

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.

Project ID	4242
Project Name	Accelerating the Adoption and Use of Electric Vehicles
Review Type	Registration
Program(s)	VCS Program
Verification Period	N/A
Project Proponent	Bridge To Renewables, Inc.
Methodology	VM0038 – Methodology for Electric Vehicle Charging Systems v1.0
VVB	SCS Global Services (SCS)
Assessment Criteria	VCS standard v4.7
Date of First Issue	17 February 2025
Date of Second Issue	28 April 2025
Review Conclusion	Approved
Date of Final Issue	29 May 2025

FINDINGS

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
1	Activity for generation of ERRs		
	<u>Issue</u> The project indicates that ERRs will be generated from accurate data collected on miles driven, KWh charged and GHG intensity. However, accurate data collection is a method for obtaining reliable information to calculate ERRs, not an activity that directly generates ERRs. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent rewrites and re-defines clearly the project activity that leads to the generation of ERRs. This update must be reflected in all the relevant sections of the project description. 2. The VVB must assess and corroborate this information in the validation report. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Project Description Template, v44, Section 1.1, 1.11, and 3.2 VCS Validation Report Template v4.4, Sections 3.1	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> 1. The project proponent has updated section 1.1 and 1.12 of the PD to further clarify that the project activity that generates the ERRs is the use and charging of electric vehicles. 2. The audit team has updated the validation report accordingly. <u>Verra Response</u> The language has been revised and indicates the use and charging of EVs will result in ERRs generation. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.	Closed
2	Incomplete Audit table		
	<u>Issue</u> The rationale for not completing the audit history is incorrect. The table must be completed in line with the template requirements. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent completes the audit history table in line with the template requirements. 2. The VVB must assess and corroborate the added information in	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> 1. The project proponent has updated Section 1.2 of the PD to include the audit history table. 2. The audit team has updated section 3.1 of the validation report accordingly.	Closed

	the audit table in the validation report. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Project Description Template, v4.4, Section 1.2 VCS Validation Report Template v4.4, Sections 3.1	<u>Verra Response</u> Audit history has been updated. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.	
--	--	--	--

3 Incorrect Sectoral scope 1 (energy)			
	<u>Issue</u> Sectoral scope 1 (Energy) does not exist and must be corrected. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must ensure that the project proponent corrects the Sectoral scope 1 (energy) under Section 1.3 of the project description. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Project Description Template, v4.4, Section 1.3	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> - The project proponent has updated section 1.3 of the PD to correct the sectoral scope 1 to Energy(renewable/non-renewable). - The audit team has updated section 3.1 of the validation report accordingly. <u>Verra Response</u> This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.	Closed

4 Justification of the project start date			
	<u>Issue</u> The justification of the project start date does not meet the requirements of Section 3.8 of the VCS standard v4.7. Additionally, it is unclear how data collection directly translates into generation of ERRs. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent provides a project start date that complies with the requirements of	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> 1. The project proponent has updated section 1.9 of the PD to reflect that the Project start date is when the EVs began generating ERRs through use and charging. 2. The audit team has updated section 3.1 of the validation report accordingly.	Closed

	Section 3.8 VCS standard v4.7 2. The VVB must explain the assessment process used to verify that the project starts date meets the VCS requirements. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS standard v4.7, Sections 3.8 VCS Project Description Template, v4.4, Section 1.9 VCS Validation Report Template v4.4, Sections 3.1	<u>Verra Response</u> The project description has been updated, and the justification meets the VCS requirements. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.	
--	---	--	--

5	Insufficient information on project location		
	<u>Issue</u> The project location geo-coordinates and the KML file are not provided, failing to meet the requirements of Section 3.11.2 (3, b) of the VCS standard v4.7.	Round 1	Closed
	<u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent provides complete information on the project location including the geo-coordinates and the KML file. 2. The VVB must corroborate and assess this information in the validation report.	<u>VVB Response</u> 1. The project proponent has uploaded the KML file on Verra Registry. 2. Section 3.1 of the validation report provides assessment of the project location.	
	<u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS standard v4.7, Sections 3.11.2 (3, b) VCS Project Description Template, v4.4, Section 1.9 VCS Validation Report Template v4.4, Sections 3.1	<u>Verra Response</u> The KML file has been submitted. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.	

6	Insufficient demonstration of the methodology applicability conditions		
	<u>Issue</u> The project proponent has not demonstrated how the project meets the applicability condition for VMD0049 in the project description. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must ensure that the project proponent demonstrates how the project meets the applicability condition for VMD0049.	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> 1. The project proponent has updated section 3.2 of the PD to address the applicability conditions for VMD0049. 2. Section 3.3.2 of the validation report provides assessment of the applicability conditions for VMD0049.	Closed

	Additionally, the VVB assesses the same and provides its opinion in the validation report. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Project Description Template, v4.4, Section 3.2 VCS Validation Report Template v4.4, Sections 3.3.1	<u>Verra Response</u> Applicability conditions for VMD49 is included in the project description. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.	
--	---	---	--

7	Comparable fleet is not defined		
	<u>Issue</u> The comparable fleet of ICE vehicle if not defined under Section 3.4 of the project description <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent defines the comparable fleet of ICE vehicle under Section 3.4 of the project description. 2. The VVB must assess and corroborate this added information in the validation report. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Project Description Template, v4., Section 3.4 VCS Validation Report Template v4.4, Sections 3.3.4	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> 1. The project proponent has updated section 3.4 of the PD to further clarify that the comparable fleet for the baseline are conventional light duty fossil fuel ICE vehicles. 2. The audit team has updated section 3.3.4 of the validation report accordingly. <u>Verra Response</u> The project description has defined the type of comparable fleet, which is the conventional light duty fossil fuel ICE vehicles. This finding cannot be closed. Round 2 <u>Issue</u> Applicability condition 2 requires Project proponents to demonstrate that the EV models comprising the applicable fleet of the project are comparable to their conventional fossil fuel baseline vehicles using the following means: • <i>Project and baseline vehicles belong to the same vehicle category (e.g., car, motorcycle, bus, truck, LDV, MDV, HDV);</i> • <i>Project and baseline vehicles have comparable passenger/load capacity (comparing the baseline vehicle with the respective project vehicle).</i> The characteristics of comparable vehicles are not defined.	Closed

		<u>Action required</u> The VVB must ensure that the project proponent provides details of the comparable vehicles in the project description. <u>VVB Round 2 Response</u> - The project proponent has updated sections 3.2 and 3.4 of the PD to clarify that it will use the VIN of all project vehicles to identify the category and load capacity of each project vehicle. - The audit team has updated sections 3.3.2 and 3.3.4 of the validation report accordingly. <u>Verra Response</u> The VVB has clarified how EV models comprising the applicable fleet of the project are comparable to their conventional fossil fuel baseline vehicles. The project proponent has updated sections 3.2 and 3.4 of the PD to clarify that it will use the VIN of all project vehicles to identify the category and load capacity of each project vehicle. Also, where project proponents apply the baseline emission default factors for MPG and AFEC determined for the US and Canada, this comparability requirement between applicable and comparable fleet models has already been completed and satisfied. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.	
--	--	---	--

8	More information on the level of assurance		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 2.3 of the validation report indicates that only 3 project personnel and 2 individuals from General Motors were interviewed during the validation exercise. However, none of the interviewees were users of project electric vehicles. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must explain how a reasonable level of assurance was attained in validating the project when only project personnel were	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> The audit team would like to clarify that one of the project personnel interviewed during the site visit (Kevin Foreman) is also the user of the first project electric vehicle (EV) enrolled under the project. As described in Section 2.4 of the validation report, the site visit activities included driving the project EV owned by Kevin and testing the data collection application installed in his vehicle. Through this	Closed

	interviewed, and none of the interviewees were the users of the project electric vehicles. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS standard v4.7, Section 4.1.2 and 4.1.8 VCS Validation Report Template v.4.4, Sections 2.3 and 2.4	site visit and direct engagement with Kevin, who is both a project representative and the EV user, we verified the operation of the vehicle and the associated data collection process. Given that Kevin is the user of the only project EV enrolled at the time of validation, interviewing him allowed us to gain sufficient and reasonable assurance regarding the project's implementation and data collection process for the initial project activity instance.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> The VVB has clarified how a reasonable level of assurance when none of the interviewees were the users of the project electric vehicles. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.	