical performance of the cookstoves. The verification process, based on both onsite inspections and document reviews, reaffirms that the cookstoves added in batch 2 meet the project’s technical and efficiency standards.

3.4 Baseline Reassessment

Did the project undergo baseline reassessment during the monitoring period?

Yes

No

The baseline has been assessed during the Joint Validation and Verification/3.1/ of the project for batch 1 ICS distribution in Madhya Pradesh. For batch 2 distribution, the baseline remains the same, as verified from the baseline survey report/31/. It is also found to be in compliance with the applied methodology; VMR0006, Version 1.1/12/.

Hence, VVB concludes that no baseline reassessment has occurred.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Details

Based on the documentation review and onsite assessment conducted by VKU's audit team, it has been confirmed that the project implementation and operation are in compliance with registered Joint PD & MR/03/. The primary objective of this grouped project activity is to distribute improved cookstoves in various states across host country India, thereby, displacing the less efficient traditional cooking stoves used in the baseline scenario. During the first instance under the grouped project, ICSs have been distributed in the state of Madhya Pradesh (batch 1) and Maharashtra (batch 2). By introducing improved and efficient cook stoves, the project has an overall objective to conserve forests and woodlands while improving the health conditions of ICS beneficiaries due to less emission and improve indoor air quality for everyday cooking.

The approach of the project leads to reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by promoting sustainable cooking practices in rural households. The Assessment Team verified the project location on-site using a GPS map camera/35/. As per the requirements of clause 3.11.1 of VCS standard; version 4.7, KML file/22/ have been provided by PP to delineate the project's geographical areas. The KML files have been cross checked by VVB using Google Earth Pro software and are found to be in line with requirements of VCS standard; version 4.7/05/.

The project proponent Outreach Projects Private Limited has distributed ICS manufactured by Swami Samarth Electronics Private Limited, for the first batch and FabEarth Manufacturing for the second batch. The beneficiaries/ end users of ICS transfer the ownership of carbon credit to the Project Proponent via an end user agreement. The overall responsibility of maintaining a database for all operating stoves lies with the PP. A ground level team has been assigned to households, where the cookstoves have been distributed. Team visits the households on annual basis to check the working condition of ICS and to provide any necessary maintenance or replacement. A designated team leader is responsible for monitoring the team's activities and ensuring that all households are visited as scheduled. The ground team also provides education and training to households for the proper use and maintenance of cookstoves. PP has also provided supporting documents for the training records/24/. The operational and management structure is verified from document review and on-site interview /45/. A monitoring survey for both the batches have been conducted by PP between 01-June-2024 to 28-June-2024/20/. The emission reductions achieved during this monitoring period are 66,258 tCO_{2e}.

The project proponent has distributed 9,200 cookstoves under batch 1 in several districts of Madhya Pradesh. During the current monitoring period, project proponent distributed 2,322 ICS in batch 2 in Jalna district of Maharashtra. The technical specifications of the cookstoves provided Appendix 3 of the monitoring report/01/, have been verified with the from Manufacturer’s specifications/18/ provided by PP.

Below Tables indicates the Technical Specification of ICS as per the brochure and confirmed by assessment team onsite visit:

Table 11- AGNEEKA ECO-MINI Model (distributed in batch 1)

Cook Stove Type/Category	Natural Draft	
Secondary Air Supply	Through Natural Draft	
Stove Material Used	Body	Mild Steel
	Body material thickness	0.6mm
	Combustion chamber	Stainless Steel
	Combustion chamber material thickness	1 mm
	Insulating Material	Thermal Wool
	Insulating Material Thickness	6 to 8mm

	Top Plate	Stainless Steel
	Top Plate Material Thickness	1 mm
Physical structure	External dissemination	Length: - 260mm Width: - 260mm Height: - 248m
	Combustion Chamber Dimension	Diameter: - 125mm
Grate Thickness	2 mm Material Mild Steel	
Weight Of the Stove	3.8 Kg	
Type of Fuel Wood	Firewood	
Feeding Process	Continuous Feeding Front Loading	
Expected life of stove	07 Years	
Guarantee /Warranty Period	2 Years	
Box Dimension	Outer Side Box Dimension	Length: - 300mm Width: - 300mm Height: - 270mm
Efficiency at the start of project	0.3642 (Fraction)	

Table 02-FE-01 Model (Distributed under Batch 02)

Cook Stove Type/Category	Natural Draft	
Secondary Air Supply	Through Natural Draft	
Stove Material Used	Body	GI Steel
	Body material thickness	0.8 mm
	Combustion chamber	Stainless Steel SS 202 2B Grade
	Combustion chamber material thickness	1 mm SS 202 2B Grade
	Insulating Material	Ceramic Thermal Wool
	Insulating Material Thickness	20 to 25 mm
	Top Plate	Stainless Steel SS 202 Mirror grade
	Top Plate Material Thickness	1 mm
Physical structure	External dissemination	Length: - 260mm Width: - 260mm Height: - 245 m
	Combustion Chamber Dimension	Diameter: - 120 mm
Grate Thickness	2 mm Material GI Steel	
Weight Of the Stove	3.5 Kg	
Type of Fuel Wood	Firewood 30 to 50 mm diameter	
Feeding Process	Continuous Feeding Front Loading	
Expected life of stove	07 Years	
Guarantee /Warranty Period	1 Years	
Box Dimension	Outer Side Box Dimension	Length: - 300mm Width: - 300mm Height: - 270mm
Efficiency at the start of project	0.3642 (Fraction)	

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion:				
Audit history	Audit type	Period	Program	Validation/verification body name	Number of years
	Joint Validation & Verification	20-November 2021 to 19-November 2028 (crediting period) 20-November 2021 to 31-December-2022 (first verification period)	VCS	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)	7 years (validation) 1 year 1 month, 12 days
	Verification	1-January 2023 to 31-May-2024 (Second Verification Period)	VCS	VKU Certifications Pvt. Ltd.	1 year 5 months
	Total	20-November 2021 - 31-May 2024	VCS	-	Validation (7 years) 2557 days Verification (2 years 6 months, 12 days) 924 days
Evidence gathering activities: Keeping in line with the requirements stated in ISO 14064-3: 2019 (E) section 6.1.3 &					

	<p>program requirement, the assessment team has performed the desk-review during the pre-engagement stage to confirm the duration of the current monitoring period, the last monitoring period & the crediting period of this project activity. Apart from the desk-review the VVB also confirmed the audit history while performing the personnel interview & focussed grouped discussion with PP during the on-site visit.</p> <p>Evidence checked: Assessment team cross checked the registered Joint PD&MR/03/ and registered Validation and Verification report/3.1/ of the grouped project. The project details available on Verra's webpage are also referred by the VVB.</p> <p>VVB's Conclusion: VVB concludes that the above-mentioned evidences gathered by the VVB team to confirm that the audit history is in-line with the ISO 14064-03 & program requirements which is deemed accurate and satisfactory to VKU's assessment team.</p>
<p>Double counting and participation under other GHG programs</p>	<p>The grouped project “Improved Cookstoves for Communities”, is not participated under any other GHG program except VCS. The project is registered under VCS with project ID 2922. This was confirmed by checking VERRA registry website and similar exercise was performed for CDM/GS/GCC/UCR registries with similar project title/capacity and Project Proponents but the assessment team was not able to trace any such project registered under any of the above stated registries or under any other similar mechanisms.</p> <p>A declaration/26/ for the same is checked and found correct by the assessment team. The assessment team has also cross-checked the issuance records available on the Verra website and thus confirmed & ensured that the emission reduction generated from the project activity are not & will not be double counted hence accepted by the assessment team.</p>

<p>No double claiming with emissions trading programs or binding emission limits</p>	<p>Assessment team conducted an independent verification through desk review of project documentation web searching of the other registries websites like; https://cdm.unfccc.int/, https://www.goldstandard.org/, https://www.ucarbonregistry.io/, https://projects.globalcarboncouncil.com/ and conducted Onsite Audit. Assessment team also reviewed the self-declaration for no double claiming/26/ submitted by PP to VVB.</p> <p>VVB draws the following conclusion:</p> <p>The project is not included in an emissions trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading. The PP declares through the declaration /26/ that Net GHG emission reductions or removals generated by the Project will not be used for compliance with an emissions trading program or to meet binding limits on GHG emissions in any Emission Trading program or other binding limits any specific monitoring period under two mechanisms.</p>
<p>No double claiming with other forms of environmental credit</p>	<p>The project has not sought or received another form of GHG-related environmental credit. The assessment team has also cross-checked the issuance records available on the Verra website and thus confirmed & ensured that the emission reduction generated from the project activity are not & will not be double counted hence accepted by the assessment team.</p> <p>By checking VERRA registry website, Similar exercise was performed for CDM/GS/GCC/UCR/ICR registries with similar project title.</p> <p>The project verification team has also checked the</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. http://cdm.unfccc.int/ 3. http://www.goldstandard.org/ 5. https://cri.nccf.in/ 6. International Carbon Registry - International Carbon Registry

	<p>7. <u>GCC PROJECTS PORTAL (globalcarboncouncil.com)</u></p> <p>In addition to checking the Verra and other registries, Assessment team also evaluated the declaration/27/ submitted by PP, declaring that the net GHG emission reductions generated by the project will not be included in any other form of environmental credit. Hence, it is concluded that the project activity has not sought, received, or is planning to receive credit from another GHG-related environmental credit system. Therefore, it is confirmed that project is in compliance with VCS standard v4.7 para 3.24.5 /05/.</p>
<p>Supply chain (scope 3) emissions double claiming</p>	<p>Assessment team confirms that:</p> <p>The project proponent or authorized representative is not a buyer or seller of a product whose emissions footprint is changed by the project activities.</p> <p>The project proponent has correctly selected "No" to the question "Do the project activities affect the emissions footprint of any product(s) (goods or services) that are part of a supply chain?" This has been verified and confirmed by assessment team via a declaration/26/ submitted to the VVB declaring that the project does not claim emission reductions in scope 3 inventories</p>
<p>Sustainable development contributions</p>	<p>Evidence gathering activities: As per the VCS Standard version 4.7/05/, section 3.17.1, it is required by the project proponent to “demonstrate that a project contributes to at least three SDGs by the end of the first monitoring period, and in each subsequent monitoring period”. To verify the SD contributions of project during current monitoring period/01/, Assessment team conducted desk review of registered project documentation/3.1/ and conducted onsite assessment.</p> <p>PP is voluntarily showing contributions to 07 SDGs. As indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDG Indicator 3.9.1: Mortality rate attributed to household and ambient air pollution

Evidence checked: to verify the claim that the project led to decrease in household air pollution, assessment team assessed the monitoring survey records/20/ and monitoring survey questionnaire/19/ provided by PP. Users of improved cookstoves have also been interviewed/45/ by the assessment team.

VB's Conclusion:

The implementation of project cookstove in states of Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra (India) resulted in a significant decrease in household air pollution. The switch from baseline stove has led to positive impacts on the health of users and family members and has reduced the indiscriminate chopping of trees for fuelwood. This was evident from the focussed group discussion with the end-users along with personal interviews while physically inspecting the cookstoves distributed, where it was confirmed the reduction in respiratory issue and itching in eyes and improvement in air quality with the use of ICS.

As per monitoring report/01/, during the current monitoring period, 100% beneficiaries have claimed reduction in indoor smoke. This is confirmed via the monitoring survey questionnaire/19/ and monitoring survey reports/20/ provided by PP, where the end users confirmed the reduction in smoke and respiratory illness. Hence, Assessment team confirm that the SDG indicator is correct and applicable for the current monitoring period.

- **SDG Indicator 5.5.2: Proportion of women in marginal position**

Evidence checked: Assessment team reviewed the end-user's agreement, monitoring survey records/20/ and conducted onsite audit and interviews with ICS beneficiaries.

VB's Conclusion:

The VVB confirmed that the majority of ICS beneficiaries have been women. During the current monitoring period, women beneficiaries reported significant improvements in their daily routines. Notably, they experienced reductions in both fuelwood collection and cooking time due to the use of improved cookstoves (ICS). These observations have been verified through the monitoring survey results/20/, which clearly demonstrated time savings attributed to the ICS.

Further verification during physical inspections/45/, along with interviews conducted as recorded in VKU.62W: Appendix-1 of the Field Assessment Checklist for Sample Selected by VVB for Energy Demand & Distribution Projects/37/, highlighted the ICS's efficiency. The improved cookstoves burn wood more effectively, enhancing thermal energy transfer. This results in less fuel consumption and reduced cooking time, directly benefiting the women who predominantly manage these household activities.

- **SDG Indicator 7.1.2: Proportion of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technology**

Evidence checked: The assessment team thoroughly reviewed the ICS distribution database and evaluated the results of the monitoring survey for the current monitoring period. In addition, onsite inspections and interviews with end-users have been conducted/45/ to verify the SDG claim.

WB's Conclusion:

The ICS cookstove dissemination project has significantly improved access to clean cooking technology, with 9,200 households equipped with improved cookstoves in batch 1 and 2,322 households in batch 2. This was confirmed through a review of the project database/17/ submitted by the PP.

During the onsite visit, the assessment team interviewed end-users, who confirmed that the cookstoves had been implemented in their homes, further validating the distribution claims. By the end of this monitoring period, the project has successfully provided improved cookstoves to a total of 11,522 households.

The VVB concluded that the claimed proportion of the population now relying on clean fuels and technology is both authentic and accurate, demonstrating a significant contribution towards clean energy access in the monitored regions.

- **SDG Indicator 8.3.1: Proportion of informal employment in total employment, by sector and sex**

Evidence checked: Assessment team reviewed registered joint project documents and monitoring report/01/, the employment records, training records and conducted onsite interviews/24/ with monitoring personnel.

VVB's Conclusion:

The implementation of improved cookstoves under the grouped project “Improved Cookstoves for Communities” has led to an employment of 20 people during the current monitoring period and 70 people cumulatively till the current monitoring period.

Assessment team verified the employment records in the form of appointment letter issued by Outreach Projects Pvt. Ltd. (PP) and trainings records/24/ provided by PP. the project proponent has created job opportunities in the ICS distribution and monitoring activities. The project contributions claimed towards the SDG 8.3.1 is deemed to be correct and acceptable by VVB.

- **SDG indicator 12.2.2: Domestic material consumption, domestic material consumption per capita, and domestic material consumption per GDP.**

Evidence checked: The assessment team thoroughly reviewed previous registered project documents and monitoring report/03/ and the ICS distribution database and evaluated the results of the monitoring survey for the current monitoring period. In addition, onsite inspections and interviews with end-users have been conducted/45/ to verify the SDG claim.

VVB's conclusion:

The grouped project has implemented improved and energy efficient cookstoves and led to reduction in fuelwood consumption. Based on the evidences gathered by VVB, it is concluded that the project is contributed to firewood saving which are directly fetched from the forest. VVB assessed the monitoring survey records and confirmed that 3.68 tonne for batch 1 and 0.70 tonnes for batch 2 of firewood is saved during the current monitoring period. The improved efficiency of the ICS cookstoves allows for better combustion of wood, resulting in enhanced thermal transfer to cooking pots and ultimately fuel savings.

- **SDG target 13.0: Tonne of greenhouse gas emissions avoided or removed**

Evidence checked: Assessment team evaluated the calculation of the emission reductions for this monitoring period in the ER sheet/02/ & also evaluated the application of correct methodology and formulae for this monitoring period with the applied methodology i.e., VMR0006: Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves, Version 1.1. For first monitoring period VKU referred to the approved VCS Joint PD & MR and Joint Validation and verification report available on the Verra's webpage.

VVB's conclusion:

With ICS cookstove dissemination through the project implemented activities lead to an emission reduction of 66,258 tons of CO₂e. in the current monitoring period. Based on the review of previous registered project documentation/03/ and project Verra webpage, VVB confirms that the above claimed Project Specific Indicator: Tonne of greenhouse gas emissions avoided or removed; authentic & correct. During the current monitoring period, the project resulted in reduction of 66,258 tons of CO₂e.

Cumulatively, the project has led to reduction of 113,684 tCO₂e (47,426 tCO₂e for the first verification and 66,258 tons of CO₂e for the current verification).

- **SDG Indicator: 15.2.1 Progress towards sustainable forest management**

Evidence Checked:

Assessment team reviewed the ER calculation spreadsheet/02/, monitoring survey records/20/ and conducted interviews with end users/45/.

VVB Conclusion:

	<p>The implementation of the ICS cookstove dissemination project in the host country India and specifically to project implemented states (Madhya Pradesh & Maharashtra) resulted in significant reduction in fuelwood consumption. Based on the gathered evidences, it was found that 3.68 tons per year of fuelwood is saved during the current monitoring period in Batch 1 distribution. 0.70 tons of fuelwood per household is saved in batch 2 during the monitoring period. The improved efficiency of the ICS cookstoves allows for better combustion of wood, resulting in enhanced thermal transfer to cooking pots and ultimately fuel savings. The fuelwood savings has been verified from the ER sheet/02/ and monitoring survey results/20/ provided by PP. Hence, VVB confirms that project has implemented activities to decrease fuelwood consumption and thereby led to sustainable forest management.</p>
<p>Additional information relevant to the project</p>	<p>As per the monitoring report/01/ for the current monitoring period, PP has included financial information such as price of cookstove, maintenance cost of cookstove and consultancy charge, etc. to be considered as “commercially sensitive” and excluded from the public versions of project documents.</p> <p>This type of financial information could influence competition or contractual outcomes, it is deemed to be commercially sensitive information by the Assessment team. In-line with clause 3.5.2 and 3.5.3 of VCS Standard; version 4.7 and VCS Program Definitions; version 4.5/07/, the disclosure of above-mentioned information could lead to material financial loss or gain, or harm contractual negotiations and hence, excluded from the public versions of project documents including the monitoring report/01/. Hence, VVB concludes that the Project conforms with the VCS Program requirements on what may be excluded. Further details are provided in Appendix 1 of this report.</p>

4.2 Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement

4.2.1 Stakeholder Identification

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Stakeholder identification	<p>Evidence Gathering Activities: Assessment team has performed documentation review of registered and validated project documents to assess the stakeholder identification process and to assess if there is any significant change in the stakeholder’s makeup over time. Assessment team also conducted onsite interviews with PP’s representatives to evaluate the same.</p> <p>Evidence Checked: The accuracy and comprehensiveness of the information gathered through the Stakeholder Analysis have been verified by cross-checking with interview/focussed group discussions with relevant experts and stakeholder representatives volunteered during the onsite audit conducted by the VVB.</p> <p>VVB’s Conclusion:</p> <p>Assessment team assessed the registered Joint PD & MR/03/ and Joint Validation and Verification report/3.1/ of the grouped project and confirmed the local stakeholders identified in the project. The local stakeholder consultation under the grouped project activity was conducted on 07-October-2021 for the first batch. For the second batch, LSC was conducted on 06-February-2024, as verified from the LSC report/21/ and other supporting documents provided by PP.</p> <p>VVB could trace that stakeholder’s identification was based on general criteria of involving local communities, non-governmental organizations that could closely and strongly engage with local villagers/communities and work actively within project boundary. Thus, assessment team confirms that the project proponent has considered the significance of user population and conducted a thorough assessment of relevant stakeholders. This is in-line with the requirements of clause 3.18.1 of VCS Standard; version 4.7.</p>

<p>Legal or customary tenure/access rights</p>	<p>Evidence Gathering Activities: Details regarding legal/customary tenure rights of stakeholders, IPs, LCs and rights holders was gathered during the verification process.</p> <p>Evidence Checked: As this is the 2nd consecutive verification of the project activity, VVB reviewed the initial registered/validated project documents/3.1/ regarding the legal rights of the Project Proponent regarding land usage, territories and resources. End-user agreements are also assessed.</p> <p>WB's Conclusion:</p> <p>Based on the documentation provided and stakeholder consultations/21/, the project developer has demonstrated adequate details of stakeholder engagement prior to and during the implementation of project. The engagement process was found to be transparent and inclusive, addressing concerns related to legal and customary tenure/access rights to the territories and resources affected by the project.</p> <p>There are no legal or customary tenure/access rights to territories and resources, including collective and conflicting rights, held by stakeholders, Indigenous People (IPs), local communities (LCs), and customary rights holders in the project areas. End-users possess rights to the ICS, secured through an end-user agreement established between the Project Proponent and the end-users, confirmed by the assessment team on basis of desk-review of project documents/01//02/, & interview with onsite personals/45/</p> <p>Under the grouped project, no significant risks or conflicts related to access or tenure rights have been identified during the verification, as confirmed from the gathered evidences.</p>
<p>Stakeholder diversity and changes over time</p>	<p>Evidence Gathering Activities: Assessment team conducted the documentation review of the registered and validated project documents and interviews with stakeholders to assess the inclusive and culturally appropriate nature of stakeholder consultation.</p>

	<p>Evidence Checked: VVB cross checked the validated Joint Validation and Verification report/3.1/ of the project, Local Stakeholder Consultation report/21/ and conducted onsite interviews/45/.</p> <p>VVB's Conclusion:</p> <p>The assessment team on basis of desk-review of project documents, & interview with onsite personals/45/ confirms the identification of the social, economic, and cultural diversity among stakeholders, as well as the interactions between them, has been adequately addressed. Stakeholder group exhibited notable diversity across social, economic and cultural dimensions. Socially, individuals from various backgrounds, including different age groups, ethnicities and socio-economic classes were present.</p> <p>As per the supporting documents and onsite observations, the diversity described by the project developer during the initial phase remains consistent during the current monitoring period, with no significant changes in the stakeholder demographics.</p> <p>In conclusion, the project developer has effectively recognized and maintained a diverse range of stakeholders, with no significant changes or challenges arising during the current monitoring period.</p> <p>Moreover, VVB's assessment is also based on the PP's ongoing stakeholder engagement/21/ to ensure that the project continues to align with the diverse needs and expectations of its stakeholders.</p>
<p>Expected changes in well-being</p>	<p>Evidence Gathering Activities: As per desk review with registered Joint PD&MR/03/, interview with stakeholders and assessment of monitoring report/01/, the assessment of changes in stakeholder well-being, characteristics, and ecosystem services was conducted.</p> <p>Evidence Checked: Registered project documents and monitoring report /03/, PP's records for Ongoing communication between Project Proponent and relevant stakeholders/21/, employment records, VVB's onsite interviews with concerned personnel/45/, attendance records/38/.</p>

WB's Conclusion:

The distribution of energy-efficient cook stoves in the project area has brought about substantial positive changes in various dimensions of well-being and stakeholder characteristics under the baseline scenario.

The project developer has adequately assessed the expected changes in well-being and other stakeholder characteristics under the baseline scenario, with particular attention to economic and environmental well-being. The following key points have been noted:

Economic Well-being: Under the baseline scenario (As verified from the Joint Validation and Verification Report/3.1/ and baseline survey report for batch 2 ICS distribution), rural households would continue to rely on traditional, less efficient stoves, which typically result in higher fuel costs and limited opportunities for economic improvement.

The project activity provides the clean cookstove for the usage to the rural families thus economic well beings are expected.

Environmental Well-being:

The project is expected to significantly reduce the use of forest fuelwood, which would otherwise continue under the baseline scenario. This contributes to the conservation of natural resources, particularly forest ecosystems that are under threat of depletion.

By reducing GHG emissions through cleaner cookstove technology, the project also contributes to mitigating climate change impacts, which are critical for the long-term environmental well-being of the region. In contrast, under the baseline scenario. As verified during interviews with ICS beneficiaries/45/ during onsite inspection of project, a significant reduction in fuelwood usage has been observed with the use of improved cookstove.

To conclude, the shift from traditional to clean cookstoves has resulted in significant improvements in both economic and environmental well-being for stakeholders, with positive impacts on key resources identified by the community.

<p>Location of stakeholders</p>	<p>Evidence Gathering Activities: As per desk review with registered Joint PD&MR/03/, interview with stakeholders/21/. The location of stakeholders, local communities, indigenous peoples, customary rights holders, and areas outside the project area that may experience impacts have been identified.</p> <p>Evidence Checked: VVB has verified the results of PP’s consultation records/21/ with local authorities and community representatives at the time of validation/03/, grievance records/30/.</p> <p>WB’s Conclusion:</p> <p>The project is implemented within geographical boundaries of India, specifically in states of Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra. The locations are verified during the onsite assessment using GPS map camera/35/ and with the help of KML file/22/ provided by PP. The end-user possesses ownership of their respective houses where Improved Cook Stoves (ICSS) have been installed. VVB confirmed the same by interviewing the end-users and also cross-checking the location during the physical visit. Also, it should be noted that as per PD the areas identified for ICS distribution are the ones where traditional cookstoves have been in use, especially tribal areas.</p> <p>The project developer has indicated that Indigenous Peoples (IPs) and local communities (LCs) reside in the project area, particularly in the forested and tribal regions of Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra. In conclusion, the project developer has provided sufficient evidence of the location of stakeholders and potential areas of impact. The inclusion of Indigenous Peoples, local communities, and customary rights holders has been adequately addressed, and the project has created positive environmental and social impacts within and around the project area.</p>
<p>Location of resources</p>	<p>Evidence Gathering Activities: VVB has assessed the ownership of resources and territories associated with the project activity.</p> <p>Evidence Checked: Focused Group Discussion and Personnel interviews with PP & local stakeholders/45/, land lease document.</p>

WB's Conclusion: based on the Focused Group Discussion and Personnel interviews with PP & local stakeholders/45/ and review of end user agreements, areas identified for ICS distribution are the ones where people (especially tribal communities) have been using traditional cookstoves.

4.2.2 Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Ongoing consultation	<p>Evidence Gathering Activities: Assessment team has performed documentation review of registered and validated project documents to assess the stakeholder identification process and to assess if there is any significant change in the stakeholder's makeup over time. Assessment team also conducted onsite interviews with PP's representatives to evaluate the same.</p> <p>Evidence Checked: The accuracy and comprehensiveness of the information gathered through the Stakeholder Analysis have been verified by cross-checking with interview/focussed group discussions with relevant experts and stakeholder representatives volunteered during the onsite audit conducted by the VVB. Onsite audit was conducted to corroborate the findings from desk-review with the registered Joint PD&MR/03/ and registered and validated Joint Validation and Verification report/3.1/.</p> <p>Assessment team also verified the supporting documents such as grievance register/30/ and records of stakeholder's consultation/21/ provided by PP.</p> <p>WB's Conclusion:</p> <p>In-line with clause 3.18.3 of VCS Standard; version 4.7/05/, the Project proponent is maintaining a grievance register/30/ to establish ongoing communication and to keep due account of all input received</p>

	<p>during the stakeholder consultation and through ongoing communications.</p> <p>As confirmed during onsite interviews with relevant stakeholders and end-users, it was confirmed that contact information of PP’s representative or field staff member is also available with beneficiaries for contacting in case of any grievance or inputs. The grievance register serves as a record of any complaints or inputs received and the resolution provided by PP. The procedure provided for ongoing communication is found to be in compliance with the registered Joint PD MR/03/.</p> <p>Alternatively, end users can get in touch with a well-trained representative from a distribution channel partner, who is often located near their communities, to record their complaint.</p>									
<p>Date(s) of stakeholder consultation</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="586 856 821 915">Date of meeting</th> <th data-bbox="821 856 1060 915">Village/Location</th> <th data-bbox="1060 856 1295 915">State</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="586 915 821 1062">07-October-2021 (batch 1)</td> <td data-bbox="821 915 1060 1062">Community hall, Alamgarh village, Chicholi, Betul</td> <td data-bbox="1060 915 1295 1062">Madhya Pradesh</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="586 1062 821 1159">06-February-2024(batch 2)</td> <td data-bbox="821 1062 1060 1159">Kurunji village, Bhor, Pune</td> <td data-bbox="1060 1062 1295 1159">Maharashtra</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Date of meeting	Village/Location	State	07-October-2021 (batch 1)	Community hall, Alamgarh village, Chicholi, Betul	Madhya Pradesh	06-February-2024(batch 2)	Kurunji village, Bhor, Pune	Maharashtra
Date of meeting	Village/Location	State								
07-October-2021 (batch 1)	Community hall, Alamgarh village, Chicholi, Betul	Madhya Pradesh								
06-February-2024(batch 2)	Kurunji village, Bhor, Pune	Maharashtra								
<p>Communication of monitored results</p>	<p>Assessment team cross verified the stakeholder consultation training/meeting records/21/ of ongoing consultation with local stakeholders and interviewed stakeholders during onsite assessment/45/. It was confirmed that the stakeholders are well communicated about the project implementations, associated risks and solutions along with project benefits. A grievance register/30/ is also being maintained by PP for continuous on-going communication. The same has been confirmed during the onsite assessment. Hence, the communication of monitored results is undertaken by project developer as per clause 3.18.6 of VCS Standard; Version 4.7/05/.</p>									
<p>Consultation records</p>	<p>Grievance registers for Madhya Pradesh (batch 1) and Maharashtra (batch 2), serve as a crucial record for Project Proponent’s communication with stakeholders. The grievance register is</p>									

	<p>maintained by the ground team to receive any feedback from stakeholders and end users.</p> <p>The project Proponent has also provided feedback forms and attendance register.</p>
Stakeholder input	<p>There has been no grievance received for the current monitoring period.</p> <p>There has been no complaints/replacements request received by end-users during the verification period.</p>

4.2.3 Free, Prior, and Informed Consent

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Consent	<p>In accordance with clause 3.18.8 of VCS standard v.4.7/05/, the project proponent has disclosed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The minimum information, including the nature, size, pace, reversibility, and scope of the cook stove project activity; 2. The purpose of the project, which is to efficiently use non-renewable biomass fuel and reduce other environmental and health hazards for the community; 3. The duration of the project activity; 4. The locations that will be affected, primarily the villages in Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra; and 5. A preliminary assessment of the likely economic, social, cultural, and environmental impact, including potential risks and fair and equitable benefit sharing in a context that respects the precautionary principle. Stakeholders are briefed that the project would bring solely positive effects on economic, social, cultural, or environmental aspects, including savings in non-renewable biomass fuel and increased employment opportunities.

	<p>6. Moreover, information regarding personnel likely to be involved in the execution of the project, including Indigenous, NGOs, local villagers including women and others, was shared with stakeholders,</p> <p>Hence, it is evident that the affected community was informed prior to the operational date of the project activity.</p>
<p>Outcome of FPIC discussion</p>	<p>Evidence Gathering Activities: The assessment team has cross-checked the end-user agreements signed by the beneficiaries during the onsite visit. Additionally, the end-users have been interviewed about how did they receive the cookstoves.</p> <p>Evidence checked: End-user agreements, Interview, Focused Group discussion with end-users, Local Stakeholder Consultation Records/21/.</p> <p>VVB's Conclusion:</p> <p>It was confirmed that improved cookstove only added an advantage to their existing usage of traditional cookstoves i.e., replacing them and providing a better opportunity to them for cooking with less firewood and less time. The end users also felt some relief in respiratory and health related issues which have been earlier more severe due to the use of less efficient cookstoves. They have not been displaced or relocated without consent and it didn't affect them either financially or in any other means.</p> <p>As per the local stakeholder consultation records/21/, the detailed aspects of the grouped project activity including its objectives, associated benefits and environmental and socio-economic issues have been discussed.</p>

4.2.4 Grievance Redress Procedure

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
------	--

<p>Grievance received and steps taken to resolve the grievance including the outcomes of the resolution</p>	<p>Evidence Gathering Activities: Assessment team reviewed the records of grievance redress procedure implemented by PP at project site to address disputes with stakeholders that may arise during project planning and implementation.</p> <p>Evidence Checked: The evidence included the grievance records provided by PP applicable for current monitoring period and conducted onsite interviews/45/ with relevant stakeholders and ICS beneficiaries to confirm the same.</p> <p>VB Conclusion:</p> <p>The Project Proponent of the grouped project activity is maintaining a grievance register/30/ at the project local office, both the both the batches (M.P and Maharashtra). Based on the grievance records accessed by VVB, it is confirmed that no grievances have been received during the current monitoring period. Also evident from the stakeholders' interview during onsite assessment, it is confirmed that the grievance management and stakeholder engagements is in place effectively.</p>
<p>Grievance redress procedure</p>	<p>In accordance with the requirements of clause 3.18.4 of VCS; Standard; version 4.7/05/, the grievance redress procedure of the grouped project includes processes for receiving, hearing, responding and attempting to resolve grievances.</p> <p>The grievance redress procedure includes following aspects:</p> <p>Receipt of Complaints: The Project Proponent of the grouped project activity is maintaining a grievance register/30/ at the project local office, both the batches (M.P and Maharashtra).</p> <p>Resolution: after the receipt of any grievance, the field staff is responsible to address the grievance within 15 days.</p> <p>During the current monitoring period, no negative comments or grievance has been received, as confirmed from the grievance register/30/.</p>

4.2.5 Public Comments

Comments received	Actions taken by the project proponent	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
<p>No comments have been received during or outside the public comments period. Hence, this section is not applicable.</p>	<p>As no comments are received during or outside public comments period, this is not applicable.</p>	<p>Evidence Gathering Activities: Onsite Audit and Desk Review</p> <p>Evidence Checked: Joint PD&MR/03/ and its corresponding validation report/3.1/</p> <p>WB Conclusion: Based on the desk review of Joint PD&MR/03/ and its corresponding Joint Validation and Verification report/3.1/ and onsite assessment/45/ it is confirmed that no public comments have been received during or outside the public comment period.</p>

4.2.6 Risks to Local Stakeholders and the Environment

4.2.6.1 Management Experience

Evidence Gathering Activities:

- Interviews with key members of the project management team to understand their background, qualifications, and previous experience in cookstove implementation and community engagement.
- Review of project documentation, employment records, and training materials, to assess the team's involvement in the project.
- Onsite visit to observe the team's interaction with the community and the implementation process of cookstoves.

Evidence Checked:

- Review of organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of the team members involved in project, Employment records and training records of the project.

- Interviews and Feedback from stakeholders regarding their experiences working with the project management team.

VB's Conclusion:

- Based on the evidence gathered, it is clear that the project management team possesses substantial expertise in both cookstove implementation and community engagement. This is demonstrated by their qualifications, the successful completion of past projects, and positive feedback from community members and stakeholders.
- The project proponent also provides trainings on regular basis to the ground and implementation team to address any gaps in expertise, ensuring that the team remains well-equipped to handle all aspects of the project. Overall, the evidence supports a high level of confidence in the management team's capability to achieve the project's objectives successfully.

4.2.6.2 Risk Assessment

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
<p>Natural and human induced risks to stakeholders' wellbeing</p>	<p>No risk identified</p> <p>Evidence Gathering Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of registered project documentation and supporting project documents • Conducting interviews with stakeholders to gather their insights and concerns regarding potential risks. • Conducted site visits to observe the project environment and operations. <p>Evidence Checked:</p> <p>Registered VCS Joint PD&MR/03/, onsite interviews with concerned personnel/45/, review of grievance records/30/ of the project.</p> <p>WB's Conclusion:</p> <p>Based on the evidence gathered, it has been thoroughly assessed that the project does not pose any natural or human-induced risks to the wellbeing of stakeholders. This conclusion is drawn from detailed risk assessments,</p>

	<p>stakeholder feedback, site visit observations and review of grievance records for current monitoring period which shows no grievances have been received currently.</p>
<p>Risks to stakeholder participation</p>	<p>No risk identified</p> <p>Evidence Gathering Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of project documentation and supporting documents • Conducting interviews with stakeholders to gather their insights and concerns regarding potential risks. • Conducted site visits to observe the project environment and operations. <p>Evidence Checked:</p> <p>Registered VCS Joint PD&MR/03/, onsite interviews with concerned personnel/45/, review of Local Stakeholder Consultation reports/21/, grievance records/30/ of the project.</p> <p>VVB's Conclusion:</p> <p>PP has made accessible arrangements for the stakeholders to record their grievances /inputs and maintain an ongoing communication. Based on the of Local Stakeholder Consultation reports/21/, it was again confirmed that stakeholders have been positively involved in the consultation process prior to the implementation of the project. Hence, it is concluded that the project does not pose any risk to stakeholder participation.</p>
<p>Working conditions</p>	<p>No risk identified</p> <p>Evidence Gathering Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewing of previous registered project documents and supporting documents provided by PP; • Onsite assessment and interviews with stakeholders • Interviews with ICS beneficiaries regarding their feedback on working with project cookstove <p>Evidence Checked:</p>

	<p>Assessment team has reviewed project documents including training records/24/ and grievance records/30/ submitted by PP. Onsite interviews have been conducted with stakeholders and ICS users to gain their insights regarding work conditions in project and use of ICS.</p> <p>VVB's Conclusion:</p> <p>The ICS provides a safer cooking alternative compared to traditional cook stoves. Additionally, comprehensive training sessions on cook stove usage are conducted for stakeholders to minimize potential risks associated with working conditions. Based on the evidence gathered, it is evident that the project ensures safe working conditions for all workers.</p>
<p>Safety of women and girls</p>	<p>No risk identified</p> <p>Evidence Gathering Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewing of previous registered project documents and supporting documents provided by PP; • Onsite assessment and interviews with stakeholders • Interviews with ICS beneficiaries regarding the benefits of project and their overall feedback about any positive or negative impact of the project activity. <p>Evidence Checked:</p> <p>To gather insights on the safety of women and girls as a part of project, Assessment team has conducted onsite interviews with ICS beneficiaries and relevant stakeholders. Records of any complaints or incidents reported, along with the resolution and actions taken by the management are also checked.</p> <p>VVB's Conclusion:</p> <p>Based on the evidence gathered, it is clear that the project effectively promotes a workplace free from sexual harassment and discrimination. Men and women are employed in the project without any discrimination involved. This conclusion is supported positive feedback from employees. Moreover, as a result of improved cooking solution provided in the project, Women and girls have to spend less time in collection of fuelwoods.</p>

<p>Safety of minority and marginalized groups, including children</p>	<p>No risk identified</p> <p>Evidence Gathering Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewing of previous registered project documents and supporting documents provided by PP; • Onsite assessment and interviews with stakeholders • Interviews with ICS beneficiaries regarding the benefits of project and their overall feedback about any positive or negative impact of the project activity. <p>Evidence Checked: During onsite assessment, assessment team conducted interviews with relevant personnel including project staff, verified the grievance records/30/, training records/24/, assessment of safety measures followed at project site.</p> <p>VB's Conclusion:</p> <p>Improved cookstoves (ICS) offer a safer cooking method compared to traditional stoves. Furthermore, stakeholders receive comprehensive training on proper stove usage and its benefits, which helps minimize potential risks, particularly for vulnerable groups such as children, minorities, and marginalized communities.</p>
<p>Pollutants (air, noise, discharges to water, generation and release of hazardous materials and chemical pesticides and fertilizers</p>	<p>No risk identified</p> <p>Evidence Gathering Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewing of previous registered project documents and supporting documents provided by PP; • Onsite assessment and interviews with stakeholders • Interviews with ICS beneficiaries regarding the benefits of project and their overall feedback about any positive or negative impact of the project activity. <p>Evidence Checked: During onsite assessment, assessment team conducted interviews with relevant personnel including project staff, verified the grievance records/30/, review of monitoring survey records/20/.</p>

VVB's Conclusion:

Based on the gathered evidence, it can be concluded that the project effectively reduces harmful emissions through the implementation of improved cookstoves. This conclusion is backed by detailed emission data, positive feedback from monitoring surveys, and insights gained from onsite interviews with end users. The project not only enhances air quality but also significantly decreases waste production (ash) due to the more efficient use of firewood compared to traditional baseline stoves. Additionally, the project promotes better health outcomes by reducing indoor air pollution and contributes to environmental sustainability by curbing deforestation and preserving natural resources.

4.2.7 Respect for Human Rights and Equity

4.2.7.1 Labor and Work

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Discrimination	<p>Evidence gathering activities: Desk-review, Personal interview & focussed grouped discussion.</p> <p>Evidence checked: The Project Proponent (PP) has provided a declaration/29/ stating that anti-discrimination practices within the grouped project and that the project abides with all the regulations regarding a discrimination free environment and work culture in the project. VVB also conducted interviews with beneficiaries to confirm the same.</p> <p>Assessment Conclusion: During the monitoring period, no incidents of discrimination have been reported, as confirmed through grievance records/30/ and onsite interviews with stakeholders. This commitment to fostering a respectful and inclusive environment highlights the project's dedication to ethical standards and the well-being of all involved. Based on this assessment, the team confirms that all beneficiaries are treated equitably, regardless of their background or identity. Additionally, the PP's declaration reinforces that the project strictly prohibits any form of discrimination.</p>

<p>Sexual harassment</p>	<p>Evidence gathering activities: Desk-review, Personal interview & focussed grouped discussion.</p> <p>Evidence checked: The Project Proponent (PP) has provided a declaration/29/ stating that no incidents of discrimination or sexual harassment have occurred within the project.</p> <p>Assessment Conclusion: There have been no reports of such incidents during the monitoring period. This commitment to maintaining a respectful and inclusive environment underscores the project's dedication to upholding ethical standards and ensuring the well-being of all stakeholders involved</p>
<p>Gender equity in labor and work</p>	<p>Evidence gathering activities: Desk-review of declaration, Personal interview & focussed grouped discussion.</p> <p>Evidence checked: Declaration provided by PP/26//27//28//29/ HR policies. Training records/24/ and employment records.</p> <p>Assessment Conclusion: In conclusion, the Project Proponent (PP) has demonstrated a strong commitment to gender equality in labour and work practices. By providing employment opportunities to women as well as men in the project activity and ensuring they get proper trainings/24/, irrespective of gender, PP has actively promoted gender equality and fair treatment in the workplace. These actions align with underscore PP's dedication to fostering an inclusive and equitable work environment.</p>
<p>Forced labor</p>	<p>Evidence Gathering Activities: Desk-review of declaration, Personal interview & focussed grouped discussion.</p> <p>Evidence checked: Assessment team checked the declaration/26//27//28//29/ provided by PP and conducted onsite interviews/45/ with stakeholders.</p> <p>VVB's Conclusion:</p> <p>Based on the evidences gathered and the declaration provided by the project proponent, it is concluded that follows Indian laws prohibiting human trafficking, forced labour, and child labour. There have been no</p>

	<p>reports of human trafficking, forced labor, or child labor during the current monitoring period, highlighting PP's commitment to upholding these laws and ensuring the protection of vulnerable populations.</p>
<p>Child labor</p>	<p>Evidence Gathering Activities: Desk-review of declaration, Personal interview & focussed grouped discussion.</p> <p>Evidence checked: Assessment team checked the declaration/26//27//28//29/ provided by PP and conducted onsite interviews/45/ with stakeholders.</p> <p>WB's Conclusion:</p> <p>Based on the evidences gathered including onsite interviews with stakeholders43/ and the declaration provided by the project proponent, it is concluded that follows Indian laws prohibiting human trafficking, forced labour, and child labour. There have been no reports of child labor during the current monitoring period, highlighting PP's commitment to upholding these laws and ensuring the protection of vulnerable populations.</p>
<p>Human trafficking</p>	<p>Evidence Gathering Activities: Desk-review of declaration, Personal interview & focussed grouped discussion.</p> <p>Evidence checked: Assessment team checked the declaration/26//27//28//29/ provided by PP and conducted onsite interviews/45/ with stakeholders.</p> <p>WB's Conclusion:</p> <p>Based on the evidences gathered including onsite interviews with stakeholders/47/ and the declaration/26//27//28//29/ provided by the project proponent, it is concluded that follows Indian laws prohibiting human trafficking. There have been no reports of child labor during the current monitoring period, confirming the project does not support human trafficking.</p>

4.2.7.2 Human Rights

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
------------------	--

<p>No risk involved</p>	<p>Evidence gathering activities: Desk review and onsite assessment</p> <p>Evidence checked: Review of Registered VCS Joint PD&MR/03/ and supporting documents including declaration/26//27//28//29/ and onsite interviews with concerned personnel/45/</p> <p>Assessment conclusion: Based on the desk review of Registered VCS Joint PD&MR/03/ and onsite interviews with concerned personnel/45/, it was confirmed that the project activity abides internationally proclaimed human rights¹. All customary rights to the land and its resources are held by the project proponent “Outreach Projects Private Limited”. Based on the onsite observation, there is no forced labour, child labour or human trafficking involved in the project activity. This is also confirmed with the help of a declaration/26//27//28//29/ provided by PP for PP’s organization. It is confirmed that the project is implemented in accordance with section 3.19.11, 3.19.12, 3.19.13, 3.19.14. 3.19.15, 3.19.16, 3.19.17, 3.19.18 of VCS Standard version 4.7/05/.</p>
-------------------------	---

4.2.7.3 Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
<p>No risk involved</p>	<p>Evidence gathering activities: Desk-review of declaration, Personal interview & focused grouped discussion.</p> <p>Evidence checked: Declaration provided by the Project Proponent (PP).</p> <p>WB’s conclusion: The Project Proponent (PP) strictly adheres to Indian laws and ensures that the project respects the cultural heritage of communities and does not affect indigenous people or</p>

¹ [Universal Declaration of Human Rights | United Nations](#)

their cultures. No risks related to the rights of Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities, or cultural heritage have been identified during the current monitoring period. The assessment confirms that there have been no reported risks, highlighting the PP's commitment to upholding these rights and protections.

4.2.7.4 Property Rights

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
No risk involved	<p>Evidence gathering activities: Desk-review of declaration, Personal interview & focused grouped discussion.</p> <p>Evidence checked: Declaration provided by PP/26//27//28//29/ and interviews with ICS beneficiaries and relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Assessment Conclusion: In conclusion, the project activity involving the distribution of cook stoves has not incorporated any land or property of the stakeholders, including Indigenous Peoples (IPs), Local Communities (LCs), and customary rights holders, as the stoves are manufactured outside their land. Furthermore, the project has obtained the free, prior, and informed consent of the end users, including the IPs, LCs, and customary rights holders. This ensures that their land and property rights are protected and respected throughout the project implementation.</p>

4.2.7.5 Benefit Sharing

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Summary of the benefit sharing plan	<p>Evidence gathering activities: Desk-review of declaration, End user agreements, Personal interview/45/.</p> <p>Evidence checked: End user agreements signed between the project proponent and end users and Declaration provided by the PP/27/.</p>

	<p>Assessment Conclusion: The project activity involves distributing cookstoves to the end-users. The project proponent has obtained the carbon rights from end users through local stakeholder meetings and by having them sign end user agreements at the time of stove distribution. This ensures that the carbon rights remain with the project proponent only throughout the project implementation period. Therefore, there is no need for benefit sharing with the end users.</p> <p>Hence, this is not applicable.</p>
Benefit sharing during the monitoring period	N/A

4.2.8 Ecosystem Health

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems	<p>No risk identified</p> <p>Evidence gathering activities: Desk-review of registered Joint PD & MR, declaration, Personal interview & focussed grouped discussion.</p> <p>Evidence checked: In person physical witness of the project implemented area during an on-site visit and the review of project documents.</p> <p>Assessment Conclusion:</p> <p>This project activity is characterized by its positive impact on biodiversity and the ecosystem. By reducing deforestation caused by traditional less efficient cookstoves, the project helps preserve local flora and fauna. Additionally, the promotion of improved cook stoves leads to more efficient use of resources, further benefiting the environment. Overall, the project contributes to the conservation of biodiversity and the enhancement of the local ecosystem.</p>
Soil degradation and soil erosion	No risk identified

	<p>Evidence gathering activities: Assessment team conducted desk review of registered project documents, conducted personnel interviews and focused group discussions during onsite audit of project.</p> <p>Evidence checked: Desk review of registered project Joint PD&MR/03/, registered Joint Validation and Verification report/3.1/ and onsite interviews and focused group discussion with concerned personnel.</p> <p>Assessment Conclusion: This project activity plays a crucial role in positively impacting biodiversity and the ecosystem. By reducing the need for traditional fuel gathering, it helps to mitigate deforestation, which is a significant threat to many species and habitats. Furthermore, the promotion of more efficient use of firewood through improved cook stoves not only helps conserve forests but also reduces the pressure on local ecosystems. This contributes to the overall health and resilience of the environment, benefiting both wildlife and local communities.</p>
<p>Water consumption and stress</p>	<p>No risk identified</p> <p>Evidence gathering activities: Assessment team conducted desk review of registered project documents, conducted personnel interviews and focused group discussions during onsite audit of project.</p> <p>Evidence checked: Desk review of registered project Joint PD&MR/03/, registered Joint Validation and Verification report/3.1/ and onsite interviews and focused group discussion with concerned personnel.</p> <p>Assessment Conclusion: This project activity plays a crucial role in positively impacting biodiversity and the ecosystem. The project's distribution of improved cookstoves has led to a decrease the need for traditional fuel gathering, it helps mitigate deforestation, a significant threat to many species and habitats. The survey data and interviews confirm that the improved cookstoves have alleviated the burden of traditional cooking methods, resulting in a more efficient use of resources and a reduction in associated stress. Therefore, the evidence indicates that the project has positively impacted water consumption and stress, in line with the project's objectives.</p>

4.2.8.1 Rare, Threatened, and Endangered species

The grouped project activity involves the manufacturing and distribution of Improved Cook Stoves (ICS), which is not situated in or near habitats for rare, threatened, or endangered species, there are no direct impacts on these species or their habitats. Moreover, the project does not fall under the category of AFOLU, as a result, the project does not pose a risk to these species or their habitats, and the assessment for this particular aspect is not applicable.

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Species or habitat	Not applicable
Areas needed for habitat connectivity	Not applicable

	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered species	Not applicable
Areas for habitat connectivity	Not applicable

4.2.8.2 Introduction of Species

This project is a distribution of improved cookstove project and does not involve introduction of any new species. Therefore, this section is not applicable.

Species introduced	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
N/A	N/A

Existing invasive species	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
N/A	N/A

Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion	
Invasive species	N/A

4.2.8.3 Ecosystem conversion

Item	Evidence gathering activities and evidence checked
Ecosystem conversion	<p>Evidence gathering activities: Not applicable</p> <p>Evidence checked: Not applicable</p> <p>VB's Conclusion: Since the project activity is not an Afforestation and Reforestation (ARR) project, Agroforestry and Agro-silvopastoral Systems (ALM) project, Wetland Restoration and Conservation (WRC) project, nor an Avoided Conversion of Grasslands and Shrublands (ACOGS) project, the information related to these specific project types is not applicable. This means that the project does not fall under any of these categories and therefore does not need to be evaluated based on the criteria specific to these types of projects.</p>

4.3 Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations

The equations and choices provided in the methodology /12/ and all other methodological tools are correctly quoted in the MR /13/. The project activity's emission reductions have been calculated using the formulae specified in the applied methodologies, VMR0006 version 1.1 /12/. The verification team has thoroughly reviewed the emission reduction spreadsheet (ER sheets /02/) and verified that all the formulae are correct and align with the monitoring plan outlined in the Joint PD & MR /03/, as well as the applied monitoring methodology /12/.

Methods and formulae set out in the project description for calculating actual emissions for current monitoring period.

According to applied methodology VMR0006 (version 1.1) /12/ the emissions are calculated as below:

Baseline Emission:

$$ER_y = \sum_i \sum_j ER_{y,i,j} \tag{Equation (1)}$$

Where:

i = Indices for the situation where more than one type/model of improved cookstove is introduced to replace three-stone fire

j = Indices for the situation where there is more than one batch of improved cookstove of type i

ER_y = Emission reductions during year y in t CO₂e

ER_{y,i=1,j} = Emission reductions by improved cookstove of type i and batch j during year y in tCO₂e And,

$$ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,savings,i,j} \times NCV_{woodfuel} \times f_{NRB} \times (EF_{wf,CO2} + EF_{wf,non\ CO2}) \times N_{y,i,j} \times 0.95$$

Where:

$B_{y,savings,i,j}$	=	Quantity of woody biomass that is saved in tonnes per improved cookstove of type i and batch j during year y
$f_{NRB,y}$	=	Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass (f_{NRB})
$NCV_{wood\ fuel}$	=	Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted or reduced (IPCC default for wood fuel, 0.0156 TJ/tonne) ²
$EF_{wf,CO2}$	=	CO ₂ emission factor for the use of wood fuel in baseline scenario (IPCC default for wood fuel, 112 tCO ₂ /TJ) ³

²2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories; Volume 2 Energy, Chapter 1 Introduction

³2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories; Volume 2 Energy, Chapter 2 Stationary Combustion

$EF_{wf,non\ CO_2}$	=	Non-CO ₂ emission factor for the use of wood fuel in baseline scenario (IPCC default for wood fuel, 26.23 tCO ₂ /TJ) ⁴
$N_{y,i,j}$	=	Number of improved cookstoves of type i and batch j operating during year y
0.95	=	Discount factor to account for leakage

The quantify of woody biomass saved $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ due to implementation of improved cookstoves is estimated by the following Equation:

$$B_{y,saving,i,j} = B_{y=1,new,i,survey} \times \left(\frac{\eta_{new,i,j}}{\eta_{old}} - 1 \right)$$

Where:

η_{old}	=	Efficiency of baseline cookstove
η_{old}	=	Efficiency of the improved cookstove type i and batch j determined through water boiling test (WBT) during year y, Alternatively, efficiency may be determined using Equation 5 of applied approved methodology
$B_{y=1,new,i,survey}$	=	Annual quantity of woody biomass used by improved cookstoves in tonnes per device of type i and batch j, determined in the first year of the implementation of the project through a sample survey.

Parameter	Description	Value applied	Unit	Source
$B_{y=1,new,i,survey}$	Annual quantity of woody biomass used by improved Cookstoves in tonnes per device of type i and batch j,	1.087	Tonne/Device/year	Calculated from results of sampling survey conducted during 1st Monitoring survey

⁴2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories; Volume 2 Energy, Chapter 2 Stationary Combustion

	determined in the first year of the implementation of the project through a sample survey.			
$B_{y,savings,i,j}$	Quantity of woody biomass that is saved per cookstove device of type i and batch j during year y	Batch 1: 3.68 Batch 2: 0.70	Tons/monitoring period	Calculation explained in Ex post ER sheet

Efficiency is determined using the following equation-

$$\eta_{new,y,i,j} = \eta_p \times (DF_n)^{y-1} \times 0.94$$

(Calculated using equation no. 05 of methodology VMR0006; version 1.1)

Where

- η_p Efficiency of project stove (fraction) at the start of project activity
- $(DF_n)^{y-1}$ Discount factor to account for efficiency loss of project cookstove per year of operation (fraction). This value may be based on actual monitoring or based on manufacturer’s declaration on expected loss in efficiency or through publicly available literature on relevant industry standards. Alternatively default value of 0.99 efficiency loss per year can be considered.
- 0.94** Adjustment factor to account for uncertainty related to project cookstove efficiency test

Parameter	Description	Value applied	Unit	Source
$\eta_{new,i,i}$	Batch 1 The efficiency of the device of each type i and batch j implemented as part of the	0.3389	Fraction	Calculated using the Equation no. 05 in methodology VMR0006 version 1.1

	project activity (During current monitoring period)			(Calculation provided in ex-post ER sheet)
$\eta_{new,i}$	Batch 2 The efficiency of the device of each type i and batch j implemented as part of the project activity (During current monitoring period)	0.3423	Fraction	Calculated using the Equation no. 05 in methodology VMR0006 version 1.1 (Calculation provided in ex-post ER sheet)

The appropriateness of default values used in the monitoring report is elaborated below:

Table No- 15 Data and Parameters Available at Validation or Ex-ante parameters:

S.No	Data/parameter	Unit	Value applied	Assessment
1	f_{NRBy} : Fraction of woody biomass saved by the project activity during year y that can be established as non-renewable biomass	Percent	91.19%	Assessment Team hereby confirms that the value has been determined using Tool 30: Calculation of the fraction of non-renewable biomass. Version:04/13/. As per the methodological tool, the value is calculated as per the following Equation (1), $f_{NRB} = NRB / (NRB + RB)$. The value is fixed as per registered Joint PD MR; Version 1.3 of 02-November-2023/03/ for the entire crediting period.
2	η_p : Efficiency of project stove at the start of project activity	Fraction	0.3642	This value is as per manufacturer specification/18/. Consistent with the registered Joint PD & MR /03/. This has been validated during registration as well. This parameter shall remain fixed for the monitoring periods.

3	<p>Old: Annual quantity of woody biomass that would have been used in the household in the absence of the project activity to generate useful thermal energy equivalent to that provided by the project devices</p>	Tonne/year	3.81	<p>The value of this parameter is Calculated according to options stated in ‘Determination of quantity of firewood consumed in absence of project activity as per options provided in Section 8.4 of the applied methodology VMR0006 version 1.1. During project validation, baseline survey was conducted to see the actual usage of fuelwood in baseline conditions. The value is fixed as per registered Joint PD & MR/03/ for the entire crediting period.</p>
---	--	------------	------	--

As assessed in this section, emission reductions for the project “Improved Cookstoves for communities” are being claimed for this monitoring period and the total population of the stoves for the current monitoring period i.e., 01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024 (both dates included) is 20,000 ICS that prevented the release of 11,522 tCO_{2e} into the atmosphere.

The Project Proponent is responsible for conducting the sampling surveys and maintaining a database with all operating stoves. Using Excel's random selection function, 400 random samples have been identified for the monitoring.

VB's Opinion:

VVB carefully examined the monitoring data collected during the specified period to confirm its accuracy and completeness. This scrutiny aimed to identify any potential errors, inconsistencies, or outliers that could affect the quality of the data. After confirming the accuracy of the monitoring data, the project proponent proceeded with data analysis. They used appropriate statistical methods and techniques to process the collected data and derive meaningful insights from it. By analysing the data, they could identify trends, patterns, and any significant changes related to the emissions reductions or environmental performance of the project.

Based on the results of the data analysis, the project proponent estimated the emissions reductions achieved as outlined in the monitoring report. This estimation is crucial for evaluating the project's effectiveness in reducing greenhouse gas emissions or achieving its intended environmental goal

Hence, the verification team found it is in line with the sampling guideline and Joint PD & MR /03/ found the sampling approach conservative and appropriate, based on the provisions of the sampling guideline and Joint PD & MR and same has been further asses in [section 4.4](#) of the Report.

Emission reductions have been calculated in accordance with the applied methodology VMR0006 version 1.1 /12/, and VCS Joint PD & MR /03/. The PP has used monitored data and ex-ante fixed data including default values as mandated/permited by the applied methodology. The values used for the calculation of GHG emission reductions have been thoroughly checked by the verification team and was found appropriate and correct.

4.4 Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals

When verifying the reported emission reduction, VKU ensured that there was a clear audit trail that contained the evidence and records that helped verify the stated figures. All source documents that form the basis for assumptions and other information underlying the GHG data are shown above.

When assessing the audit trails, VKU also examined:

1. whether sufficient evidence was available, both in terms of frequency and in covering the full monitoring period
2. the source and nature of the evidence
3. if comparable information was available from sources other than that used in the monitoring report/01/, VKU cross-checked the monitoring report against the other sources to confirm that the stated figures are correct. The sources and the data referenced are shown in Section 2.2 above.

All records needed for monitoring are archived in line with the requirements of the registered monitoring plan. No significant, lack of evidence and missing data have been detected during verification. Hence, the verification team confirms that the monitoring system ensures the required quality of the monitoring system to ensure the quality of the monitored data. All internal data are subjected to QA/QC measures.

The operational status of project ICS is monitored through sample survey following UNFCCC sampling and survey guideline follows 90/10 confidence precision. 90/10 is a methodological choice/12/. The survey forms/19/ and photographs have been checked to ascertain the monitoring results reported in survey/20/.

Table-16 Monitored Parameters

Parameter	Description	Source of data	Monitoring Frequency
$N_{y,i,k}$	Number of project devices of type i and batch j operating during year y	Monitoring	At least once every two years
$B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$	Quantity of woody biomass used by project devices in tonnes per device of type i and batch j	first monitoring survey	Determined in the first year of project implementation
$\eta_{new,l,j}$	The efficiency of the device of each type i and batch j implemented as the part of project activity	Calculated as per equation 5 of the methodology VMR0006.	Annually
η_{old}	The efficiency of baseline stove	Use of default value of 0.10	Fixed for each individual household at the time of project implementation
Life Span	The operating lifetime of the project device. The life span should be reported if the methodology equation 5 is adopted to determine the project stove efficiency	The data source is as per manufacturer specification	Once at the time of installation of the batch of type of stove

Target Population:

The project aims to distribute Improved Cook Stoves (ICS) across the project area, replacing traditional cooking devices in households. The target population is the complete set of households that received the ICS. Overall, all project instances have the same group of end-users which is from households from rural. The project is implemented in rural areas. Since the population is homogeneous, with similar technology and operating characteristics, a simple random sampling technique is used to select samples, drawn using a random number generator.

Sampling Frame & Implementation

The project employs two sampling frames to ensure continuity across the instances included in a single sampling plan. All project instances target a homogenous group of end-users, primarily households in rural or semi-urban areas. Since the project is implemented in rural regions, it is expected that the geographic location does not significantly influence the parameter of interest, resulting in a high degree of homogeneity for each improved cookstove model. This approach is assessed and found to be in compliance with the project's monitoring plan.

Sampling Frame for the Proportion of Improved Cookstoves in Operation ($N_{y,i,k}$):

The VVB has reviewed the sampling methodology and can confirm that the sampling frame covers all relevant information sources stored in the project database/17/. These sources primarily include:

The Registration Process for newly distributed and installed improved cookstoves.

Monitoring Surveys/20/, which combine household questionnaires and visual inspections.

These processes follow the guidelines outlined in the “Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programme of Activities, version 04.” The VVB finds the structure appropriate for capturing the operational status of the improved cookstoves. The monitoring survey records have been verified by the VVB and found to be appropriate.

Primary Sampling Unit Definition and Justification

The project instances have been grouped into Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) based on the characteristics of the cookstove models and instances. The VVB confirms that the grouping aligns with EB 86 Annex 04, Appendix-2, paragraph 1. Where homogeneity is demonstrated, a single sampling plan is applied using a 90/10 confidence/precision for biennial sampling.

Adjustments for Continued Use of Pre-Project Devices ($\mu_{y,i,j}$)

As per the methodology VMR0006/12/, the VVB has reviewed and confirms that the adjustment process for accounting for the continued use of pre-project devices is appropriate.

Quantity of Woody Biomass Used by Project Devices ($B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$):

The VVB has assessed the sampling procedure used to determine the quantity of woody biomass consumed by the project devices. It has been confirmed that this parameter can either be sampled separately or combined with other survey parameters. The inclusion of specific questions within household interviews to estimate average fuelwood use per device type is deemed appropriate. The sampling methodology for this parameter follows the guidance in the Monitoring Report.

Sampling method

The sampling method applied for the monitored parameters $N_{y,i,k}$ (proportion of ICS in operation) and $\mu_{y,i,j,\mu}$ (continued use of pre-project devices) is based on Simple Random Sampling. The VVB has reviewed the procedures and confirms the appropriateness of this method for the project, ensuring random selection of Improved Cookstoves (ICS) from the Primary Sampling Units.

Each ICS in the target population is uniquely identifiable by its ID number, allowing for accurate sample selection using a random number generator. The process ensures that each ICS can be randomly chosen from the predefined sampling frame up to the required sample size.

The VVB has reviewed the approach used for determining the following parameters and finds it to be consistent with the applied methodology:

- **$N_{y,i,k}$:** The proportion of ICS in operation is verified through visual inspection and interviews with end-users. The VVB finds that the method of assessing operational status and usage is in line with the monitoring plan.
- **$\mu_{y,i,j,\mu}$:** For pre-project devices used alongside ICS, the proportion of usage is determined by a survey on cooking habits. The VVB confirms that this method is suitable for quantifying the continued use of baseline devices. VVB has verified the survey questionnaire/19/ used by PP's team during the survey for the current monitoring period
- **$B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$:** The quantity of woody biomass used by the ICS was determined during the first year of installation and is not covered in the current monitoring survey. The VVB acknowledges that this parameter has been appropriately handled, with sampling completed during the initial period.

Sample Size and Confidence/Precision Levels

The VVB confirms that the sampling approach follows the guidelines for achieving 90/10 confidence/precision for annual monitoring. The procedure used by the PP ensures that the sample size is representative of the broader project population, thus minimizing sampling error. Random samples have been selected from each PSU based on the required confidence and precision levels, as outlined in the "Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities" guidelines.

The sample size was calculated using the population of 11,522 households. The VVB has verified that the calculation for determining the sample size is based on a conservative approach, ensuring that the required 90/10 confidence/precision level is met.

For the current monitoring period, involving the distribution of 11,522 cookstoves, the sample size was calculated to ensure a 90% confidence level and 10% relative precision. The formula used for determining the minimum sample size is:

$$n \geq \frac{1.645^2 N \times p(1 - p)}{(N - 1) \times 0.1^2 \times p^2 + 1.645^2 \times p(1 - p)}$$

Where:

- **n** = Sample size
- **N** = Population size (Total number of households/ICS distributed)
- **p** = Expected proportion (assumed 0.5 for maximum variance)
- **1.645** = Z-value for a 90% confidence level
- **0.1** = Relative precision (10%)

Sample Size Calculation with Values

For the current monitoring period, the calculation was performed as follows:

$$n \geq \frac{1.645^2 \times 11,522 \times 0.5(1 - 0.5)}{(11,522 - 1) \times 0.1^2 \times 0.5^2 + 1.645^2 \times 0.5(1 - 0.5)}$$

By substituting the values:

N = 11,522 (Population size)

p = 0.5 (Expected proportion)

The calculated sample size is:

n = 356

VVB's justification/assessment for Sample Size: Trained personnel from the project participant conducted the sampling, having received training in surveying techniques to reduce errors and avoid conflicts of interest, confirmed by assessment team while interviewing the site in charges/implementors. The start and end dates of each monitoring period have been recorded, and emission reductions attributable to each period are calculated. PP selected survey samples randomly using excel properties. To be reliable on the sample results and decrease the error, total of 400 random samples are conducted in the monitoring.

VVB's justification/assessment for oversampling: The Assessment Team cross-verified the Monitoring Survey Sheet and confirmed that the Project Proponent (PP) opted a conservative estimate based on professional judgment and prior experience. This high rate accounts for potential non-availability during household surveys, rather than lack of engagement, as the focus is primarily on the operability of stoves and the beneficiaries are routinely surveyed by field officers, any such nonresponse is basically a non-availability at the time of survey and not lack of engagement. Once the required number of ICS is covered, the survey team ends the survey. Therefore, no oversampling is done in actual. However the PP follows the guidelines stated in the applied methodology, VVB apart from that also cross-checked the standard CDM documents for conducting survey that also states that the chosen non-response rate also aligns with instructions outlined in the Standard "Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities" version 9.0/10/, allowing for "if at the time of survey when survey team arrives at end user household and they (Household member who is familiar with cooking practices) are not present." In that case, the survey team may disregard that sample and proceed to the next available sample for the survey. Once the required number of ICS is covered the survey team ends the survey. The oversampling additional samples was conducted not only to compensate for potential non-responses but also to ensure the necessary reliability for analysis without requiring further sampling efforts. Hence, this seems correct and satisfactory approach by the assessment team.

Leakage Assessment: The methodology uses a net-to-gross adjustment factor of 0.95 to account for leakages, eliminating the need for surveys. All ICSs in the project are newly manufactured or installed, so no other leakage is applicable.

Monitoring Reporting: The project proponent assessed all monitoring data and produced a record for VVB's verification. The monitoring plan aims to ensure successful monitoring of emission reductions. PP manages overall monitoring and activities related to emissions reduction. Roles and responsibilities for data monitoring, collection, archiving was also provided by the PP

Table 17- During desk-review & onsite visit following roles and responsibilities have been confirmed with registered Joint PD & MR & interview with the people associated with the project:

Project division	Team member(s)	Responsibility and trainings provided.
Project Management	Program Coordinator	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supervises the overall implementation of the project, while ensuring that the necessary compliances are being met. 2. Works with internal and external stakeholders involved in the project.
	General Manager (GM)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oversees the distribution plans of the Project Managers (PMs) in the entire project boundary. 2. Ensures that local implementer and Village Volunteers are efficiently trained to deliver on the requirements of the project. 3. Supervises all the operational and carbon compliance activities for the project.
Ground Operations	Project Manager (PM)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supervises distribution and monitoring campaigns across multiple districts under the project boundary. 2. Prepares a distribution plan with the local implementer and demarcates the distribution area for each village volunteers.
	Local Implementer	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manages the local implementer for supervised execution of the project implementation process 2. Communicates and coordinates between the PMs and village volunteers 3. Involved in awareness generation and monitoring activities along with the village volunteers

		4. Verify and pass on (to the Data team) the end-user information, carbon rights transfer declarations and other documents collected by the Village volunteers
	Village Volunteers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Primary link to the rural household beneficiaries 2. Distribute and monitor the improved cookstoves, collect the end-user information and train the users to use the stoves efficiently 3. Address the customer grievances as and when they arise
Data Management	Data team Manager & Data verification officers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oversees proper functioning of the data systems and database 2. Ensures that the user data record is updated and verified.
Carbon Compliance	Project Consultant & Carbon Associates	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensures that the project complies to the methodological requirements of the carbon registry under which the project is listed.

VKU verification team verified 11 random household samples (each household has 01 cookstove) with acceptance number (c) as 0. samples from the sampling survey done by project participants as per the applied methodology VMR0006 version 1.1/12/. All the stoves visited by the team are found operational according to the data provided by the project participants, which is required number of samples as explained in section 2.4 above to ascertain accuracy of information. VKU confirms the project cook-stoves are operating in all samples interviewed/45/, each cook-stove has unique identification number (ID) which has been provided in the end user agreement & ICS card that is owned by the end-user are consistent as per project database & monitoring survey/20/. Along with the serial number, the stove model, end user name, address, installation date, location etc. had also been noted which are found to be consistent on ground during the site visit/45/.

VKU verification team has assessed the baseline scenario during onsite audit through interviews with end-users/45/ and also verified it with the help of baseline survey records provided for batch 2/31/. VKU verification team noted during the onsite audit that the targeted population have been using non-renewable wood fuel firewood traditional stoves for cooking now completely replaced with improved cookstoves.

VKU verification team confirms that all the emission sources within the project boundary have been considered appropriately. Monitoring of all parameters during the monitoring period is followed as per registered monitoring plan. The table below describes the data/parameters relevant to the monitoring plan.

Table no- 18 Data and Parameters Monitored

S.no	Parameter	Unit	Value applied	Description/Assessment
1.	$N_{y,i,j}$ Number of project devices of type i and batch j operating in year y	Number	11,522 ICS	<p>The project has implemented 11,522 cookstoves till current monitoring period. PP has conducted the monitoring survey/20/ in line with monitoring plan and sampling and survey guidelines stated in the methodology VMR0006 version 1.1/12/. Sampling standard is used for determining the sample size to achieve 90/10 confidence precision according to the latest version of Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and program of activities. PP has selected 400 samples (300 from Madhya Pradesh and 100 from Maharashtra).</p> <p>PP had conducted monitoring survey between the period of from between 01- June- 2024 to 28-June- 2024 for both the batches. During the survey it was found that 100% project devices are in operation therefore the precision of the samples is within the limit of</p>

				<p>benchmark and this was further confirmed by the Verification team from the submitted sampling survey sheet by PP.</p> <p>VKU confirmed with the household/end user whether or not the PP has performed survey on stove operation (for the parameter $N_{y,i,j}$). The verification team also interviewed HH on baseline scenario of the household and observed the pre-project/baseline stove/s and its operation during the project scenario. The verification team also assessed Competence of personnel involved in conducting monitoring.</p> <p>Hence, VKU's verification team employed acceptance sampling and verified taking random 11 household samples with acceptance number 0 and verified ICS samples and all samples are found operational. Thus, VKU concludes that reported results are deemed satisfactory.</p>						
<p>2.</p>	<p>$\eta_{new,i,j}$:</p> <p>The efficiency of the device of each type i and batch j implemented as part of the project activity</p>	<p>Fraction</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year(y)</th> <th>$\eta_{new,y,i,j}$</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Batch 1</td> <td>0.3389</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Batch 2</td> <td>0.3423</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year(y)	$\eta_{new,y,i,j}$	Batch 1	0.3389	Batch 2	0.3423	<p>This parameter is used for calculation of emission reductions & is defined as the efficiency of the improved cook stove type i and batch j determined as per equation 5 of methodology during year y.</p> <p>Efficiency of the improved cookstoves to be estimated using equation 5 of the applied methodology where loss in efficiency per year is calculated, and</p>
Year(y)	$\eta_{new,y,i,j}$									
Batch 1	0.3389									
Batch 2	0.3423									

				<p>therefore this parameter does not need to be monitored in every verification.</p> <p>Calculation to be performed using equation below:</p> $\eta_{new,y,i,j} = \eta_p \times (DF_n)^{y-1} \times 0.94$ <p>This parameter is determined ex-ante. The average lifetime of the cookstove is 7 years The value has been provided as per manufacturer’s specification.</p> <p>(The project has chosen to determine the efficiency using equation 5 as given by the methodology; therefore, monitoring this parameter via a sampling survey is not required.)</p> <p>A default value of 0.99 efficiency loss per year can be considered. In case of a change in the ICS model for new project activity instances, the efficiency of the new ICS model should be determined during the verification, and the same will be considered for that project activity instance.</p> <p>This is in line with the methodology and registered VCS Joint PD & MR /03/ hence deemed satisfactory to VKU’s assessment team.</p>
3.	<p>$B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$</p> <p>Annual quantity of woody biomass used by</p>	Tonnes	1.087 tonnes/device/year ⁵ .	According to the applied methodology VMR0006: Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves,

⁵ Detailed Computation stated in ER sheet as well as section 5.4 of this report

	<p>improved cookstoves in tonnes per device of type <i>i</i> and batch <i>j</i>, determined in the first year of the implementation of the project through a sample survey</p>			<p>Version 1.1, and the validated registered Joint PD & MR /03/, a i.e., $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ is determined during the first verification and remains fixed for the entire crediting period.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the project proponent (PP) utilized the verified value, which was assessed during the first Monitoring Period. This value was approved by Verra and documented in the Joint validation and Verification Report/3.1/.</p> <p>For the current Monitoring Period (MP), the value of Annual quantity of woody biomass used by the improved cookstoves in tonnes per device of type <i>i</i> and batch <i>j</i> ($B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$) for the improved cookstove distributed as a part of the project activity was determined by measurement campaigns at the representative households along with sample surveys.</p> <p>The VKU assessment team cross-checked this value by examining a sample of project participants' samples through questionnaire operation surveys and interviews, including activities such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensuring consistency between the information recorded in the Survey sheet and the data obtained from on-site interviews.
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>This process was carefully documented, and the validation and verification body (VVB) thoroughly reviewed the survey records. Additionally, the monitoring report (MR) outlined robust (QA/QC) procedures that align with the requirements specified in VCS Joint PD & MR /03/. These measures have been implemented to ensure accurate and reliable data collection throughout the project, promoting confidence in the reported results and the calculation of Verified Carbon Units (VCUs).</p> <p>This thorough verification process helps ensure the accuracy and validity of the verified value used by the project proponent in the current Monitoring Period</p>
4.	Life Span	Number of years	7	<p>This parameter is determined from manufacturer's specifications/18/. The average lifetime of the cookstove is 7 years. The value has been determined once at the time of installation of the batch or type of stove.</p> <p>For batch 1, Life span was determined at the Joint Validation and Verification/3.1/ of the project from manufacturer's specifications.</p> <p>For batch 2 installation during the current monitoring period, the life span is determined as 7 years. The same has</p>

				been confirmed from the manufacturer's specifications/18/ provided for batch 2. This parameter is also in line with the section 9.2 of the applied methodology /12/ and cross checked with the manufactures specification and found inline. Hence deemed satisfactory to VKU's assessment team.
5.	η_{old} Efficiency of baseline cookstove	Fraction	0.1	<p>Fixed for each individual household at the time of project implementation. As per the applied methodology, the efficiency of baseline cookstove is taken as a default value of 0.1 if baseline device is a three-stone fire using fuelwood (not charcoal), or a conventional device with no improved combustion air supply or flue gas ventilation, that is without a grate or a chimney.</p> <p>The parameter and its value is assessed by VVB and found to be in compliance with the applied methodology VMR0006/12/.</p>

GHG calculations:

Actual ER calculations for the ICS distribution for the current monitoring period from 01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024 (both dates inclusive):

1. Determination of efficiency of ICS during the current monitoring period:

For batch 1 and batch 2:

$$\eta_{new,y,i,j} = \eta_p \times (DF_n)^{y-1} \times 0.94$$

Where:

$$\eta_p = 0.3642$$

$$DF_n = 0.99$$

Hence,

Parameter	Batch	Equation	Value	Unit
$\eta_{new,y,i,j}$	1	$0.3642 \times (0.99)^{(2-1)} \times 0.94$	0.3389	Fraction
$\eta_{new,y,i,j}$	2	$0.3642 \times (0.99)^{(1-1)} \times 0.94$	0.3423	Fraction

2. Determination of quantity of woody biomass $B_{(y,savings,i,j)}$ that is saved in tons per ICS during the current monitoring period:

$$B_{y,savings,i,j} = B_{y=1,new,i,survey} \times \left(\frac{\eta_{new,y,i,j}}{\eta_{old}} - 1 \right)$$

Where:

$B_{y=1,new,i,survey}$	=	1.087
η_{old}	=	10
$\eta_{new,y,i,j}$ (Batch 1)	=	0.3389
$\eta_{new,y,i,j}$ (Batch 2)	=	0.3423
Total number of Monitoring days	=	517 (Batch 1) 97 (Batch 2)

Parameter	Batch	Equation	Value	Unit
$B_{y,savings,i,j}$	1	$1.087 \times [(0.3389/0.1) - 1] \times (517/365)$	3.68	tons/monitoring period
$B_{y,savings,i,j}$	2	$1.087 \times [(0.3423/0.1) - 1] \times (517/365)$	0.70	tons/monitoring period

3. Determination of emission reduction for each batch for the current monitoring period-

$$ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,savings,i,j} \times NCV_{wood\ fuel} \times f_{NRB,y} \times (EF_{wf,CO2} + EF_{wf,non\ CO2}) \times N_{y,i,j} \times 0.95$$

Where:

(For Batch 1)

η_{old}	10%	%
$\eta_{new,i,j}$	33.89%	%
$B_{y=1,new,survey}$	1.087	tons/Monitoring period
$B_{y,saving,l,j}$	3.68	tons/Monitoring period
$N_{y,i,k}$	9,200	number
$F_{NRB,y}$	91.19%	%
$NCV_{Biomass}$	0.0156	TJ/tonne
$EF_{wf, CO2}$	112.00	tCO2e/TJ
$EF_{wf, non CO2}$	26.23	tCO2e/TJ
$(DF_n)^{y-1}$	0.99	Default value
LE_y	0.95	Default Value

For batch 2:

η_{old}	10%	%
$\eta_{new,i,j}$	34%	%
$B_{y=1,new,survey}$	1.087	tons/Monitoring period
$B_{y,saving,l,j}$	0.70	tons/Monitoring period
$N_{y,i,k}$	2,322	number
f_{NRB}	91.19%	%

NCV_{Biomass}	0.0156	TJ/tonne
$EF_{\text{wf, CO}_2}$	112.00	tCO ₂ e/TJ
$EF_{\text{wf, non CO}_2}$	26.23	tCO ₂ e/TJ
$(DF_n)^{y-1}$	0.99	Default value
LE_y	0.95	Default Value

Hence,

Parameter	Batch	Equation	Value	Unit
$ER_{y,i,j}$	Batch 1	$3.68 \times 91.19\% \times 0.0156 \times (112.0 + 26.23) \times 9.200 \times 0.95$	63,221	tCO ₂ e
$ER_{y,i,j}$	Batch 2	$0.70 \times 91.19\% \times 0.0156 \times (112 + 26.23) \times 2,322 \times 0.95$	3,037	tCO ₂ e
Total			66,258	tCO ₂ e

According to the results of the second monitoring survey, which was applicable for the current monitoring period, All the distributed cookstoves are deemed to be operational. Further for being conservative project proponent.

So, VKU is of the opinion that this method of calculation of emission reductions is accurate and results in conservative estimation of emission reduction and is line with the applicable VCS requirements requirements set out in section 3.15 of VCS Standard version 4.7/05/ and that the verification of the GHG statement was conducted in in accordance with ISO 14064-3; 2019/14/.

4.5 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

This is not an AFLOU project, hence non-permeance risk is not applicable to the present project activity.

5 VERIFICATION OPINION

5.1 Verification Summary

VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd. (referred to as VKU) declares that it conducted the second verification of the first crediting period, for the monitoring period 01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024, (inclusive of both start and end dates), for the project activity “Improved Cookstoves for Communities”, [VCS Registry Project ID 2922](#), with regard to the relevant requirements for VCS activities. The grouped project amounts to 66,258 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO_{2e}). These reported reductions have been assessed in accordance with the relevant requirements outlined in the VCS Standard, version 4.7/05/

The project proponents of the “Improved Cookstoves for Communities” are responsible for:

- The preparation of greenhouses gas emissions data and the reported greenhouse gas emission reductions from the project on the basis set out in the monitoring plan contained in the registered project design and monitoring report version 1.3 of 02-November-2023/03/.
- The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of greenhouse gas emission reductions of the project.

It is the responsibility of VKU to express an independent verification opinion about the project’s conformity with the requirements of VCS Standard version 4.7/05/ and GHG program applied, on the reported greenhouse gas emission reductions from the project.

Based on documented evidence and confirmed by an on-site assessment, VKU can confirm that:

- the project has been implemented and operated as per the joint project description & monitoring report /03/;
- the monitoring report and other supporting documents provided are complete and verifiable and in accordance with the applicable VCS standard version 4.7 requirements/05/;
- the monitoring is in place as per the applied baseline and monitoring methodology/12/;
- The monitoring plan in the joint project description version 1.3 of 02-November-2023/03/ & monitoring report version 1.2 of dated 16-October-2024/01/is as per the applied baseline and monitoring methodology.

As per VCS Standard Version 4.7, clause 4.1.23, 4.1.24 and 4.1.25, VKU is of opinion that that GHG emission reduction stated in the monitoring report version 1.2 dated 16-October-2024 for the “Improved Cookstoves for Communities” in India for the period 01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024 (Inclusive of both start and end dates) **are fairly and correctly stated.**

5.2 Verification Conclusion

VKU’s verification approach is based on the understanding of the risks associated with reporting of GHG emission data and the controls in place to mitigate these. VKU Certification planned and performed the verification by obtaining evidence and other information and explanations that VKU Certification considered necessary to give **Reasonable level of assurance** that reported GHG emission reductions are fairly stated.

Table No- 19 Opinion/Conclusion by Validation-Verification Body

Opinion	Final Documents	Monitoring Period	Emission Reductions achieved	Remarks
Positive opinion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Negative Opinion <input type="checkbox"/> Adverse Opinion <input type="checkbox"/> Unmodified Opinion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Modified Opinion <input type="checkbox"/>	Monitoring Report version 1.2 dated 16-October-2024 Emission Reduction Sheet version 1.2 dated 16-October-2024	01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024 (Inclusive of both the days)	66,258 tCO _{2e}	The GHG emission reductions are calculated on the basis of approved methodology, VMR0006 /12/ and the monitoring plan included in the registered VCS Joint PD and MR/03/

Hence VKU is able to certify that the emission reduction from the project during the current monitoring period 01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024 (Inclusive of both the days) amounts to 66,258 tCO₂e assessed in line with the applicable VCS requirements set out in section 3.15 of VCS Standard version 4.7/05/

The VVB hereby issues a resolutely positive and unmodified opinion meticulously drafted in strict accordance with ISO 14064-3:2019, /14/ Section 09, and the precise provisions of Clause 9.7.1.6 & 9.7.2 of ISO 14065:2020. /14/. This opinion stands in full alignment with the exacting requirements delineated in ISO/IEC 17029:2019, Section 9.7./14/

Our verification process provides a robust and reasonable level of assurance regarding the veracity of the reported GHG emission reduction data. This data is devoid of any material misstatements and is steadfastly supported by the evidence furnished by the Project Proponent (PP), comprehensively presented in Table 04 of this report.

Verification period: From 01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024

Verified GHG emission reductions and carbon dioxide removals in the above verification period:

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Reduction VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Removal VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCUs (tCO ₂ e)
01-Jan-2023 to 31-Dec-2023	44,634	0	0	44,634	-	44,634
01-Jan-2024 to 31-May-2024	21,624	0	0	21,624	-	21,624
Total	66,258	0	0	66,258	-	66,258

For projects required to assess permanence risk: Since the grouped project activity does not fall under the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use) or Geologic Carbon Storage (GCS) project categories, it is not required to assess the permanence risk. Therefore, the following tables are not applicable.

The non-permanence risk rating (%)	N/A
If applicable, the Long-term Average (LTA), whether it has been properly updated, and if it has been reached.	N/A
Whether a loss has been appropriately accounted for, in accordance with the VCS Program rules, if applicable.	N/A

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Buffer pool allocation (tCO ₂ e)	Reductions VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Removals VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCU issuance (tCO ₂ e)
DD-MMM-YYYY to 31-Dec-YYYY	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

5.3 Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison

Vintage period	Ex-ante estimated reductions/removals	Achieved reductions/removals	Percent difference	Explanation for the difference
01-Jan-2023 to 31-Dec-2023	55,651	44,364	-20%	The Project Proponent (PP) has justified the discrepancy between estimated and actual Emission Reductions (ERs) by explaining that during the year 2023, only 9,200 improved cookstoves have been functional, despite estimations being based on 11,522 cookstoves. An additional 2,322 cookstoves have been distributed from February
01-Jan-2024 to 31-May-2024	23,023	21,624	-6%	
Total	78,674	66,258	-16%	

				<p>2024 onward, which contributed to the variance between the estimated and actual ERs for the reporting period.</p> <p>Upon reviewing the evidence provided, the VVB concludes that the justification is reasonable and aligned with the project's implementation timeline.</p> <p>The difference in ER values is attributable to the phased distribution of cookstoves. As a result, the achieved ERs are lower than initially projected for the earlier period. The VVB confirms that the data and explanation are consistent with the monitoring results, and no discrepancies have been identified in the reported values.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION

Section	Information	Justification	Assessment method and conclusion
-	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purchase price of cookstove 2. Distribution and maintenance cost for the cookstove 3. Cost to NGO 	<p>This type of financial information could influence competition or contractual outcomes, it is deemed to be commercially sensitive information by the Assessment team.</p>	<p>In-line with clause 3.5.2 and 3.5.3 of VCS Standard; version 4.7 and VCS Program Definitions; version 4.5/07/, the disclosure of the mentioned information could lead to material financial loss or gain, or harm contractual negotiations and hence, excluded from the public versions of project documents including the monitoring report/01/. Hence, VVB concludes that the Project conforms with the VCS Program requirements on what may be excluded.</p>

APPENDIX 2: ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations	Full texts
AT	Assessment Team
BE	Baseline Emissions
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CDM M&P	Modalities and Procedures CDM
CER(s)	Certified Emission Reduction(s)
CH ₄	Methane
CL	Clarification Request
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO _{2e}	Carbon dioxide equivalent
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EB	Executive Board
EF	Emission Factor
ER	Emission Reductions
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG(s)	Greenhouse gas(es)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HH	Household
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MoV	Means of Verification
MR	Monitoring Report
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
JOINT PD & MR	Joint project description & monitoring report
PE	Project Emission
PP(s)	Project Proponent(s)
PSA	Power Sale Agreement
Ref.	Document Reference
SS(s)	Sectoral Scope(s)
TA(s)	Technical Area(s)
TR	Technical Reviewer
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VCU	Verified Carbon Unit
VKU	VKU Certification Ltd.
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard

APPENDIX 3: QUESTIONNAIRES FOR END USERS INTERVIEW

Appendix: 1⁶

Household / Stakeholder's Details for Improved Cookstoves Projects by end-user visited by Assessment team as per VVB Sample selected

Sr. No.....	
End-user/ Stakeholder's name <i>(Indicate relationship with owner in case is different person)</i>	
ID of the related sales agreement/Any relevant document	
Location with coordinates <i>(Village / District / Region / neighbourhood)</i>	
Device Model / Type/Size (fill according to applicability)	
Date of purchase/installation/distribution	
ID of the device	
Is the device in operation? How many in number?	Yes/No
Is the baseline stove in use?	Yes/No
How many dependants in the household? (Family Size)	

⁶ This is appendix of VKU Internal document VKU.F62W. Field Assessment Checklist for Sample Selected by VVB for Energy Demand – Distribution

<p>How many meals cooked per day? <i>(Per day preferentially, other measures allowed)</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Breakfast <input type="checkbox"/> Lunch <input type="checkbox"/> Dinner
<p>Do you know how to contact CME/PP/ PD in case of any problem/complaint/suggestion?</p>	<p>Yes/No</p>
<p>Is there any test that has been conducted for your device by CME/PP/ PD? <i>(e.g., efficiency tests)</i></p>	<p>Yes/No</p>
<p>How much it saves? <i>(% of firewood save/Currency/day preferentially, other measures allowed but trying to keep homogeneity)</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> < 30% saving <input type="checkbox"/> 30 % – 50 % saving <input type="checkbox"/> 31 >50 % saving
<p>Is there any other previous device in use actually? In which situations?</p>	<p>Yes/No. If yes, explain.</p>
<p>Which was the previous used fuel?</p>	<p>Firewood/Charcoal/Coal/LPG/others-</p>
<p>Cooking inside home? Outside?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Inside <input type="checkbox"/> Outside
<p>Opinion about:</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Less smoke observed <input type="checkbox"/> Respiratory wellness improved <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease in Allergies <input type="checkbox"/> No Itching in eyes <input type="checkbox"/> Time-saving <input type="checkbox"/> Fuel Saving
<p>The user is happy with the stove. <i>(Include any comments of the user)</i></p>	<p>Yes/No If No, please comment</p>
<p>Signature/Thumb Impression of the end-user: <i>(If the end-user doesn't want to sign, respect the decision)</i></p>	

APPENDIX 4: AUDIT FINDINGS

Finding No. 01		Date: 11-July-2024
Finding Type- CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR <input type="checkbox"/>		
Stage of finding raised:		
Desk Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
On-site/remote/hybrid assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Technical Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Project Review Report by Registry	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Requirement		
VCS MR Template; Version 4.4		
VCS Standard; Version 4.7, clause 3.5.5		
Non-Conformity		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) File name of Monitoring Report; Version 01.0 dated 18-June-2024 is not consistent with VCS MR Template; version 4.4. 2) Date format and Formatting (Font, size and colour) is not consistent throughout with VCS MR Template; version 4.4 throughout the Monitoring Report. 3) PP has not mentioned if monitoring period is inclusive of both start and end dates. 4) PP has not referred the latest version of VCS Standard in the cover page of Monitoring Report. 5) Content table is not updated in the Monitoring Report. 6) PP has not updated the Appendix in Monitoring Report. 7) Some sections are not filled by PP throughout the Monitoring Report (Section 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.3.5, 5.4, Appendix 1) 		
Evidence		
Monitoring Report; version 01.1 dated 18-June-2024		
1st Response from PP		Date: 30-July-2024
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The file name for the monitoring report has been updated to VCS MR 2922 010123023-31052024 as described in the MR template version 4.4. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1 		

- 2) Date format in the entire monitoring report has been updated to DD – Month- YYYY format as described in the MR template version 4.4. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1
- 3) The monitoring period for the project is 01 – January – 2023 to 31- May- 2024 (inclusive of both the dates) the same has been updated in the Monitoring report. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1.
- 4) The latest version of VCS standard i.e. version 4.7 has been referred for the verification of the project under this monitoring period. The same has been updated in the cover page of the monitoring report version 1.1. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1
- 5) The content table is updated in the monitoring report. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1
- 6) Appendix section of the monitoring report has been updated with the Commercial sensitive information (appendix 1), Data collection form (appendix 2), Cookstove technical details (appendix 3), Monitoring Survey Form (appendix 4). Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1.
- 7) Sections in the Monitoring report are been updated with the required information’s. kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1

Documents provided by PP for review

- a. Monitoring Report version 1.1

1st Review by Assessment Team

Date: 05-October-2024

1. Project Proponent has updated the file name for the revised Monitoring Report and it is in line with the VCS MR template version 4.4 guidelines. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**
2. Project Proponent has updated the date format to DD-MONTH-YYYY form in the updated monitoring report. The date format is now consistent with VCS MR Template v4.4. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**
3. PP has mentioned that the current monitoring period i.e., 01-January-2023 to 31-May-2024 is inclusive of both start and end dates and it is correctly mentioned throughout the revised MR; version 01.1. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**
4. PP has mentioned the latest version of VCS standard i.e., 4.7 referred for the current verification in the revised MR; version 1.1. It is correct and **hence, accepted and closed by assessment team.**
5. The content table in the revised MR; version 01.1 is found to be updated. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**
6. In the revised MR; version 1,1, PP has updated the appendix: Appendix 1 (Commercially sensitive information), Appendix 2 (Data collection form), Appendix 3 (Cookstove technical details) and Appendix 4 (Monitoring Survey Form). The section is found to be correct and inline with VCS MR template filling guidelines. Hence, this is accepted and closed.
7. PP has revised the MR and filled all the sections of the Monitoring Report template; version 4.4. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**

Hence, CAR#01 is closed by assessment team.

Finding No. 02	Date: 11-July-2024
Finding Type- CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR <input type="checkbox"/>	
Stage of finding raised:	
Desk Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
On-site/remote/hybrid assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Review	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Review Report by Registry	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requirement	
VCS MR Template; Version 4.4	
VCS Standard; Version 4.7, clause 3.5.	
Non-Conformity	
Section 1.1	
8) PP has not provided the date of commissioning of this grouped project activity for Batch 1 and Batch 2 in the summary description.	
Section 1.2	
9) PP has not mentioned Joint Validation and Verification in the audit history table of Monitoring Report. Complete name of current VVB is not mentioned. Number of days for total project timeline are not correctly calculated. PP has not updated the audit history table.	
Section 1.8	
10) District Niwari is not shown in Fig 1 (Districts of Madhya Pradesh) in the Monitoring Report. Moreover, the survey sample sheet provided by PP in the ER spreadsheet shows few more districts of Madhya Pradesh which are not included in the MR.	
11) Assessment team is not able to locate the geo-coordinates provided by PP in section 1.8 of Monitoring Report.	
Section 1.12	
12) PP has not mentioned the relevant SDG indicator for SDG target 12.0 in table “Sustainable Development Contributions” in the Monitoring Report.	
13) Value of ERs for the current monitoring period is not correctly mentioned in Section 1.12 of monitoring report.	

Evidence	
Monitoring Report; version 01.1 dated 18-June-2024	
1st Response from PP	Date: 30-July-2024
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For the group project activity, the batch 1 of improved cookstoves were distributed from 20 – November – 2021 and the batch 2 of the improved cookstoves were distributed from 06 – February – 2024. A total of 9200 cookstoves were distributed in the batch 1 and a total of 2322 cookstoves were distributed in the batch 2. The same information has been updated in the Monitoring report version 1.1. Kindly refer to the monitoring report version 1.1. 2. The table for the audit history in section 1.2 has been updated accordingly. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1 3. District Niwari is with the district Tikamgarh. The same is provided in the figure 1 of the section 1.8. kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1. 4. The geo coordinates of all the districts are mentioned in the section 1.8. kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1. 5. Under the SDG impact table SDG 12, indicator 12.2.2. Domestic material consumption, domestic material consumption per capita and domestic material consumption per GDP is relevant and this indicator is monitored in terms of tonnes of fuelwood saved in consumption for energy purposes per household. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1. 6. The corrected ER for current monitoring period has been updated in the following table. Kindly refer to the update monitoring report version 1.1. 	
Documents provided by PP for review	
a. Updated monitoring report version 1.1	
1st Review by Assessment Team	Date: 05-October-2024
<p>Section 1.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PP has incorporated the commissioning date of ICS distribution for batch I and Batch II in the updated MR; version 1.1. ICS distribution started from 20-November-2021 and 06-February-2024 for Batch I and Batch II respectively. It has been verified from the ICS distribution data provided by PP and found to be correct. Hence, accepted and closed. <p>Section 1.2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. PP has updated the audit history table in section 1.2 of the revised MR; version 1.1. details regarding Joint Validation and Verification have been updated in the audit history table. The timeline mentioned for each verification period has been updated and found correct as per the previous registered project documents. Hence, accepted and closed <p>Section 1.8</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The ER sheet and ICS distribution database provided by PP show project ICS implemented in various districts of Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra. PP has included all the districts of ICS implementation in Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra. It is now in line with project implementation database and survey sample sheet. Hence, this is accepted and closed. 4. PP had updated the geo-coordinates of districts where ICSs are distributed in section 1.8 of the revised MR; version 1.1. All the districts where project cookstove are distributed are 	

included in the revised monitoring report. **Hence, this is accepted and closed by the assessment team.**

Section 1.12

- 5. In table 1 “Sustainable Development Contribution” of MR; version 1.1, PP has incorporated the SDG indicator for SDG target 12.0. It in in-line with “Global indicator framework for the Sustainable Development Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”. **Hence, accepted and closed.**
- 6. The value of ER is updated in section 1.12 of revised MR; version 1.1. The value is consistent with Emission Reduction calculation spreadsheet. **Hence, accepted and closed.**

Hence, CAR#02 is closed by assessment team.

Finding No. 03	Date: 11-July-2024
Finding Type- CAR <input type="checkbox"/>	CL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FAR <input type="checkbox"/>
Stage of finding raised:	
Desk Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
On-site/remote/hybrid assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Review	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Review Report by Registry	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requirement	
VCS MR Template; Version 4.4	
VCS Standard; Version 4.7, clause 3.5.5 & 3.26.	
Non-Conformity	
Supporting evidences are not provided to support the information in Monitoring Report.	
Evidence	

Supporting evidences/documents regarding:

- 1) Project ownership
- 2) Entity contracted for ICS Manufacturing
- 3) Agreement between PP and ICS distribution agency
- 4) Agreement between of carbon waiver between PP and end-users
- 5) Total number of ICS distributed
- 6) Separate KML file for project location
- 7) Evidence to support the claim that the project is not receiving or seeking credits under another GHG program, that the project is not registered under any other GHG program
- 8) Evidence to support the claim that the grouped project activity is not included in an emission trading program or binding emission limit or is receiving any credit from another GHG-related environmental credit system.
- 9) evidence to support the claim that the grouped project activity does not affect the emissions footprint of any product(s) (goods or services) that are part of a supply chain.
- 10) Grievance redress procedure
- 11) Baseline survey records
- 12) Monitoring survey records
- 13) Random sample selection by PP
- 14) Technical Specifications of ICS from manufacturer or supplier
- 15) Evidence for improved air quality due to installation of ICS
- 16) Evidence regarding employment of local volunteers and NGOs
- 17) Ongoing communication with local stakeholders
- 18) Annual check or spot check by PP's designated team
- 19) Training records of monitoring team
- 20) WBT Test Report for new instances added in current monitoring period
- 21) fNRB Report for new instances added in current monitoring period
- 22) Evidences of Human Rights Principles & Equality (Includes Discrimination and sexual harassment, Labour Rights, Property Rights etc)
- 23) Project's contributions to sustainable forest management.

1st Response from PP

Date: 31-July-2024

1. Project ownership is determined by: declaration signed by beneficiary, manufacturing unit
2. Details for the contracted entity for the cookstove manufacturing is provided
3. Agreement between the distribution agency and PP is provided
4. Signed declaration from the user for the transfer of carbon rights is provided
5. Distribution data for confirming the total number of cookstove distributed is provided
6. KML for the separate locations is provided.
7. Declaration signed by the PP is provided
8. Declaration signed by the PP is provided
9. Declaration signed by the PP is provided
10. Grievance Register is provided with the redress procedure
11. Baseline survey report is provided
12. Monitoring survey record is provided with the ER verification sheet
13. Selection of random sampling is provided.
14. Technical specifications of the ICS is provided
15. Monitoring survey results is provided for the claim of decrease in the household air smoke due to use of improved cookstove is provided.
16. Training attendance records are provided

- 17. Ongoing communication with the stakeholder is provided
- 18. Spot check mechanism is provided
- 19. Training records and training attendance is provided
- 20. WBT report for the efficiency of cookstove is provided
- 21. fNRB remains the same for the instance. Kindly refer to the worksheet fNRB in the Emission reduction sheet
- 22. Declaration signed by PP for the anti-discrimination is provided.
- 23. Project contribution for the SDG 15 is from the fuelwood saved per household is provided in the Emission Reduction sheet.

Documents provided by PP for review

Project ownership, end user agreement, declaration, training record, grievance, technical specification, baseline survey report, KML file, distribution database etc.

1st Review by Assessment Team

Date: 05-October-2024

Assessment team confirms that PP has provided the required supporting documents regarding:

- 1) Project ownership
- 2) Entity contracted for ICS Manufacturing
- 3) Agreement between PP and ICS distribution agency
- 4) Agreement between of carbon waiver between PP and end-users
- 5) Total number of ICS distributed
- 6) Separate KML file for project location
- 7) Evidence to support the claim that the project is not receiving or seeking credits under another GHG program, that the project is not registered under any other GHG program
- 8) Evidence to support the claim that the grouped project activity is not included in an emission trading program or binding emission limit or is receiving any credit from another GHG-related environmental credit system.
- 9) evidence to support the claim that the grouped project activity does not affect the emissions footprint of any product(s) (goods or services) that are part of a supply chain.
- 10) Grievance redress procedure
- 11) Baseline survey records
- 12) Monitoring survey records
- 13) Random sample selection by PP
- 14) Technical Specifications of ICS from manufacturer or supplier
- 15) Evidence for improved air quality due to installation of ICS
- 16) Evidence regarding employment of local volunteers and NGOs
- 17) Ongoing communication with local stakeholders
- 18) Annual check or spot check by PP's designated team
- 19) Training records of monitoring team
- 20) WBT Test Report for new instances added in current monitoring period
- 21) fNRB Report for new instances added in current monitoring period
- 22) Evidences of Human Rights Principles & Equality (Includes Discrimination and sexual harassment, Labour Rights, Property Rights etc)
- 23) Project's contributions to sustainable forest management.

The documents are found to be appropriate and support the information provided by the PP in the monitoring report.

Hence, CL#03 is closed by assessment team.

Finding No. 04	Date: 11-July-2024
Finding Type- CAR <input type="checkbox"/>	CL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	FAR <input type="checkbox"/>
Stage of finding raised:	
Desk Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
On-site/remote/hybrid assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Review	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Review Report by Registry	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requirement	
VCS MR Template; Version 4.4	
VCS Standard; Version 4.7, clause 3.5.5	
Non-Conformity	
Section 1.12	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) SDG indicator 5.4.1 mentioned in section 1.12 of MR is not mentioned in the table 2 “Sustainable Development Contributions” in the MR. 2) It is not clear why PP has incorporated an additional table (Table 1) for Sustainable Development goals addressed by the project. 3) In the table “Sustainable Development Contributions” (SDG indicator 3.9.1) of monitoring report, it is not clear how PP ensured that 100% end users have claimed reduction in indoor smoke. Moreover, there is no statement regarding mortality rate attributed to households. 4) In the table “Sustainable Development Contributions” (SDG indicator 5.5.2) it is not clearly demonstrated how PP has ensured the increased participation of women in managerial position. 5) In the table “Sustainable Development Contributions” (SDG indicator 8.3.1) PP has not mentioned how many employees have been employed in project under current MP. Moreover, it is not clear how many people are trained during current monitoring period and over project lifetime. 	

- 6) In the table “Sustainable Development Contributions” (SDG indicator 15.2.1), the project does not clearly differentiate its contributions towards SDG 12.0 and SDG 15.2. Additionally, the calculation method for saving 2.70 tonnes of fuel wood per year lacks clarity.

Section 1.13

- 7) PP has not briefly described and justified the items to which commercially sensitive information pertains.

Section 2.1.1

- 8) PP has not clearly described the processes used to identify stakeholders in section 2.1.1

Section 2.1.2

- 9) It is not clearly demonstrated how PP is fulfilling the requirement of Clause 3.18.5 and 3.18.6 of VCS Standard v4.7 in section 2.1.2 of monitoring report.

Section 2.1.3

- 10) This section is not filled as per the VCS MR template filling guidelines.

Section 2.1.5

- 11) It is not clear if any comments were received during the 30-day public comment period.

Section 2.2.1

- 12) It is not demonstrated how PP has ensured the teams have expertise or experience in implementing similar project activities or engaging communities?

Section 2.2.2

- 13) It is not clear how is PP ensuring there is not risk associated with working conditions of stakeholders in project?

Section 2.3.2

- 14) PP has not demonstrated how human rights are respected and promoted in the project, as per VCS MR template filling guidelines.

Section 2.4

- 15) The section is not completed as per the clause 3.19.25 of VCS Standard V4.7.

Section 3.1

- 16) It is not clear if ICS are distributed in Aurangabad or not.

Section 3.4

- 17) PP has not clarified if any baseline assessment is done for installation of Batch 2 in Maharashtra.

Section 4.2

- 18) Duration/dates of monitoring survey are not mentioned for monitored parameters in the MR.
 19) It is not clear why the value for parameter η_{old} is fixed ex-ante, if this is a monitored parameter.

Section 4.3

- 20) Not clearly demonstrated which approach for confidence/precision is used by PP. PP also needs to clearly define whether sampling done us annual or biennial.
 21) PP has not clarified if any replacement has taken place during the current MP.

<p>22) PP has not clarified that what type of education has been provided by ground level team.</p>	
<p>Section 5.4</p> <p>23) As per applied methodology, PP has not calculated the leakage factor for this project in section 5.4 of MR.</p>	
<p>Evidence</p>	
<p>Monitoring Report; version 01.1 dated 18-June-2024</p>	
<p>1st Response from PP</p>	<p>Date: 30-July-2024</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) SDG Indicator 5.4.1: Proportion of time spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age and location has been used as the monitoring indicator. The indicator is monitored by determining the number of women beneficiaries (primary beneficiaries) claiming the reduction in the wood collection time and cooking time on the use of improved cookstove. The same is mentioned in the table 1: Sustainable development contribution. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1. 2) Table 1: Sustainable Development Contribution is mandatory as per the MR template version 4.4. the table is updated with 7 SDGs that are impacted by the group project activity. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1. 3) SDG indicator 3.9.1: Mortality rate attributed to household and ambient air pollution. This indicator is monitored by determining the proportion of beneficiaries claiming the reduction in ambient air smoke with the use of improved cookstove. the same is been determined during the monitoring survey. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1. 4) SDG indicator 5.4.1: Proportion of time spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by age, sex and location. This indicator is monitored by proportion of women beneficiaries (primary beneficiaries) claiming reduction in fuelwood collection time and cooking time. This has been determined in the monitoring survey. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1. 5) SDG indicator 8.3.1.: Proportion of informal employment in total employment, by sector and sex. The indicator is monitored using the number of people trained for the monitoring and data collection using mobile devices. For the current monitoring period a total of 50 youth were trained. Training attendance is provided as the supporting for claiming the impact on the SDG. Kindly find the updated monitoring report version 1.1 and training attendance. 6) SDG 15.2.1: Progress towards sustainable forest management. This indicator is monitored by the fuelwood savings per household in the current year of the monitoring. The value for the impact on SDG is determined by the use of Methodology VMR0006 version 1.1. the By,savings is determined using the equation 4 of the applicable methodology. The impact on SDG 12.0 and 15.2 are determined by the same means of fuelwood savings by the project activity. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1 and ER sheet. 7) Commercial sensitive information include the purchase prices of cookstove, distribution cost, the maintenance cost and the monitoring cost for the cookstove paid to the NGO partners. The same has been updated in the appendix 1 of the monitoring report version 1.1. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report 1.1. 8) The section 2.1.1. of the monitoring report has been updated with the stakeholder identification. Kindly refer to the updated Monitoring report version 1.1. 9) The section 2.1.2 of the monitoring report is updated with the required information according to the VCS standard version 4.7. kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1. 	

- 10) The section 2.1.3 has been updated according to the MR template version 4.4. kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1.
- 11) There were no comments received during the public commenting period. The same information is updated in the section 2.1.5 in the updated monitoring report version 1.1
- 12) The team for implementation of the project include the experts from the field of community engagement projects. The information related to the team members are updated in the section 2.2.1 in the updated monitoring report. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1.
- 13) In the current grouped project activity there is training provided associated with the safety of the field staff for the distribution of improved cookstoves. the proper usage of the cookstove is also demonstrated to the beneficiaries during the local stakeholder consultation meetings and during the distribution too.
- 14) The grouped project activity is following anti-discrimination practices and follow the Human rights moral principles and PP prepared Anti-discrimination Policy before implementation of the project activity. All the stakeholders are identified without discrimination based on gender, race, caste, national origin, religion, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, cooperative membership, or political affiliation. The same information is updated in the section 2.3.2 of the updated monitoring report. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1.
- 15) The section 2.4 has been completed with all the information related to the clause 3.19.25 of the VCS standard version 4.7. kindly refer to the updated section in monitoring report version 1.1.
- 16) There was no distribution of ICS in Aurangabad in the current monitoring period. All the improved cookstove distributed in the second batch are distributed in Jalna district of Maharashtra. The same is updated under the section 3.1 in updated monitoring report. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1.
- 17) For the distribution of the second batch, the baseline was same as evaluated earlier, the use of traditional biomass cookstove with no grate or chimney used in the rural households. the data for the use of cookstove in baseline is captured during the assessment before distribution. The same information is updated in section 3.4 of the updated monitoring report. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1.
- 18) The monitoring survey was carried during 01-June-2024 to 28-June-2024, the same is updated in the monitoring parameters under section 4.2 of the updated monitoring report. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1.
- 19) The improved cookstove is distributed in only those households where the baseline device is traditional mud cookstove or 3 stone firewood cookstove with no proper combustion air supply or flue gas ventilation, that is without grate or chimney. According to applied methodology default of 0.1 can be taken. Therefore fixing this parameter ex-ante. The same is described in the section 4.2 parameter η_{old} . kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1.
- 20) Under the section 4.3, sampling plan. For the current monitoring period 90/10 confidence interval and 10% of relative precision. The number of samples for the current monitoring are done by simple random sampling approach. The same is described under the section 4.3 of the updated monitoring report with the sampled number of cookstoves. kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1.
- 21) There was no replacement of cookstove that has been done during the current monitoring period. There were some cookstoves which needed the maintenance of tightening of handles and cleaning the base plate which was carried out on regular intervals by the field staff.
- 22) Ground level team has been trained for the maintenance of the cookstoves, tracking the use of the cookstoves and data collection for the monitoring and distribution of the cookstoves. there is a regular visit by the field staffs for the determination of project stove usage. The

<p>information is also provided in the section 4.3 of the updated monitoring report. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.1.</p> <p>23) The leakage factor is calculated in the emission reduction equation as per equation 2 of the applied methodology VMR0006 version 1.1. Therefore, the factor is not evaluated separately.</p>	
<p>Documents provided by PP for review</p>	
<p>a. Updated monitoring report version 1.1 b. Training attendance c. ER sheet</p>	
<p>1st Review by Assessment Team</p>	<p>Date: 05-October-2024</p>
<p>Section 1.12</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PP has incorporated the SDG indicator 5.4.1: Proportion of time spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age and location in Table 2 “Sustainable Development Contributions” in the MR; version 1.1. It is correct as per “Global indicator framework for the Sustainable Development Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”. Hence, it is accepted and closed. 2. The additional table for the Sustainable Development Goal, which is not part of the VCS MR template; version 4.4, has been removed by the PP in the revised MR; version 1.1. Therefore, this is accepted and closed. 3. In the table “Sustainable Development Contributions”, for SDG target 3.9.1, PP has clarified that project has attributed to decreased mortality rates and 100% end users have claimed reduction in indoor smoke. This is documented in the monitoring survey records provided by the PP. Hence, this is accepted and closed. 4. In the table “Sustainable Development Contributions” (SDG indicator 5.5.2), PP has clarified that due to reduction in wood fetching time with the use of improved cookstove, women end users can now spare more time in doing other works and learning new skills. This is consistent with onsite interviews with end users. Hence, this is accepted and closed. 5. For SDG indicator 8.3.1, "Proportion of informal employment in total employment, by sector and sex," PP reported the employment of 20 people and the training of 50 during the current monitoring period. PP has also provided sample copies of appointment letters of employees working in the project. The information provided is consistent with onsite interviews with project personnel. Hence, this is accepted and closed. 6. For the SDG targets 12.0 and 15.2, PP has clarified that the impacts are determined by the same means of fuelwood savings by the project activity. PP has provided the values for fuelwood saved under the project in the monitoring report, which is consistent with the values provided in ER sheet. Hence, this is accepted and closed. 	
<p>Section 1.13</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. PP has clarified in the revised MR; version 1.1 that the commercially sensitive information includes the purchase prices of cookstove, distribution cost, the maintenance cost and the monitoring cost for the cookstove paid to the NGO partners. PP has also updated the same in appendix 1 of the report. Hence, it is accepted and closed. 	
<p>Section 2.1.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. PP has updated the section and incorporated the stakeholders identified for distribution of ICS in Batch 2. It is consistent with VCS MR template v4.4 and VCS standard v4.7 clause 3.18.1. Hence, it is accepted and closed. 	
<p>Section 2.1.2</p>	

9. In the section, PP has mentioned in the updated MR version 1.1 that a grievance register is placed at local offices to establish “ongoing consultation” with the stakeholders. The section in the revised MR is now aligned with clause 3.18.6 of VCS Standard v.47. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**

Section 2.1.3

10. PP has updated the section 2.1.3 “Free Prior and Informed Consent” and it is inline with VCS MR template; version 4.4. **Hence, accepted and closed.**

Section 2.1.5

11. As per the MR template filling guidelines, PP has clarified in the revised MR that no comments have been received during or outside the public comments period. The same has been confirmed during the onsite interviews with concerned personnel. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**

Section 2.2.1

12. PP has clarified that the implementation team of the project has expertise in community engagement projects. The same has been confirmed during the onsite interviews with concerned personnel. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**

Section 2.2.2

13. PP has clarified that working conditions in the grouped project is favourable for workers and trainings for safety of field staff is provided under the project. PP has also provided the training records trainings MoM to verify the same. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**

Section 2.3.2

14. In section 2.3.2 “Human Rights”, PP has mentioned that PP prepared Anti-discrimination Policy before implementation of the project activity. PP has also provided a declaration stating the anti-discrimination environment maintained under the project. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**

Section 2.4

15. PP has updated the section 2.4 with all the information in accordance to the clause 3.19.25 of the VCS standard version 4.7. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**

Section 3.1

16. PP has clarified in the MR; version 1.1 that ICS are only distributed in Jalna, Maharashtra and no distribution is done in Aurangabad district. The same has been verified during onsite interviews with PP’s team. **Hence, it is accepted and closed.**

Section 3.4

17. PP has clarified that for the second batch, the baseline was same as evaluated earlier, the use of traditional biomass cookstove with no grate or chimney used in the rural households. the data for the use of cookstove in baseline is captured during the assessment before distribution. PP has also submitted the baseline survey records to confirm the same. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**
18. PP has updated the section 4.2 of the MR and incorporated the details of monitoring survey. PP has also provided the monitoring survey records to confirm the same. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**

Section 4.2

19. It is clarified by PP that the value of parameter η_{old} was selected based on the applied methodological default value of 0.1 for the baseline device, which is a traditional mud or 3-stone firewood cookstove without proper combustion air supply or flue gas ventilation. **Hence, the issue is accepted and closed.**

Section 4.3

20. PP has demonstrated in the MR that for the current monitoring period 90/10 confidence interval and 10% of relative precision. The number of samples for the current monitoring are done by simple random sampling approach. The same was also confirmed during the onsite interviews with concerned personnel. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**

21. PP has clarified that no ICS is replaced replacement during current MP. The same has been verified during the onsite interviews with concerned personnel. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**

22. PP has clarified that Ground level team has been trained for the maintenance of the cookstoves, tracking the use of the cookstoves and data collection for the monitoring and distribution of the cookstoves. PP has also provided training records to confirm the same. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**

Section 5.4

1. PP has clarified that leakage is considered as per equation 2 of applied methodology VMR0006; Version 1.1 in the ER calculation. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**

Hence, CL#04 is closed by assessment team.

Finding No. 05	Date: 11-July-2024
Finding Type- CAR <input type="checkbox"/> CL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FAR <input type="checkbox"/>	
Stage of finding raised:	
Desk Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
On-site/remote/hybrid assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Review	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Review Report by Registry	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requirement	
VCS MR Template; Version 4.4	
VCS Standard; Version 4.7, clause 3.5.5	

Non-Conformity	
<p>In the ER calculation sheet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Value for $B_{y, savings, i, j}$ is not mentioned in sheet “description”. 2) $N_{y, i, k}$ is the monitored parameter as per registered PD and monitoring report. PP has not mentioned the source and value for this parameter. 3) Value for $B_{y=1, new, I, survey}$ is not mentioned in the ER sheet. Value of this parameter is also not correctly mentioned. 4) Total number of ICS distributed (value for $N_{y, i, k}$) is not correctly mentioned (Total ER tab). 5) Units of parameters are not mentioned in Cell E24 and E25 (Batch 1 tab). 6) Source of parameter $N_{y, i, k}$ is not mentioned (Batch 1 tab). 7) Number of days of monitoring period calculated for batch 2 is not clear in provided ER Sheet, Batch 2) 	
Evidence	
Emission Reduction spreadsheet; Version 1.3	
1st Response from PP	Date: 31-July-2024
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The value of $B_{y, savings, i, j}$ is different for the different batches, for the value of same parameter kindly refer to the cell D27 in worksheet Batch 1 and cell D27 in worksheet Batch 2 of the workbook ER sheet version 1.3. Kindly refer to the ER sheet version 1.3. for the same. 2) The parameter $N_{y, i, k}$ is determined by the total distribution records and the same has been updated in the ER sheet. Kindly refer to the updated ER sheet version 1.3 for the same. 3) The value of $B_{y=1, new, I, survey}$ is in accordance to the amount of fuelwood consumed in the new project stove determined in the first year of distribution. Value for the parameter is 1.087 tonnes/household/annum the same is updated in the ER sheet version 1.3. kindly refer to the updated ER sheet version 1.3 4) The total number of distributed cookstoves are 11,522 the same has been updated in the cell D10 of worksheet Total ER. Kindly refer to the updated ER sheet version 1.3. 5) The units of parameter in E24 and E25 cell of worksheet Batch 1 is percentage (%). The same is updated in the ER sheet version 1.3. kindly refer to the updated ER sheet version 1.3. 6) The parameter $N_{y, I, j}$ is determined by the distribution data. The same is updated in the ER sheet version 1.3. kindly refer to the updated version of ER sheet version 1.3. 7) This has been calculated by the average number of days the project technology is operating from the date of distribution. The same has been updated in the ER sheet version 1.3. kindly refer to the updated ER sheet for the same. 	
Documents provided by PP for review	
a. ER sheet version 1.3	

1st Review by Assessment Team	Date: 05-October-2024
<p>In the ER calculation sheet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PP has clarified that value of $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ is different for the different batches. The values for both the batched are provided in the ER sheet. Hence, this is accepted and closed. 2. PP has updated the information regarding the parameter $N_{y,i,k}$ in the ER sheet; version 1.3. Hence, this is accepted and closed. 3. PP has updated the ER sheet and mentioned the value of parameter $B_{y=1,new,I,survey}$. It is found to be correctly calculated in the ER sheet. Hence, this is accepted and closed. 4. Total number of ICS distributed (value for $N_{y,i,k}$) has been updated in the cell D10 of worksheet Total ER in the ER sheet. It is consistent with the ICS implementation database. Hence, this is accepted and closed. 5. Units of parameters in E24 and E25 cell of worksheet Batch 1 has been incorporated in the ER sheet. This is found to be correct. Hence, accepted and closed. 6. PP had clarified the source of parameter $N_{y,i,k}$. It is determined using ICS distribution database. The same is updated in the ER sheet version 1.3. Hence, this is accepted and closed. 7. PP has clarified the approach of calculating the number of days of monitoring period calculated for batch 2. The same has been updated in the ER sheet version 1.3. Hence, this is accepted and closed. <p>Hence, CL#05 is closed by assessment team.</p>	

Finding No. 06	Date: 11-July-2024
Finding Type- CAR <input type="checkbox"/> CL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FAR <input type="checkbox"/>	
Stage of finding raised:	
Desk Review	<input type="checkbox"/>
On-site/remote/hybrid assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Technical Review	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Review Report by Registry	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requirement	
VCS MR Template; Version 4.4	

VCS Standard; Version 4.7, clause 3.5.5	
Non-Conformity	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) During interview of the HH, it was confirmed that the traditional cookstove is in use occasionally for the festival or family gathering. But, PP has not provided justification on the same along with the survey record of current monitoring period. 2) During onsite interviews with end-users, it was found that end-users are lacking complete awareness regarding the use and maintenance of ICS. PP needs to provide the actual maintenance plan followed onsite. 3) During onsite assessment, interviews and desk review of registered PD, it was found that some amount is charged from end users at the time of ICS distribution. However, PP has not provided the details in section 2.3.5 of the monitoring report. 	
Evidence	
Monitoring Report; version 01.1 dated 18-June-2024	
1st Response from PP	Date: 31-July-2024
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The baseline cookstove are used very minimal/occasionally during the festivals or the large family gatherings. During the monitoring survey a question related to same is asked for the better understanding of the baseline cookstove usage. The monitoring survey data is shared in ER sheet verification. Kindly refer to the worksheet monitoring survey response in workbook ER sheet version 1.3. 2) Regular visits are scheduled for inspecting sampled cookstoves by the ground field team. These visits include thorough checks for wear and tear, as well as tightening of nuts and bolts. The ground team is trained to assess cookstove usage and perform any necessary maintenance. The maintenance plan for the project activity is provided for reference. 3) A nominal fee, ranging from 150 to 300 INR depending on the location, is charged to beneficiaries. This amount is not used as revenue by the PP. Instead, it is utilized to enhance the value of the product, rather than distributing it for free. For further details, please refer to section 2.3.5 of the updated monitoring report, version 1.1. 	
Documents provided by PP for review	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maintenance plan b. Monitoring report version 1.1 c. ER sheet verification version 1.3 	
1st Review by Assessment Team	Date: 05-October-2024

1. PP has clarified that baseline cookstove are used very minimal/occasionally during the festivals or the large family gatherings. The verify this, the monitoring survey is provided where it is evidence that households are using baseline stoves only occasionally. The same was confirmed during the onsite interviews with end users. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**
2. PP has clarified in section 4.3 of MR; version 1.1, that the maintenance plan of the grouped project includes regular visits and inspection of cookstoves. The ground team is trained to assess ICS usage perform required maintenance. The same has been verified during onsite interviews with PP’s team. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**
3. PP has clarified in the revised MR; version 1.1 that some amount of money ranging from INR 150 to 300 in the form of initial cost has been charged from ICS beneficiaries to enhance the value of product and for the management of ground staff. The maintenance and other management cost is taken care by PP. It is also confirmed during onsite interviews with project staff and end users. **Hence, this is accepted and closed.**

Hence, CL#06 is closed by assessment team.

Finding No. 01-TR		Date: 16-October-2024	
Finding Type- CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		CL <input type="checkbox"/>	FAR <input type="checkbox"/>
Stage of finding raised:			
Desk Review		<input type="checkbox"/>	
On-site/remote/hybrid assessment		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Technical Review		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Project Review Report by Registry		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Requirement			
MR Template guideline version 4.4			
Non-Conformity			
File name, Font size, font colour of the MR is not adhering the guideline of MR template v4.4			

Evidence	
PP has mentioned incorrect file name, font size in section 3.1, 3.3, 4.1, font style in section 3.1 and font colour in section 2.1.1 of MR.	
1st Response from PP	Date: 17-October-2024
The file name for the monitoring report has been updated to meet the criteria according to the VCS MR template guide version 4.4. the font, font size and font colour has been updated and made consistent throughout the Monitoring report. Kindly refer to the updated monitoring report version 1.2.	
Documents provided by PP for review	
a. Monitoring report version 1.2	
1st Review by Assessment Team	Date: 22-October-2024
1. PP has updated the file name, font size, font colour following the guideline of MR template v4.4 in revised monitoring report version 1.2. Hence, this is accepted and closed.	
Hence, CAR#01-TR is closed.	

Finding No. 02-TR	Date: 16-October-2024
Finding Type- CAR <input type="checkbox"/> CL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FAR <input type="checkbox"/>	
Stage of finding raised:	
Desk Review	<input type="checkbox"/>
On-site/remote/hybrid assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Project Review Report by Registry	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requirement	
MR Template guideline version 4.4	
Non-Conformity	

<p>Clarification on selection the number of samples for both batches and value 4.83 of sub sheet “total ER” in ER Sheet version 1.1.</p>	
<p>Evidence</p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is found that there are 300 samples is for batch 1 and 100 samples is for batch 2 how PP selected the number of samples for each batch in 4.3 of MR? 2. What is value 4.83 in Sheet “Total ER”. AT has not provided assessment of estimated ER calculation? 	
<p>1st Response from PP</p>	<p>Date: 17-October-2024</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sampling of the cookstove according to the different batches has been explained under the section Sampling plan, the same is also described in the ER sheet version 1.2. kindly refer to the updated MR version 1.2 and ER sheet version 1.2. 2. The value of 4.83 is taken as per the approved PDMR for the project, the average ER per cookstove is 4.83 tCO2. the same is used for estimation of the ex-ante determination of the ER for the current monitoring period. 	
<p>Documents provided by PP for review</p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. MR version 1.2 b. ER sheet version 1.2 	
<p>1st Review by Assessment Team</p>	<p>Date: 22-October-2024</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PP has explained the sampling plan and provided clarification about the selection of samples in updated MR version 1.2 and ER sheet version 1.2 for both batches. Hence, this is accepted and closed. 2. PP has clarified that the value 4.83 is used for ER estimation as per the approved PD&MR for the project and same is used for estimation of the ex-ante determination of the ER for the current monitoring period. Hence, this is accepted and closed. 	
<p>Hence, CL#02-TR is closed.</p>	

APPENDIX 5: COMPETENCE STATEMENTS

Team Leader and Technical Expert 3.1



Certification Pvt. Ltd.

VKU.F50W. Competence Statement

COMPETENCE STATEMENT

Name	Barun Kumar
Nationality	Indian
Countries of Experience	India, South Africa, Kenya, Uganda, DR Congo, Zambia, Madagascar, Fiji, Egypt, Singapore
Educational Qualification	B.Sc. (Environmental Science and Water Management) M.Sc. (Ecology & Environmental Sciences)
Year of Experience	13 Years +
Area of Expertise	Climate Change & Environment
Eligible Sectoral Scope	SS 1 – TA 1.2 - Renewables SS 3 – TA 3.1 – Energy Demand SS 6 – TA 6.1 – Construction SS 7 – TA 7.1 – Transport SS 13 – TA 13.1 – Solid waste and wastewater SS 14 – TA 14.1 – Forestry He is a GS Approved Auditor

Roles

Project Trainee	NO
Validator/Verifier Trainee	NO
Validator	YES
Verifier	YES
Team Leader	YES
Technical Reviewer	YES
Local Expert (India)	YES
TA Expert (1.2, 3.1, 6.1, 7.1, 13.1, 14.1)	YES
Financial Expert	NO

Technical Reviewer and Technical Expert:



Certification Pvt. Ltd.

VKU.F50W. Competence Statement

COMPETENCE STATEMENT

Name	Vivek Kumar Ahirwar
Nationality	Indian
Countries of Experience	India, Madagascar, Thailand, Nepal, South Africa, Vietnam, Mozambique, Kenya, Ethiopia, Spain, Singapore, Zimbabwe, Columbia, Zambia, Libya, Indonesia, Myanmar
Educational Qualification	B.E.(Mechanical) M.Tech. (Energy Management)
Year of Experience	15 Years +
Area of Expertise	Climate Change & Environment & Industry
Eligible Sectoral Scope	SS 1 – TA 1.1 Thermal Energy & Biomass SS 1 – TA 1.2 Renewable /Non-renewable SS 2 – TA 2.1 Energy Distribution SS 3 – TA 3.1 Energy Demand SS 13 – TA 13.1 Solid Waste and Wastewater He is a GS Approved Auditor

Roles

Project Trainee	NO
Validator/Verifier Trainee	NO
Validator	YES
Verifier	YES
Team Leader	YES
Technical Reviewer	YES
Local Expert (India)	YES
TA Expert (TA 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 13.1)	YES
Financial Expert	YES

Validator/Verifier Trainee:



Certification Pvt. Ltd.

VKU.F50W. Competence Statement

COMPETENCE STATEMENT

Name	Km Nisha Chauhan
Nationality	Indian
Countries of Experience	India
Education Qualification	B.Sc. (PCM) M.Sc. (Environmental Science)
Year of Experience	1 year in VKU
Area of Expertise	Climate Change & Environment
Eligible Sectoral Scope	NA

Roles

Project Trainee	NO
Validator/Verifier Trainee	YES
Validator	NO
Verifier	NO
Team Leader	NO
Technical Reviewer	NO
Local Expert (Country Wise)	NO
TA Expert (X.X)	NO
Financial Expert	NO

Reviewed by	Vandana Gupta (Quality Manager)	Date	08.09.2023
Approved by	Vivek Kumar Ahirwar (Technical Manager)	Date	08.09.2023

Project Trainee:



Certification Pvt. Ltd.

VKU.F50W. Competence Statement

COMPETENCE STATEMENT

Name	Megha Modi
Nationality	Indian
Countries of Experience	India
Education Qualification	B.Sc. Biotechnology (Hons) M.Sc. Biotechnology
Year of Experience	Fresher
Area of Expertise	NA
Eligible Sectoral Scope	NA

Roles

Project Trainee	YES
Validator/Verifier Trainee	NO
Validator	NO
Verifier	NO
Team Leader	NO
Technical Reviewer	NO
Local Expert (Country Wise)	NO
TA Expert (X.X)	NO
Financial Expert	NO

Reviewed by	Vandana Gupta (Quality Manager)	Date	02/09/2023
Approved by	Vivek Kumar Ahirwar (Technical Manager)	Date	02/09/2023