

PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

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

Review Type	Verification
Project ID	2349
Project Name	Installation of high efficiency wood burning cookstoves in Kenya
Program(s)	VCS
Verification Period	06-October-2020 to 31-August-2021
Project Proponent	C-Quest Capital Stoves Asia Limited
Methodology	VMR0006: Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves, Version 1.1
VVB	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
Assessment Criteria	VCS Version 4
Date of First Issue	1 September 2022
Review Conclusion	Approved
Date of Final Issue	28 November 2022

FINDINGS

#	Description	Response	Status
1	<p>Project Description Deviation not described or applied correctly</p> <p><u>Issue</u> 1. The PD deviation and how it impacted additionality is not well described in the monitoring report (MR). 2. The new additionality assessment was not validated or assessed by the VVB and therefore has not been confirmed as appropriate.</p> <p><u>Action item</u> A. The VVB must ensure that Section 3.2.2 of the MR is updated per template guidelines. In that section the project proponent (PP) must clearly outline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what the deviation is and why it was required (e.g., if any stoves or materials were sold at cost to end-users, if the PP earned revenues from any additional sources other than the sale of VCUs, etc.) • how/if the deviation impacted the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario • The VVB must provide with track changed version of the PD highlighting the changes made in reference to the deviation. <p>C. The VVB must provide their assessment in Section 3.3 of the verification report (VR) based on the updates to the additionality in the revised MR and the PD.</p> <p><u>Program rule(s) or methodology section</u> VCS Standard, v4.3 Section 3.19.2, 3.19.4, 3.4.3 and 4.1.14</p> <p><u>Background (optional)</u></p>	<p>Round 1: VVB Response: 1)PP has provided the revised MR. Section 3.2.2 has been revised and is described clearly on the impacted additionality. 2) New Additionality is been assessed by the VVB and the revised validation report has been submitted.</p> <p>VVB has checked and verified the section 3.2.2 of the MR and this has been updated as per the template guideline, and PP has clearly stated the deviation. Also track change version of the PD has been submitted.</p> <p>VVB has revised the section 3.3 of the verification report and same has been submitted.</p> <p>Verra Review: This finding is closed and no further action is required.</p>	Closed

Since a PD deviation was applied the PP submitted an updated PD along with the required verification and monitoring documents. Submitting an updated, unvalidated PD is not in line with the VCS Standard or process. A PD deviation is designed to allow the PP to make changes to the PD without submitting a new report.

2 The no net harm section must be updated to reflect the impact of PD deviation

Issue

The impact of the applied PD deviation (providing stoves at cost to the end-user or earning revenue from sources other than VCU sales) has socio-economic implications that are not described in the No Net Harm section.

Action item

A. The VVB must ensure Section 2.1 of the MR is updated to identify any potential environmental and socio-economic impacts of the applied PD deviation, as well as the steps taken by the PP to mitigate them.

B. The VVB must update Section 4.2.1 of the VR to describe how a remote audit sufficiently confirmed the impacts of charging for stoves or stove materials.

Program rule(s) or methodology section

VCS Standard, v4.3, Section 3.17, 3.17.2, 3.4.3 and 4.1.14

Round 1:

VVB Response:

VVB through end users' interview could clarify that just 2000 end users were charged with a small amount of one-time charges. However, due to charging of the small amount, around 300 Kenyan shillings, to 2000 households just for the bricks that is used for construction of the stoves, did not affect the end users much, as it was a onetime payment. Also, PP has now changed the implementation partners and hence the stoves are now distributed free of cost to the end users. The section 4.2.1 of the verification report now describes the details.

Verra Review: This finding is closed and no further action is required.

Closed

3 GHG ERR quantification sections must be presented such that the calculations are reproducible

Issue

Sections 5.1 - 5.4 in the MR do not present calculations with enough detail to allow a reader to reproduce them

Action item

The VVB must ensure that Section 5.1-5.4 in the MR are updated so that calculations are reproducible, and so that a reader can clearly follow how the project proponent calculated the baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage and net GHG ERRs.

Round 1:

VVB Response:

PP has submitted the revised MR; the calculation is now presented clearly under section 5.4.

Verra Review: This finding is closed and no further action is required.

Closed

Currently, some calculations are provided in Section 5.4, but it is not evident how the baseline emissions or net GHG ERR values were generated.

Program rule(s) or methodology section
VCS Standard, v4.3 Section 3.14, 3.4.3 and 4.1.14

4 It is not clear how the project proponent has taken due account of any/all input received during ongoing communication

Issue

The MR does not clearly indicate what input has been received during the current monitoring period/ongoing communication, and how due account has been taken.

Action item

The VVB must ensure Section 2.2 of the MR is updated to describe how due account has been taken of all and any input received during the monitoring period. The VVB must also provide verra with a copy of the survey results spreadsheet with a full list of all stakeholder concerns.

Program rule(s) or methodology section
VCS Standard, v4.3 Section 3.17.4, 3.17.5, 3.4.3 and 4.1.14

Round 1:

VVB Response:
 PP has submitted the revised MR, section 2.2 clearly states the ongoing communication and the full list of the stakeholder concerns has been provided in the section 2.2 of the MR. This has been checked by the verification team. VR has been updated in this regard.

Verra Review: This finding is closed, and no further action is required.

Closed

5 Lack of information on how remote audit was conducted

Issue

The VR does not contain sufficient information on how the audit was conducted remotely given that there were also substantial changes impacting the additionality of the project.

Action item

- A. The VVB must update relevant sections in the VR to provide:
- information on how all monitored parameters and any parameters impacted by the change to the additionality demonstration (e.g., Bold, Nold) were checked during audit.

Round 1:

VVB Response:
 VVB has revised the section 2.2 of the verification report. Also, section 2.3 of the verification report has been updated with the topic and questions discussed during the remote interviews.

Verra Review: This finding is closed, and no further action is required.

Closed

- how the global database was checked and how the VVB verified the information flow for all the monitoring parameters.

B. The VVB must also update Section 2.3 of the VR to indicate the topics and questions discussed during interviews. Currently this information is missing for end users and some other interviewee types.

Program rule(s) or methodology section

VCS Standard, v4.3 Section 3.19.2, 3.19.3, 3.19.4, 4.1, 3.4.3 and 4.1.14