

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	2351
Project Name	Installation of high efficiency wood burning cookstoves in Mozambique
Review Type	Verification
Program(s)	VCS Program
Monitoring Period	01 September 2021 – 28 February 2022
Project Proponent	C-Quest Capital SGS Stoves Private Limited
Methodology	VMR0006: Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves, Version 1.1
VVB	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
Assessment Criteria	VCS Standard, v4.4
Date of First Issue	03 August 2023
Review Conclusion	Approved
Date of Final Issue	29 September 2023

FINDINGS

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
1	Insufficient project location information and KML file missing in the Registry		
	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Section 1.7 of the monitoring report does not include sufficient information about the project location of the instances included in this monitoring period. The information is general. The project proponent has not submitted a KML file in the Registry as per <i>VCS Standard v4.4, section 3.11.1</i> requirements. <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The VVB must ensure that the project proponent updates Section 1.7 of the monitoring report to include sufficient additional geographic information on the location of the project activity instances to enable evidence gathering by the VVB. Further, the VVB must demonstrate how they assessed the location of the initial project instances. The project proponent must submit a KML file as per VCS Standard requirements. The VVB must assess that the KML file submitted by the project proponent meets VCS Standard requirements. <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>VCS Standard, v4.4, section 3.11.1.</i></p>	<p>Round 1</p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <p>1.PP has updated section 1.7 of the MR, additional geographic information on the location of the project activity instances along with location of the province in which instances has been added in the MR.</p> <p>2.PP submitted a KML file corresponding to the location of initial project instances. VVB assessed the KML and cross-verified latitude/longitude of the samples with the End user agreements and found acceptable.</p> <p>3.PP has submitted KML file for the Republic of Mozambique as per VCS Standard v4.4 requirements.</p> <p>4.VVB assessed the KML file submitted and it met the VCS Standard v4.4 requirement, para 3.11.1.(2)(b) and 3.11.1.(3).</p> <p><u>Verra Response</u></p> <p>Finding sub-sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 above have been reviewed and accepted. The finding is closed.</p>	Closed

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
2	Lack of clarity in section 3.1 of the monitoring report		
	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>Section 3.1 of the monitoring report does not provide clarity on</p>	<p>Round 1</p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p>	

<p>the timeline of the distribution of cookstoves/project activity instances (PAIs) during this monitoring period.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u> The VVB is required to ensure that section 3.1 of the monitoring report provides clarity on the timeline of the inclusion of PAIs.</p> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> Section 3.1, VCS Monitoring Report Template v4.2</p>	<p>PP has updated the section 3.1 of the monitoring report with clarity on the timeline of Inclusion of PAIs in the current monitoring period. PP has added year wise number of stoves installed/added for Year 2021 and 2022.</p>	<p>Closed</p>
	<p><u>Verra Response</u> The changes made have been accepted. The finding is closed.</p>	

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
3	<p>Incomplete assessment of project eligibility criteria and it is unclear how the VVB verified <i>bold</i> during the onsite audit</p>	<p>Unclear how the VVB verified <i>bold</i> during the onsite audit</p>	
	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In section 3.3 of the monitoring report, the project proponent has not completed the eligibility criteria requirements as per VCS Standard v4.4, section 3.6.16 and 3.6.17. In section 3.4 of the verification report, it is unclear how the VVB verified during its onsite audit the operationality of all ICS during this monitoring period. In section 3.4 of the verification report, is it unclear how the VVB verified during its on-site audit that the project activity instances added during the current verification were distributed at zero cost to meet the additionality criteria. In section 3.4 of the verification report, it is unclear how the VVB verified during its on-site audit that the baseline cookstoves were not used. In Section 4.1 of the verification report, in the table “Data parameters fixed ex-ante and available at validation are given below”, number 5, it is unclear how the VVB verified the 10 percent default value for <i>bold</i> 	<p><u>Round 1</u></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The project proponent has updated section 3.3 of the monitoring report to include all eligibility criteria for the inclusion of new project activity instances as per VCS Standard requirements v4.4. The VVB assessed the eligibility criteria updated by the project proponent and VVB has updated section 3.4 of the verification report accordingly. In section 3.4 of the verification report, the VVB has included detailed information on the assessment performed(interviews) during its onsite audit to verify that the ICS were distributed at Zero-cost/No cost to the beneficiary. It was also noted that all ICS samples visited by VVB were operational. In section 3.4 of the verification report, the VVB has included detailed information on the assessment (interviews)performed during its onsite audit to verify that the ICS distributed to the beneficiary were provided at zero cost to meet the additionality criteria. 	<p>Closed</p>

<p>during the onsite audit. The information is general, and it does not describe how the VVB assessed the baseline during the onsite audit.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent updates section 3.3 of the monitoring report to include all eligibility criteria for the inclusion of new project activity instances as per VCS Standard requirements. 2. The VVB must assess the eligibility criteria updated by the project proponent and update section 3.4 of the verification report accordingly. 3. In section 3.4 of the verification report, the VVB must include detailed information on the assessment performed during its onsite audit to verify that 100% of the ICS are operational. 4. In section 3.4 of the verification report, the VVB must include detailed information on the assessment performed during its onsite audit to verify that the ICS distributed during the current monitoring period were provided at zero cost to meet the additionality criteria. 5. In section 3.4 of the verification report, the VVB must include detailed information on the assessment performed during its onsite audit to verify that the baseline cookstoves were not used by the end users. 6. In section 4.1 of the verification report, the VVB must describe how it assessed the baseline during the onsite audit to apply the 10 percent default value for <i>ηold</i>. <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> Sections 3.6.16 and 3.6.17, VCS Standard v4.4</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. In section 3.4 of the verification report, the VVB has included detailed information on the assessment performed (interview and onsite photographs) during its onsite audit to verify that the baseline cookstoves were not used by the end users. 6. In section 4.1 of the verification report, the VVB has described how it assessed the baseline during the onsite audit to apply the 10 percent default value for <i>ηold</i>. <p>The changes made have been reviewed and accepted. The finding is closed.</p>	
--	---	--

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
---	---------------------	--------------	--------

4	Incorrect name of the project proponent listed in section 1.4 of the verification report		
	<p><u>Issue</u> In Section 1.4 of the verification report, the VVB reports the incorrect name of the project proponent as C-Quest Capital Stoves Asia Limited. Whereas section 1.5 of the monitoring report lists C-Quest Capital SGS Stoves Private Limited as the name of the project proponent.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u> The VVB is required to provide the correct name of the project proponent in section 1.4 of the verification report.</p> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> N/A</p>	<p>Round 1</p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <p>Project Proponent has been made consistent in the verification report and the monitoring report. PP has taken a deviation for the same in Section 3.2.2 of MR which has been assessed by VVB in Section 3.3 of the Verification Report.</p>	Closed
		<p><u>Verra Response</u></p> <p>The project deviation, as well as Accession and Partial Release Representations have been reviewed and accepted. The finding is closed.</p>	

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
5	VVB statement in Section 2.6 of the verification report		
	<p><u>Issue</u> In section 2.6 of the verification report, the VVB states that they have not undertaken validation activities, while, as per VCS Standard v4.4, section 4.1.25, the inclusion of new instances is a validation activity. There are requirements for validation activities.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u> The VVB must amend section 2.6 of the verification report to align with VCS Standard v4.4, section 4.1.25.</p> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Standard v4.4, section 4.1.25 VCS Standard v4.5, section 4.1.29 VCS Program Guide v4.4, section 5</p>	<p>Round 1</p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <p>VKU Certification Private Ltd. currently does not hold the accreditation for Validation. It is currently undergoing validation accreditation for which the witness audit was conducted on 04-September-2023 and 05-September-2023. We are hoping to receive the accreditation soon.</p> <p>Section 2.6 of the revised FVR has been amended to include the requirements against which the validation of eligibility of any new project activity instances included under this grouped project during this monitoring period has been carried out in accordance with the VCS Standard v4.4, section 4.1.25 and VCS Program Guide v4.3, section 5.</p>	Closed

		<u>Verra Response</u> The changes have been reviewed and accepted because Verra made an exemption.	
--	--	---	--