

Validation Opinion for Post Registration Changes

Report for:
Powerica Limited

CDM project for
Wind power project at Gujarat by Powerica Limited
(UNFCCC Ref No. 3632)

LRQA Reference : MUM-0061951/PRC, version 01.1
Date : 03/04/2013

Verification Team

Sanjay Kumar Team Leader, Sector Expert
Agarwalla

Technical Reviewer : Imran Ustad



Validation opinion

Lloyd's Register Quality Assurance Limited (LRQA) has been contracted by Powerica Limited, the project participant (PP), to undertake second periodic verification of the registered project activity "Wind power project at Gujarat by Powerica Limited" project reference number 3632 registered as a CDM project activity on 18/09/2010.

LRQA conducted an independent third party assessment of the Post Registration Changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD following the VVS, section 9.5 and the PS section 12.8 for Post Registration Changes.

LRQA has verified that the corrections made by the PP in the revised PDD comply with the requirements of the PS and accurately reflects the actual project information. The corrections identified are:

- 1) In section A.4.2 of the registered PDD, version 3.2 dated 06/04/2010, "Rated wind speed" is stated as 14.4 rpm which is incorrect. PP has clarified that it was a typographical error in the registered PDD and it is corrected as "Nominal Revolution" as 14.4 rpm and "Nominal Wind Speed" as 13 m/s in the revised PDD, version 3.3, dated 03/04/2013.
- 2) In section B.7.1 of the registered PDD, version 3.2 dated 06/04/2010, accuracy class of the sub station meters is stated 0.2s but the accuracy class of the WTG yard meters is not stated. Nevertheless, the accuracy class of the WTG yard meters was stated in section 4.5 of the Validation Report, version 1.2 dated 07/04/2010 as 0.5. The verification team noted that as per the registered PDD, both the sub station meters and the WTG yard meters are used for arriving at the final net energy supplied by the project activity. Hence the team considers this as a typographical error (i.e. missing out mention of the accuracy class of the WTG yard meters in the PDD). PP has submitted the revised PDD, version 3.3 dated 03/04/2013 by stating the accuracy class of the WTG yard meters as 0.5s in section B.7.1.

LRQA therefore requests the approval, by the CDM EB, of the post registration changes of the project activity as described above, in accordance to the guidance of the EB in the PCP.

Decision Maker

Michiaki Chiba
Climate Change Manager – Asia & Pacific
08/04/2013

Lloyd's Register Quality Assurance Ltd
Hiramford
Middlemarch Office Village
Siskin Drive
Coventry CV3 4FJ, United Kingdom

Registered office:
Lloyd's Register
71 Fenchurch Street
London EC3M 4BS
United Kingdom



Findings

1. Description of the corrections to project information:

- 1) In section A.4.2 of the registered PDD, version 3.2 dated 06/04/2010, "Rated wind speed" is stated as 14.4 rpm which is incorrect. PP has clarified that it was a typographical error in the registered PDD and it is corrected as "Nominal Revolution" as 14.4 rpm and "Nominal Wind Speed" as 13 m/s in the revised PDD, version 3.3, dated 03/04/2013.
- 2) In section B.7.1 of the registered PDD, version 3.2 dated 06/04/2010, accuracy class of the sub station meters is stated 0.2s but the accuracy class of the WTG yard meters is not stated. Nevertheless, the accuracy class of the WTG yard meters was stated in section 4.5 of the Validation Report, version 1.2 dated 07/04/2010 as 0.5. The verification team noted that as per the registered PDD, both the sub station meters and the WTG yard meters are used for arriving at the final net energy supplied by the project activity. Hence the team considers this as a typographical error (i.e. missing out mention of the accuracy class of the WTG yard meters in the PDD). PP has submitted the revised PDD, version 3.3 dated 03/04/2013 by stating the accuracy class of the WTG yard meters as 0.5s in section B.7.1.

2. Validation findings for temporary deviation

2.1 Accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions

Not applicable

2.2 Exact period to which the deviation applies

Not applicable

3. Validation findings for corrections

3.1 Corrected information

The following two information are corrected in the revised PDD, version 3.3 dated 03/04/2013:

- 1) In section A.4.2 of the registered PDD, version 3.2 dated 06/04/2010, "Rated wind speed" is stated as 14.4 rpm which is incorrect. It is corrected as "Nominal Revolution" as 14.4 rpm and "Nominal Wind Speed" as 13 m/s.
- 2) In section B.7.1 of the registered PDD, version 3.2 dated 06/04/2010, accuracy class of the sub station meters is stated 0.2s but the accuracy class of the WTG yard meters is not stated. Nevertheless, the accuracy class of the WTG yard meters was stated in section 4.5



of the Validation Report, version 1.2 dated 07/04/2010 as 0.5. PP has submitted the revised PDD, version 3.3 dated 03/04/2013 by stating the accuracy class of the WTG yard meters as 0.5s in section B.7.1.

3.2 Corrected parameters

There is no correction in any of the parameters which were validated at the time of registration of the project activity. There is only corrections in the above stated two information.

4. Validation findings for changes to the start date of the crediting period

4.1 New starting date of the crediting period

Not applicable

4.2 Baseline

Not applicable

4.3 Progress made to start the project activity

Not applicable

5. Validation findings for permanent changes from the registered Monitoring Plan and/or monitoring methodology

5.1 Level of accuracy and completeness

Not applicable

5.2 Conformance to approved monitoring methodology

Not applicable

5.3 Findings of previous verification reports related to the changes (if any)

Not applicable

6. Validation findings and resolution for changes to the project design of a registered project activity

6.1 Description of the changes

Not applicable

6.2 Additionality of the project activity

Not applicable

6.3 Scale of CDM project activity in the new PDD, if changes affect the scale of a small scale Project activity

Not applicable



6.4 Applicability and application of approved baseline methodology

Not applicable

7. Appendix

Appendix 1: List of documents reviewed

1	Registered project design document, version 03.2 dated: 06/04/2010
2	Revised project design document for the project activity, version 03.3 dated 03/04/2013
3	Validation report (Ref: CDM-MUM-0061595), version 1.2 dated: 07/04/2010
4	Catalogue for technical specifications of the V82 model Vestas made WTGs installed for the project activity
5	Validation and Verification Standard, version 03.0
6	Guideline for Completing the Monitoring Report Form, version 03.2
7	Clean development mechanism project standard, version 02.1
8	Clean development mechanism project cycle procedure, version 03.2

Appendix 2: List of persons interviewed

Date	Location	Team Members on site	Subjects covered	Persons interviewed
21/02/2013	Project site and Vandhiya and Shikarpur substations	Sanjay Kumar Agarwalla	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Project implementation and management•Site tour•Data management and reporting systems•Data verification•QA/QC, management systems	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Jignesh V, Regional Manager, Vestas2. Jitesh Visaradia, Sr. Manager, Powerica Ltd.3. Sridharan S, Sr Engineer, Powerica Ltd.4. Murugesh S, Sr Engineer, Vestas



Protocol

- Part 1 Validation of temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan and/or monitoring methodology
- Part 2 Validation of corrections
- Part 3 Validation of changes to the start date of the crediting period of the Project Activity or CPA
- Part 4 Validation of permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or monitoring methodology
- Part 5 Validation of changes to the project design of a registered project activity
- Part 6 Validation of changes to the project design of a registered PoA



1- Validation of temporary deviations

Team conclusions	
1-1. Documentation from the PP	
1-1.1. Is the alternative monitoring proposal completed?	Not applicable
1-1.2. Has the supplemental documentation been submitted as appropriate, especially when further explanation is necessary on the alternative monitoring?	Not applicable
1-2. Level of accuracy (Para 253 of the VVS)	
1-2.1. Determine whether the deviation is likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions: Have the project participants applied conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the deviation?	Not applicable



2- Validation of corrections

Team conclusions	
2-1. Documentation from the PP	
2-1.1. Is the revised PDD with the corrections completed in clean and track change versions?	Yes PP has submitted revised PDD with corrections completed in clean and track change versions.
2-1.2. Has the supplemental documentation been submitted as appropriate?	Not required
2-2. Means of verification (Para 258 of the VVS)	
2-2.1. Determine whether the corrected information is an accurate reflection of actual project information.	<p>The following two corrections in the PDD are identified reflecting the actual project information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In section A.4.2 of the registered PDD, version 3.2 dated 06/04/2010, “Rated wind speed” is stated as 14.4 rpm which is incorrect. PP has clarified that it was a typographical error in the registered PDD and it is corrected as “Nominal Revolution” as 14.4 rpm and “Nominal Wind Speed” as 13 m/s in the revised PDD, version 3.3, dated 03/04/2013. The verification team cross checked this correction of the technical specifications of the project WTGs in the revised PDD section A.4.2 with the catalogue for the V82 WTG models used in the project activity supplied by Vestas and found to be correct. 2) In section B.7.1 of the registered PDD, version 3.2 dated 06/04/2010, accuracy class of the sub station meters is stated 0.2s but the accuracy class of the WTG yard meters is not stated. Nevertheless, the accuracy class of the



	<p>WTG yard meters was stated in section 4.5 of the Validation Report, version 1.2 dated 07/04/2010 as 0.5. The verification team noted that as per the registered PDD, both the sub station meters and the WTG yard meters are used for arriving at the final net energy supplied by the project activity. Hence the team considers this as a typographical error (i.e. missing out mention of the accuracy class of the WTG yard meters in the PDD). PP has submitted the revised PDD, version 3.3 dated 03/04/2013 by stating the accuracy class of the WTG yard meters as 0.5s in section B.7.1 of the PDD. The verification team confirms this correction as correct based on the Validation Report, version 1.2 dated 07/04/2010, first periodic issuance and the on site visit and document review during the second periodic verification.</p> <p>The verification team confirms that the above two permanent changes in the PDD do not affect the design of the project activity and the corrected information is an accurate reflection of actual project information thereby satisfying the requirement of paragraph 258 of VVS, version 03.0. Hence the above permanent changes qualify as “Corrections” as per Appendix 1 of Project Standard, version 02.1 and does not require prior approval by the Board.</p> <p>In accordance to paragraph 212 and 213 of Project Standard, version 02.1, PP has informed the verification team regarding the above corrections and submitted a revised PDD.</p> <p>Hence in accordance to paragraph 135 of Project Cycle Procedure, version 03.2, the above changes in the PDD are being submitted to EB for acceptance as part of request of issuance.</p>
--	--



2-2.2. Determine whether the corrected parameters are in accordance with the applied methodology and/or selected monitoring plan.	Not applicable
---	----------------

3- Validation of changes to the starting date of the crediting period of the Project Activity or CPA

	Team conclusions
3-1. Documentation from the PP or the CME	
3-1.1. Is a demonstration of no changes to the project activity or CPA that would result in a less conservative baseline provided?	Not applicable
3-1.2. Has supplemental documentation been submitted to demonstrate that substantive progress has been made by the project participants or the CME to start the project activity?	Not applicable
3-2. Assessment of the demonstration (Para 217 of the PS)	
3-2.1. Determine whether the baseline is affected by the delay in the starting day of the crediting period. If it is affected, verify if the new baseline is less conservative or not.	Not applicable



3-2.2. Assess if the PPs have implemented actions to start the project activity or CPA. List these actions and determine if the new start date of the crediting period can be met.	Not applicable
--	----------------



4- Validation of permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan and/or monitoring methodology

Team conclusions	
4-1. Documentation from the PP	
4-1.1. Does the revised PDD contain a revised monitoring plan completed in clean and track change versions?	Not applicable
4-1.2. Has the supplemental documentation been submitted as appropriate, especially when further explanation is necessary on the revised monitoring plan?	Not applicable
4-2. Level of accuracy (Para 263 VVS)	
4-2.1. Did the revision of the monitoring plan ensure that the level of accuracy in the monitoring and verification process was not reduced as a result of revision? 1) frequency of measurements 2) quality of monitoring equipment 3) calibration requirements 4) QA/QC procedures.	Not applicable
4-3. Completeness (Para 266 VVS)	



4-3.1. Ensure that the permanent changes are not likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions	Not applicable
4-3.2. In case the permanent changes will lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions, request the PPs to apply conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the permanent change.	
4-4. Compliance with approved monitoring methodology (Para 264 VVS)	
4-4.1. If the proposed revision refers to a later version of the applied methodology, does the revised monitoring plan ensure that the application does not compromise the conservativeness in the monitoring and verification process and of the ER calculations?	Not applicable
4-5. Findings of previous verification reports	
4-5.1. If there are findings in the previous verifications related to the proposed revision of the monitoring plan, have the findings been taken into account?	Not applicable



5- Validation of changes to the project design of a registered project activity

Team conclusions	
5-1. Background (Section 12.8 of the PS)	
5-1.1. Identify concerns related to the conformity of the actual project activity and its operation with the registered PDD.	Not applicable



<p>5-1.2. If the identified changes fall in the following, check the elements in 5-2 below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Changes in the effective output capacity due to increased installed capacity or increased number of units, or installation of units with lower capacity or units with a technology which is less advanced than that described in the PDD(b) Addition of component or extension of technology(c) Removal or addition of one (or more) sites of a project activity registered with multiple sites(d) Different values of those actual operational parameters relevant to determination of emission reduction which are within the control of project participant and which result in the IRR passing the benchmark as described in the registered PDD. <p>(Para 221 of the PS)</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
---	-----------------------



5-1.3. If the identified changes cause a project activity to no longer meet the criteria for small-scale CDM project activities, check the elements in 5-3 below. (Para 222 of the PS)	Not applicable
5-1.4. If the identified changes in the implementation of project activity result in the following, check the elements in 5-4 below. (a) the original methodology would no longer be applicable, or (b) another methodology would have been applicable, or (c) another baseline scenario would be more appropriate. (Para 221 of the PS)	Not applicable
5-2. Changes which may impact the additionality of the project activity	
5-2.1. Check the impact of the change on the additionality of the project activity established at the time of registration and the specific conditions (investment / costs variables, barriers, relevant regulations).	Not applicable



5-2.2. Review the investment analysis, if applicable, based on all original input data and check if the PPs have only modified the key parameters in the original spreadsheet calculations.	Not applicable
5-2.3. Check, if applicable, that the barriers are still valid under new circumstances, if only barriers were claimed to demonstrate additionality at the registration stage.	Not applicable
5-3. Changes in the scale of CDM project activity	
5-3.1. Check the changes against the applicable SSC criteria for Type I, Type II or Type III.	Not applicable
5-4. Changes which impact the applicability/application of baseline methodology	
5-4.1. Check the applicability and application of baseline methodology with which the project has been registered.	Not applicable

6- Validation of changes to the project design of a registered PoA

	Team conclusions
6-1. Changes allowed (Para 131 of the PCP)	



	Team conclusions
6-1.1. PoA boundary: Check that the change is only: i. to expand geographical coverage and/or ii. to includes additional host parties	Not applicable
6-1.2. Eligibility criteria: Check that these changes are under the circumstances indicated in the “Standard for Demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for PoA”	Not applicable
6-1.3. .Addition of specific case CPA: i. Check that the PoA include more than one generic CPA-DD ii. Check that the new Specific CPA correspond to a generic CPA for which no specific CPA was submitted at the time of registration.	Not applicable
6-1.4. Application of provisions of the most recent version of the “Standard for sampling and surveys of for CDM PAs and PoAs”	Not applicable
6-2. Eligibility criteria	



	Team conclusions
6-2.1. Check that the CME has updated the Eligibility criteria for inclusion of CPAs in the PoA to reflect the changes above and has included them in new versions of PoA-DD and generic CPA-DD.	Not applicable