

PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

This project review report includes findings raised during Verra's review of the project specified below. The VVB must address the findings before the project request can be considered for approval by Verra. The project review report will be made publicly available on the Verra Registry. Confidential information may be provided in separate attachments.

Project ID	4219
Project Name	Improved Cookstoves in Liberia
Review Type	Registration
Program(s)	VCS Program
Verification Period	N/A
Project Proponent	Carbonibus S.r.l
Methodology	VMR0006: Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves, Version 1.1
VVB	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
Assessment Criteria	VCS standard v4.4
Date of First Issue	03 July 2023
Review Conclusion	Approved
Date of Final Issue	15 August 2023

FINDINGS

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
1	Parameter η_{old} is not monitored according to the methodology <u>Issue</u> According to VMR0006, η_{old} must be a monitored parameter fixed at project implementation, however, the project description includes it as a fixed parameter under Section 5.1. Additionally, since part of the implementation will be after project registration, it is unclear what information was used to determine η_{old}. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent includes η_{old} as a monitored parameter fixed at project implementation in accordance with VMR0006 v1.1. 2. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent justifies the source of η_{old}. 3. The VVB must assess this in the validation report. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VMR0006 V1.1, Section 9.2 VCS Project Description Template, v4.2, Section 4.4 VCS Validation Report Template v4.1, Sections 3.3.8	Round 1 <u>VVB Response:</u> The parameter η_{old}, as per the methodology VMR0006 ver 1.1, page 19 (in conjugation with AMS II.G. version 11.1), provides two source options: i) Default value: 0.1 or 0.2; or ii) Surveyed prior to implementation of project activity The project activity uses the option i) default values, to define η_{old} values for project beneficiaries rather than conducting survey prior to implementation of the project activity. The use of default value for η_{old} therefore, renders the parameter value to be fixed ex-ante at validation (either 0.1 or 0.2) rather than being monitored. Further the monitoring frequency of the parameter η_{old} is “Fixed for each individual household at the time of project implementation”. Here the project implementation is deemed as the installation / distribution of the first ICS in the project and not at the time of each project ICS distribution over the project’s lifetime. Thus, this makes the information to be available before the project implementation and not after implementation (which also resonates with the source that refers to determining the value using surveys prior to project implementation). Thus, even in case of option ii), η_{old} shall only be determined once in the first year of the entire crediting period, for cases where a project implementation starts after closure of validation / registration. More clarity on expected monitoring requirements, is provided by AMS II.G ver 12 (subsequent version), Section 5.2., Page 19, for parameter η_{old}. Page 19 of AMS II.G. ver 12.0, clearly states that “there is no	Closed

		need to determine baseline efficiency for each individual household when including in the project activity database” substantiating the aforesaid for option ii). In the project activity, the value of 0.1 shall be used for ICS beneficiaries using woodfuel (as their baseline pertains to using woodfuel on traditional wood stoves / three stone fires) and 0.2 shall be used for ICS beneficiaries using charcoal (as their baseline pertains to using charcoal on traditional coal pots). By fixing the parameter value ex-ante the PP is committed to using defaults values only as specified above and no other value for ex-post ER calculations. 1. As justified by the PP, the project activity applies option i), i.e., Default values for the parameter η_{old} which has been fixed ex-ante in the PD. The project shall capture the baseline technology at the time of each ICS distribution and shall not include any ICS in the project ICS distribution database, in case the baseline device is an improved stove. Thus, the project shall only involve replacement of traditional / inefficient stoves in the baseline. Therefore, the application of default values for η_{old}, (0.1 for woodfuel and 0.2 for charcoal) is deemed correct. Further, given these two values shall remain fixed for the crediting period i.e. a value of 0.1 shall be applied for all woodfuel ICS and a value of 0.2 shall be applied for all charcoal ICS, hence the VVB team deems it fit to be fixed ex-ante in the PD. Thus, the justification provided by the PP is deemed acceptable by the validation team. 2. In accordance with the justification provided by the PP, the source of the values applied for the parameter η_{old} is the default values as per the applied methodology. Further, as explained in the response above, fixing these values ex-ante at validation is deemed appropriate.. 3. This has been checked by the validation team and is included under section 3.3.8 of the validation report.	
--	--	---	--

		<u>Verra Response</u> Justification has been provided and the project proponent has confirmed that the households using ICS in the baseline will be excluded. The project shall only involve replacement of traditional / inefficient stoves in the baseline. Therefore, the application of default values for η_{old} , (0.1 for woodfuel and 0.2 for charcoal) is deemed correct. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.	
2	The monitoring plan is incomplete		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 5.3 of the project description does not mention the following aspects of the monitoring plan. - Organizational structure and responsibilities or personnel - Policies for oversight and accountability - Procedures for internal auditing and QA/QC - Procedures for handling non-conformances with validated monitoring plan <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent includes all information in the monitoring plan. 2. The VVB must corroborate this in the validation report. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Monitoring Report Template, v4.2, Section 5.3 VCS Verification Report Template v4.2, Sections 3.3.8.	<u>Round 1</u> <u>VVB Response</u> PP has now included the required information in the monitoring plan under section 5.3 of the PD. This has been included under section 3.1 of the validation report. <u>Verra Response</u> This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.	Closed
3	Mechanism for on-going communication with stakeholders is not assessed		
	<u>Issue</u> The VVB does not assess the mechanism for ensuring ongoing communication with project stakeholders described by the project proponent. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must assess the mechanism for ensuring ongoing	<u>Round 1</u> <u>VVB Response</u> As a part of on-going communication with local stakeholders, end users were informed during the stakeholder consultation about the feedback register (for ongoing communication) which is maintained at the local office locations of the PP. Also, during the stakeholder	Closed

	communication with project stakeholders described by the project proponent. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS standard v4.4, Section 3.18.4 VCS Validation Report v4.2, Section 3.2.2	consultation, the PP shared the contact details (phone number and email id) to facilitate on going communication with the stakeholders. Thus, it was explained during the stakeholder meeting that end users/stakeholders are free to share feedback / concerns as part of on-going communication regarding the project activity in the feedback register. Any relevant concerns received during operation of project activity, shall be addressed by the PP according to its merit. The validation team evaluated and confirmed the ongoing communication mechanism described by the project proponent, based on interviews with local stakeholders during on-site audit. This is now included in Section 3.2.2 of the validation report. <u>Verra Response</u> The validation report has been updated to include this information on the grievance mechanism. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.	
--	--	--	--

4 Inconsistency in the project description and validation report			
	<u>Issue</u> Page 11 of the validation report states that “this project aims ICS distribution of 500,000 per year over the crediting period.” However, this is not consistent with the implementation plan described in Section 1.1 of the project description. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must correct this inconsistency in the validation report. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Project Description Template v4.2, Section 3.1	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> Section 1.1 of the project description states the year-wise Proposed Implementation Plan, the total of which is 500,000 ICS distribution in Liberia over the crediting period. This has been revised in section 3.1 (page 11) of the validation report. <u>Verra Response</u> Revisions have been made. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.	closed