

# 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.

<b>Project ID</b>	2673
<b>Project Name</b>	UPENERGY-SOCIAL AND CLIMATE IMPACT PROGRAMME- NIGERIA-1
<b>Review Type</b>	Validation and Verification Approval
<b>Program(s)</b>	SD VISta Program
<b>Verification Period</b>	7/May/2022 – 31/October/2022
<b>Project Proponent</b>	UpEnergy Group
<b>VVB</b>	Earthood Services Private Limited
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<i>Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0</i>
<b>Date of First Issue</b>	09 February 2024
<b>Date of Second Issue</b>	24 April 2024
<b>Date of Third of Issue</b>	23 July 2024
<b>Review Conclusion</b>	Approved
<b>Date of Final Issue</b>	23 August 23, 2024

## FINDINGS

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
1	<p><b>Incorrect reporting of contributions</b></p>		
	<p><u>Issue</u> In Section 1 of the SD VISTa project description and monitoring report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is unclear which indicators are self-defined and which use SDG indicators.</li> <li>2. In rows 2 and 6, the indicators used are the same, despite contributing to two different SDG targets, 1.4 and 7.1.</li> </ol> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent updates table 1 to clarify which indicators are official SDG indicators and which ones are self-defined indicators.</li> <li>2. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent updates rows 2 and 6 to include different and target-specific indicators.</li> <li>3. The VVB must assess the updates to the project description and monitoring report and update the relevant sections of the validation and verification reports accordingly.</li> </ol> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>Sustainable Development Verified Standard, v1.0</i></p>	<p><b>Round 1</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. VVB would like to clarify that Project Proponent (PP) has used only self-defined SDG indicators to specifically capture the social impact of the grouped activity and not used any official UN official indicator in line with SD VISTA PROJECT DESCRIPTION TEMPLATE v1.0. The revised PD and MR explicitly state the same for each SDG indicator for PA.</li> <li>2. PP has considered the same monitoring indicator namely “Number of households having access to improved cooking technology due to project activity” for both the SDG target 1.4 &amp; 7.1. The SDG target 1.4 emphasis on access to basic services to poor &amp; vulnerable population and SDG 7.1 focusses on access to modern energy services, as the project focusses on distribution of ICS which falls under both basic services and modern energy services, PP has used a single self-defined monitoring indicator for both the SDGs</li> <li>3. VVB has assessed the updates in the PD and Monitoring report where it has been now clearly indicted if the indicator are official SDG indicators or are Project specific. Further VVB has assessed impact for SDG target 1.4 and 7.1, and confirms that while the same monitoring indicator has been used, the resulting impact is two fold resulting in positive impact for both SDGs. Hence VVB deems the use of same monitoring indicator for both SDGs appropriate. VVB has duly updated the validation and verification Report in line with the above assessment.</li> </ol>	<p>Closed</p>

		<p><u>Verra Response</u> The PD and MR have been updated to include labels for which indicators are self-defined. The explanation for the same indicator being used in rows 2 and 6 is acceptable. This is sufficient to close the finding.</p>	
--	--	---	--

<b>2 Inconsistencies in project description summary of benefits table</b>			
	<p><u>Issue</u> Row 10 of Section 1 of the SD VISta project description indicates 010 there are multiple stove models being distributed. However, Section 2.1 mentions only one type of stove.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent clarifies how many stove models are being used for this project and provide details about those in relevant sections of the project description.</li> <li>2. The VVB must assess the updates to the project description and update the relevant sections of the validation report accordingly.</li> </ol> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>Sustainable Development Verified Standard, v1.0</i> Section 1</p>	<p><b>Round 1</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In line with suggestion from VERRA during PRR-2 of the VCS 2673 project, PP has revised the design structure of the project activity to include only improved charcoal stoves being installed under the project activity. The SD VISta Project description has been revised accordingly and all the references of the firewood stoves have been removed in the latest version of joint SD VISta project description. VVB has confirmed that all the project documentation viz., SD VISta monitoring report, SDG Impact tool ex-ante &amp; MP 1 have only the details related to the improved charcoal stoves and all the references to firewood stoves are removed as per VERRA's comment.</li> <li>2. VVB has assessed the updated PD &amp; MR and ensures that no reference to Improved firewood stove is present either in PD or Validation Report, VVB confirms that only Improved charcoal stove will be distributed in project activity.</li> </ol> <p><u>Verra Response</u> The PD and MR have been updated to only mention charcoal stoves. This is sufficient to close the finding.</p>	Closed

<b>3 Inadequate stakeholder consulting</b>			
--	--	--	--

<p><u>Issue</u> Section 2.1.3 of the SD VISTa project description and monitoring report states that ICSs were being distributed before the first stakeholder consultation. However, stakeholders must be involved in the project design and development process both before the project design is finalized and during implementation.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The VVB must ensure the project proponent updates Section 2.2.3 of the project description and Section 2.2.1 of the monitoring report to provide a clarification of how local stakeholders were involved in project design and development before the project design is finalized and during implementation as well as present evidence demonstrating their involvement.</li> <li>The VVB must provide a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the stakeholder consultation process in accordance with the requirements in the Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard v1.0, and update the relevant sections of the validation report and verification report accordingly.</li> </ol> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>Sustainable Development Verified Standard, v1.0</i> Sections 2.1.4, 2.2.4 - 2.2.6</p>	<p><b>Round 1</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <p>1. VVB would like to clarify that the SDG attributes resulted by this grouped project activity is SD VISTa labelled VCU not a SD VISTa asset. Hence Local Stakeholder Consultation (LSC) meeting has been conducted in line with the VCS standard 4.4 that was relevant during the validation time.</p> <p>The following table demonstrates the requirement for local stakeholder consultation from the applied standard VCS standard 4.4 and project's compliance to VERRA requirement</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="945 576 1690 1406"> <thead> <tr> <th>Section #</th> <th>Requirement</th> <th>Compliance</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3.18.3</td> <td>The project proponent shall conduct a local stakeholder consultation prior to validation as a way to inform the design of the project and maximize participation from stakeholders. Such consultations allow stakeholders to evaluate impacts, raise concerns about potential negative impacts, and provide input on the project design.</td> <td>PP has conducted the physical LSC meeting on 23 June 2022, which is prior to the project validation that has happened in May 2023. PP has mentioned the feedback received from the stakeholders in Section 2.2.3 of SD VISTa project description, there is no specific suggestion was made during the LSC on the project design.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.18.4</td> <td>The project proponent shall establish mechanisms for ongoing communication with local</td> <td>PP has mentioned the mechanisms for on-going communication with</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Section #	Requirement	Compliance	3.18.3	The project proponent shall conduct a local stakeholder consultation prior to validation as a way to inform the design of the project and maximize participation from stakeholders. Such consultations allow stakeholders to evaluate impacts, raise concerns about potential negative impacts, and provide input on the project design.	PP has conducted the physical LSC meeting on 23 June 2022, which is prior to the project validation that has happened in May 2023. PP has mentioned the feedback received from the stakeholders in Section 2.2.3 of SD VISTa project description, there is no specific suggestion was made during the LSC on the project design.	3.18.4	The project proponent shall establish mechanisms for ongoing communication with local	PP has mentioned the mechanisms for on-going communication with	<p>Closed</p>
Section #	Requirement	Compliance									
3.18.3	The project proponent shall conduct a local stakeholder consultation prior to validation as a way to inform the design of the project and maximize participation from stakeholders. Such consultations allow stakeholders to evaluate impacts, raise concerns about potential negative impacts, and provide input on the project design.	PP has conducted the physical LSC meeting on 23 June 2022, which is prior to the project validation that has happened in May 2023. PP has mentioned the feedback received from the stakeholders in Section 2.2.3 of SD VISTa project description, there is no specific suggestion was made during the LSC on the project design.									
3.18.4	The project proponent shall establish mechanisms for ongoing communication with local	PP has mentioned the mechanisms for on-going communication with									

			<p>stakeholders to allow stakeholders to raise concerns about potential negative impacts during project implementation.</p>	<p>local stakeholders in Section 2.2.3 of SD VISta PD</p>		
		<p>3.18.5</p>	<p>The project proponent shall take due account of all and any input received during the local stakeholder consultation and through ongoing communications, which means it will need to either update the project design or justify why updates are not appropriate. The project proponent shall demonstrate to the validation/verification body what action it has taken in respect of the local stakeholder consultation as part of validation, and in respect of ongoing communications as part of each subsequent verification</p>	<p>PP has documented the suggestions received from the stakeholders and furnished the actions plans and justification in Section 2.2.3 of SD VISta PD</p>		
		<p>Further the PP also complied with the requirement of Sustainable Development Verified Standard, v1.0 on the local stakeholder consultation process as demonstrated in the table below,</p>				
		<p><b>Section #</b></p>	<p><b>Requirement</b></p>	<p><b>Compliance</b></p>		

		<p>2.2.4</p>	<p>Stakeholders identified in Section 2.2.1 above shall be notified of the project development process.</p>	<p>PP has sent an open initiation via National Daily Newspaper “PUNCH” on 23rd May 2022, which addresses the entire population / region of Nigeria, thus enabling the participation of the common citizen across the project boundary.</p>		
		<p>2.2.5</p>	<p>Effective consultation (see Box 3 below) shall be used to enable project stakeholders, including all stakeholder groups, to influence project design and implementation. The consultation shall be carried out with respect for local customs, values and institutions. It shall provide an ongoing opportunity for self-identification of stakeholder groups that are vulnerable (i.e., lacking ability to anticipate, cope with, resist and recover from stresses or shocks due to physical, social, economic and environmental factors or processes) and/or</p>	<p>PP has invited the potential stakeholders viz., project beneficiaries, micro-entrepreneurs, NGOs, financial institutions, local distribution partners etc. these group of identified key stakeholders across Nigeria to address various socio-economic issues, gender equality, climate change mitigation etc. The inputs obtained from the local stakeholders were considered during design and</p>		

			<p>marginalized (i.e., unable to participate fully in economic, social, political and cultural life). Where those groups are identified, project proponents shall emphasize optimizing benefits to them.</p>	<p>implementation of the project.</p>		
		<p>2.2.6</p>	<p>All communications, consultations and participatory processes shall be undertaken with stakeholders directly or through their legitimate representatives, ensuring adequate and timely levels of information sharing with the members of the stakeholder groups in a form they understand. Information sharing shall include provision of information about potential costs, risks and benefits to all stakeholder groups. Different stakeholder groups may require different communication and consultation methods; communication and consultation shall be implemented in a culturally appropriate and gender</p>	<p>Further stakeholder feedbacks is continuous process and PP has highlighted the mechanism for on-going communication with local stakeholders in Sections 2.2.2 &amp; 2.2.10 of SD VISTa project description and Sections 2.2.1 &amp; 2.2.7 of SD VISTa monitoring report</p>		

		sensitive manner.	
		<p>VVB concludes that PP complied the requirement of both VCS standard 4.4 &amp; Sustainable Development Verified Standard, v1.0 for the local stakeholder consultation process and further PP has adequate mechanism in place to receive the continuous feedback from the local stakeholders for adaptive management.</p>	
		<p><u>Verra Response</u> This finding cannot be closed.</p> <p><u>Issue</u> The VVB has provided justification for the distribution of ICS before local stakeholder consultation. However, Box 3 of the <i>Sustainable Development Verified Standard, v1.0</i> clearly states that stakeholders should have an opportunity to evaluate impacts and raise concerns about potential negative impacts, express desired outcomes and provide input on the project design before the project design is finalized. It is unclear how the VVB concluded that the local stakeholder consultations were effective if the project design was finalized, and the project activity was executed before the stakeholders had this opportunity.</p> <p>Moreover, these requirements are applicable for SD VSta labelled VCUs as well.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u> The VVB must clarify how it assessed the adequacy and effectiveness of the local stakeholder consultation process to provide an opportunity to stakeholders to provide input on the project design.</p> <p><u>Program Rules</u> <i>Sustainable Development Verified Standard, v1.0, Box 3, Guidance on Effective Consultation</i></p> <p><b>Round 2</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p>	

		<p>VVB would like to clarify that PP had conducted the physical stakeholder consultation meeting on 23 June 2022 as per the requirements set in VCS Standard version 4.2 section 3.17, which was latest and applicable at that point in time. Additionally the project’s physical stakeholder consultation process also meets the requirements of VCS Standard version 4.4 para 3.18.3 to 3.18.5 as applicable during the time of validation. As the project has been conceptualized as a VCS project and eventually SD VISta program as well, hence there is no requirement for a separate demonstration of conformance with the requirements set out in Section 3.18 (which includes with Local Stakeholders Consultation process) of VCS standard version 4.4. (kindly note that the VCS PD has been webhosted for public commenting period from 29 Mar 2023 to 28 April 2023, and the PD perceived the SD VISta labelling process for the project subsequently). As per the VCS Standard version 4.4 the local stakeholder consultation to be conducted prior to validation, which PP has complied fully therefore local stakeholders had a sufficient time and opportunity to express their feedbacks and concerns.</p> <p>Further, it is to be noted that the CME of the project has past experience in cookstove projects and trail and tested cookstove design running successfully in Sub Saharan Africa (VCS 2789, VCS 2676, GS 10967, GS 11007, GS 10970, GS 11211) and with this experience PP went ahead with the pilot distribution of project cookstove in May 2022. PP has distributed single ICS in May 2022 and only 73 units ( ~4.4% of total distribution) has been distributed before the physical stakeholder meeting as can be evidenced from the project cookstove distribution database. Further PP has not received any specific comments and feedback on design of the improved cookstove during the physical stakeholder meeting, hence original design of the project cookstove remains unchanged.</p> <p>Further incompliance with the VCS Standard version 4.4 para 3.18.4, PP has a ongoing communication channel, wherein various stakeholders are encouraged to register their feedback on the project’s impact, design, etc through the continuous stakeholder feedback process as</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>highlighted in the ‘mechanism for on-going communication with local stakeholders’ in Sections 2.2.2 &amp; 2.2.10 of SD VISTa project description and Sections 2.2.1 &amp; 2.2.7 of SD VISTa monitoring report and the same has been assessed in section 2.3.3 of the validation report.</p> <p>Its worth to mention that the project has not received any negative feedback from any of the stakeholder, including comments related to project design till the submission of the project documents to VERRA on 07 Nov 2023. As the stakeholder feedback process is a continuous process, stakeholders have been provided with oppouturity to raise their concerns and input their feedback at any time during the project implementation, thus CME’s stakeholder consulation approach is inline with the “Box 3: Guidance for Effective Stakeholder Consultation”. VVB further observed, as stated in section 1.8 of the Validation Report and Verification Report, that while conducting physical interviews with the end users during the on site visit and telephonic interviews conducted with other stakeholders, that all the interviewees hold positive opinion of the project activity, meeting out the benefits of the PA for them. Hence VVB concludes the stakeholder consulation process is effective and adequate.</p> <p><u>Verra Response</u></p> <p><u>Issue</u> The VVB has provided a detailed response. However, the details of why the first stakeholder consultation meeting occurred after the first distribution of stoves have not been included in the PD and MR.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent updates Section 2.2.3 of the project description and Section 2.2.1 of the monitoring report with the details provided in the PRR.</li> <li>2. The VVB must provide a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the stakeholder consultation process and update the relevant sections of the validation report and verification report accordingly.</li> </ol>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> Sustainable Development Verified Standard, v1.0 Sections 2.1.4, 2.2.4 - 2.2.6</p> <p><b>Round 3</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VVB has ensured that section 2.2.3 of the project description and section 2.2.1 of the monitoring report have been updated to reflect the response provided above in the PRR.</li> <li>VVB has incorporated a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the stakeholder consultation process as explained in the PRR response above in section 2.3.3 of the Validation report and section 3.3.1 of the verification report.</li> </ol> <p><u>Verra Response</u> The reason for why some cookstoves were distributed before the first stakeholder consultation has been included in the project documents. This is sufficient to close the finding.</p>	
--	--	---	--

4	<b>Insufficient project location details</b>		
	<p><u>Issue</u> Section 2.1.7 of the SD VISTa project description and Section 2.1.6 of the SD VISTa monitoring report only provide a political map of Nigeria. However, a political map does not fulfil the standard's requirements of specifying the project location with precise geodetic coordinates or geographic boundaries. Further, Section 3.2 of the SD VISTa project description notes that the location of the household is documented. This indicates that specific locations are being targeted for this project.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The VVB must ensure the project proponent provides a</li> </ol>	<p><b>Round 1</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VVB would like to highlight the project aims to distribute the ICS to the entirety of Nigeria. Hence the geo-coordinate and political map of Nigeria has been provided in the section 2.1.7 of SD VISTa project description. As the project falls under distributed technologies category the project instances will be distributed across the project boundary, hence defining a specific geodetic coordinate will not be possible. Further PP has furnished the geodetic coordinates of the regions where the project ICS distributed in MP 1 in the SD VISTa monitoring report and exact geocoordinates for all 1,648 project instances distributed during MP 1 has been furnished in the ICS distribution database.</li> </ol>	Closed

<p>defined area using precise geodetic coordinates or a detailed shapefile. The project proponent must update the respective sections according to this updated area.</p> <p>2. The VVB must assess the project description and monitoring report updates and update the validation and verification reports' relevant sections accordingly.</p> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> Sustainable Development Verified Standard, v1.0 Section 2.1.1</p>	<p>2. VVB has assessed the revisions in the SD VISta PD which now documents all 37 regions of Nigeria as a part of project boundary. This is deemed appropriate given that the project intends to distribute ICS to the entire country, and during baseline survey, a diversity in samples was ensured and 165 households spread across rural, semi-urban and urban areas in Nigeria and targeting all the key geographical areas of Nigeria, i.e., Northern Region, Southwest Region and Southeast Region were considered.</p> <p>Further the SD VISta MR now documents the geocoordinates of all the 16 regions where ICS has been distributed in the concerned MP.</p> <p>The Validation and Verification Reports have been updated accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p><u>Verra Response</u></p> <p><u>Issue</u> Verra would like confirmation from the VVB that the project proponent will provide the geocoordinates of which districts had ICS distributed for each monitoring period.</p> <p><u>Action required</u> The VVB must ensure the project proponent clarifies whether it will provide the geocoordinates of which districts had ICS distributed for each monitoring period.</p> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> Sustainable Development Verified Standard, v1.0 Section 2.1.1</p> <p><b>Round 2</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <p>VVB would like to clarify that PP already has a practice of capturing the location details of the each project ICS such as End users</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>address, districts, region, geodetics etc. in the project distribution database and the same has been verified by VVB.</p> <p>PP has incorporated in Section 2.1.7 of the SD VISTa project description and Section 2.1.6 of the SD VISTa monitoring report a statement clarifying that the geodetics of all future sites wherein distribution will take place over the course of the project lifetime would be clearly indicated in the relevant ER sheet and geodetics of ICS distribution districts will be captured in monitoring report.</p> <p>As a further safeguard,VVB has raised a FAR in Appendix IV of the verification report, instructing VVBs undertaking subsequent verifications to ensure that the geodetic information of the sites where distribution takes place in the following Monitoring Periods (MPs), over the project lifetime, are clearly stated in the corresponding ER sheet and the districts where project ICS is distributed are duly captured in the corresponding monitoring reports.</p> <p><u>Verra Response</u> The PD and MR now have a line stating that any future sites where cookstoves will be distributed will be included in future monitoring reports. The VVB has also written an FAR to ensure future VVBs lookout for new location data. This is sufficient to close the finding.</p>	
--	--	---	--

5	<b>Casual chain</b>	
	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section 2.1.9 of the project description provides a causal chain that does not capture the complete extent of the project’s activities described in other sections of the project description. It is unclear how the project justifies all the impacts/outcomes claimed because of the activities and correlates them to the SDG contributions in Section 1.1.</li> <li>2. The first box of Stage 3 states this project will ‘eliminate’</li> </ol>	<p><b>Round 1</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.PP has updated the causal chain in Section 2.1.9 of SD VISTa project description in line with the SDG contributions in Section 1. PP has replaced the word “eliminates” with “reduces” in the causal chain diagram to make the claim consistent throughout the document.</li> <li>2. The causal chain diagram has been revised to better represent</li> </ol>

<p>poverty. This claim is not made elsewhere in the document. Rather, the project states it aims to ‘reduce’ poverty in the project area.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent updates the causal chain to capture the entirety of the project’s activities, impacts and outcomes through logical relationships.</li> <li>2. The VVB must assess the project description updates and update the verification report’s relevant sections accordingly.</li> </ol> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> Sustainable Development Verified Standard, v1.0 Section 2.1, 2.1.5</p> <p><u>Background</u> The casual chain should capture all the activities planned to contribute to the SD contributions. This should also include any impact or outcomes mentioned in the other sections of the project description for consistency. Likewise, there is no justification for how each activity led to the connected impact and resulting outcome. In other words, a description of the cause-and-effect relationship is missing.</p>	<p>and provide a comprehensive picture of the PA’ impacts and outcomes. VVB has assessed the modifications in the causal chain and found it to be appropriate. W.r.t poverty, the impact of PA has been revised from ‘eliminate’ to ‘reduce’. The VVB has updated the Validation Report accordingly.</p> <p><u>Verra Response</u></p> <p><u>Issue</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In Appendix B, the text boxes in Stage 1 of the new Casual Chain are blank in the clean version of the project description.</li> <li>2. SDG 13 is listed as an impacted SDG in Table 1 of the project description. However, it is absent in the casual chain.</li> </ol> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent updates the casual chain, so all text is included.</li> <li>2. The VVB must ensure the project proponent updates the casual chain, so all impacted SDGs are included.</li> <li>3. The VVB must provide an independent assessment of the project description updates and update the validation report accordingly.</li> </ol> <p><b>Round 2</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PP has updated boxes and made the text visible in the causal chain in Appendix B of latest verion of SD VISTa PD</li> <li>2. PP has missed to include the SDG 13 in the casual chain and on the suggestion from VERRA same has been included in the causal chain figure in Appendix B of latest verion of SD VISTa PD</li> <li>3. VVB confirms that the Causal Chain diagram in Appendix B has now been updated to reflect all the ‘project activities’ under Stage 01 . Further impact on all relevant SDGs, including SDG 13 has been represented in the revised diagram.</li> </ol> <p><u>Verra Response</u> The causal chain has been updated so all boxes are filled and the</p>	<p>Closed</p>
--	--	---------------

		relevant SDGs are included. This is sufficient to close the finding.	
--	--	--	--

<b>6</b>	<b>Incorporation of traditional conflict resolution methods in grievance procedure</b>			
	<p><u>Issue</u> Section 2.2.10 of the SD VSta project description does not demonstrate that the grievance redress procedure considers traditional conflict resolution methods, if applicable.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent updates Section 2.2.10 of the project description to provide further information or clarification as to how the project's grievance redress procedure incorporates and respects traditional conflict resolution methods, if applicable.</li> <li>2. The VVB must assess the updates to the project description and update the relevant sections of the validation report accordingly.</li> </ol> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0;</i> Section 2.2.14</p>	<b>Round 1</b>	Closed	
		<p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <p>1. VVB would like to clarify that the Section 2.2.10 of the SD VSta project description states that “The first step of a complaint is typically applied to the informal procedure, where the affected person discussed the identified issue or provides feedback with the Field Coordinator. The Field Coordinator attempts to resolve the grievance immediately on an informal basis, The Field Coordinator and affected person work together as immediately as possible, to solve the identified issue.” Hence the very first step of the resolving in the grievance is typically an informal / traditional way of conflict resolution and subsequently the grievance gets formally registered if it is not resolved in the informal / traditional conflict resolution method.</p> <p>2. Traditional conflict resolution means involve one on one conversations i.e. verbal complaint and then subsequent remedial action. Beneficiaries are not required to go through the formal channel (which they may find cumbersome) if the issue can be solved informally via the traditional means. This involves conversing with the field coordinator and intimating him about the issues, the field coordinator then attempts conflict resolution via one-on-one discussions, and the field officer ensures that the issues are adequately addressed. A clarification regarding the above has been incorporated both in the PD and validation report.</p>		
		<p><u>Verra Response</u></p> <p>The PD and VR have been updated to clarify that the existing feedback and grievance redress mechanism incorporates traditional forms of conflict resolution. This is sufficient to close the finding.</p>		

7	<b>Safe water systems</b>	
	<p><u>Issue</u> Section 2.2.3 of the SD VISTA project description provides an email sent to stakeholders on 24 May 2022 that mentions providing water purification systems alongside the cookstoves. The project activities detailed in Section 1, Section 2.1.1, Section 2.1.2 or Section 2.1.9 do not mention any benefit related to water purification systems nor is there any mention of this benefit again throughout the document.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the project proponent clarifies if it has provided accurate information about the project to the stakeholders.  2. The VVB must provide steps taken to assess that the information provided in the project description matches the information given to the stakeholders and update the relevant sections of the verification reports accordingly.</p> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>Sustainable Development Verified Standard, v1.0;</i> Section 2.2.6</p>	<p><b>Round 1</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u> 1. PP has conducted a combined LSC to sensitize Nigerian population with the various kinds of clean energy products viz., Improved Cookstoves (ICS), Electric Pressure Cooker (EPC) and Domestic &amp; Institutional Safe Drinking Water System that are distributed by the UpEnergy Group (PP) at a subsidized price. However, as mentioned in the sections 2.1.1, 2.1.2 &amp; 2.1.9 of SD Vista PD, VVB would like to clarify and confirm that this grouped project activity only involves distribution of charcoal ICS to replace the baseline traditional / inefficient charcoal stoves. Hence to avoid any confusions PP has not provided the reference of Water Treatment Systems in Section 2.2.3. The PD has been updated and clarification regarding the same has been incorporated as footnote 11 in Section 2.2.3. 2. During Local Stakeholder Consultation, participants were provided information about both Energy Efficient Cooking Technologies and Safe Water Systems, as was confirmed via telephonic interview with the LSC participants. This includes the verbal testimony of their community leader, Government officials and Local NGO representatives who confirmed that while information of both devices were provided, it was clarified that both would be different PA. The VVB has incorporated the above clarification in Section 2.3.3 of the Validation report.</p> <p><u>Verra Response</u> The VVB has clarified that this project will only be regarding the distribution of cookstoves. The safe water systems mentioned in the stakeholder consultation are not part of the project. This is sufficient to close the finding.</p>
	Closed	

8 Failure to describe conditions at the project start date	
<p><u>Issue</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 3.1 of the project description presents limited national-level information about different stakeholders, especially current and potential beneficiaries but does not provide the information specific to the regions where the cookstoves are distributed. This information is insufficient to understand the social, economic, and cultural conditions found at the project start date in the project location. It is also unclear how the national-level overview is applicable to the regions where the project is being implemented.</li> <li>The information provided in the same section does not reflect the diversity within and between the stakeholder groups and their interactions</li> </ol> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The VVB must ensure that the project proponent updates Section 3.1 of the project description to describe the social, economic, and cultural conditions found at the project start specific to the different regions where the program is being implemented.</li> <li>The VVB must provide an independent assessment of the project proponent’s updates to the project description and update the validation report as needed.</li> </ol> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0; Section 3.1.1</p>	<p style="background-color: #1a3d54; color: white; padding: 2px;"><b>Round 1</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <p>1. VVB would like to clarify and confirm that PP intended to distribute 500,000 project ICS to beneficiaries across the country of Nigeria as mentioned in section 2.1.7 of SD VISTA project description. Hence PP has given the national overview of various affected stakeholders Section 3.1 of SD VISTA project description. Further PP has included additional information of the conditions found at the project start date in Section 3.1 of SD VISTA project description. Footnote 17 has been incorporated in Section 3.1 of the PD clarifying the intended pan Nigeria implementation of the PA, hence making a national level baseline assessment appropriate. VVB has assessed the update in the PD and has incorporated clarification in section 3.1.1 of the Validation Report reiterating the intended national scale of the PA. Emphasising on the pan Nigeria impact of the PA, PP in collaboration with ICEED conducted baseline survey of 165 households spread across rural, semi-urban and urban areas in Nigeria and targeting all the key geographical areas of Nigeria, i.e., Northern Region, Southwest Region and Southeast Region. In line with the urban / rural demographic breakup of Nigeria<sup>1</sup>, the considered 165 samples were split into 2 strata i.e., 47% sampled from urban areas, and rest 53% sampled from rural areas. The sample selection of households from the identified key localities was done through a combination of stratified and random sampling. This highlights the intended pan Nigeria impact of the PA. The same has been incorporated in Section 3.1.1 of the validation report.</p> <p>2. PP has updated section 3.1 to describe the conditions of the directly affected stakeholders during the start date of the project and</p>
Closed	

<sup>1</sup> <https://population.un.org/wup/Publications/Files/WUP2014-Highlights.pdf> (refer page # 25)

		<p>removed the indirectly affected stakeholders, since impacts for the indirectly affected stakeholders cannot be objectively demonstrated / verified via material evidence.</p> <p>In place of the same, PP has incorporated and expounded upon the conditions of Local Implementation Partners and CCL Employees in the host country along with that of the beneficiaries (end users). PP has ensured that diverse stakeholders, belonging to different walks of life and affected by the PA in different capacities are considered. As elaborated above, the baseline survey was conducted in houses across rural, semi-urban and urban households, in order to ensure diversity within the beneficiaries for comprehensive assessment. Further it was also ensured that the respondents are not clustered in single or similar geographical areas, hence households from across Nigeria i.e. Northern region southwestern region and South-Eastern Region were considered. This ensures that diversity is maintained within the stakeholder group and a variety of households is considered. Similarly, a variety of stakeholders have also been identified who are poignantly impacted by the PA. This includes, apart from the beneficiary households, The Local Implementation partners like distribution agents, laboratories, NGOs etc and the CCL Employees in the host country who are not only provided with employment opportunity, but also trained to gain skills than ensure their employability even after the PA ceases.</p> <p>VVB has updated section 2.3.2 of the Validation report to reflect the above assessment provided.</p>	
		<p><u>Verra Response</u></p> <p><u>Issue</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The updates to Section 3.1 of the project description to not provide greater detail on the social, economic, and cultural conditions of all stakeholders at the project onset. If baseline data was collected, as implied in Section 3.3.3 of the monitoring report and Section 2.2.6 of the validation report, it should be presented in this section.</li> </ol>	

		<p>2. It is unclear why the indirect stakeholders have been removed from Section 3.1 of the project description. These groups must be included in the baseline if identified in Section 2.2.1</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent updates Section 3.1 of the project description to describe the social, economic, and cultural conditions found at the project start.</li> <li>2. The VVB must ensure the project proponent includes the baseline conditions for the indirect stakeholder that was previously part of the project description.</li> <li>3. The VVB must provide an independent assessment of the project proponent’s updates to the project description and update the validation report as needed.</li> </ol> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u>  <i>Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0; Section 3.1.1</i></p>	
		<p><b>Round 2</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. VVB would like to confirm that PP has updated the section 3.1 of SD VISta project description and included the findings of baseline study to describe further the conditions of the Beneficiaries at the project start. This includes assessment of the percentage of Nigerian population with reliance on non renewable biomass (charcoal and firewood), percentage of families which carry out indoor cooking and the consequent impact on women’s health and the average time spent on cooking. It also includes a reflection of the fuel consumed (quantified) in the baseline scenario. The concerned section now encompasses the social, economical and cultural aspects found in baseline with reference to the PA.</li> <li>2. Further based on VERRA’s suggestion PP has included the indirectly affected stakeholders in section 3.1 of SD VISta PD. PP has</li> </ol>	

		<p>also stated that the impact created by project activity for indirectly affected stakeholders cannot be monitored and quantified and most importantly cannot be objectively demonstrated / verified via external / internal material evidence. This approach adopted by PP is inline the recently validated and verified clean cooking SD VISta projects in sub-saharan countries. Hence PP has furnished only the qualitative assessment of indirectly affected stakeholders in Section 3.1 of SD VISta PD based on PP’s interactions with local NGOs, Academica, Environmental agencies, Governmental authroities etc. during the phycial local stakeholder meeting and ongoing interactions.</p> <p>3. VVB has assessed the updates in the PD w.r.t the stakeholders impacted by the PA. PP has now duly incorporated the stakeholders indirectly impacted by the PA. Some indirectly affected stakeholders identified include Local NGOs and Business, Government Authority, Media, and Academic institutions in the host country; all the stakeholders are described in detail, which was confirmed by VVB via telephonic interviews with stakeholders like community leaders, government officials and representatives of local NGO. Thus, validation team has confirmed the baseline scenario of not only the direct stakeholders, but also that of the indirect stakeholders of the PA. VVB has duly updated the Validation Report in line with the above assessment.</p>	
		<p><u>Verra Response</u> The baseline survey data and descriptions of the indirect stakeholders have been included. This is sufficient to close the finding.</p>	

9	<b>Incomplete information about benefits for the planet</b>		
	<p><u>Issue</u> Section 4.1 in the project description presents a national-level overview about deforestation in the country but does not provide detailed information about the conditions and threats to natural capital at the project start date specific to the regions in which the cookstoves are distributed. It is also</p>	<p><b>Round 1</b> <u>VVB Response</u> 1. VVB would like to clarify and confirm that PP has intended to distribute 500,000 project ICS to beneficiaries across the country of Nigeria as mentioned in section 2.1.7 of SD VISta project description. Hence PP has given the national-level overview of deforestation</p>	Closed

	<p>unclear how the national-level overview is applicable to the regions where the project is being implemented.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent updates Section 4.1 to include sufficient location specific information.</li> <li>2. The VVB must assess the updates to the project description and update the relevant sections of the validation report accordingly.</li> </ol> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0; Section 3.2.1</p>	<p>scenario in Nigeria based on the credible sources, as it is very relevant and applicable to start date of project since PP has no specific targeted area for ICS distribution and it aims to distribute project ICS to entire Nigeria. Further it is difficult to get the deforestation details for specific regions. Footnote 22 has been incorporated in Section 4.1 of the PD clarifying the intended pan Nigeria implementation of the PA, hence making a national level baseline assessment appropriate.</p> <p>2. VVB has assessed the update in the PD and has incorporated clarification in section 4.1.1 of the Validation Report reiterating the intended national scale of the PA. Emphasising on the pan Nigeria impact of the PA, PP in collaboration with ICEED conducted baseline survey of 165 households spread across rural, semi-urban and urban areas in Nigeria and targeting all the key geographical areas of Nigeria, i.e., Northern Region, Southwest Region and Southeast Region. The sample selection of households from the identified key localities was done through a combination of stratified and random sampling. This highlights the intended cross Nigeria impact of the PA. The same has been incorporated in Section 4.1.1 of the validation report.</p> <p><u>Verra Response</u> The information provided is deemed acceptable. This is sufficient to close the finding.</p>	
--	--	--	--

<b>10</b>	<b>Percentage of female workers</b>		
	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>In section 3.1 of the SD VISTA monitoring report, Impact 3 states that “60% of the total employees working as a part of the project activity are females during monitoring period.” However, in row 3 of Section 1, the proponent says, “Around 28% of the total employees working as a part of the project activity are females.” Section 3.3 also indicates a female worker percentage of 28%.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <p>The VVB must ensure the project proponent provides an accurate percentage of female workers in all sections of the monitoring report.</p> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u></p> <p>SD VISTA Monitoring Report Template, v1.0 Section 3.1 Sustainable Development Verified Standard, v1.0; Section 3.1.4</p>	<p><b>Round 1</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <p>1. VVB would like to clarify, the total number of jobs created due to the grouped project activity during MP 1 is 69, which includes the 19 female employees and accordingly the female work force is computed to be 28%. This grouped project has 03 female senior leadership staff with the total 05 leadership staffs, thus the % female employees in leadership / managerial works out to 60%. PP acknowledged a typo error and has revised the section 3.1 of SD VISTA monitoring report and made it consistent with the Section 1 and 3.3.</p> <p><u>Verra Response</u></p> <p>The PP has updated section 3.1 of the monitoring report to align impact 3 with the employment data cited throughout the document. This is sufficient to close the finding.</p>	Closed

<b>11</b>	<b>End user interviews</b>		
	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sections 1.6 and 1.9 verification report state that 11 household samples/interviews with beneficiaries were used to confirm the monitoring survey results. However, in Section 1.8 of the verification report, none of the listed interviewees are end users.</li> <li>Sections 1.8 of the validation report and verification report states that the VVB may have relied solely on remote interviews for some stakeholders.</li> </ol> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The VVB must clarify how many end users were interviewed</li> </ol>	<p><b>Round 1</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 1.8 of both Validation and Verification reports have been updated to include the names of the households inspected to confirm the baseline and the project implementation. VVB team physically visited 22 households (11 for assessing baseline and 11 for assessing PA post CEP distribution). The Validation report documents the location (i.e. urban/rural) and fuel type along with the names of the households. The verification Report provides the Stove UID along with the beneficiary’s names.</li> <li>VVB employed telephonic interview with the LSC participants owing to their unavailability during the scheduled dates of the on-</li> </ol>	Closed

<p>and update the verification report accordingly.</p> <p>2. For any sites where telephone interviews were the primary method of assessment, the VVB must clarify how this activity was deemed appropriate.</p> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u>  <i>SD VISTa Validation Report Template, v1.0 Section 1.6, 1.9 Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0; Section 5.4.2</i></p>	<p>site audit. The stakeholders included the community leader, Government Representative and NGO representatives, whose input was considered crucial for comprehensive assessment of the PA. Given that the authenticity of the Local Stakeholder Consultation is assessed via the participants’ verbal testimony, recorded telephonic interview was deemed appropriate as an alternate means of verification to receive inputs from stakeholders which otherwise wouldn’t be possible, hence otherwise affecting the quality of assessment.</p>	
	<p><u>Verra Response</u></p> <p><u>Issue</u>          The VVB has provided sufficient reason as to why some interviews were conducted by phone. However, the explanations have not been included in the validation and verification reports.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u>          The VVB must include the explanations as to why some interviews were conducted by phone in the validation and verification reports.</p> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u>  <i>SD VISTa Validation Report Template, v1.0 Section 1.6, 1.9 Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0; Section 5.4.2</i></p>	
	<p><b>Round 2</b></p>	
	<p><u>VVB Response</u>          VVB has revised the Validation and Verification Reports to incorporate the above described rationale as to why certain interviews were conducted via telephonic means. This has been included in section 1.8 of both the Validation report and Verification report.</p>	
	<p><u>Verra Response</u>          Section 1.8 of the validation and verification reports have been</p>	

		updated to explain why some interviews were conducted by phone. This is sufficient to close the finding.	
--	--	---	--

<b>12</b>	<b>Incorrectly numbered sections</b>		
	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All sections after Section 3.3.7 in the verification report are incorrectly numbered.</li> <li>Section 3.3 of the verification report contains information that was supposed to be under Section 3.2.</li> </ol> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <p>The VVB must ensure all sections are numbered in accordance with the <i>SD VISTA Validation Report Template, v1.0</i></p> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u></p> <p><i>SD VISTA Validation Report Template, v1.0</i> Section 3.3.8 – 8 <i>Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0</i>; Section 5.4.2</p>	<p style="background-color: #1a3d4d; color: white; padding: 2px;"><b>Round 1</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <p>1.VVB has revised the Verification Report in line with the SD VISTA Verification Report Template, v1.0. All section numbers have been updated and are now numbered correctly.</p> <p>2.Likewise, the Validation Report has been updated to ensure that all sections contain the correct corresponding information. Section 3.3 and 3.2 have been revised to reflect details in line with the SD VISTA Validation Report Template, v1.0.</p> <hr/> <p><u>Verra Response</u></p> <p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>Section 3.3.8 of the verification report has an incorrect section label.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <p>The VVB must ensure all sections are numbered in accordance with the <i>SD VISTA Verification Report Template, v1.0</i>.</p> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u></p> <p><i>SD VISTA Verification Report Template, v1.0</i> Section 3.3.8 <i>Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0</i>; Section 5.4.2</p> <p style="background-color: #1a3d4d; color: white; padding: 2px;"><b>Round 2</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <p>VVB has revised the Verification Report in line with the SD VISTA Verification Report Template, v1.0. Section number 3.3.8 has been updated and are now numbered and labelled correctly.</p> <hr/> <p><u>Verra Response</u></p>	Closed

		<p><u>Issue</u> Section 3.3.8 of the verification report still has an incorrect section label.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u> The VVB must ensure all sections are labelled in accordance with the <i>SD VISta Verification Report Template, v1.0</i>.</p> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>SD VISta Verification Report Template, v1.0</i> Section 3.3.8 <i>Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0</i>; Section 5.4.2</p> <p><b>Round 3</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u> VVB has updated section 3.3.8 of the Verification Report, which is now titled as ‘Stakeholder Access to Project Documentation’, in line with the SD VISta Verification Report Template v1.0.</p> <p><u>Verra Response</u> The section numbers in the verification report have been corrected. This is sufficient to close the finding.</p>	
--	--	---	--

13	<p><b>Inconsistent monitoring plan</b></p> <p><u>Issue</u> In Section 3.3 of the SD VISta project description, the sixth table’s impact (access to cleaner energy technologies) unit of measure described is “households,” whereas in Section 3.4 of the same document the monitoring plan columns’ unit of measure is “total number of ICS distributed per year.”</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The VVB must ensure the project proponents monitoring plan and monitoring impacts are consistent.</li> <li>2. The VVB must assess the updates to the project description and update the relevant sections of the validation report accordingly.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Round 1</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PP has acknowledged the inconsistency in the unit of measurement for the impact “Access to cleaner energy technologies”. VVB has ensured that Section 3.4 of the project description is revised and the unit of measurement is denoted as “Number of Households” consistently throughout the document.</li> <li>2. VVB has assessed the revisions in the project description and has updated the Validation Report to be in line with the same. The Validation Report (Section 3.1.5) has been revised to reflect the impact on access to clean technologies in terms of beneficiary households.</li> </ol> <p><u>Verra Response</u> The table in Section 3.4 of the project description has been</p>	Closed
----	---	--	--------

	<p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0; Section 3.1.3</p>	<p>updated to have the same metric as Section 3.3. This is sufficient to close the finding.</p>	
--	---	---	--

14 Impact on natural capital			
	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 6.1.1 Impact 1 of the verification report states there has been an increase in above-ground biomass compared to pre-project scenarios. But the VVB does not provide sufficient evidence to support their claim.</li> <li>The VVB also states that they “[compared] current biomass cover with the pre-project scenario as described in online reports by UN.” However, the VVB does not explain what tests or methodology they used to come to this conclusion.</li> </ol> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The VVB must justify their claims in section 6.1.1 with quantitative metrics or remove the paragraph referring to slowing deforestation/increasing above-ground biomass.</li> </ol> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> SD VSta Validation Report Template, v1.0 Section 3.1.2-3.1.3 Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard, v1.0; Section 5.4.2</p>	<p><b>Round 1</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u> VVB has acknowledged the statement pertaining to impact of PA on biomass has been incorrectly phrased, and has modified the same to not include a comparison of pre and post PA biomass levels in the host country in section 6.1.1 of the Verification report.</p> <hr/> <p><u>Verra Response</u> Statements regarding above-ground biomass in Section 5.1.1 of the verification report have been removed. This is sufficient to close the finding.</p> <p>Note: The initial issue raised by Verra incorrectly identified the section in question as Section 6.1.1 when in fact it was Section 5.1.1.</p>	<p>Closed</p>

15 Implementation schedule			
	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>Section 3.2.3 of the verification report states the baseline survey was conducted between October 2022 and January 2022. This is not consistent with the timeline provided in Section 2.1.3 of the project description.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The VVB must ensure they clarify the correct dates and</li> </ol>	<p><b>Round 1</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u> 1.VVB has rectified the typographical error and updated the dates of the baseline survey to have been conducted from ‘October 2021 to January 2022, which is in line with the timeline provided in Section 3.2.3 of the verification report</p> <hr/> <p><u>Verra Response</u> Section 3.2.3 of the verification report has been updated with the</p>	<p>Closed</p>

	<p>update the verification report accordingly.</p> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> SD VSta Standard, v1.0 Section 2.1.4</p>	<p>correct dates of the baseline study. This is sufficient to close the finding.</p>	
--	---	--	--

16 Inconsistency in monitoring period results			
	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The verification report states the actual ICS distribution is lower than the target ICS distribution for this monitoring period due to the logistical and managerial choices of the project proponent. However, those choices are not highlighted in the monitoring report and verification report.</li> <li>In section 9 of the VVB's Verification Report, the first row of the first table has values of \$0.44 and \$0.20, which would equate to \$0.24 in savings, whereas the net benefit is listed as \$0.23.</li> <li>In row 9 of the second table in section 9, the ex-ante and Project values are not the same, but the percent difference column says 0%.</li> </ol> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The VVB must ensure the project proponent justifies the differences in ex-ante and project values. The VVB must provide an assessment of the above and update the verification report accordingly.</li> <li>The VVB must provide correct numbers and update the verification report accordingly.</li> </ol> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> SD VSta Standard, v1.0 Section 2.1.9</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Round 1</b></p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Verification Report has been updated to expound upon the reasons resulting in the lower number of ICS distribution undertaken in the current monitoring period. This includes the fact that being a pilot project, penetration of the project has been low due to the ICS distribution hasn't met the envisaged target.</li> <li>VVB would like to clarify that for SDG 1.1, the amount spent on fuel per day per household in baseline and project scenario are \$0.4360 and \$0.2024 respectively, resulting in a difference of \$0.2337. All values have been rounded up to 2 places after the decimal hence resulting in the values of \$0.44, \$0.20, and \$0.23, as also showcased in the NG VCS 2673 SDG Impact Tool_MP 01_v1.2. Clarification regarding the same has been incorporated in the Verification Report as footnote No. 1.</li> <li>VVB has updated the table to reflect the correct difference between the ex-ante and achieved values for SDG 12.2. VVB has also provided justification for the resulting difference in the two. The actual fuel saving achieved is marginally more than what was envisaged owing to the 'annual discount factor for efficiency' employed in the latter. However, given the PA is undergoing 1<sup>st</sup> verification for the 1<sup>st</sup> Monitoring Period, the loss of efficiency of the ICS is less than the default value prescribed in methodology VMR0006. Likewise, 'The Baseline stove usage factor to account for use of baseline cookstoves along with improved cookstoves' (<math>\mu_y=0.06</math>), ascertained from the Monitoring Survey has been found to be lesser than default value (0.10) used in ex ante calculations, affecting the minor increase in fuel savings.</li> </ol>	<p>Closed</p>

		<p><u>Verra Response</u>            The verification report has been updated to clarify why so few cookstoves were distributed compared to the expected total. In addition, the calculations in section 9 have been explained satisfactorily. This is sufficient to close the finding.</p>	