

PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

This document tracks the findings raised in Verra’s review of the project specified below. The VVB must address the findings before the project request can be considered by Verra for approval. The document will be made publicly available on the Verra Registry. Confidential information may be provided as separate attachments.

Review Type	Verification
Project ID	1822
Project Name	10 MW wind power project by Powerica at BDS - Gujarat
Program(s)	VCS
Verification Period	01/01/2021 - 31/12/2021
Project Proponent	Powerica Limited
Methodology	AMS-I-D “Grid connected renewable electricity generation” version 18
VVB	RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA)
Assessment Criteria	VCS Standard Version 4.2
Date of First Issue	07 September 2022
Review Conclusion	Approved
Date of Final Issue	13-November-2022

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS			
#	Description	Response	Status
1	<p>Incorrect project name in verification report</p> <p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>The verification report refers to the project’s name as “10 MW wind power project by Powerica at BDS Gujarat” while the monitoring report as “10 MW wind power project by Powerica at BDS-Gujarat”.</p> <p><u>Action item</u></p> <p>The VVB must correct the project’s name throughout the verification report.</p> <p><u>Program rule(s) or methodology section</u></p> <p>VCS Verification Report Template v.4.1</p>	<p>Round1:</p> <p>VVB Response: The project title has been revised and updated at every place in verification report.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>The project title has been corrected</p>	Closed
2	<p>Incorrect references in the verification report</p> <p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>Section 2.2 of the verification report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) shows erroneously the reference to project ID 701 (link), PD dated 24/01/2011 and Validation Report dated 20/04/2021, under the reference /02/. b) shows erroneously the reference <i>TUV Nord_Verification Report_VCS monitoring period from 01/04/2010 to 31/08/2010</i>, under the reference /03/. c) reference /08/ indicates the reference to two monitoring reports which are not related to the project. d) Reference /01/ shows that there is a version 3.0 of the MR. However, the only version submitted for review is v2.0. <p>Further, page 8 of the validation report also refers to project ID701.</p>	<p>Round1:</p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The link has been removed and the verification report has been updated accordingly b) The reference error has been removed and the verification report is revised and updated. c) The same has been revised and it is reporting template form 	Closed

	<p>Action required</p> <p>The VVB must correct the references provided under numbers /02/, /03/, /08/, /01/ and page 8 of the verification report.</p> <p>Program rule(s)</p> <p>VCS-Verification Report Template, v.4.1, Section 2.2</p>	<p>d) The reference 01 has been corrected in the verification report</p> <p>The references under /01/, /02/, /03/, /08/ have been corrected and revised in the verification report</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>Corrected as requested</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>Wrong number of verification</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Section 2.5.1 of the verification report states that the project activity is undergoing <i>third</i> verification under VCS, while this is the fourth verification under VCS.</p> <p>Action required</p> <p>The VVB must correct the reference number of the VCS verification in Section 2.5.1 of the verification report.</p> <p>Program rule(s)</p> <p>VCS-Verification Report Template, v.4.1, Section 2.5.1</p>	<p>Round1: Closed</p> <p>VVB Response: The VR has been revised and corrected in section 2.5.1.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>Corrected as required</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Misleading statement in verification report</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Section 3.1 of the verification report states that “<i>the VCS monitoring period does not overlap with the CDM Monitoring Period</i>”. However, the project is not registered under the CDM.</p> <p>Action required</p> <p>The VVB shall explain which is the potential overlap with CDM that it refers to in Section 3.1 of the verification report.</p> <p>Program rule(s)</p> <p>VCS-Verification Report Template, v.4.1, Section 3.1</p>	<p>Round1: Closed</p> <p>VVB Response: Verification report has been revised and updated. As there is not potential overlap as the project proponent has declared that they will not claim carbon credits under any other mechanisms, only under VCS it will be claimed</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>The revision is accepted as correct</p>

<p>5</p>	<p>Missing information on on-going communication with local stakeholders</p> <p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>Section 3.1 of the verification report states that “for this monitoring period local people were interviewed by phone”. However, Section 2.3 does not provide the details of the interviewed local stakeholders or their authorized representatives.</p> <p><u>Action required</u></p> <p>The VVB must elaborate and indicate the details of the local people which have been interviewed by phone in Section 2.3 of the verification report. The VVB shall provide the interview notes to Verra for review.</p> <p><u>Program rule(s)</u></p> <p>VCS-Verification Report Template, v.4.1, Section 2.3</p>	<p>Round1:</p> <p>VVB Response: This is in section 4.2.2 of the VR, and not in section 3.1.</p> <p>The local people were represented by Mr. Nilesh and stakeholder consultation was discussed during the remote audit.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>Response accepted, and hence closed</p>	<p>Closed</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>Inconsistent calibration frequency</p> <p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>Page 15 of the verification report states that “as per the MR the calibration frequency is once in three years”, however this is in contradiction with the information in the monitoring report.</p> <p><u>Action required</u></p> <p>The VVB must further explain the calibration frequency defined as per the project description and monitoring report.</p> <p><u>Program rule(s)</u></p> <p>VCS-Verification Report Template, v.4.1, Section 4.5</p>	<p>Round1:</p> <p>VVB Response: In section 4.2 of the MR page no. 13, it is mentioned that Calibration Frequency: The meters are calibrated at least once in five years period as per CEA notification.</p> <p>The same was verified during the verification and found to be correct.</p> <p>Also, in section 4.4., page no. 16 of the VR, it is mentioned that meters will be calibrated at least once in five years as per CEA notification.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>Clarified and consistent</p>	<p>Closed</p>

7	<p>Misleading statement in verification report and spreadsheet requested</p> <p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>Page 14 of the verification report states that “<i>the reported average emission reductions is 15.88% higher than than the estimated average emission reductions</i>”, while in the monitoring report they are reported as 15.88% lower. Further, the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet has not been provided.</p> <p><u>Action required</u></p> <p>The VVB must ensure that statements are consistent between the MR and the VR, and explain if the achieved emission reductions are higher or lower than the estimated ones and provide the calculation spreadsheet for further reference.</p> <p><u>Program rule(s)</u></p> <p>VCS-Verification Report Template, v.4.1, Section 4.4</p>	<p>Round1:</p> <p>VVB Response: This is typo error and the value is actually lower one. The same has been corrected in the VR.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>Corrected as lower and therefore accepted</p>	Closed
---	--	---	--------