

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	4003
Project Name	Bundled Solar Power Project by AMP Energy - 01
Review Type	Registration and verification
Program(s)	VCS Program
Verification Period	N/A
Project Proponent	Ampsolar Power Generation Private Limited
Methodology	AMS-I.F. v05.0 Small-scale methodology: Renewable electricity generation for captive use and mini-grid
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Assessment Criteria	VCS Standard v4.4 and AMS-I.F. v05.0
Date of First Issue	05 March 2023
Review Conclusion	Approve
Date of Final Issue	18 August 2023

FINDINGS

1 KML file not specific to project instances			
<u>Issue</u> Verra cannot efficiently review and confirm the project geographic boundaries as the KML file includes the whole of India as a country. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the KML file accurately depicts the specific geodetic coordinates and polygons per project instance. 2. The VVB must update all the related and impacted sections in the validation report. <u>Background</u> Per VCS Standard Section 3.11.1 2b), projects shall provide geodetic polygons to delineate the project's geographic area or areas provided in a KML file , and sufficient additional geographic information (with respect to the location of the instances) to enable evidence gathering by the validation/verification body. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Standard, 4.4, Section 3.11.1	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> PP has submitted all the locations of PV units involved in the project in KML format, VVB has confirmed that all files have geo tags of all the locations of individual solar PV units as mentioned in the Joint PD and MR.		Closed
	Verra Response The newly provided KML files indeed depict the specific sites per project instance. The finding is closed.		
	Round 2 <u>VVB Response</u>		
	Verra Response		
2 Eligibility			
<u>Issue</u> The PD explains that surplus electricity will be fed into the	Round 1 <u>VVB Response:</u> The project involves in the installation of roof top solar photovoltaic		Closed

	national grid of India. VVB has not confirmed the quantity of electricity that will be fed into the national India grid from the project, nor how this will be monitored. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must demonstrate eligibility of the project in terms of VCS Standard v4.4 Section 2.1.3 “Grid-connected electricity generation1 activities using wind, geothermal, or solar photovoltaic (PV) power plants.” 2. The VVB must demonstrate how the quantity of electricity being fed into the national grid is confirmed and monitored on an ongoing basis. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Standard, v4.4, 2.1.3	power plant to meet the demands of the owner’s premises of Kochi Metro Rail Limited 2 (KMRL 2) premises, Subros Ltd. and SECI. For Kochi Metro Rail Limited 2 (KMRL 2) premises and Subros Ltd, net metering is not mandatory (explanation is provided in the Section 1.3 Project Eligibility of the Joint PD and MR. For SECI, the net Contract/Sanctioned demand of all 9 project locations exceeds the installed capacity, hence the metering has not been done as there will not be any surplus power generated from the project for the Grid and the project is not a grid connected renewable energy project and does not fall in the excluded category as per the paragraph 2.1.3 of VCS Standard 4.4. A detailed analysis is performed and presented in the report along with substantiation to the evidences provided by the PP. <u>Verra Response</u> Covered in 1.3 of the revised joint PD. The VVB justified that given that the installed capacity is much lower than the demand, it is very difficult for the projects to have excess capacity to deliver to the grid, thus complying with the eligibility requirement to deliver the majority of the electricity to the consumer. The finding is closed. Round 2 <u>VVB Response</u> <u>Verra Response</u>	
--	--	---	--

3	Validation of additionality		
	<u>Issue</u>	Round 1	Closed

	The VR does not explicitly identify the method or tool applied to demonstrate additionality and describe the steps taken to validate the procedure for determining additionality was correctly applied. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must clearly set forth the steps taken to validate the procedure for determining additionality was correctly applied. 2. The VVB must submit the calculation spreadsheet for the additionality. 3. The VVB must update the VR accordingly. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Standard, v4.4	<u>VVB Response</u> Under section 3.4.5 of the Joint Val and Ver report, VVB has demonstrated the additionality of the project in general as well as for each site in particular. 1. Kochi Metro Rail Limited (5.19 MW) 2. Subros Limited (0.187 MW) 3. SECI Rooftop (4.05 MW) The step wise approach mentioned in Tool 21 has been applied to demonstrate additionality of the project in the revised Jt Val and Ver report. In all these sub-sections, VVB has proved the additionality along with the sensitivity analysis of all three locations where the solar PV units are installed for the premises. As per the 10% variation, the values of O&M, Project Cost and Tariff Rate are not breaching the Benchmark value but PLF is found to be crossing the benchmark, for that in all the sections VVBs has provided the justification (<i>"variation in PLF of more than 10% is unlikely to happen as the PLF has been reported as per the Third-Party Report based on long term data"</i>). Updated IRR sheet has also been provided for the same. The average PLF achieved at the project level is 11.21% while PLF assumed is 17.73% at project level. So it can be seen that the PLF achieved is 36% lower than the assumed values. <u>Verra Response</u> Content seen in 3,5 of revised joint PD The finding is closed. Round 2 <u>VVB Response</u> <u>Verra Response</u>	
--	---	--	--

4	Unclear how electricity is delivered to the captive consumer in instances with net metering		
	<u>Issue</u> It is unclear if the grid is used for wheeling the electricity generated by the PV system to the captive consumer. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must clarify if the grid is used for wheeling in the grid connected instances <u>Program Rule(s)</u> AMS I.F: Renewable electricity generation for captive use and mini grid Ver 5 .0, Section 2.2	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> The project uses the AMS I.F. methodology because the rooftop and ground-mounted solar units generate electricity to deliver to captive consumers. Excess electricity is supplied to the grid, and wheeling is not used in grid-connected instances*. This scenario is similar to S.I. no. 2 in the table 1 of the methodology AMS IF version 5.0 The solar units in the project are installed to meet the captive electricity demand of the premises owners. The rooftop solar units are connected to the national grid through net metering. Actual electricity consumption is much higher than the electricity generated by the solar units. The project is eligible in line with para 2.1.3 of the VCS Standard Version 4.4 because it is implemented with the primary purpose of meeting captive electricity demand. At the same time as per the section 2.1.3, does not generate enough power to supply to grid itself. Thus not even meeting the criteria of ineligibility of 50% of energy generated being supplied to grid. <i>*: Please note that the reference to the term instances is used in normative terms and not as per the VCS definition</i> <u>Verra Response</u> Covered in 3.2 and 1.3 of revised joint PD. The VVB clarified that the grid is not used for wheeling the electricity generated to the captive consumer. The finding is closed.	Closed

5	Verification report does not assess the project against the clustering rule for grouped projects		
	<u>Issue</u> It is unclear if the VVB assessed project compliance with the capacity limit and clustering rules in section 3.6.17 of the VCS Standard, v4.4 <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must assess if the project meets the capacity limit requirements specified in section 3.6.17 of the VCS Standard, v4.4 2. The VVB must describe their assessment and conclusion in the joint validation report <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Standard, v4.4, Section 3.6.17 10)	Round 1	Closed
		<u>VVB Response</u> As per the project summary in both Joint PD and MR as well as Joint Val and Ver, it is clearly mentioned that the total capacity of the project is 9.43 MW (section 3.1 of Joint Val and Ver report) which comprises Kochi Metro, Subros Ltd and SECI Solar PVs which is less than the threshold of 15 MW, hence it is a small scale bundled project not a grouped project. According to the section 3.6.17 of the VCS standard, version 4.4, applicability of project instances is not met by the project activity and there is no requirement to prove the additionality and baseline scenario on adding new units/PI, since it is a small scale bundled project.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> Duly noted. The finding is closed.	
		Round 2	
		<u>VVB Response</u>	
		<u>Verra Response</u>	