

# PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

<b>Project ID</b>	1671
<b>Project Name</b>	<i>Wind Based Power Generation by Panama Wind Energy Private Limited In Maharashtra, India</i>
<b>Program(s)</b>	VCS
<b>Project Proponent</b>	<i>Panama Wind Energy Private Limited</i>
<b>Methodology</b>	<i>ACM0002 "Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" version 12.3.0</i>
<b>Sectoral Scope(s)</b>	<i>Scopes 1: Energy Industries</i>
<b>Validation/Verification Body (VVB)</b>	<i>LGAI Technological Center S.A. (Applus+ Certification)</i>
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<i>VCS Standard, v4.1 and VCS Standard V4.2</i>
<b>Date of First Issue</b>	<i>21<sup>st</sup> April 2022</i>
<b>Date of Final Issue</b>	<i>22<sup>nd</sup> September 2022</i>

## Summary:

An accuracy review of the *Wind Based Power Generation by Panama Wind Energy Private Limited In Maharashtra, India* 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 4 assessment findings and 4 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 4 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

As per *VCS Monitoring Report Template V4.0*, section 3.3.2 should describe and justify any methodology deviations applied during this monitoring period.

Deviation 2 stated in this section of the submitted MR states that WTG ID number 49 is not operational since 2014 due to severe technical issues. However, the project has received several CERS and VCU issuances after year 2014 and this deviation was not introduced earlier.

Therefore, the PP and VVB are required to clarify if this WTG was not working then how were the previous credits claimed from this unit. Further, it should also be clarified if the request is to remove this WTG ID from the purview of the project. The relevant sections of the MR and VR are required to be updated accordingly.

**VVB Response:** Since there is no generation from the WTG ID 49, no CER or VER are claimed. The WTG 49 is connected to feeder 1 having WTGs 4, 8-13 and 49 connected. The summation of generation values was mentioned of WTG number 4 and 8-13. Credit notes by Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited (MSEDCL) is the primary generation source and on same generation values, the invoices are raised.

PP accepts that was not mentioned earlier report. The non-functioning of WTG was being mentioned from monitoring period 02-March-2017 to 28-February-2018. Around 18 WTGs are not commissioned as there due to regulatory update in the state. There is a possibility of commissioning of left-over WTGs and recommissioning of WTG 49, there PP don't want to remove WTGs from the current project configurations.

**Verra Response:**

As stated by the VVB, there is a possibility of commissioning of left-over WTGs and recommissioning of WTG 49, the PP don't want to remove WTGs from the current project configurations. In this case it is unclear what exactly is the project trying to deviate from. The VVB and PP are required to clearly state the desired outcome of the proposed deviations. **This finding is open and requires further action.**

**VVB Response:** PP has now removed the applied deviation and revised monitoring report accordingly in view of recommissioning of the 18 non-commissioned WTGs and one non-functional WTG. Thus, VVB also revised FVR for removing project description deviations as there is a possibility of commissioning of left-over WTGs and recommissioning of WTG 49. Hence then there will be no requirement of applied deviation.

**Verra Response:**

The relevant sections were updated and were found to be OK. This finding is now closed, and no further action is required.

### Finding 2

As per *VCS Verification Report Template V4.0*, section 2.3 should describe the interview process and identify personnel, including their roles, who were interviewed and/or provided information additional to that provided in the project description, monitoring report and any supporting documents.

As per *VCS Verification Report Template V4.0*, section 2.4 should describe the methods and objectives for any on-site inspections performed.

However, it was found that both section 2.3 and 2.4 of the VR do not state anything regarding the mode of the interview process and site visit. The VVB is required to provide details about the same in these sections of the VR.

**VVB Response:**

Details related to interview process and identify personnel, including their roles, who were interviewed and/or provided information additional to that provided in the project description, monitoring report and any supporting documents is now mentioned under section 2.3 of revised verification report. Moreover, also provided description related to methods and objectives for any on-site inspections performed in section 2.4 of revised verification report.

**Verra Response:**

The relevant sections were updated and were found to be OK. This finding is now closed, and no further action is required.

### Finding 3

As per *VCS Verification Report Template V4.0*, section 2.5 should state the total number of corrective action requests, clarification requests and forward action requests and other findings raised during the verification. Provide a summary of each finding, including the issues raised, the response(s) provided by the project proponent, and the final conclusions and any resulting changes to project documents.

However, it was observed in Appendix 2 that 6 CARs and 1 FAR was raised during this verification. Therefore, the VVB is required to correct this in the relevant sections of the VR.

**VVB Response:**

VVB has rectified typo error under section 2.5 and appendix 2 of verification report. Now it is correctly mentioned that 05 CARs have been raised during verification and one FAR raised during 2<sup>nd</sup> CDM verification is still open.

**Verra Response:**

The relevant sections were updated and were found to be OK. This finding is now closed, and no further action is required.

### Finding 4

As per *VCS Monitoring Report Template V4.0*, section 3.1 should describe the implementation status of the project activity(s), include the operation of the project activity(s) during this monitoring period, including any information on events that may impact the GHG emission reductions or removals and monitoring.

As per *VCS Verification Report Template V4.0*, section 4.1 should identify the implementation status of the project activity(s) and describe the steps taken to assess the following:

- The existence of any material discrepancies between project implementation and the project description.
- The implementation status of the monitoring plan and the completeness of monitoring, including the suitability of the implemented monitoring system (i.e., process and schedule for obtaining, recording, compiling, and analyzing the monitored data and parameters).
- The existence of any material discrepancies between the actual monitoring system, and the

monitoring plan set out in the project description and the applied methodology.

It is observed that section 5.4 of the MR states that that actual days of operation is 243 due to 'shut down due to force majeure'. However, the MR does not indicate which dates, and does not include the same in Appendix 2.

The VVB in Section 4.1 of the VR states that 'due to plant was shut down in September and October 2021 due to force majeure'. It is unclear where the VVB got this information that is not included in the MR, and not a discussion topic in Section 2.3 (and also did not provide any assessment in CAR 04).

Therefore, the PP and VVB are required to explain the same in the relevant sections of the MR and VR. Further, it should also be justified how the PP arrived at the 25.04% less comparison. Given that only 44 WTGs were working during the MP, and only 243 days out of 304. The comparison value should be provided on pro rata basis.

**VVB Response:** MR and FVR is now revised and found correct. Further, estimated VERs Vs actual VERs are already compared only on the basis of actual installed capacity and actual plant working days (excluding 2 months shutdown). ER sheet also clearly mentioned same.

**Verra Response:**

The relevant sections were updated and were found to be OK. This finding is now closed and no further action is required.

## 2. MINOR FINDINGS

### Finding 1

Please adjust the following minor findings in the project description document:

- 1) The PP is required to stick to the font style and size as per the VCS Monitoring Report Template V4.0.
- 2) The VVB is required to provide a sign off from the appropriate VVB office corresponding with accreditation in the VR.
- 3) The PP is required to reference the correct section which provided the details of commissioning details in section 1.5 of the MR.
- 4) The VVB states in section 2.5.1 that the 'one FAR open from 3rd CDM verification & previous VCS verification' However, it is observed that only two verifications have occurred under CDM. Therefore, the VVB is required to indicate the correct verification number in this section of the VR.
- 5) The VVB shall clarify why it has referred to, CDM Project Standard for project activities, Version 03.0 and CDM project cycle procedure for project activities, Version 03.0 considering it is a VCS project they applying the issuance for.

**VVB Response:**

- 1) MR has revised now for the font style and size as per the VCS Monitoring Report Template V4.0. and found correct.
- 2) The VVB has provided the signed "VCS Verification Deed of Representation" like for any other VCS verification assessment, which is the VCS requirement in accordance with the VCS Standard Section 4.1.14. Likewise, the VR in its page 2 already provided who is the approval authority from the accredited VVB (signatory of the Deed in consequence).
- 3) Section 1.5 of the MR is now revised appropriately.
- 4) FVR has been now revised for FAR references.

- 5) Irrelevant references of CDM Project Standard CDM project cycle procedure are now removed in FVR.

### 3. ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

On 21<sup>st</sup> April 2022 Verra concluded a review of the verification approval request for project Wind Based Power Generation by Panama Wind Energy Private Limited in Maharashtra, India and raised the 4 assessment findings detailed above.

On 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2022 Verra submitted the review report to the VVB LGAI Technological Center S.A. (Applus+ Certification) and the project proponent Panama Wind Energy Private Limited.

On 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2022 Verra closed all findings.