

# 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>	Joint CP renewal and verification approval request
<b>Project ID</b>	909
<b>Project Name</b>	Grid Connected Wind Power Project in Tamil Nadu
<b>Program(s)</b>	VCS
<b>Verification Period</b>	01 January 2021 – 31 December 2021
<b>Project Proponent</b>	CLP Wind Farms (India) Private Limited
<b>Methodology</b>	ACM0002, Methodology: “Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” Reference: v20.0
<b>VVB</b>	Document Prepared by LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Aplus+)
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	VCS Version 4.2
<b>Date of First Issue</b>	15 August 2022
<b>Review Conclusion</b>	3 October 2022
<b>Date of Final Issue</b>	3 October 2022

**ASSESSMENT FINDINGS**

#	Description	Response	Status
1	<p><b>Missing GHG ERR generation data</b></p> <p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>The total GHG ERR generated in this monitoring period is not indicated in Section 1.1 of the joint project description and monitoring report (PD-MR).</p> <p><b>Actions Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The VVB must ensure that the project proponent indicates the total GHG ERR generated for this monitoring period in section 1.1 of the joint PD-MR.</li> </ul> <p><b>Program rules:</b></p> <p>VCS Standard, v4.2, Section 3.14.2</p>	<p><b>Round 1:</b></p> <p>VVB Response: The details regarding total GHG ERR generated in this monitoring period are now provided in Section 1.1 of the revised joint project description and monitoring report (PD-MR).</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p><b>Finding 1 is closed.</b></p> <p>Section 1.1 of the PD-MR has been updated accordingly.</p>	Closed
2	<p><b>VCUs for the context of the Paris Agreement</b></p> <p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>The project documents do not indicate whether the VCUs will be used in the context of the Paris Agreement.</p> <p><b>Actions Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The VVB must ensure that the project proponent indicates whether or not the VCUs will be used in the context of the Paris Agreement.</li> <li>The VVB must assess and describe the assessment process if the VCUs generated from this project will be used in the context of the Paris Agreement.</li> </ul> <p><b>Program rules:</b></p>	<p><b>Round 1:</b></p> <p>VVB Response: The VCUs generated during current monitoring period will not be used in the context of the Paris Agreement. The same has been included in revised joint project description and monitoring report (PD-MR).</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p><b>Finding 2 is closed.</b></p> <p>The PD-MR has indicated that the project will not use its VCUs in the context of Paris agreement. This also have</p>	Closed

<p>VCS Standard, v4.2, Sections 3.21.1 and 3.21.2</p> <p>VCS Joint Project Description and Monitoring Report Template, Section 1.16.1</p> <p>VCS Joint Validation and Verification Report Template, Section 3.1</p>	<p>been assessed in a CAR02 of the joint validation and verification report.</p>
<p><b>3</b></p> <p><b>Confusing inclusion of the SD Contributions table template</b></p> <p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>The project proponent included the SD Contributions table template and instructions in Section 1.17 of the joint PD-MR, which is confusing since the project proponent is not reporting any SD contributions.</p> <p><b>Actions Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The VVB must request the project proponent to remove the table and template instructions in Section 1.17.</li> </ul> <p><b>Program Rules:</b></p> <p>VCS Joint Project Description and Monitoring Report Template, v4.1, Section 1.17.</p> <p><b>Background:</b></p> <p>The project proponent is only required to report a minimum of three SD Contributions after 20 January 2025 (see Row 4, <a href="#">2022 Q1 VCS Program Update: Overview of Substantive Updates to Program Rules &amp; Requirements</a>).</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Closed</p> <p><b>Round 1:</b></p> <p>VVB Response: Since, project proponent is not reporting any SD contributions, PP has removed SD Contributions table template and instructions in Section 1.17 of the revised joint PD-MR.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p><b>Finding 3 is closed.</b></p> <p>Section 1.17 Of the joint PD-MR has been updated accordingly.</p>
<p><b>4</b></p> <p><b>Missing tools and the inclusion of outdated tools</b></p> <p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>The project proponent did not refer to the latest version of the additionality tool and did not refer to the tool for updated baseline at crediting period renewal in Section 3.1 of the joint PD-MR. The VVB also did not assess the tool for updated baseline at crediting period renewal in Section 3.4.1 of the joint validation and verification report (joint VVR).</p> <p><b>Actions Required:</b></p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Closed</p> <p><b>Round 1:</b></p> <p>VVB Response: In accordance with the paragraph 3.8.9 clause 1 of VCS standard v 4.2, “A full reassessment of additionality is not required when renewing the project crediting period. Hence, PP has not applied the latest version of the additionality tool. However, PP has referred to the tool for updated baseline at crediting period renewal in Section 3.1 and assessment is provided under section 3.4 of revised joint PD-MR.</p> <p>The VVB has mentioned the reference of tool for updated baseline at crediting period renewal under section 3.4.1</p>

- The VVB must ensure the project proponent refers to the latest version (i.e., Version 7) of the “Tool for demonstration and assessment of additionality” in Section 3.1 of the joint PD-MR.
- The VVB must ensure the project proponent refers to the tool “Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period” in Section 3.1 of the joint PD-MR.
- Similarly, the VVB must refer to the tool “Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period” in Section 3.4.1 of the joint VVR.

**Program Rules:**

VCS Joint Project Description and Monitoring Report Template, v4.1, Section 3.1

VCS Joint Validation and Verification Report Template, v4.1, Section 3.4.1

VCS Standard, v4.2, Section 3.8.9 (2b)

of the verification report. Furthermore complete assessment of baseline as per the tool “assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period” v 03.0.1 is provided under section 3.4.4 of the verification report.

Verra Review:

**Finding 4 is closed.**

The updated PD-MR has referred and use “Tool for Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality”. This also has been assessed in the verification report by the VVB. Regarding the first action item, VVB has clarified why using latest tool of additionality is not necessary.

**5 Inconsistency in estimated annual ERRs reported in joint PD-MR and joint VVR**

Closed

**Issue:**

In Section 3.1 of the joint VVR, the VVB states the project has an estimated annual ERRs of 112,763 tCO<sub>2</sub>e. However, in Section 1.10 of the joint PD-MR, the project proponent reports an estimated average annual ER of 56,132 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.

**Actions Required:**

- The VVB is required to update Section 3.1 of the joint VVR to reflect the correct estimated annual ERRs, to be consistent with that reported in the joint PD-MR and the rest of the joint VVR.

**Program Rules:**

Not applicable.

Round 1:

VVB Response: Apologies for the inconvenience. Value of estimated average annual ERs is corrected in Section 3.1 of the joint VVR.

Verra Review:

**Finding 5 is closed.**

The error in the VVR has been fixed.