

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	2673				
Project Name	UpEnergy-Social and Climate Impact Programme- Nigeria-1				
Review Type	Sdvista Verification Approval				
Program(s)	Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard				
Verification Period	01-11-2022 - 31-10-2024				
Project Proponent	UpEnergy Group				
Proponent Contacts	<table><thead><tr><th>Contact Name</th><th>Email</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>UpEnergy Group</td><td>johanna.perez@rrgnbs.com</td></tr></tbody></table>	Contact Name	Email	UpEnergy Group	johanna.perez@rrgnbs.com
Contact Name	Email				
UpEnergy Group	johanna.perez@rrgnbs.com				
Methodology					
VVB	SustainCERT S.A.				
Assessment Criteria	SD VISTa Standard v1.0				
Date of First Issue	09-01-2026				
Review Conclusion	Approved				
Date of Final Issue					

FINDINGS

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
1	SDG Indicators		
	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>In Section 1 of the SD VISta monitoring report</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In Rows 2 and 6, the quantity of cookstoves is the same for the second monitoring period and the project lifetime. It does not represent the value of this monitoring period specifically under the relevant column. In Row 3, it is unclear whether the additional women's participation for this monitoring period was 36% and the project lifetime equivalent remained 34%. In Row 4, it is unclear why the time saved per household per day during this monitoring period exceeds the project lifetime. In Row 8, the value of project contribution is same for this monitoring period and project lifetime but the project had positive contributions in MP1. It is unclear if the project lifetime contribution includes both MP1 and MP2 contributions. <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The VVB must ensure that the project proponent addresses all inconsistencies and provides clarifications where necessary by updating the project documents. The VVB must assess any changes to the monitoring report and update the relevant section(s) of the verification report. 	<p><u>Round 1</u></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> For SDG 7.1 and SDG 1.4 (Project Specific Indicator: Number of households having access to improved cooking technology due to project activity), the Project Proponent has applied a cumulative accounting approach, as defined in the registered SD VISTA Project Description. <p>Under this approach, the reported value represents the total number of beneficiary households that have gained access to improved cooking technology as a result of the project, up to the end of the respective monitoring period, rather than the incremental contribution of the individual monitoring period alone. Accordingly, the quantity of cookstoves reported for the second monitoring period and for the project lifetime appears identical in Section 1 (Rows 2 and 6) of the Monitoring Report.</p> <p>The calculation methodology for these indicators is clearly described in Section 3.3 of the registered SD VISTA Project</p>	Closed

Program Rule(s)

Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0, Section 2.1.1

Evidence Observed

N/A

Background

N/A

Description, where the monitoring indicator “Number of beneficiary households” is derived by multiplying the cumulative number of ICS distributed by the proportion of project device usage (nj,k,y) for the monitoring period. For MP2, this results in: 29,614 (cumulative ICS distribution) × 0.897 (ICS usage proportion in MP2) = 26,564 beneficiary households.

As the impacts for SDG Targets 1.4 and 7.1 are cumulatively accounted, the project lifetime contribution corresponds to the latest monitoring period value, until additional distributions or monitoring periods occur. This interpretation is also explicitly clarified in Footnote 2 of the Monitoring Report. Based on the above, the VVB confirms that the presentation of identical values for the second monitoring period and the project lifetime is consistent with the approved cumulative accounting methodology and does not constitute a misrepresentation of the monitoring period impacts.

2. With respect to Row 3 under SDG Target 5.5 (Women’s participation), the VVB confirms that the value of 36% reported for the second monitoring period represents a monitoring-period specific result for MP2, as derived from the “SDG 5.1” tab

of the SD VISta – SDG Impact Tool. The value of 34% presented under the column “Contributions during Project Lifetime” is calculated using a weighted average methodology, combining the women’s participation values from MP1 (28%) and MP2 (36%), prorated according to the respective duration of each monitoring period. Given the longer duration of MP2, the resulting project lifetime value is appropriately weighted toward the MP2 outcome. This weighted average approach ensures that the project lifetime contribution reflects women’s participation over the full implementation period in a proportionate and representative manner for this grouped project activity. The calculation methodology is further clarified in Footnote 2 of the Monitoring Report and is supported by the “Lifetime Project Contribution Calculation Sheet” provided by the Project Proponent.

Accordingly, the VVB confirms that the reported figures 36% for the current monitoring period and 34% for the project lifetime are correctly derived, transparently explained, and consistent with the applied methodology.

3.For Row 4 under SDG Target 5.4 (Time saved per household per day), the VVB confirms that the reported values are calculated in accordance with the methodology defined in Section 3.3 of the registered SD VISTA Project Description.

As per the approved calculation procedure, the average time savings are determined as the difference between cooking time in the baseline scenario and cooking time in the project scenario. Based on monitoring data, the net time savings amount to 0.82 hours/day/household for MP1 and 0.90 hours/day/household for MP2, as reflected in the “SDG 5.4” tab of the SD Vista, SDG Impact Tool.

The value reported under “Contributions during Project Lifetime” is derived using a weighted average of the MP1 and MP2 values, prorated according to the respective duration of each monitoring period. Given that MP2 demonstrates higher time savings and has a longer duration, the resulting project lifetime value is appropriately influenced by the MP2 outcome. As such, the lifetime value is not intended to replicate the value of an individual monitoring period but rather to represent average performance across the full

monitoring duration. This weighted average approach is consistently applied across SDG indicators, is explained in Footnote 2 of the Monitoring Report, and is supported by the “Lifetime Project Contribution Calculation Sheet” provided by the Project Proponent.

Based on the above, the VVB confirms that the reported project lifetime value is correctly derived and that its relationship to the individual monitoring period values is reasonable and methodologically justified.

4. With respect to Row 8 under SDG 8 (Number of jobs created), the VVB confirms that the Project Proponent has applied a cumulative reporting approach, consistent with Section 3.3 of the registered SD VISTA Project Description.

Under this approach, the value reported for each monitoring period represents the total number of jobs created from the start of project implementation up to the end of the respective monitoring period, rather than the incremental jobs created during that period alone.

Accordingly, the cumulative number of jobs created at the end of MP1 was 69. By the end of MP2, the cumulative total increased to 111 jobs, which

includes the 69 jobs created during MP1, corresponding to an additional 42 jobs generated during MP2. As the project lifetime contribution reflects the total cumulative jobs created to date, the value reported for the second monitoring period is identical to the project lifetime value. This cumulative interpretation and presentation of values is further clarified in Footnote 2 of the Monitoring Report and supported by the “Lifetime Project Contribution Calculation Sheet” provided by the Project Proponent.

Based on the above, the VVB confirms that the project lifetime contribution explicitly includes contributions from both MP1 and MP2, and that the presentation of identical values for MP2 and project lifetime is methodologically appropriate and transparent.

Uploaded Files:

Lifetime project contribution - MP2, NG VCS 2673 SD Vista - SDG Impact Tool_MP 02_v2.1, VCS 2673 SDG Sheet -Ex Ante_v3.2, SD-VISta-2673-Monitoring-Report-v2.3_clean, SD-VISta-2673-Monitoring-Report-v2.3_tc, UpEnergy_Nigeria SD-VISta-PD-v2.1_clean, UpEnergy_Nigeria SD-VISta-PD-v2.1_tc

Verra Response

Issue

The VVB has provided an explanation and rationale behind providing the values in the SD Contributions table:

1. The VVB mentions that the PP applied a cumulative accounting approach for Rows 2 and 6. However, the cumulative approach applies to the project lifetime contributions, the SD contributions value for a specific monitoring period still needs to be quantifiable impact of the project's activities related to the SDG indicator, during the monitoring period.
2. The VVB confirms that the lifetime value is a weighted average of MP1 and MP2. This issue is resolved.
3. The VVB confirms that the lifetime value is a weighted average of MP1 and MP2. This issue is resolved.
4. The VVB mentions that the PP applied a cumulative accounting approach for Row 8. However, the cumulative approach applies to the project's lifetime contributions; the SD contributions value for a specific monitoring period

still needs to be quantified as the impact of the project's activities related to the SDG indicator during that monitoring period.

Action Required

1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent addresses all inconsistencies and provides clarifications where necessary by updating the project documents.
2. The VVB must assess any changes to the monitoring report and update the relevant section(s) of the verification report.

Round 2

VVB Response

1. The VVB has reviewed the information presented in Table 1, Rows 2 and 6 of the Monitoring Report and confirms that the value of 26,564 represents the project impact for SDG 1.4 and SDG 7.1, i.e., the number of households having access to improved cooking technology due to the project activity during the current monitoring period, based on the total number of operational stoves during the monitoring period, in line with the monitoring approach defined in Section 3.3 of the registered SD VISta Project Description. In addition, the PP has revised the Monitoring Report to include the value of 25,086, which represents the operational stoves distributed during the current monitoring period, calculated by applying the monitored usage rate to the units distributed in the current monitoring period. Based on its review, the VVB confirms that the Monitoring Report now clearly presents the contribution made during the current monitoring period.

4. The VVB has reviewed the revised Monitoring Report, including Row 8, and confirms that the value of 111 represents the total project impact for SDG

8.5 (Project Specific Indicator: Number of jobs created) during the current monitoring period, based on the total number of individuals engaged in project-related activities during the monitoring period. This includes personnel involved in marketing, sales, distribution, monitoring, and technical functions supporting project implementation, as verified through the supporting evidence submitted. These positions have been sustained during the current monitoring period. In addition, for greater transparency, the PP has revised the Monitoring Report (table 1, row 8) to also present the value of 42 new jobs, which represents the new jobs created during the current monitoring period and which form part of the total of 111. Based on its review, the VVB confirms that the Monitoring Report now clearly represents the total impact generated during the current monitoring period. Assessment team revised Section 3.1 of the verification report for the same.

Uploaded Files:

SD-VISta-2673-Monitoring-Report-v2.4_clean, SD-VISta-2673-Monitoring-Report-v2.4_track, SDVista 2673 VerR 01112022 to 31102024_Round2_clean, SDVista 2673 VerR 01112022 to 31102024_Round2_track

Verra Response

		<p>The VVB has clarified the reporting approach and confirmed that the Monitoring Report has been updated to distinguish between total operational impact and monitoring period-specific contributions. Based on the revisions, the Monitoring Report now provides sufficient transparency regarding contributions during the monitoring period and over the project lifetime. This finding is closed.</p> <p>However, it is noted that cumulative values are still presented under the monitoring period column. While acceptable, the terminology does not imply that these represent incremental impacts for the monitoring period.</p>	
--	--	--	--

2 Stakeholder Consultation			
-----------------------------------	--	--	--

2	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>Section 2.2.1 refers to the stakeholder consultation conducted on 23 June 2022. However, this was not within the current monitoring period. There are no other stakeholder consultations conducted to maintain the continuous adaptation requirements in this monitoring period.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent provides details regarding the consultation methods used during this monitoring period. 	<p>Round 1</p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <p>Regarding stakeholder consultation and continuous adaptation during the current monitoring period, the VVB confirms that the Project Proponent has implemented ongoing stakeholder engagement mechanisms, in line with the requirements of SD VISta v1.0, Section 2.2.8, and</p>	Closed
----------	---	---	--------

2. The VVB must assess any changes to the monitoring report and update the relevant section(s) of the verification report.

Program Rule(s)

Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0, Section 2.2.8

Evidence Observed

N/A

Background

N/A

VCS Standard v4.4, Section 3.18.4.

While the in-person stakeholder consultation referenced in Section 2.2.1 of the Monitoring Report was conducted on 23 June 2022 (outside the current monitoring period), the project has maintained continuous stakeholder communication and consultation throughout the monitoring period through multiple engagement channels. These include regular community-level interactions with beneficiaries and local stakeholders, awareness-raising campaigns, and engagement through implementing partners and field staff.

During the monitoring period, stakeholders were informed and engaged through awareness activities, distribution of flyers containing the Project Proponent's contact details, and routine field visits. In addition, stakeholders were provided access to a formal continuous input and grievance mechanism, including a physical grievance logbook maintained at the Climate Catalyst Limited office in Lagos, Nigeria, as well as toll-free telephone numbers, email communication, and feedback channels via salespersons and distribution partners. These mechanisms ensure that stakeholders can raise concerns

and provide feedback on an ongoing basis, including those without access to digital communication tools.

Furthermore, as part of broader stakeholder consultation, the Monitoring Report was made publicly available on the Verra Registry for a 30-day public commenting period from 02 April 2025 to 02 May 2025. No stakeholder comments were received during this period.

Based on the review of documentation and evidence provided, the VVB confirms that the Project Proponent has adequately demonstrated the consultation and communication methods applied during the current monitoring period and that the project continues to meet the continuous adaptation and stakeholder engagement requirements of the applicable standards, despite the absence of a new formal consultation meeting during this monitoring period.

Uploaded Files:

SDVista 2673 VerR 01112022 to 31102024_Round1_Clean,
SDVista 2673 VerR 01112022 to 31102024_Round1_Track

Verra Response

The VVB has confirmed that the stakeholders were consulted

throughout the monitoring period. This finding is closed.

3 Validation of Stakeholder Consultation

Issue

Under Section 3.2.2 of the SD VISTa verification report, the VVB claims that “Inclusive consultations were conducted prior to stove distribution”. However, the monitoring report clearly states that the stakeholder consultation took place after the distribution began in May 2022.

Action Required

The VVB must provide clarification on its assessment and update the project documents accordingly.

Program Rule(s)

Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0, Section 2.1.4, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.2.6

Evidence Observed

N/A

Background

N/A

Round 1

VVB Response

The VVB acknowledges the inconsistency identified between Section 3.2.2 of the SD VISTa Verification Report and the stakeholder consultation timeline presented in the Monitoring Report and confirms that the statement indicating that “inclusive consultations were conducted prior to stove distribution” was a typographical error, which has been corrected in line with Section 2.2.3 of the registered SD VISTa Project Description. As documented, stove distribution commenced in May 2022, while the formal in-person stakeholder consultation was conducted on 23 June 2022 in compliance with the applicable VCS Standard, V 4.4 requirements in force at the time. The VVB confirms that this sequencing does not affect the validity of the stakeholder consultation process or the conclusions of the verification, as the project met the relevant consultation requirements prior to validation and has maintained continuous stakeholder engagement mechanisms throughout implementation. The Verification Report has been

Closed

updated accordingly to reflect the accurate consultation timeline.

Uploaded Files:

SDVista 2673 VerR 01112022 to 31102024_Round1_Clean,
SDVista 2673 VerR 01112022 to 31102024_Round1_Track

Verra Response

The VVB has confirmed that the consultation dates were mistakenly inconsistent. The verification report has been updated with the correct dates and justification. This finding is closed.