

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	4661
Project Name	SMG - Cookstove Program 20
Review Type	Registration & Verification Approval
Program(s)	VCS Program
Verification Period	01/01/2023 – 30/09/2023
Project Proponent	Shri Maa Marketing Private Limited.
Methodology	VMR0006: Energy efficiency and fuel switch measures in thermal application v1.2.
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A.
Assessment Criteria	VCS Standard, v4.5
Date of First Issue	07/06/2024
Review Conclusion	Approved
Date of Final Issue	0711/2024

FINDINGS

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
1	Incomplete eligibility criteria		
	<u>Issue</u> - The JPD&MR in section 1.4 does not show how the project meets paragraph 3.6.17 (7&8) of the VCS Standard v4.5. <u>Action Required</u> - The VVB must ensure that the JPD&MR lists and complies with all the eligibility criteria. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Standard v4.5; section 3.6.17 (7&8).	<u>Round 1</u> <u>VVB Response</u> VVB team verified that; PP has revised Section 1.4 of JPD&MR to ensure full compliance with all eligibility criteria, including those specified in paragraphs 3.6.17 (7&8) of the VCS Standard v4.5. The eligibility criteria outlined in these paragraphs and their descriptions have been updated accordingly. Consequently, the assessment team ensures that the JPD&MR now complies with all eligibility criteria mentioned in the VMR006 methodology, and the assessment regarding this compliance is provided in section 3.1 of the JVVR. <u>Verra Response</u> The PP has revised the JPD&MR and included all the eligibility criteria under Section 3.6.17 of the VCS Standard. The issue is closed.	Closed
2	Incomplete information on the project description		
	<u>Issue</u> - The project has not provided complete information on baseline stove efficiency and how it was determined in the JPD&MR. - The project description in the JPD&MR is unclear whether each family will receive one stove or multiple stoves. Additionally, no information is provided if one project stove is enough to meet the energy demands of end users (levels of services) for cases where the	<u>Round 1</u> <u>VVB Response</u> The PP has provided detailed information on baseline stove efficiency (Section 6.1 of the JPD&MR, parameter table η_{old}), demonstrating that stove efficiency is assessed through the Water Boiling Test (WBT) in accordance with the guidelines specified in Table 2: Data/Parameter $\eta_{PJ,BL}$, Section 9.2 of VMR0006 Energy Efficiency and Fuel Switch Measures in Thermal Application v1.2.	Closed

	baseline was two stoves. 3. The project boundary has another project activity being included by the same project entity (VCS No. 3771); however, how double counting will be avoided has not been discussed in relation to this project. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project provides comprehensive information on how the baseline stove efficiency is determined and the appropriateness of the values chosen. 2. The VVB must ensure that the project provides complete information on whether the stove provided can meet all the household energy needs. 3. The VVB must ensure there is transparency on project crediting by the project proponent, how double counting will be prevented from other projects by the same PP, and how the VVB validated it. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Joint Project Description & Monitoring Report, v4.2 AMS-II. G: Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass, v13.1	In accordance with version 4.2.3 of the WBT Protocol mentioned in the applied methodology¹ a minimum of three project devices with three tests per device were evaluated by a third-party accredited laboratory (Maulana Azad National Institute of Technology). The samples were randomly selected from the Baseline survey conducted. Assessment regarding the same provided under section 3.4.8 of JVVR. 2. PP has now provided the complete information under section 1.13 and 3.4 of JPD&MR that how the project activity will meet the energy demand of each household by replacing baseline stove with project stove as according to baseline survey report submitted by PP shows that each household have family size of 5 peoples and only one baseline stove was used. the Project activity aims to reduce the baseline technology with the project technology. Hence only one stove is provided which is deemed sufficient to meet the energy demands of end users. 3. The double counting issue is avoided across all projects via the Unique Serial no. embedded on the metal plate on each project stove, Same is properly explained in section 1.11 under heading” Data collection of the ICS end-user” of JPDMR. The project proponent also shares the project database with the VVB containing the unique serial numbers. Hence, despite having overlapping boundaries no double counting occurs across different projects. Same has been included in section 3.1 of the joint validation and verification report.	
--	--	--	--

¹ <https://cleancooking.org/research-evidence-learning/standards-testing/protocols>

		<u>Verra Response</u> 1. The PP and the VVB have provided more information on how the efficiency of the baseline stove is established. The information provided is deemed sufficient. The issue is closed. 2. The VVB has clarified that the project stove is able to meet the energy demand of the households. More information has been provided in sections 1.13 and 3.4 of the JPD&MR. The issue is closed. 3. The PP and VVB have clarified how double counting is avoided, considering that the project developer has other projects registered with Verra and operating within the same region. The double counting is avoided by having each stove with a unique serial number entered in their respective project database, and the database is shared with the verifying VVB for checks. The explanation is acceptable. The issue is closed.	
--	--	--	--

3 Inconsistency in the description of conditions prior to project activity			
3	<u>Issue</u> 1. The project does not provide empirical data on the baseline survey that was carried out. 2. The project does not identify the relevant laws and statutes and demonstrates how it complies with them in line with the filling guidelines of the JPD&MR template in section 1.14. 3. Section 1.13 states that baseline stoves are used for room heating, as per the survey findings. The project has not confirmed whether the project stove being distributed can meet the room heating needs of end users.	<u>Round 1</u>	Closed
		<u>VVB Response</u> 1. Baseline survey responses, analysis and data in accordance with Appendix – 2 of AMS. II. G v13.0 are submitted as supporting document by PP and included in the ER sheet as well. 2. PP has now updated the section 1.14 in the JPD&MR and further there are no mandatory laws and regulations in the host country (India) regarding the use of improved cookstoves in India. The project include distribution of cookstove is completely voluntary. 3. As the project stoves are moveable, beneficiaries can relocate it within the premises as per the needs and room	
		<u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must submit or include the baseline and project survey analysis and data in the ERR sheet,	

	the raw and analysed data on types of fuel, types of stoves, fuel quantities, poverty levels, etc., that formed the basis for arriving at the baseline scenario. - The VVB must ensure that the project identifies all the relevant laws and statutes and demonstrates how it complies with them. - The VVB must describe how it validated that the project would meet all the needs of the end users and that the baseline stove will not continue to be used for room heating. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Joint Project Description & Monitoring Report, v4.2; section 1.13 and 1.14.	heating requirements. The PP has been included the same in Section 1.11 of JPD&MR and further VVB team validated and confirmed during interview with the beneficiary. Thus accepted. <u>Verra Response</u> - The PP has updated the JPD&MR and the VVB has confirmed that the baseline survey was checked and confirmed to be correct. The issue is closed. - The JPD&MR has been updated in section 1.14, and it is confirmed that there are no mandatory laws and regulations in the host country regarding the use of improved cookstoves. The issue is closed. - The PP and the VVB have confirmed that the project is portable and can be easily moved within the household to provide room heating needs when needed. The issue is closed.	
--	--	--	--

4	Incomplete stakeholders' consultation		
	<u>Issue</u> - Section 2.2 of the JPD&MR does not provide the following information: - The procedures or methods used for documenting the outcomes of the local stakeholder consultation. - The mechanism for ongoing communication with local stakeholders. - How has the due account of all and any input received during the consultation been taken? Include details on any updates to the project design or justify why updates are not appropriate.	<u>Round 1</u> <u>VVB Response</u> VVB team verified that: PP has now updated Section 2.2. of the JPD&MR to address the specified topics with respect to stakeholder consultation and engagement. The information provided complies with the guideline outlined in Joint Project Description & Monitoring Report, v4.2 <u>Verra Response</u> The JPD&MR has been updated. However, no new information has been provided and the following information is missing: - The procedures or methods used for documenting the outcomes of the local stakeholder consultation. - The mechanism for ongoing communication with local stakeholders. - How has the due account of all and any input received	Closed

	<u>Action Required</u>	during the consultation been taken? Include details on any updates to the project design or justify why updates are not appropriate	
	1. The VVB must ensure that the JPD&MR has all the information on how stakeholders' consultation and engagement was carried out and adheres to VCS Joint Project Description & Monitoring Report, v4.2, filling guidelines.	The issue is open.	
	<u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Joint Project Description & Monitoring Report, v4.2; section 2.2. VCS Standard v4.5; section 3.18.2.	Round 2	
		<u>VVB Response</u> (Pending) 1. The procedures or methods used for documenting the outcomes of the local stakeholder consultation is updated. 2. The mechanism for ongoing communication with local stakeholders is updated in the section 2.2 of JPD&MR which is found to be consistent as checked against the stakeholder consultation documents by the VVB. 3. Stakeholder Input received during the consultation is now incorporated in the JPD&MR version 1.5, which is found to be consistent as checked against the stakeholder consultation documents by the VVB.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> 1. The has updated the revised JPDMR and provided procedures used for documenting stakeholders outcomes, mechanism for ongoing communication and how input received was considered. The issue is closed.	

5	Public comments are not covered.		
	<u>Issue</u>	Round 1	Closed
	1. One comment was received during the public comment period. However, section 2.4 of the JPD&MR has not discussed how the project considered the comment received.	<u>VVB Response</u> VVB team verified that; there were no public comment was received during the commenting period respective project, same has been crossed checked with the project registry page under the 'VCS OTHER DOCUMENTS' section (https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/4661) same has been updated in section 3.3.4 of JVW report.	
	<u>Action Required</u>		
	1. The VVM must ensure that all comments received during and after the public comment are listed and		

	discussed. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Joint Project Description & Monitoring Report, v4.2; sections 2.4. VCS Standard, v4.5; Section 3.18.12 - 3.18.14.	<u>Verra Response</u> 1. The project received 1 comment which was not specific and was not made public and accessible to VVB. The issue is closed.	
--	--	---	--

6	The baseline scenario has not been justified.		
	<u>Issue</u> 1. The JPD&MR in section 3.4 states, "The baseline scenario sample size, identification, and outcomes are explained in section 1.13"; however, section 1.13 does not discuss sample size, identification, or outcomes. 2. The project has not explained nor justified key assumptions, rationale and methodological choices used in the JPD&MR. 3. The baseline is determined for the whole state of Madhya Pradesh, where another project, VCS No.3771, is also requesting registration and whose project boundary is the entire state. However, the parameter $B_{y=1, new, I, survey}$ differs for the two projects. Considering that the project instances will be distributed within the state without a rigid boundary between the two projects, the two baselines should be similar. <u>Action Required</u>	<u>Round 1</u> <u>VVB Response</u> 1. The VVB has cross- checked baseline scenario sample size, identification and outcome with the detailed report on baseline survey submitted by PP and found acceptable, Moreover Section 3.4 is now updated with relevant information in JPD&MR. Assessment regarding the same provided in section 3.1 of JVVR. 2. The VVB has cross-checked the JPD&MR and found that PP has now updated the Section 3.4 of information ON Assumptions for establishment of baseline scenario are based upon results of baseline survey designed in line with appendix 2 of AMS. II. G v13.0. The project applies VMR0006 v1.2 in conjunction with AMS. II. G v13.0 and the applicability are defined in section 3.2 of JPD&MR. 3. The VVB has reviewed the baseline fuel consumption calculation and observed that the project has chosen option 3: Water boiling test as defined in "para 32 of AMS. II. G v13.0" to calculate $B_{y, savings, i, j}$ and accordingly there is no calculation required for baseline fuel consumption.	Closed

	1. The VVB must provide how they validated the baseline identified by the project and verified and cross-checked the key assumptions and values applied. 2. The VVB must ensure the JPD&MR provides and explains key assumptions, rationale and methodological choices. 3. The VVB shall review the baseline fuel consumption and assess why the two projects have different fuel savings, considering they have the same baseline and project boundary for the whole state. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Joint Project Description & Monitoring Report, v4.2; sections 1.13 and 3.4.	The value of $B_{y=1, new, I, survey}$ is the Quantity of woody biomass used by project devices in tonnes per device of type i and batch j (tonnes) which is entirely dependent on the monitored sample taken from the project database. So, the monitored sample for the projects i.e. 3771 and 4661 are different respective to the related project database. Hence the average fuel consumption of the monitored value is different for both projects. For conservative calculations, the PP has calculated baseline fuelwood consumption through representative questionnaire and In - person interviews conducted. Due to difference in target beneficiaries, sample population and fuel consumption between the two projects, hence the baseline fuel consumption are different. Please note: The methodology AMS-II.G.: Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass version referred is v13.0 as the submission of the project activity document was done on-29 Feb-2024. For the same date v13.0 was enforced. The clarification changes on the latest version AMS-II.G.: Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass version 13.1 was enforced from 05-Mar-2024.	
--	--	--	--

		Version 13.1 Sectoral scope(s): 03 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Document information</th></tr> <tr> <th>Version</th><th>Date</th><th>Description</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>13.1</td><td>5 March 2024</td><td>Editorial revisions to correct the best practice example under box 6.</td></tr> <tr> <td>13.0</td><td>8 September 2022</td><td>EB 115, Annex 11 Revision to: - Introduce a reference to TOOL33; - Ensure the consistency in definitions of market penetration metrics and thresholds. </td></tr> <tr> <td>12.0</td><td>14 December 2020</td><td>EB 108, Annex 10 Revision to include best practice examples for stove stacking.</td></tr> <tr> <td>11.1</td><td>5 June 2020</td><td>Editorial revisions to correct cross-references throughout the document.</td></tr> <tr> <td>11.0</td><td>28 November 2019</td><td>EB 105, Annex 8 Revision to: - Introduce regional default fossil fuel emission factors and an alternative for the project participant to calculate the fossil fuel emission factor, as explained in CDM-MP80-A16; - Clarify monitoring requirements; - Include non-binding best-practice examples; - Incorporate the responses to clarification requests: SSC_733, SSC_739, SSC_742, SSC_743, SSC_744, SSC_746, SSC_752, SSC_753, SSC_759 and SSC_760. </td></tr> <tr> <td>10.0</td><td>31 August 2018</td><td>EB 100, Annex 12 Revision to include simplified provision for automatic additionality (if market penetration is less than or equal to 5 percent).</td></tr> <tr> <td>09.0</td><td>1 November 2017</td><td>EB 97, Annex 11</td></tr> </tbody> </table> Verra Response 1. Section 3.4 of the JPDMR has been updated, and information on sample size was provided. It is also stated that the baseline survey report was made available to the validating VVB. However, a summary of the baseline survey is not provided in the JPDMR. The issue is open. 2. The JPDMR has been updated, and assumptions made included. The issue is closed. 3. The PP and the VVB have clarified the different fuel consumption values for two projects by the same PP in the state. The difference in numbers is due to different samples being used. The approach taken is in line with the applied methodology. The issue is closed. Round 2	Document information			Version	Date	Description	13.1	5 March 2024	Editorial revisions to correct the best practice example under box 6.	13.0	8 September 2022	EB 115, Annex 11 Revision to: - Introduce a reference to TOOL33; - Ensure the consistency in definitions of market penetration metrics and thresholds.	12.0	14 December 2020	EB 108, Annex 10 Revision to include best practice examples for stove stacking.	11.1	5 June 2020	Editorial revisions to correct cross-references throughout the document.	11.0	28 November 2019	EB 105, Annex 8 Revision to: - Introduce regional default fossil fuel emission factors and an alternative for the project participant to calculate the fossil fuel emission factor, as explained in CDM-MP80-A16; - Clarify monitoring requirements; - Include non-binding best-practice examples; - Incorporate the responses to clarification requests: SSC_733, SSC_739, SSC_742, SSC_743, SSC_744, SSC_746, SSC_752, SSC_753, SSC_759 and SSC_760.	10.0	31 August 2018	EB 100, Annex 12 Revision to include simplified provision for automatic additionality (if market penetration is less than or equal to 5 percent).	09.0	1 November 2017	EB 97, Annex 11
Document information																													
Version	Date	Description																											
13.1	5 March 2024	Editorial revisions to correct the best practice example under box 6.																											
13.0	8 September 2022	EB 115, Annex 11 Revision to: - Introduce a reference to TOOL33; - Ensure the consistency in definitions of market penetration metrics and thresholds.																											
12.0	14 December 2020	EB 108, Annex 10 Revision to include best practice examples for stove stacking.																											
11.1	5 June 2020	Editorial revisions to correct cross-references throughout the document.																											
11.0	28 November 2019	EB 105, Annex 8 Revision to: - Introduce regional default fossil fuel emission factors and an alternative for the project participant to calculate the fossil fuel emission factor, as explained in CDM-MP80-A16; - Clarify monitoring requirements; - Include non-binding best-practice examples; - Incorporate the responses to clarification requests: SSC_733, SSC_739, SSC_742, SSC_743, SSC_744, SSC_746, SSC_752, SSC_753, SSC_759 and SSC_760.																											
10.0	31 August 2018	EB 100, Annex 12 Revision to include simplified provision for automatic additionality (if market penetration is less than or equal to 5 percent).																											
09.0	1 November 2017	EB 97, Annex 11																											

		<u>VVB Response</u> (Pending) 1. A summary of the baseline survey is provided in the section 3.4 of the JPD&MR version 1.5, which as confirmed against the baseline survey submitted by PP, hence accepted by VVB. Moreover, the baseline survey sample size is added in section 6.3 of the revised JPD-MR.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> 1. The JPD&MR has been updated and information on sample size determination is now provided. The issue is closed.	

7	Inconsistencies in the emission reduction calculations		
	<u>Issue</u> 1. On page 37 of the JPD&MR, the baseline stove efficiency is taken as 12.7%. At the same time, in the ER sheet tab Data & Parameters, the source of the value is indicated as "Test results from accredited laboratories following national or international standards as per VMR0006 v1.2". It is not clear how this test was carried out. Additionally, sections 3.4 or 1.13 of the JPD&MR do not contain information on baseline stove efficiency. 2. On PD pages 37 and 49, the estimated wood biomass consumption in households is ~4.02kg; however, in the ERR sheet, data and parameters tab, cell E27, the value applied is 4.55kg/day. 3. The PP has not submitted or included the f_{NRB} calculation sheet in the ERR sheet to allow for third-party checks. 4. On page 49 of the JPD&MR, the Biomass Savings Tonn/year is 1.47, while in the ER Sheet Data and Parameters tab, cell E28, it is 2.8246. 5. The ERR sheet does not provide steps for estimating the ex-ante ERRs, vintage-wise values, and	<u>Round 1</u>	Closed
		<u>VVB Response</u> 1. The VVB has cross- checked the revised JPD&MR and found that the baseline fuel efficiency is calculated and fixed as per the guideline prescribed in "Table 2: Data/parameter $h_{PJ,BL}$ in Section 9.2 of VMR0006 Energy efficiency and fuel switch measures in Thermal applications v1.2." option (b): Water Boiling Test is conducted for three baseline devices with three tests per device as per report submitted by PP. In addition to this, Section 3.4 and 1.13 are now updated with information on: 1) Sample size calculation 2) Survey approach and results 3) Calculation of stove efficiency as per guidance for WBT – VMR0006 v1.2 and the same changes has been incorporated in section 3.1 and 3.4.8 of FVR. 2. The VVB upon assessment found that the value mention in section 5.4 is estimated ex-ante value which is inline as per guideline for filling section 5.4 of the JPD&MR template. The value mentioned in cell E27 of ER Sheet is the EX- Post results of sampling survey conducted during 1st Monitoring	

	determination of the annual average. - The applied value for the parameters $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$, is taken as 1.6 tonnes/yr. However, there is no information in monitoring on how this value was calculated. - In the sampling process, the following information is missing: - Number of samples selected - Sample frame - How sampling was conducted - The precision achieved - The survey sheet is not included in the ER sheet for cross-checking. - The VVB confirm, based on the site visit in section 2.1 of the JVVR, that each end user started using their stove the same day it was given to them, and in the ERR sheet, the same is reflected in the calculation of the fraction of operation during the first vintage. Therefore, each stove claims full ERR for the first day of use, even if the stove was delivered to the end user in the evening or past lunchtime. The VVB has not provided justification of how conservative the claiming ERs on the day of installation is, considering that the same household could have used the baseline stove in the morning and lunchtime if the project stoves were delivered to them in the afternoon. <u>Action Required</u> - The VVB must provide how they assessed the baseline stove efficiency, considering that in the JVVR in section 2.1 under methodology and criteria, the VVB asked end users during interviews the following question “<i>What type and number of Stoves</i>	survey. Hence, this is accepted by VVB. Further, PP detailed out about baseline survey under section 1.13 of the JPD&MR. Same has been assessed by VVB and mentioned in section 3.1 of JVVR. - The PP has now submitted the f_{NRB} calculation sheet to VVB and found acceptable. - The VVB upon assessment found that value mentioned in section 5.4 of JPD&MR is based on Ex – ante estimations of wood consumption as per the guidelines for filling section 5.4 in JPD&MR template. The applied value of “2.8246 tonnes/year” mentioned in cell E28 is based on wood consumption calculated through monitoring surveys conducted by the PP for Ex – post calculations and also mentioned in Ex – post ER sheet accordingly. - The VVB during assessment found that ex – ante ER estimation is done in a conservative manner based on PP’s implementation experience. Vintage – wise values and annual average is now updated in the ex- ante sheet in tab “ER Summary” of Ex – ante ER sheet. - The VVB upon assessment found that the value of “1.6 tonnes/year” is calculated through monitoring surveys conducted by the PP for Ex – post calculations and mentioned in cell E27 of tab “Data & parameter” in Ex – post ER sheet accordingly and same has been submitted to VVB hence found acceptable for this value. - The VVB reviewed the revised JPD&MR and found that sampling process is updated in section 3.4 and Section 6.3 of JPD&MR and make it in line with the CDM sampling and survey requirement. Monitoring survey sheet and Baseline survey sheet are submitted by PP found acceptable. - The project proponent has considered that not all meals might have been cooked on the first day of receiving the project device. Hence the PP has forgone the credits for the first day and has claimed credits starting the next day of	
--	---	--	--

	<u>did you use? Mud stove fire, Self-built low efficient clay stove, Traditional low efficient stove or Others. If others, the type and number of stoves are”.</u> - The VVB must ensure that the JPD&MR, ERR sheet, and JVVR values are consistent. Additionally, the JPD&MR should provide all necessary information about the baseline survey and its key dates and properly distinguish it from the project survey. - The VVB must submit the f_{NRB} calculation sheet. - The VVB must ensure consistency between the baseline fuel savings values mentioned in the JVVR and the ERR sheet. - The VVB must ensure that the ERR sheet also provides a tab for ex-ante ERR estimation that clearly indicates how the ex-ante ERRs are estimated. - The VVB must ensure transparency regarding how the parameter $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ is calculated. - The VVB must provide how the sampling process complied with the methodology requirement and the CDM Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, v09 and CDM Guidelines for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, v04. - The VVB must re-visit the ERR calculation and ensure that each stove can only start claiming carbon emissions from the following day after the date of delivery/installation and that the ERR calculations are adjusted accordingly. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> CDM Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, v09.0. CDM Guidelines for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, v04.	distribution of project device. PP has revised the ER calculation sheet as well as updated the same in section 7.5 of JPD&MR. Accordingly, Values has been revised throughout the JVVR <u>Verra Response</u> - The JPD&MR is now updated, and the source of the baseline stove efficiency is confirmed. The issue is closed. - The PP and the VVB have confirmed on the baseline fuel consumption values applied. The difference in values arises from one being ex-ante value while the other is post-ante value. The issue is closed. - The VVB has provided f_{NRB} sheet and the following issues are identified: - The wood density has only considered 22 tree species. VVB must confirm if those are the only tree species found in Madhya Pradesh. The VVB shall clarify why the calculation did not consider all the tree species in in Asia from the source provided and justify the use of only 22 species. The issue is open. - Table 13.14.1 indicates forest area of 8,708,000 ha, where in the excel sheet cells C9 and H12, the forest area is 6,480,000 ha. VVB to confirm on the how they reviewed and confirmed the values. The issue is open. - MAI forest in cell H56, N40 is used twice. The issue is open. - The PP and the VVB shall confirm if tundra climatic conditions (G52) are found in Madhya Pradesh. The issue is open. - It is not clear how the value of 13.665 million tonnes (annually) is arrived at for $HW \times N$. The issue is open. - The VVB shall confirm if bamboo can be classified as woody biomass. The issue is open. - The PP and the VVB have confirmed on the baseline fuel savings values applied. The difference in values arises	
--	---	---	--

	AMS-II.G: Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass, v13.1 VMR0006: Energy efficiency and fuel switch measures in thermal application v1.2.; section 9.1.	from one being ex-ante value while the other is post-ante value. The issue is closed. - The VVB has submitted a revised Excel sheet containing the ex- ante vintage wise calculation. The issue is closed. - The PP and the VVB have confirmed on the baseline fuel consumption values applied. The submitted file “VCS 4661 Sampling – Database” is used to calculate the $B_{new,survey}$. In the survey results tab, the first two stoves were not operational (column H) when the survey was being undertaken and their fuel use should not have been included in the analysis. Therefore, their fuel saving should not have been included in the analysis. VVB shall provide their assessment and the rationale for including them when they were not operational. The issue is open. - The revised JPDMR does not contain new information which addresses the issues raised. The issue is open. - The PP and VVB have confirmed that the project has revised how ERs are calculated, and all stoves start counting the ERs from the next day following the installation. The ER sheet has been checked and it is confirmed that the calculation now counts ERs from the next day after installation. The issue is closed. Round 2 <u>VVB Response</u> (Pending) - The PP has provided revised fNRB sheet to the VVB which has been cross checked based on the following: - The wood density of 428 tree species found in Madhya Pradesh in different forest zone is considered as per FAO Forestry Paper - 134. The same is refracted in Fnrb sheet “wood density” tab. - As cross checked by VVB, in the revised Fnrb sheet at tab “Fnrb” “forest area” is taken from ISFR 2019 vol ii; p-149; Table 11.15.14. and a proper justification is added in cell H15 to H18. The given forest area of 8,708,000 is mentioned in the publicly available data, which is an Indian Government (Forest Survey	
--	---	--	--

		of India Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change Government of India) data hence acceptable to VVB. c) The VVB team assessed the updated fNRB sheet and found that the MAI forest value is updated and calculation is revised in the tab “Fnrb” and thus acceptable. d) The PP updated climatic condition in tab “MAI_value” in data source 4, with tropical moist deciduous forest and tropical dry forest as per 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: table 4.9 (updated) which is not including Tundra climate condition. e) Detailed calculation is added for $HW \times N$ in the revised FNRB sheet under the “Consumption_of_woody_biomass” tab wherein the value is calculated as per source International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS) and ICF. 2021. National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5), India, 2019-21: Madhya Pradesh. Mumbai: IIPS. P-3 and socio-economic consumption of forest, India report. The detailed calculation along with value used in explained in cell D6 to D11. of same tab. Moreover, since the above-mentioned data is provided in the publicly available research, which is an authorized Indian Government data hence acceptable to VVB. f) The bamboo is not used in revised Fnrb calculation, as confirmed to VVB, although there is no such impact on the total calculation, hence acceptable to VVB. 6. The non-operational ICS are now excluded from the overall assessment, thus incorporated with the revised values of $B_{y=1,new,i,survey}$ & $B_{y,savings,i,j}$. Same has been included in the revised JPDMR version 1.5 as well as in the JVVR version 02.0. 7. Revised PDMR version 1.5 was checked by VVB and it was found	
--	--	--	--

		that both the sections 3.4 & 6.3 are now revised as checked by the VVB, and includes the information regarding: • Number of samples selected • Sample frame • How sampling was conducted • The precision achieved • The survey data in the ER sheet for cross-checking.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> 1. a). The f_{NRB} calculation has been updated, and now a wood density of all trees found in Madhya Pradesh is applied. The issue is closed. b). The f_{NRB} value has been recalculated and the forest area in the state is provided. The issue is closed. c). The f_{NRB} has been revised and the MAI value has been recalculated. The issue is closed. d). The f_{NRB} value has been revised, and the correct climatic zones as per IPCC 2019 refinement values are now applied. The issue is closed. e). The f_{NRB} sheet has been updated, and the correct formula for the establishment of $HW \times N$ is now indicated. The issue is closed. f). The bamboo values have been excluded from the woody biomass count. The issue is closed. 6. The baseline values of $B_{y=1,new,i,survey}$ & $B_{y,savings,i,j}$ have been recalculated and the non-functioning stoves are now excluded from the analysis. The ER for the project have been recalculated and adjusted accordingly. The issue is closed. 7. The JPD MR has been revised and sampling details such as sample size, precision achieved, sample frame etc have been provided. The issue is closed.	

8	The sampling process and outcome are not justified by the VVB		
	<u>Issue</u>	Round 1	Closed

	1. Section 2.1 of the JVVR, the VVB confirms that the PP only selected 31 samples for the baseline and monitoring surveys. However, the ERR sheet does not provide information on whether the 31 samples met the confidence and precision levels for their values to be utilised. Additionally, it is unclear whether all 31 samples selected were paired samples for the baseline and monitoring surveys or unpaired. 2. The sampling standard mentioned on page 42 is version 07, while the latest version available was v09. 3. The JPD&MR has not provided complete information on how the sample size was calculated/determined. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must provide how the sampling process was carried out and whether it complied with the methodology requirement and the CDM Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, v09, and CDM Guidelines for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, v04. 2. The VVB must ensure that the correct version of the sampling standard applied should be reported. 3. The VVB must ensure that the PP clearly describes	<u>VVB Response</u> 1. PP has submitted the Baseline Excel sheet containing responses of the survey and sampling calculations. CDM sampling guideline is followed for sample size calculation. The baseline survey was conducted before the project start date and monitoring was conducted later on. VVB team verified that; the selected samples were unpaired. Same has been cross checked with the beneficiary details in both baseline and monitoring responses and found consistent. Thus, VVB confirmed that the 31 samples met the confidence and precision levels for the values utilized, Calculation of samples are now provided by PP under “VCS4661 Monitoring Responses” sheet and “VCS4661 Baseline Responses” sheet. Thus accepted. 2. PP has now updated the version number of Sampling and Surveys for CDM project activity and program of activities Standard and make it in line with the latest version number. Hence, accepted by VVB 3. The VVB upon assessment found that under section 3.4 of the JPD&MR, PP has now mentioned the method of sampling done by following the CDM Sampling and Surveys of project activities and programme of activities version 04.0 standard.	
--	--	---	--

	the processes followed in the sample size determination in the ERR sheet. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> CDM Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, v09.0. CDM Guidelines for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, v04. VMR0006: Energy efficiency and fuel switch measures in thermal application v1.2; section 9.1.	<u>Verra Response</u> 1. The VVB has clarified the sampling approach and confirmed that the samples were unpaired. The issue is closed. 2. The JVVR has been updated and the correct version of the sampling standard that was applied indicated. The issue is closed. 3. The sample size determined has been clarified. The issue is closed.	
--	--	--	--

9	Inconsistency and omissions in the JVVR		
	<u>Issue</u> 1. The outcome of the site visit interviews for the questions listed in section 2.1 is not provided in the JVVR. 2. The source of the value for parameter $\eta_{old,i}$, is indicated as methodology default in section 4.1 of the JVVR, although the JPD&MR did not suggest having applied a default value. 3. The VVB has not provided information on the project survey for parameter $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ in section 4.2 of the JVVR. 4. Section 2.5 states that 10 CLs were issued during the validation and verification exercise; however, in Appendix 3, the JVVR has listed and discussed only 9 CLs. 5. For CL ID 01, the VVB raised a CL issue related to the	<u>Round 1</u> <u>VVB Response</u> 1. VVB has cross checked the JVVR and revised the section 2.1 with relevant information related to onsite visit interview. 2. The source of value for parameter $\eta_{old,i}$ is revised by VVB in section 4.1 of the JVVR and make it in line with the source of value mentioned in JPD&MR. 3. The VVB has cross- checked the JVVR and included the survey outcome for parameter $B_{y=1,new,i,j,survey}$ in section 4.2. 4. During thorough assessment VVB cross checked the section 2.5 and Appendix 3 of JVVR and found consistency in number of CLs in both sections. Hence found acceptable.	Closed

	efficiency of the baseline stove (η_{old}). However, the PP response provided was for f_{NRB} and the VVB closed the CL even when the PP response was not related to the efficiency of the baseline stove. 6. On page 62, the $B_{y=1, new, i, j, survey}$ is indicated as .661 tonnes/device/year. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must list and discuss the findings from the interviews and questions posed to the end users. 2. The VVB must confirm the correct value and source of the baseline stove efficiency. 3. The VVB must provide information on survey outcomes for the parameter $B_{y=1, new, i, j, survey}$. 4. The VVB must confirm the number of CLs raised during the validation. 5. The VVB must re-visit the response provided for CL ID. 01 and confirm if the PP correctly addressed the issue before closing it. 6. The VVB must update the JVVR and ensure there is the consistency of values provided between the JVVR and the JPD&MR, and the ERR. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Joint Validation & Verification Report, v4.2 filling guidelines. VCS Standard v4.5; section 2.2.1.	5. Due to Technical Issue, wrong CL was visible under CL No. 01 table. However, VVB team now revised the respective section. 6. Values mentioned under PDMMR has been revised as 1.661 Tonnes/Household/year. Same has been inline with ER sheet. <u>Verra Response</u> 1. The VVB has updated the JVVR and included the outcome of the interviews. The issue is closed. 2. The VVB has updated the JVVR and corrected the source of the value of parameter $\eta_{old, i}$ and made it consistent with the JPDMR. The issue is closed. 3. The VVB has updated section 4.2 of the JVVR and included information for the project survey for parameter $B_{y=1, new, i, j, survey}$. The information provided is acceptable. The issue is closed. 4. The VVB has updated JVVR and made the number of CLs raised consistent with Appendix 3. The issue is closed. 5. The VVB and the PP have corrected the Pp response for CL01. The issue is closed. 6. The VVB has updated the JVVR and corrected the value for $B_{y=1, new, i, j, survey}$ to 1.661 tonnes/device/year. The issue is closed.	
--	---	---	--