

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.g

Project ID	3662
Project Name	15 MW Nam Hinboun Downstream Hydropower Project
Review Type	Registration & Verification Approval
Program(s)	VCS Program
Verification Period	01 February 2021 – 31 July 2022
Project Proponent	Rasita Power Co. Ltd.
Methodology	AMS I.D, Small-scale methodology for grid-connected renewable electricity generation, v18.0
VVB	4K Earth Science Private Limited
Assessment Criteria	VCS Standard, 4.3, AMS I.D, v18.0
Date of First Issue	10 March 2023
Review Conclusion	The project document updates and VVB responses were sufficient to close all findings.
Date of Final Issue	11 April 2023

FINDINGS

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
1	No information on equipment lifetime		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 1.11 of the joint project description and monitoring report (PDMR) does not include information about the lifespan of the bulk turbines. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must ensure that the project proponent (PP) updates section 1.11 of the joint PDMR to include the lifespan of the bulk turbines. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> Section 1.11 of the VCS Joint Project Description and Monitoring Report Template, v4.1	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> The life span of bulb turbine is now included in section 1.11 of Joint PDMR <u>Verra Response</u> The PP has updated section 1.11 of the joint PDMR to include the lifespan of the bulk turbines.	Closed
2	Insufficient information about rules and regulations considered		
	<u>Issue</u> The PP states in section 1.14 of the joint PDMR that the project has received all necessary approvals for the project. However, they do not describe the rules and requirements that mandate such approvals. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must ensure the PP updates section 1.14 of the joint PDMR to include a list of all rules and requirements	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> PP has updated section 1.14 of the Joint PDMR with the list of all rules and requirements they have considered for compliance. The assessment is provided in the Joint Val & Ver report. <u>Verra Response</u> The PP has updated section 1.14 to include the relevant	Closed

they have considered for compliance. 2. The VVB must assess any updates as needed. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> Section 1.14 of the VCS Joint Project Description and Monitoring Report Template, v4.1	laws and requirements regarding the project's implementation. The VVB has provided the same in section 3.1 of the joint VVR.	
--	---	--

3 Clarify relocation mitigation measures			
	<u>Issue</u>	Round 1	Closed
	The PP states in section 2.1 of the joint PDMR that some households may have to relocate because of their proximity to the dam. However, it is unclear what the outcomes are, given that the project has already started and is in its first verification period. Further, the VVB did not assess this in Section 3.3.1 of the joint validation verification report (VVR).	<u>VVB Response</u>	
	<u>Action Required</u>	<u>Verra Response</u>	
	1. The VVB must clarify whether the households have been relocated or not, given that the project has already started. 2. The VVB must also clarify if these households were part of the PP's stakeholder consultation process, and how their feedback was taken into consideration. 3. The VVB must clarify how they have assessed this issue pertaining to no net harm during the validation and verification, especially during site visit. <u>Program Rule(s)</u>	1. The PP has confirmed that no relocation has occurred as a result of the project in sections 2.1 of the joint PDMR. 2. The VVB has confirmed the same, and assessed there is no net harm due to the project.	

	Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the <i>VCS Joint Project Description and Monitoring Report Template, v4.1</i> , Section 3.3 of the <i>VCS Joint Validation and Verification Report Template, v4.1</i> , and Sections 3.17.3 – 5 of the <i>VCS Standard, v4.3</i>		
--	--	--	--

4 Mechanism for on-going communication with local stakeholders			
	<u>Issue</u> The PP states in section 2.2 of the joint PDMR that “Local people were invited to the meeting via personal face to face invitations and posters. Local government officers were invited to the meeting via face-to-face invitations and invitation letter” but does not describe the mechanism for ongoing communication with the local stakeholders subsequent to 12/07/2017. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the PP updates section 2.2 of the joint PDMR and describe the mechanism for ongoing communication with the local stakeholders. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> Section 2.2 of the <i>VCS Joint Project Description and Monitoring Report Template, v4.1</i> , and Section 3.17.4 of the <i>VCS Standard, v4.3</i>	Round 1	Closed
		<u>VVB Response</u> The details of ongoing communication with stakeholders are now provided in section 2.2 of the joint PDMR	
		<u>Verra Response</u> 1. Information on the mechanism for ongoing communication with the local stakeholders has been included in section 2.2 of the joint PDMR.	

5 Insufficient justification for data used to calculate grid emission factor			
	<u>Issue</u> The PP does not include justification on why the three-year generation weighted average for $EF_{grid,OM-ave,y}$ used data from 2017, 2018 and 2019, instead of 2018, 2019 and 2020, given	Round 1	Closed
		<u>VVB Response</u> The 2020 data was not available earlier. However, now 2020 is data received from EDL. Hence, the $EF_{grid,OM-ave,y}$ have now been	

	that the project started in 2021.	calculated based on the 2018, 2019 & 2020 data. The same is updated in the ER sheet & Joint PDMR. The assessment is also now provided in the Joint Val & Ver report.	
	<u>Action Required</u> The VVB must clarify why the three-year data used to quantify $EF_{grid,OM-ave,y}$ is appropriate, given that the project started in 2021. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> Sections 6.4.1 and 6.4.4 of TOOL07, Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, v5.0	<u>Verra Response</u> The parameter, $EF_{grid,OM-ave,y}$ was updated in the joint PDMR based on data from 2018-2020 as requested.	

6 Insufficient information for data/parameters			
	<u>Issue</u> In section 5.2 of the joint PDMR the PP has not provided the accuracy class for EGPJ, y. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must ensure the PP updates section 5.2 of the joint PDMR with the accuracy class for EGPJ, y. the accuracy class should be the same as reflected in section 6.1. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> Section 5.2 of the VCS Joint Project Description and Monitoring Report Template, v4.1	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> PP has updated section 5.2 of the joint PDMR with the accuracy class for EGPJ, y which is consistent with the accuracy class mentioned in section 6.1.	Closed
		<u>Verra Response</u> The PP has included the accuracy class for EGPJ, y as requested.	

7	Inconsistent information on GHG ERRs
---	--------------------------------------

Issue	Round 1	Closed
The VVB does not provide consistent information for the ex-ante GHG ERRs for the project in section 1.4, 3.1 and 3.4.6 of the joint validation & verification report and the values are inconsistent with that reported in the joint PDMR.	<u>VVB Response</u>	
<u>Action Required</u>	1. Section 1.4 & 3.1 of Joint VVR are updated with correct ex-ante GHG ERRs for the project. This is now consistent with the Joint PDMR 2. The mistake in the ERR in section 3.4.6 of Joint VVR are corrected now. 3. The GHG ERR spreadsheet is now submitted to VERRA	
1. The VVB must ensure to update section 1.4 and section 3.1 of the joint VVR and provide the correct ex-ante GHG ERRs for the project. This information should reflect the information presented in the joint PDMR. 2. Further, the VVB is requested to update section 3.4.6 of the joint VVR and indicate how the ERRs were calculated (i.e., 257,735 tCO₂e) given BE_y = 44,957 tCO₂e. The VVB must ensure the ERRs are consistently (and correctly) referenced in the joint VVR. 3. The VVB must also ensure the PP shares the GHG ERR spreadsheet with Verra.	<u>Verra Response</u>	
<u>Program Rule(s)</u>	1. The VVB has provided the ex-ante GHG ERRs consistently as requested and updated sections 1.4, 3.1 and 3.4.6 of the joint VVR. 2. The PP also shared the GHG ERR spreadsheet with Verra.	
Section 1.4, 3.1 and 3.4.6 of the <i>VCS Joint Validation and Verification Report Template, v4.2</i>		
<u>Background</u>		
Sections 1.10, 1.11 and 4.4 of the joint PDMR states that the estimated annual average net GHG ERRs is 44,957 tCO₂e.		
Sections 1.4 and 3.1 of the joint VVR states that the estimated average annual net GHG ERR is 44,615 tCO₂e. Sections 3.4.6		

	and 5 of the joint VVR states this value to be 44,957 tCO ₂ e.		
--	---	--	--

8	No indication on involvement with emissions trading (ETs) program		
	<u>Issue</u> The VVB does not indicated whether the project has been rejected or included in an ET program or any other compliance mechanism in section 3.1 of the joint VVR. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB is requested to update section 3.1 and 4.1 of the joint VVR and indicate whether the project has been rejected or included in an ETs or other compliance mechanism. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> Section 3.1 and 4.1 of the VCS <i>Joint Validation and Verification Report Template</i>, v4.2	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> Information on whether the project has been rejected or included in an ETs or other compliance mechanism are included in section 3.1 and 4.1 of the joint VVR	Closed
		<u>Verra Response</u> 1. The VVB has updated sections 3.1 and 4.1 of the joint VVR and indicated the project has not been rejected or included in an ETs program or any other compliance mechanism.	