

PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

Project ID	Project 1884
Project Name	Bikes for the Planet - Brazil
Program(s)	VCS
Verification Period	18 December 2018 - 26 January 2021
Project Proponent	ZSCORE S.A.
Methodology	AMS-III.BM., Lightweight two and three wheeled personal transportation, Version 1.0
Sectoral Scope(s)	Sectoral Scope 07, Transport
Validation/Verification Body (VVB)	RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA)
Assessment Criteria	VCS Standard, v4.1, AMS-III.BM.
Date of First Issue	03 February 2022
Date of Final Issue	30 March 2022

Summary:

An accuracy review of the Bikes for the Planet – Brazil verification approval request has been conducted by Verra in accordance with Section 4.3 of the *Registration and Issuance Process*.

The accuracy review has raised eight assessment findings and three minor findings, detailed below. The VVB, in coordination with the project proponent, is hereby required to provide a response to the assessment findings presented in Section 1. The eight assessment findings must be addressed to the satisfaction of Verra. The VVB need not address the minor findings during this review. Please note, however, that where Verra finds consistent minor findings by the VVB in future reviews, minor findings shall be escalated to assessment findings.

This project review report will be made publicly available. Confidential information may be provided as separate attachments.

1. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

Finding 1

Section 3.4.3 of the *VCS Standard, v4.1* states that “The project proponent shall use the *VCS Monitoring Report Template* or an approved combined monitoring report template available on the Verra website, as appropriate, and adhere to all instructional text within the template.”

Section 1.1 of the *VCS Monitoring Report Template, v4.0* instructs the project proponent to provide the relevant implementation dates and the total GHG emission reductions or removals generated in this monitoring period.

Section 1.1 of the monitoring report does not state the relevant implementation dates and total GHG emission reductions achieved. The project proponent is requested to update Section 1.1 of the monitoring report, and the VVB is requested to assess the updates as needed.

VVB Response:

Section 1.1 of MR was revised in order to include information on relevant implementation dates and total GHG emission reductions achieved.

Verra Response:

Section 1.1 of the monitoring report has been updated to include the relevant implementation dates and the total GHG emission reductions achieved during this monitoring period. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.

Finding 2

Section 1.7 of the *VCS Monitoring Report Template, v4.0* instructs the project proponent to provide the project location including geodetic coordinates. Grouped projects may submit a KML file.

The project proponent did submit a KML file. However, the KML file only shows Brazil as the project boundary and there are no geodetic coordinates for the project instances.

The project proponent is requested to submit an updated KML file with information of the project instances. The VVB is requested to assess the updates as needed.

VVB Response:

During the validation/verification of the project documents, three KML files were submitted and verified by the VVB (“Brazil kml.kmz” + “Rio de Janeiro.kmz” e “Sao Paulo KML.kmz”). But as only a single file can be submitted to Verra, only the file “Brazil kml.kmz” was submitted, which, to the best of the PPs understanding, contained geodetic coordinates of the project instances (see screenshot of the sent file below, with coordinates of the project instances).



Nevertheless, the PPs prepared and submitted two additional files to the VVB, a new grouped project KML file (which will be later submitted to Verra) and, a file with screenshots of the visualization of it using Google Earth (showing the geodetic information of the project instances).

Verra Response:

The project proponent has submitted additional KML files to Verra, which now shows the boundary of the two regions the project covers.

The project proponent and VVB are requested to clarify if the project boundary shown in the KML file is the entire extent of the project activity. Specifically, please clarify if the boundary is the maximum range that the electric bikes can operate in. If not, the project proponent is requested to provide an updated KML file showing the boundary of which the electric bikes are allowed to operate in. The VVB shall assess the updates as needed.

This finding remains open.

VVB Response:

The PP call the attention to the fact that, the project instances operate only with dock stations inside the given project boundary and, up to the end of this monitoring period, without electric bikes. Additionally, rides with the project bikes are only accounted between the check-in and the check-out docking stations. As the bikes do not have GPS to fully track the trips, for conservative reasons only the shortest path between the check-in and the check-out docking stations is accounted as trip distance (exactly the same procedure applied in the first approved verification). Just as an example of the conservativeness of the procedure, in the case of a trip with the same docking station used for check-in and check-out, the trip distance is set to zero. Having said that, no trip outside the project boundary, even if it happens, is or will be considered in the project activity.

Verra Response:

The VVB provides justification that the bikes used in the project will not exceed the project boundary. Additionally, the distance used to quantify the emission reductions are conservative. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.

Finding 3

Section 1.11 of the *VCS Monitoring Report Template, v4.0* instructs the project proponent to describe how the project contributes to achieving any nationally stated sustainable development priorities.

The project proponent describes the general sustainable development contributions of the project, but does not provide information about any nationally stated sustainable development priorities.

The project proponent is requested to update Section 1.11 of the monitoring report to include

information about the nationally stated sustainable development priorities, and the VVB is requested to assess the updates as necessary.

VVB Response:

Section 1.11 of MR was revised in order to include additional information on how the project contributes to achieving nationally stated sustainable development priorities. In addition, section 4.1 of Verification report was also revised.

Verra Response:

Section 1.11 of the monitoring report and Section 4.1 of the verification report have been updated to include information about any nationally stated sustainable development priorities. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.

Finding 4

Section 2.1 of the *VCS Monitoring Report Template, v4.0* instructs the project proponent to summarize any potential negative environmental and socio-economic impacts and steps taken to mitigate them.

Section 2.1 of the monitoring report states that the section is not applicable.

The project proponent is requested to update Section 2.1 to summarize any potential negative environmental and socio-economic impacts and steps taken to mitigate them. If no negative impacts are caused, the project proponent is requested to elaborate how this is so. The VVB is requested to assess the updates as needed.

VVB Response:

PPs are not aware of any relevant negative environmental and socio-economic impacts with the implementation of the project. To support such vision, the PPs revised section 2.1 of the monitoring report to include inferences of a recent official national publication on bicycle mobility indicating many alignments with the UN SDGs and, no relevant negative impact. Section 4.2.1 of Verification report was also revised.

Verra Response:

Section 2.1 of the monitoring report and Section 4.2.1 of the verification report have been updated to include information about the any environmental and socioeconomic impacts of the project. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.

Finding 5

Section 3.16.2 of the *VCS Standard, v4.1* states that “The project proponent shall conduct a local stakeholder consultation prior to validation...” Further, Section 3.16.3 states that “The project proponent shall establish mechanisms for ongoing communication with local stakeholders...”

Section 2.2 of the *VCS Monitoring Report Template, v4.0* instructs the project proponent to describe the process for and outcomes from ongoing communication with local stakeholders.

Section 2.2 of the monitoring report and Section 4.2.2 of the verification report state that no local stakeholder consultation was held prior to validation and only a global stakeholder consultation in form of a public comment period was held.

The project proponent is requested to clarify why no local stakeholder consultation was held prior to

validation and the installment of the third project instance. The VVB is requested to clarify the same.

VVB Response:

The PPs included additional clarifications on why no additional local stakeholder consultation was held, and information on different mechanisms for ongoing communication with local stakeholders (documents of the mentioned example interactions are supplied to demonstrate the availability of the channels and the results of the interactions) in section 2.2 of the monitoring report. Section 4.2.2 of verification report was revised to clarify the mechanisms for ongoing communication with local stakeholders.

Verra Response:

The project proponent and VVB have confirmed that there are ongoing communication mechanisms in place for all project instances. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.

Finding 6

Section 3.2.1 of the monitoring report and Section 3.2 of the validation report describes a methodology deviation the project proponent undertook.

The sections describe that the project proponent used ex-ante surveys to determine the baseline emissions of the project instances.

Verra notes that the survey used for project activity instance 3, Tembici, Rio de Janeiro, was carried out in 2012 and published in 2014. The project activity instance started in 2018.

The project proponent and VVB are requested to clarify why a survey conducted in 2012 was chosen instead of a more recent survey. Please clarify how the deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals or how the deviation result in increased accuracy of the quantification approach, as per Section 3.17.2 of the VCS *Standard, v4.1*.

Additionally, the project proponent mentions that project instance 2, Grow, has ceased its operations. The project proponent is requested to report this as a project description deviation in Section 3.2.1 of the monitoring report. The VVB is requested to assess this in Section 3.2 of the validation report.

VVB Response:

The PP choose the survey conducted in 2012 (and published in 2014) because it is the most recently available official (developed by STRJ, the State of Rio de Janeiro Secretary of Transport) survey. As explained in section 3.2.1 of MR, aware of the fact that the survey was conducted in 2012 and, the project instance started 6 years later, the PP used the results of a recent study (published by ANTP, in 2020 using data from 2018) to confirm the applicability and conservativeness of the results of the STRJ's survey. ANTP is a non-profit civil entity, created in 1977, dedicated to the public transport and transit sector in Brazil and whose objective is to develop and disseminate knowledge with a view to its continuous improvement (URL: <http://www.antp.org.br/>).

The PP revised section 3.2.2 of MR to inform that project instance 2 ceased its operations and, that the deviation does not have any other additional impact. The verification report was revised to include the project description deviation.

Verra Response:

The project proponent and VVB have provided more information about the methodology deviation and the data used to establish the baseline and project emissions of the project instances.

Verra requests that the project proponent and the VVB clarify why 2012 data was used for project instance 3 (i.e. Tembici, Rio de Janeiro) instead of the ANTP 2020 estimations.

This finding remains open.

VVB Response:

Please note that the official STRJ's (the State of Rio de Janeiro Secretary of Transport) data from 2012 (in a report published in 2014) is the most recently available full survey data, with over 250,000 respondents. ANP's data published in 2020 (based in data from 2018) is an estimation (with a few transport modes aggregated), not a survey. Data from ANP's estimation is used by the PP to demonstrate that STRJ's data from 2012 data is still applicable. The PPs are the opinion the detailed data from the survey in 2012 is more appropriate and, applicable, also considering that is the data used today by the public authorities.

Verra Response:

The VVB clarifies that the project uses 2012 data for the latest instance as the data is from the latest regional survey. The modal breakdown in the survey closely follows the latest estimations from 2018. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.

Finding 7

Section 4.3 of the *VCS Monitoring Report Template, v4.0* instructs the project proponent to describe the organizational structure, responsibilities and competencies of personnel, methods used for generating, recording and reporting date of monitored parameters, and handling any internal auditing and non-conformities.

Section 4.3 of the monitoring report does not discuss the information above.

The project proponent is requested to update Section 4.3 of the monitoring report to include the information above. The VVB is requested to assess the updates as needed.

VVB Response:

Section 4.3 of MR was revised to include information about the structure for the generation and treatment of monitored parameters.

Verra Response:

Section 4.3 of the monitoring report has been updated to include the organizational structure, responsibilities and competencies of personnel, methods used for generating, recording and reporting date of monitored parameters, and handling any internal auditing and non-conformities. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.

Finding 8

Section 5.1 of the *VCS Monitoring Report Template, v4.0* instructs the project proponent to provide sufficient information to allow the reader to reproduce the calculation.

Section 5.1 of the monitoring report does not include sufficient information to allow the reader to reproduce the calculation.

The project proponent is requested to update Section 5.1 of the monitoring report to include sufficient

information and share the emissions calculations spreadsheet with Verra. The VVB is requested to assess the updates as necessary.

VVB Response:

With the intention of guiding the reader to sufficient information to allow reproduction of the calculation, the PPs included the following paragraph at the end of section 5.1: "Section 5.4 below and, the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet, also submitted as part of this monitoring report, provide sufficient information to allow the reader to reproduce the calculation of GHG emission reductions and removals, i.e., baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage. The same information is added at the end of sections 5.2 and 5.3 of MR.

Verra Response:

Sections 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 have been updated to reference Section 5.4 and the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet, which provide sufficient information to allow the reader to reproduce the calculation of the GHG emission reduction of the project during this monitoring period. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.

2. MINOR FINDINGS

Finding 1

The monitoring report title is not filled out on the cover page of the monitoring report. The project proponent is requested to update the monitoring report cover page.

Finding 2

Section 5.2 of the monitoring report includes a breakdown of the project emissions and/or removals achieved by the separate project instances. However, no table of the total project emissions and/or removals achieved by the entire project is provided. The project proponent is requested to provide a combined table.

Finding 3

Section 5.4 of the monitoring report includes a table (Table 19) of the net GHG emission reductions and removals achieved by the entire project. However, the baseline emissions or removals do not add up to the net GHG emission reductions or removals achieved. The project proponent is requested to update Table 19.

Additionally, Sections 4.4 and 5 of the verification report include the table for the net GHG emission reductions and removals achieved by the entire project. However, it appears that some numbers were rounded down. For issuance accuracy, the project proponent and VVB are requested to update the net GHG emission reductions and removals tables to include the rounded down numbers.

3. ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

On 03 February 2022, Verra completed the review of the VCS verification approval request for Project 1884, Bikes for the Planet – Brazil. The project review report was sent to ZSCORE S.A. and RINA Services S.p.A. with eight assessment findings and three minor findings.

On 23 March 2022, Verra closed all findings except Findings 2 and 6. The project review report is sent back to the project proponent and VVB for further response.

On 30 March 2022, Verra closed all findings and no further response is required.