

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	1497
Project Name	VCS Grouped Project for Renewable Power Generation by Essel Mining
Review Type	Verification
Program(s)	VCS Program
Monitoring Period	01 September 2022 to 31 October 2023
Project Proponent	Essel Mining & Industries Limited (EMIL)
Methodology	AMS-I.D, AMS-I.F, and ACM0002
VVB	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
Assessment Criteria	VCS Standard v4.5
Date of First Issue	26 September 2024
Review Conclusion	Verification Approved
Date of Final Issue	03 December 2024

FINDINGS

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
1	Project deviations in the MR and VR		
	<u>Issue</u> In section 3.2.2 of the monitoring report (MR), the project proponent has not provided enough information on project deviation 1.	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> MR is revised by PP and sufficient information on same is updated in revised MR which is also mentioned in section 3.3 of revised FVR submitted to VERRA for review.	Closed
	<u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent updates section 3.2.2 of the MR to include the sites for which the geodetic coordinates were changed during this monitoring period (MP). 2. The VVB must assess the above-mentioned information and update the verification report (VR) accordingly.	<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending) The information provided is sufficient. No further action is required.	
		Round 2 <u>VVB Response</u> (Pending)	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending)	
		Round 3 <u>VVB Response</u> (Pending)	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending)	
2	Project proponent designation		
	<u>Issue</u> All project owners are listed under one project proponent table in section 1.3 of the MR. it is unclear if all of them are project proponents, or they are entering under an 'other entities' role.	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> The tables have been separated for each project proponent under table in section 1.3 of revised MR and the footnote is added for better clarity and it is found to be correct and same has been assessed in Table 3 of revised FVR.	Closed
	<u>Action Required</u> 1. VVB must ensure that only the project proponents are listed in the project proponent table. If there is more than one project proponent, each must be listed in a separate table with their respective information. If they are entering as 'other entities', the project owners	<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending) The information provided is sufficient. No further action is required	
		Round 2 <u>VVB Response</u> (Pending)	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending)	

	must be listed in section 1.4 as other entities in separate tables for each with their respective information. 2. The VVB must provide its assessment of the above and update the VR should it deem appropriate.	Round 3	
		<u>VVB Response</u> (Pending)	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending)	

3	Editorials in the VR		
	<u>Issue</u> 1. In section 1.3 of the VR, the VVB provided the incorrect number of ERs achieved during this MP. 2. In section 4.1 of the VR, the VVB states that “The latitude and longitude coordinates specified in the registered VCS PD/3/, VCS validation Report/15/, and VCS MR/1/ were confirmed to be accurate”, however, geodetic coordinates have been modified during this MP. <u>Action Required</u> 1. In section 1.3 of the VR, the VVB must correct the ERs achieved during this MP. 2. In section 4.1 of the VR, the VVB must edit the sentence to reflect the accuracy of the status of the geodetic coordinates based on the changes made during this MP.	Round 1	Closed
		<u>VVB Response</u> 1. Section 1.3 has been revised and correct ER numbers have been provided in revised FVR submitted. 2. The latitude and longitude of corrected version of MR were used, hence this statement was written, but it is updated in section 4.1 of revised FVR submitted.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending) The changes applied are sufficient, no further action is required.	
		Round 2	
		<u>VVB Response</u> (Pending)	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending)	
		Round 3	
		<u>VVB Response</u> (Pending)	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending)	

4	Monitored parameter $EG_{BL,y}$ in the ER calculation sheet		
	<u>Issue</u> In the <i>ER Sheet_1497_Clean.xlsx</i> , the monitored parameter $EG_{BL,y}$ as per AMS-I.F and the validated PD dated 15 December 2018, is incorrectly expressed. <u>Action Required</u>	Round 1	Closed
		<u>VVB Response</u> The monitored parameter naming is corrected by PP in revised ER sheet submitted by PP and it is found to be correct.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending)	

	The VVB must ensure that the project proponent expresses the correct parameter $EG_{BL,y}$ in the <i>ER Sheet_1497_Clean.xlsx</i>. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> AMS-I.F	With the VVB confirmation, no further action is required.	
		Round 2	
		<u>VVB Response</u> (Pending)	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending)	
		Round 3	
		<u>VVB Response</u> (Pending)	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending)	

5	Site visit locations		
	<u>Issue</u> In section 2.4 of the VR, the VVB does not list the sites that were visited during the audit. <u>Action Required</u> In section 2.4 of the VR, the VVB must include a summary of the sites that were visited during the audit from 27 to 30 December 2023 and 03 to 06 January 2024.	Round 1	Closed
		<u>VVB Response</u> Section 2.4 have been updated in revised FVR which now includes the table for the sites visited and date and the type of visit was clearly mentioned in revised FVR submitted for review.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending) The VVB has included the sites visited during the audit. No further action is required.	
		Round 2	
		<u>VVB Response</u> (Pending)	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending)	
		Round 3	
		<u>VVB Response</u> (Pending)	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending)	

6	Ex-ante vs achieved ERs table		
	<u>Issue</u> 1. In section 5.4 of the MR, the project proponent has not provided detail on whether the 4,997 hours (3.49%) of total plant breakdown were considered when calculating ERs and whether these had an impact on	Round 1	Closed
		<u>VVB Response</u>	
		1. MR has been revised by PP and breakdown hours as reason are included in the response and it is found to be correct by assessment team.	

	the achieved ERs this MP.	2. FVR is also revised by assessment team and the section now clearly includes breakdown as one of the reason.	
	2. In section 5.1 of the VR, the justification provided by the VVB of the ex-ante vs achieved ERs has not considered the above-mentioned breakdown.	<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending) No further action is required. The VVB confirms that the reduction in achieved ERRs is a result of breakdown hours out of the operational hours during the monitoring period.	
	<u>Action Required</u>	Round 2	
	1. VVB must ensure that the project proponent provides detail on whether the 4,997 hours (3.49%) of total plant breakdown were considered when calculating achieved ERs and whether this influenced the achieved ERs during this MP.	<u>VVB Response</u> (Pending)	
		<u>Verra Response</u> (Pending)	
	2. The VVB must include in its assessment whether the above-mentioned plant breakdown was considered when calculating the achieved ERs and whether these affected the value.	Round 3	
		<u>VVB Response</u> (Pending) <u>Verra Response</u> (Pending)	