

ANNEX AQ – MICRO-SCALE VALIDATION REPORT TEMPLATE

CONTENTS



A. Brief Project Description

B. Objective Observers' opinion

C. Details about the site-visit

1. Team on site
2. Period of site-visit
3. People interviewed
4. Means for interviews

D. Stakeholder Consultation Process

1. Evaluation of the Local Stakeholder Consultation Process
2. Evaluation of the Stakeholder Feedback Round
3. Evaluation of the Continuous input / grievance mechanism implemented

E. Evaluation of the risks potentially associated with the project activity

1. 'Do no harm assessment'
2. Evaluation of the proposed mitigation measures

F. Evaluation of sustainable development related issues potentially associated with the project activity

1. Environmental issues
2. Social and economic issues

G. Sustainable Development Eligibility criteria for inclusion of a VPA to the PoA

SECTION A. BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Please indicate the scheme applicable to the micro-scale activity:

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 1. Project activity is applying under the micro-scale scheme | X |
| 2. Project activity is applying under the micro-programme scheme | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Title of the Activity or VPA:

Kakamega Stove Project

Title of the PoA:

Discuss the current status of the project activity and what will happen as per the project scenario. Briefly discuss the technology employed by the project activity.

The production and dissemination of fuel wood saving Upesi Stoves has started on 1st November 2013. Until October 2016 over 900 stoves were installed around Kakamega Forest. The installation activities are going on with a pace of about 50 stoves per month.

A stakeholder meeting (LSC) was held on 14th November 2014. A first PDD draft was submitted on 24th February 2015, another on 29th October 2015 (official first date of submission).

In the context of the Stakeholder Feedback Round (SFR), another meeting was held on 1st April 2015 in the KEEP meeting hall in Buyangu. Since the first LSC, end-users have also been reached out to through multiple "Barasas" (official local village meetings). Furthermore, grievance books have been laid out in 1) Kenya Forest Service (KFS) Office in Isecheno; 2) Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) Buyango; 3) KEEP Office in Buyango for all stakeholders to use.

Comments were taken into account and according changes were made in the PDD.

The baseline monitoring has been completed. It was undertaken by external experts Sarah Heinlein and Anastasia Mwaura (KWS) with data processing, text editing and layout by Michael Schwarz and Felix Cybulla (both Ivakale e.V.). The Baseline Study has been uploaded to the Markit registry.

Efficient Upesi-Stoves are a locally produced and affordable alternative to traditional open fireplaces (so called 3-stone-stoves). Upesi stoves are built from a clay foundation in which 1 or 2 conical ceramic "liner" are embedded. While there are transportable types of Upesi Stoves available, the PP only uses permanently installed stoves.

The Upesi liners are produced in contracted local potteries, namely Mlachake Women group, Valongji Women Group and Ilesi pottery and installed by technicians of KEEP.

SECTION B. OBJECTIVE OBSERVERS' OPINION

Please provide an opinion as to whether the project activity is in line with The Gold Standard principles and should be validated.

As per decision of Gold Standard Foundation (email from Johann Thaler on 16th April 2015), an Objective Observer's opinion is not necessary before validation, but verification.

(To be filled only in the event of the use of an Objective Observer)

SECTION C. DETAILS ABOUT THE SITE-VISIT

(To be filled only in the event of the use of an Objective Observer)

i. Individual or team on site

List Objective Observer(s) that went on site. Provide brief information about his/her (their) background and relevant skills.

n.a.

ii. Period of site-visit

Time period during which Objective Observer(s) was (were) on-site.

n.a.

iii. People interviewed

Provide the list of the individuals interviewed during the site visit and include relevant information on the group or organisation they represent.

n.a.

iv. Means for interviews

Describe the means used to interview individuals during site visit; e.g. one to one interactions, telephonic conversations, etc.

n.a.

SECTION D. STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION PROCESS

(To be filled only in the event of the use of an Objective Observer)

D. 1. Evaluation of the Local Stakeholder Consultation Process

Please discuss whether attendance was representative enough (both qualitatively and quantitatively), whether the comments raised have been answered and addressed appropriately, and summarize what the main outcomes were.

n.a.

D. 2. Evaluation of the Stakeholder Feedback Round

Please discuss the comments raised or assess if any open issues raised by the stakeholders during the LSC have been addressed.

n.a.

D. 3. Evaluation of the Continuous input / grievance mechanism implemented

Please evaluate whether the approved/selected methods of Continuous Input/Grievance Mechanism from the LSC report / other consultations have been implemented on site. For retroactive projects check that appropriate means were used by the PP to reach out to relevant stakeholders and seek their feedback on the Continuous Input / Grievance Expression methods as there was no LSC conducted for retroactive projects.

n.a.

SECTION E. EVALUATION OF THE RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROJECT ACTIVITY

i. 'Do no harm' assessment

The "Do no harm" Assessment resulted in none of the safeguarding principles being associated with a medium or high risk. The contrary, some principles such as health are thought to be positively affected due to a decrease in smoke emitted by the new stove type.

The full protocol of the "Do no harm" assessment is captured in the LSC minutes starting at 15:55

	Safeguarding Principle	Risk	comment
	Human Rights		
1	The project Respects internationally proclaimed human rights including dignity, cultural property and uniqueness of indigenous people. The Project is not complicit in Human Rights abuses.	low	-
2	The project does not involve and is not complicit in involuntary resettlement.	Low	-
3	The project does not involve and is not complicit in the alteration, damage or removal of and critical cultural heritage.	Low	-
	Labour Standards		
4	The project respects the employees' freedom of association and their right to collective bargaining and is not complicit in restrictions of these freedoms and rights.	Low	-
5	The project does not involve and is not complicit in any form of forced or compulsory labour.	Low	-
6	The project does not employ and is not complicit in any form of child labour.	Low	-
7	The project does not involve and is not complicit in any form of discrimination based on gender, race, religion, sexual orientation or any other basis.	Low	-
8	The project provides workers with a safe and healthy work environment and is not complicit in exposing workers to unsafe or unhealthy work environments	Low	-
	Environmental Protection		
9	The project takes a precautionary approach in regard to environmental challenges and is not complicit in practices contrary to the precautionary principle. This principle can be defined as: "When an activity raises threats of harm to human health or the environment, precautionary measures should be taken even if some cause and effect relationships are not fully established scientifically."	Low	-
10	The project does not involve and is not complicit in significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats, including those that are (a) Legally protected, (b) Officially proposed for protection, (c) Identified by authoritative sources for their high conservation value or (d) Recognized	Low	-

	as protected by traditional local communities		
	Anti-Corruption		
11	The project does not involve and is not complicit in corruption.	Low	-

[See GS Annex H for guidelines on safeguarding principles]

Safeguarding principles associated with a medium to high risk	Assessment of project risks breaching it (medium, high)	Mitigation or compensation measure proposed by project proponents after discussion with Objective Observer(s)
none	n.a.	n.a.

ii. Evaluation of mitigation or compensation measures proposed by project proponents

There are no mitigation or compensation measures needed.

Mitigation measure	Comments
n.a.	-
n.a.	-

SECTION F. EVALUATION OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT RELATED ISSUES POTENTIALLY ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROJECT ACTIVITY

[See GS Annex I]

i. Environmental issues

Does the implementation of the project activity contribute to any negative environmental impacts, (e.g. on air quality, water quality and/or quantity, soil condition, biodiversity or any other pollutant) compared with the baseline situation (i.e. current situation or most likely situation in the absence of the project activity)?

During the LSC, the safeguarding principles related to environmental protection were checked against with all stakeholders and all principles were rated with “low risk”

(compare LSC meeting documentation in the PDD). Further interviews with Nature Kenya as well as individual consultations with the potteries revealed no medium or high risks associated with the project.

The project does therefore not contribute to any negative environmental impacts.

Discussion and further explanation to each indicator:

1. **Air quality:** no risk. Air quality will very likely increase as the stoves show cleaner combustion and less smoke and air pollution. Multiple international research studies have been published that show no decrease in air quality in any improved cookstove projects around the world. To the contrary, all projects report a significant improvement of indoor air quality after the installment of improved cookstoves.
2. **Water quality and/or quantity:** The project at hand has no implications on water quality and or quantity. Water is not used in any of the steps of the production of the stoves. The stoves do not impact ground water or above water levels at all. No interaction in between water bodies of any sort is associated with the project.
3. **Soil condition:** Low risk. The stove producers are the only place where soil is taken out to produce the stove core part (so called liner). The potteries are regularly interviewed about soil condition and possible erosion. Compare Monitoring Manual as well as PDD.
4. **Biodiversity:** There is no expected negative impact on biodiversity whatsoever. Due to a reduction in fuel wood consumption and therefore a reduction in timber outtake from the forest, if anything a positive impact on biodiversity can be expected.
5. **Any other pollutant:** There are no other pollutants involved in all steps of the process/project implementation. Production as well as building the stoves is not involving any chemicals or other materials except of natural clay.

ii. Social and economic issues

Does the implementation of the project lead to any negative social and economic impacts e.g. was there any deterioration of livelihoods, or reduction in the quality and quantity of employment, compared with the baseline situation (i.e. current situation or most likely situation in the absence of the project activity)?

During the LSC, the safeguarding principles related to human rights and labor standards were checked against with all stakeholders and all principles were rated with “low risk” (compare LSC meeting documentation in the PDD). Further interviews with KEEP staff, technicians as well as the potteries revealed no medium or high risks associated with the project.

The Project does therefore not contribute to any negative social or economic impacts.

Discussion and further explanation to each indicator:

1. **Quality of employment:** Since the project involves many local partner NGOs, the potteries as well

as individual people, the quality of employment is at all increased. Potteries are selling the stove core parts (so called liners), partner NGOs and individual people responsible for the building of the stoves, the monitoring and data checks. Sustainable and fairly paid employment is offered to all partners and employees, that comply with the safeguard principles. All project employees receive security training and are equipped with appropriate equipment and tool (rubber boots, gloves, rain coats, pens and paper as well as print outs) Work times are flexible so that employees can fulfill other duties (bringing children to school, help with harvest, sell own groceries on market, other economical activities). No negative impacts of the project are therefore expected.

2. Livelihood of the poor: Since materials used for the products come from local sources, there is no import of goods from an external source. Potteries show an increase sale since the project uses their product (the liners). Many local people find part time or long term employment through the project. Most of the employed staff members come from poor backgrounds. Additionally, the benefitting households who are receiving an improved cookstoves will experience a reduction in fuel wood which directly translates into saved time and money which again translates into a higher quality of life and therefore improved livelihoods. There is no associated risk that would threaten livelihoods of the poor.

3. Access to affordable and clean energy services: Since the improved cookstoves show a more efficient and clean combustion, indoor air pollution is reduced as well as the overall fuel wood consumption. Without the project, benefitting households would not be able to afford an improved cookstoves. The access to affordable and cleaner energy services is therefore enhanced and supported. No risk can be identified that would state the opposite and hinder local people from access to clean and affordable energy.

4. Human and institutional capacity: The project supports and involves local organizations as well as individuals. Their opinion is valued and actively taken into account for the project implementation. Technicians learn how to improve their stove building skills and hold workshops where they exchange knowledge and best practices. At no stage is the project hindering human or institutional capacity development. If at all, it helps foster and strengthening their capacity.

5. Quantitative employment and income generation: The project involves local organizations as well as individuals in all stages. Potteries are selling stove cores (so called liners), the project technicians are paid to build the stoves in households, individuals are doing data checks and monitoring work for the project. At no stage is the project decreasing the quantitative employment and income generation of organizations, potteries or individual people.

6. Access to investment and Technology transfer and technology self-reliance: The project does not hinder anyone involved to access investment of any sort. Technology transfer as well as technology self-reliance is not prevented by the project as there is no foreign technology involved at any of the stages of the project. To the contrary, the project solely depends on local resources (clay for the stoves, local knowledge on how to build stoves, knowledge of the region, etc). The project does therefore not pose any risk to the indicator "Access to investment and Technology transfer and technology self-reliance".

iii. Sustainability Monitoring Plan

[See Toolkit section 2.4.3 and Annex I]

(Copy Table for each indicator being monitored)

No	1	
Indicator	Indoor Air quality	
Mitigation measure	n.a.	
Chosen parameter	Percentage of end-users answering the question "Has air pollution changed since using the new stove? Rate on the following scale: 1) Air pollution has decreased 2) Air pollution has stayed the same 3) Air pollution has increased"	
current situation of parameter	As the parameter measures a change between baseline and the project situation, a value for the current situation can not be assigned. Various studies e.g. of the World Health Organisation (see http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs292/en/) proof severe health impacts of open fires on a global scale. It is assumed, the same is applicable for the project situation and project baseline scenario.	
Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	see above	
Future target for parameter	80% of end-users confirm above question with "1"	
Way of monitoring	How	summary and statistical of answers on this parameter in baseline and project survey questionnaires, see Monitoring manual
	When	Annually
	By Who	KSP monitoring manager

No	2	
Indicator	Soil quality	
Mitigation measure	Tree planting	
Chosen parameter	surface area (in m ²) with signs of soil erosion in clay mines of project potteries	
current situation of parameter	occasional soil erosion on small surface area (< 10 m ²)	
Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	occasional soil erosion on small surface area (< 10 m ²)	
Future target for parameter	surface area with signs of soil erosion in clay mines of project potteries does not exceed 10 m ²	
Way of monitoring	How	on-site visit of clay mines of all project potteries, measurement of eroded surface area due to KSP production, see Monitoring manual
	When	Annually

	By Who	KSP monitoring manager
--	---------------	------------------------

No	3	
Indicator	Livelihood of the poor	
Mitigation measure	n.a.	
Chosen parameter	time spent for firewood collection per person	
current situation of parameter	time for firewood collection is same as in baseline situation	
Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	still to be elevated, see Monitoring Manual	
Future target for parameter	decrease of time spent for firewood collection	
Way of monitoring	How	summary and statistical of answers on this parameter in baseline and project survey questionnaires, see Monitoring manual
	When	Annually
	By Who	KSP monitoring manager

No	4	
Indicator	Access to clean and affordable energy services	
Mitigation measure	n.a.	
Chosen parameter	Number of people benefitting from new KSP cookstove	
current situation of parameter	about 4651 (969 households * 4,8 people/household), as of 11 th October 2016	
Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	0 (baseline for KSP)	
Future target for parameter	about 4800	
Way of monitoring	How	Summary and analysis of Stove Protocols, see Monitoring manual
	When	Annually
	By Who	KSP monitoring manager

No	5a	
Indicator	Quantitative employment and income generation	
Mitigation measure	n.a.	
Chosen parameter	Number of people directly employed by KSP	
current situation of parameter	3 (management) + 5 (technicians) = 8, as of 1.Oct.2015	
Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	0	
Future target for parameter	same or higher as current situation	
Way of monitoring	How	Summary and analysis of financial records of KSP, see Monitoring manual
	When	Annually
	By Who	KSP monitoring manager

No	5b	
Indicator	Quantitative employment and income generation	

Mitigation measure	n.a.	
Chosen parameter	Number of people indirectly employed by KSP	
current situation of parameter	5 potteries produce stoves for KSP, occasional employment for car drivers and helpers, exact number of people still to be monitored	
Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	0	
Future target for parameter	same or higher as current situation	
Way of monitoring	How	Summary and analysis of financial records of KSP, see Monitoring manual
	When	Annually
	By Who	KSP monitoring manager

SECTION G. Sustainable Development eligibility criteria for inclusion of a VPA to the PoA

(This section is applicable for micro-programme scheme only)

Please discuss the compliance of the SD eligibility criteria for inclusion of the VPA as per the registered micro-programme.

n.a.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATION

(To be filled only in the event of the use of an Objective Observer)

I, [insert full name], aged [insert age] years, residing at [insert full home address], and working for [insert company name], which is located at [insert company headquarters address], having been selected to serve as an Objective Observer on behalf of The Gold Standard Foundation, hereby certify and declare as follows:

Neither I nor anyone else having influence over me has an interest with any person or in any firm, corporation or other business entity that is involved in the assessed project activity "GS _____" nor have I participated, directly or indirectly, by committee or as a consultant, advisor, employee, officer, director, agent, trustee, or otherwise, in the development, implementation, or administration of GS _____. I further certify and declare that in no way do I have a bias in favor or against any person, firm, corporation or business entity involved with GS _____, and I understand that such bias would disqualify me as an Objective Observer. If at any time during the evaluation process I should become aware of any interest or bias, I will report it immediately to The Gold Standard Foundation.

For purposes of this declaration, I understand “interest” to include any consideration or other thing of economic value, including future consideration.

Name: _____

Signed this _____ day of _____ Year _____