

# 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.*

<b>Review Type</b>	Verification
<b>Project ID</b>	0051
<b>Project Name</b>	29.70 MW Wind Power Project in Karnataka, India
<b>Program(s)</b>	VCS
<b>Verification Period</b>	01 January 2018 to 31 May 2018
<b>Project Proponent</b>	Acciona Wind Energy Pvt. Ltd. (AWEPL)
<b>Methodology</b>	ACM0002, Version 6.0
<b>Sectoral Scope(s)</b>	14. AFOLU
<b>VVB</b>	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	VCS Standard, v4.1,
<b>Date of First Issue</b>	30 June 2022
<b>Assessment Conclusion</b>	Closed
<b>Date of Final Issue</b>	09-Sept-2022

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS			
#	Description	Response	Status
1	<p><b>a) Project Crediting Period:</b></p> <p>i. <b>Issue:</b> The project start date is 06/06/2008 in Section 1.6 of the MR, with a ten-year crediting period, the end of the crediting period should be 05/06/2018. However, it is stated as 31/05/2018.</p> <p><b>Actions:</b> The VVB must assess this deviation and ensure that the crediting period end date is reflected correctly in all the relevant sections of the monitoring report and verification report</p> <p><b>Program Rule:</b> VCS Standard, v4.2, Section 3.7, Section 3.8</p> <p>ii. <b>Issue:</b> The MR Section 1.9 further states '<i>However, GHG credits for this project activity were issued for the monitoring period of 06-June-2008 to 21-November-2008 under CDM and GHG credits for the monitoring period of 20-November-2008 to 31-December-2011 were issued under CDM which does not fall under the current monitoring period.</i>'</p> <p>a) The first VCS issuance was from 06 June 2008 – 21 November 2008. Therefore, the statement is incorrect that VCUs were issued under CDM for this vintage.</p>	<p><b>Round 1:</b> VVB Response:</p> <p>i. In the approved VCS PD, the crediting period end date is mentioned as 31/05/2018 and hence the same is considered the MR. However, now the crediting period end date is changed to 05/06/2018 in both MR &amp; verification report.</p> <p>ii. This issue was raised and resolved during the previous verification period. Please refer PRR report of previous verification. The energy meter is in the control of DISCOM and the energy meter reading are taken by DISCOM as per their convenient. As a calibration of energy meter was conducted on 21<sup>st</sup> Nov 2008, the meter readings are taken on two times in the month of November 2008 (ie on 21<sup>st</sup> Nov-2008 and 30-Nov-2008). So, for the VCS 1<sup>st</sup> monitoring period, the electricity generation till 21<sup>st</sup> November 2008 is taken based on the energy meter readings are taken on 21<sup>st</sup> Nov 2008.</p> <p>Though the 1<sup>st</sup> CDM monitoring period started on 20<sup>th</sup> November 2008 (to be line with the start date of crediting period), the energy generation only from 21<sup>st</sup> November 2008 is considered for verification. Effectively, the monitoring period can be considered as 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2008 to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2009 (Refer Page 3 (introduction) of CDM MR and footnote of ER sheet of 1<sup>st</sup> CDM verification. Also please refer assessment provided in the 1<sup>st</sup> verification report.</p> <p>Hence there is no double counting of emission reduction though there is an overlap of 2 days between the VCS 1<sup>st</sup> Monitoring period and CDM 1<sup>st</sup> monitoring period.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>i. The end date of the CP is changed to 05/06/2018. However, this monitoring period still ends on 31/05/2018 in the revised MR. As the end of the CP of 31/05/2018 is in the VCS approved PD, the VVB must ensure that the same is corrected to align with the approved VCS PD and the vintage for this monitoring period</p> <p>ii. The explanation is accepted and no risk of double counting</p>	Closed

	<p>b) The first CDM issuance was from 20 November 2008. From the information provided, there are two days of potential double counting.</p> <p><b>Actions:</b> The VVB must assess the issue on double counting and ensure that corrected information on the dates are included in the revised monitoring report and verification report.</p> <p><b>Program rule:</b> VCS Standard, v4.1, Section 3.20.4</p>	<p><b>Round 2:</b> VVB Response: The crediting period is now changed as per the approved VCS PD.</p> <p>Verra Review: The end date of the CPI has been revised to 31/05/2018.</p>	
2	<p><b>a) Interviews with local stakeholders:</b> <b>Issue:</b> The VVB in Section 2.3 of the Verification Report indicates that it interviewed a 'Local Stakeholder'.</p> <p><b>Actions:</b> The VVB must demonstrate that all relevant local stakeholders were interviewed as a part of their auditing process. The VVB must ensure that the updated information is provided in the monitoring and verification reports</p> <p><b>Program and template rule:</b> VCS Standard, v4.1, Section 3.16.3. Verification Report Section 2.3</p>	<p><b>Round 1:</b> VVB Response: The monitoring period of this verification is only 5 months. As verified from the grievance register there is no grievance received during the monitoring period. Also due to COVID restriction, a remote audit was conducted through Skype and availability of local stakeholder was limited due to the unavailability of network. Hence, verification team could interview only one stakeholder. Additionally, verification team interviewed the PP's representatives and consultants and reviewed documents to achieve a reasonable level of assurance in the verification. This is in line with Section 4.1.2 of the VCS Standard, v4.0 which does not explicitly mandate site visits as part of the validation and verification process, only that VVBs must achieve a reasonable level of assurance on all validations and verifications.</p> <p>Verra Review: The MR and VR now include information that no grievances were received during this monitoring period, and how the VVB verified the same.</p>	Closed
3	<p><b>Accuracy of Emission Reductions:</b> <b>Issue:</b> The results of the delayed calibration have not been provided.</p> <p><b>Actions:</b> The VVB must assess the conservativeness of the emission reduction</p>	<p><b>Round 1:</b> VVB Response: The result of delayed calibration is now shown clearly in the MR and the assessment is provided in the FVR</p> <p>Verra Review:</p>	Closed

	<p>calculations from the results of the delayed calibration of the metering equipment.</p> <p><b>Program and template rule:</b> <i>MR template v4.0, Appendix I</i></p>	<p>The MR has been revised to demonstrate that the MPE has been applied, in line with §366 of the CDM Validation and Verification Standard v3.0. However, the MR does not indicate the result of the delayed calibration, to demonstrate the conservativeness of the applied 0.2 value</p> <p><b>Round 2:</b> VVB Response: The results of delayed calibration is already explained in Appendix 1 of MR &amp; section 4.2 monitoring table as well.</p> <p>Verra Review: The MPE has been applied and therefore the finding is closed</p>	
4	<p><b>Project Type:</b> <b>Issue:</b> In Section 1.2, the MR does not include whether it is a grouped project or not</p> <p><b>Actions:</b> The PP shall include whether the project activity is a grouped project or not</p> <p><b>Program and template rule:</b> <i>Monitoring Report Template, v4.0 Section 1.2</i></p>	<p><b>Round 1:</b> VVB Response: This is not grouped project. PP already confirmed same in section 3.3 of MR. Section 1.2 of MR also now confirms the same.</p> <p>Verra Review: The MR is revised to include the type of project.</p>	Closed
5	<p><b>Editorials issues:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) MR Title Page: Report ID not consistently assigned when compared to the previous MP MR</li> <li>b) VR Title Page: Clarify if 0051 is an internal project ID or VCS ID</li> <li>c) VR Section 1.2: Please clarify how the CDM Project Cycle Procedure is applied in the VCS verification activities</li> <li>d) VR Section 2.3 &amp; Appendix 1: All references to DOE to be replaced with VVB</li> <li>e) VR Appendix 1: The VVB shall clarify why it referred to the VCS Project 1931</li> </ul>	<p><b>Round 1:</b> VVB Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) MR Title Page: Report ID is internal ID of project proponent. In earlier monitoring report, PP wrongly considered VCS reference ID as report ID. For this report PP wants to retain the report ID 0051-2021-2</li> <li>b) VR Title Page: The internal project ID is corrected</li> <li>c) VR Section 1.2: The reference to the CDM Project Cycle Procedure has been removed</li> <li>d) VR Section 2.3 &amp; Appendix 1: All references to DOE has been replaced with VVB</li> <li>e) VR Appendix 1: The reference to project 1931 is a type which is now corrected.</li> <li>f) VR Appendix 1: The reference to the CDM PDD and VCS PD is now included</li> <li>g) Appendix 1: <i>CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, V3.0 is now referred</i></li> </ul> <p>Verra Review: a) Explanation accepted</p>	Closed

	<p>f) VR Appendix 1: The VVB has not included the CDM PDD and VCS PD it referred to as a basis for its verification exercise</p> <p>g) Appendix 1: The VVB shall clarify why it referred to an out-of-date <i>CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, V2.0.</i></p> <p><b>Program rules, MR and VR Template:</b> VCS Monitoring &amp; Verification Report Template, v4.0</p>	<p>b) Correction accepted</p> <p>c) Deleted and accepted</p> <p>d) Correction accepted</p> <p>e) Correction accepted</p> <p>f) Correction accepted</p>	
6	<p><b>Verification Reporting:</b></p> <p><b>Issue:</b> The verification Report Section 2.2 is not completed as required by the VCS Verification report template v4.0.</p> <p><b>Actions:</b> The VVB shall ensure that the verification report includes the audit process, in particular, the documents reviewed, the assessment of the monitoring plan, QA/QC procedures, interview process.</p> <p><b>Verification Report Template:</b> VCS Verification Report Template, v4.0, Section 2.2</p>	<p><b>Round 1:</b></p> <p>VVB Response: The requested details are already provided in section 2.1. However, clear description is provided in section 2.2 on how the document review has been conducted.</p> <p>Verra Review: The section now includes details of the audit process, including documents referred and reviewed. However, the numbering of the section and all sections in the verification report is not in line with the applied VCS VR template v4.0, and shall be revised.</p> <p><b>Round 2:</b></p> <p>VVB Response: The numbering of all sections in the verification report is corrected as per VCS VR Template v4.0</p> <p>Verra Review: Corrections have been effected</p>	Closed
7	<p><b>Verification Reporting:</b></p> <p><b>Issue:</b> The verification report states that the project is not registered under any other program.</p> <p><b>Actions:</b> The VVB must ensure that the verification report provides accurate information in Section 3.1.</p>	<p><b>Round 1:</b></p> <p>VVB Response: This sentence is corrected now.</p> <p>Verra Review: Section 3.1 has been revised to include that the project is registered under CDM with the project ID 1949</p>	Closed

<b>Verification Report Template:</b> <i>VCS Verification Report Template, v4.0, Section 3.1</i>		
--	--	--