

---

# **ASSESSMENT OPINION ON POST-REGISTRATION CHANGES**

---

**Vish Wind Infrastructure LLP**

**Renewable Energy Wind Power  
Project in Rajasthan**

**UNFCCC Ref. No. 5090**

---

**SGS Climate Change Programme**

SGS United Kingdom Ltd

SGS House

217-221 London Road

Camberley Surrey

GU15 3EY

United Kingdom

<b>Date of Issue:</b>		<b>Project Number:</b>	
09/07/2014		CDM.VER 1424 MP2 PRC	
<b>Project Title:</b>			
Renewable Energy Wind Power Project in Rajasthan			
<b>Organisation:</b>		<b>Client:</b>	
SGS United Kingdom Limited		Vish Wind Infrastructure LLP	
<b>Subject:</b>			
Assessment Opinion for Request for Approval of Changes:			
	Temporary Deviation from the Monitoring Plan		<b>Distribution/Document Control</b>
[X]	Permanent changes to the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD		
[X]	Corrections from Registered PDD		
	Temporary Deviation from the monitoring plan and Permanent changes to the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD		
<b>Validation Team:</b>			
Vijaybhai Patel – Lead Assessor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Distribution (without permission from the Client or responsible organisational unit)	
Ravikant Soni – Assessor, Local Assessor and Sectoral Scope Expert (TA 1.2)			
<b>Technical Review:</b>			
Date: 11/07/2014		<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Distribution	
Name: Ramkrishna Patil			
<b>Authorised Signatory:</b>			
Name: Siddharth Yadav		<input type="checkbox"/> Unrestricted Distribution	
Date: 18/07/2014			
<b>Revision Number:</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>Number of Pages:</b>	
0	27/05/2014	29	
1	11/06/2014	29	
2	28/06/2014	30	
3	09/07/2014	31	

## Abbreviations

CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CL	Clarification Request
CMP	Conference of Parties Serving as Meeting of Parties
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon dioxide
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
DISCOM	Distribution Company
DR	Document Review
EB	Executive Board
EPC	Engineering, Procurement and Construction
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Green House Gas
JMR	Joint Meter Reading
kW	Kilowatt
kWh	Kilowatt hour
LCS	Local Control System
MoV	Means of Verification
MW	Megawatt
MWh	Megawatt-hour
NEWNE	Northern Eastern Western Northern-Eastern
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
PRC	Post Registration Changes
QA/QC	Quality Assurance and Quality Control
RMP	Revision in Monitoring Plan
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard
WTG/WEG	Wind Turbine Generator/Wind Energy Generator

## Table of Content

1. Assessment Opinion .....	5
2. Introduction .....	6
2.1 Objective .....	6
2.2 Scope.....	6
2.3 GHG Project Description.....	6
3. Methodology .....	7
3.1 Review of CDM-PDD and Additional Documentation.....	7
3.2 Use of the Validation Protocol.....	7
The validation protocol is attached with the report as Annex 1. ....	7
3.3 Findings.....	7
3.4 Internal Quality Control .....	8
4. Validation Findings- Post registration Changes from the Registered PDD .....	9
4.1 Permanent Changes from the monitoring plan .....	9
4.2 Corrections that do not affect the project design.....	15
4.3 Findings of Previous Verification Reports.....	16
5. List of Persons Interviewed.....	17
6. Document References.....	18
Annex 1: Validation Protocols.....	19
Annex 2: Overview of Findings.....	26
Annex 3: Statement of Competence.....	29

## 1. Assessment Opinion

Section 9.5 "Post Registration Changes" of the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard version 7.0 (EB 79 Annex 03), require the DOE to assess post registration changes to a project activity.

Section 6.2 "Changes to registered CDM project activity or programme of activities" of the CDM Project Cycle Procedure, Version 7.0 (EB 79 Annex 05) provides the category and procedure for changes to project activity, subject to the changes being validated by a Designated Operational Entity.

SGS United Kingdom Ltd has been contracted by Vish Wind Infrastructure LLP to perform such a validation for the registered CDM project "Renewable Energy Wind Power Project in Rajasthan" and UNFCCC Reference No. 5090. The category for the change is "permanent changes to the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD and corrections made in the registered PDD".

The purpose of the validation is to have an independent third party assessment of the permanent changes to the registered PDD (version 07 dated 06/03/2013 and approved on 23/05/2013) and corrections made to the registered PDD. In particular, the DOE should assess whether the changes affect the level of accuracy and/or completeness, and the conformity with the applied approved monitoring methodology compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan.

The category of the changes considered are permanent changes and corrections to the registered PDD along with the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD based on findings raised during the course of the second periodic verification for the project activity. The sole objective of the proposed revision to the registered PDD along with the monitoring plan is to bring more transparency and clarity with respect to the actual monitoring system being followed at the project site and more transparency with regards to the control over the monitoring process between the PP and the State Utilities.

This change improves the accuracy of information provided and consistency between the registered PDD and the monitoring plan.

Furthermore, we confirm that:

- (a) the proposed changes have been described, and an assessment has been provided to substantiate the reasons for each of the proposed revision points of the registered monitoring plan, using objective evidence;
- (b) the proposed changes to the monitoring plan ensures that the level of accuracy or completeness in the monitoring and verification process is not reduced as a result of the revisions; The corrected information mentioned in the proposed revised PDD is an accurate reflection of the actual project information.
- (c) the proposed changes to the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved monitoring methodology applicable to the project activity whilst ensuring the conservativeness of the emission reductions calculation.
- (d) the findings of the ongoing second verification have been taken into account.

**Signed on Behalf of the Validation Body by Authorized Signatory**



Signature:

Name: Siddharth Yadav

Date: 18/07/2014

## 2. Introduction

### 2.1 Objective

Section 9.5 “Post Registration Changes” of the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard version 7.0 requires the DOE to assess post registration changes to a project activity.

Section 6.2 “Changes to registered CDM project activity or programme of activities” of the CDM Project Cycle Procedure, Version 7.0 provides the categories and procedure for changes to project activity and, subject the changes to validation by a Designated Operational Entity.

SGS United Kingdom Ltd has been contracted by Vish Wind Infrastructure LLP to perform such a validation for the CDM registered project “Renewable Energy Wind Power Project in Rajasthan” and UNFCCC Reference No. 5090.

The purpose of the validation is to have an independent third party assessment of the permanent changes to the registered PDD version 07 dated 06/03/2013 and (approved on 23/05/2013). In particular, the DOE should assess whether the changes affect the level of accuracy and/or completeness, and the conformity with the applied approved monitoring methodology compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan.

The category of the changes considered are permanent changes to the registered PDD along with the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD based on findings raised during the course of the second periodic verification for the project activity. The sole objective of the proposed revision to the registered PDD along with the monitoring plan is to bring more transparency and clarity with respect to the actual monitoring system being followed at the project site and more transparency with regards to the control over the monitoring process between the PP and the State Utilities. The Validation was performed in accordance with the UNFCCC criteria for the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) i.e. CDM Validation and Verification standard version 7.0 and the host country criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

SGS reviewed the project design documentation (proposed post registration changes in the revised PDD), using a risk based approach and conducted follow-up interviews.

### 2.2 Scope

The scope of the validation is defined as an independent and objective review of permanent changes to the registered PDD along with monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD. The information in these documents is reviewed against the Kyoto Protocol requirements, the UNFCCC rules and associated interpretations.

The validation is not meant to provide any consulting towards the Client/the project. However, SGS may issue requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions which may provide input for improvement of the project design.

### 2.3 GHG Project Description

Refer to <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/BVQI1312546277.77/view> for the registered project information. The project was registered on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2012 under UNFCCC Reference No. 5090. A revision in the monitoring plan (for change in metering point from Amarsagar to Akal Sub-station) was previously validated by another DOE and approved (refer registered PDD version 07 dated 06/03/2013 and approved on 23/05/2013 by the UNFCCC). In the current post registration changes request, the PP has removed some parameters from the registered monitoring plan (see section 4 for more details). The monitoring and relevant apportioning related to these parameters are not under the control of the PP and the data related to non-project activity WEGs are also not accessible by the PP (from the second monitoring period onwards), which remains under the jurisdiction of the EPC contractor/DISCOM.

**The term “registered PDD” in this report will be understood to mean the current valid PDD version 7 (validated and approved by CDM EB on 23/05/2010); and the term “ revised PDD” will be used to refer to the PDD version 11 submitted along this validation opinion with request for permanent changes.**

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Review of CDM-PDD and Additional Documentation

The validation is performed primarily as a document review of the publicly available project documents i.e. registered PDD<sup>/2/</sup> version 07 dated 06/03/2013 and the verification report of the first periodic verification<sup>/5/</sup>. The Revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup> version 08 to 11 (final version) were checked for information in line with the actual implementation. The assessment is performed by trained assessors using a validation protocol.

A site visit was carried out to verify assumptions/ information in the registered PDD along with monitoring plan.

#### 3.2 Use of the Validation Protocol

The validation protocol used for the assessment is partly based on the templates of the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard version 7.0:

- it organises, details and clarifies the requirements the project is expected to meet; and
- it documents both how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the validation.

The validation protocol consists of several tables. The different columns in these tables are described below.

Checklist Question	Ref ID	Means of Verification (MoV)	Comment	Draft and/or Final Conclusion
The various requirements are linked to checklist questions the project should meet.	Lists any references and sources used in the validation process. Full details are provided in the table at the bottom of the checklist.	Explains how conformance with the checklist question is investigated. Examples of means of verification are document review (DR) or interview (I). N/A means not applicable.	The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist question and/or the conformance to the question. It is further used to explain the conclusions reached.	This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (Y/OK), or a Corrective Action Request (CAR) due to non-compliance with the checklist question (See below). A Clarification request (CL) is raised if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM requirements have been met.

The validation protocol is attached with the report as Annex 1.

#### 3.3 Findings

As an outcome of the validation process, the team can raise different types of findings.

In general, where insufficient or inaccurate information is available and clarification or new information is required the Assessor shall raise a **Clarification Request (CL)** specifying what additional information is required.

Where a non-conformance arises the Assessor shall raise a **Corrective Action Request (CAR)**. A CAR is issued, where:

- Non-conformities with the monitoring plan or methodology are found in monitoring and reporting, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;
- Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions which will impair the estimate of emission reductions;
- Issues identified in a FAR during validation to be verified during verification have not been resolved by the project participants.

A Forward Action Request (FAR) is raised during verification for actions if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.

The validation process may be halted until this information has been made available to the assessors' satisfaction. Failure to address a CL/FAR may result in a CAR. Information or clarifications provided as a result of a CL/FAR may also lead to a CAR.

Corrective Action Requests, Clarification Requests and Forward Action Requests are raised in the draft validation protocol and detailed in a separate form (Findings Overview). In this form, the Project Developer is given the opportunity to address and "close" outstanding CARs and respond to CLs and FARs. The detailed Finding Overview is attached with this document as Annex 2.

### **3.4 Internal Quality Control**

Following the completion of the assessment process and a recommendation by the Assessment team, all documentation will be forwarded to a Technical Reviewer. The task of the Technical Reviewer is to check that all procedures have been followed and all conclusions are justified. The Technical Reviewer will either accept or reject the recommendation made by the assessment team.

#### **Technical Review Team**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>
Ramkrishna Patil	Technical Reviewer and Technical Area Expert (TA 1.2)



## 4. Validation Findings- Post registration Changes from the Registered PDD

### 4.1 Permanent Changes from the monitoring plan

This current scope of work involves only assessment of the changes to the registered monitoring plan; the changes are permanent in nature and therefore there is no temporary deviation from the monitoring plan. The proposed changes to the registered PDD are not covered under Appendix 1 of the CDM Project Standard and hence require prior approval by the Board.

The permanent changes in the registered PDD of monitoring plan are a result of a CAR raised by SGS during the second periodic verification of the project activity.

The revision in the monitoring plan has been proposed by the PP in response to the CAR, along with the revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup> and types of changes are summarized as below;

1. Monitoring plan mentioned in sections B.7.1, B.7.3 and Annex 3 of the revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup> are updated in line with actual monitoring practice being followed at the site.
2. Section B.7.1 of the revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup> is updated with removal of following parameters:
  - a.  $EG_{Controller, i}$  – Net electricity generation (Gross Export-Gross Import) by a WEG of the project activity or non project activity, as measured at the controller (LCS meter) at the project site. Each WEG has exclusive LCS meter that records net electricity generation (Gross Export-Gross Import) from the WEG (project or non project)
  - b.  $\sum EG_{Controller, i}$  – Summation of net electricity generation (Gross Export-Gross Import) by all WEGs (i number of WEGs) of project activity (j number of WEGs) and non project activity (k number of WEGs), as measured at the controller (LCS meter) at the project site. Each WEG has exclusive LCS meter that records net electricity generation (Gross Export-Gross Import) from the WEG (project or non project).
  - c.  $EG_{JMR, Export}$  – Electricity export by the project activity & non project activity recorded by the main meter installed at the DISCOM sub-stations.
  - d.  $EG_{JMR, Import}$  – Electricity import by the project activity & non project activity recorded by the main meter installed at the DISCOM sub-station

During the site visit, the verification team noted that even though the first two parameters ( $EG_{Controller, i}$  and  $\sum EG_{Controller, i}$ ) as described above are monitored and recorded by EPC contractor for the purpose of apportioning the electricity supplied to the grid by each Wind Turbine Generator of the entire wind farm; the same data apportioning is not under the control and/or jurisdiction of the Project Participant (PP) since the monitored data also includes electricity generation values of non-project activity wind turbines. Similarly the other two parameters ( $EG_{JMR, Export}$  and  $EG_{JMR, Import}$ ) for the entire wind farm along with apportioned share for individual promoters is being monitored and recorded by the representative of DISCOM and EPC contractor, based on the measured data of  $EG_{Controller, i}$  and  $\sum EG_{Controller, i}$ . The PP does not have any control of such apportioning and data recording procedure involved.

However, it is confirmed that due to the exclusion of these parameters from the project monitoring plan, the above issues do not have any adverse impact on the emission reduction calculation, since there is no change in the monitoring and apportioning procedure of net electricity generation supplied to the grid by the project activity WEGs; and the same is adopted from the monthly apportioned share certificate issued by the EPC contractor to the PP. Therefore only monitoring parameters under the control of the PP and relevant to project activity are kept in the revised monitoring plan.

3. Section B.7.3 of the revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup> includes a diagram indicating the monitoring locations involved for the project activity and detailed description on apportioning procedure being followed at site by DISCOM to calculate “Net electricity generation supplied to the grid by the Project activity”.

Furthermore, to improve the transparency and completeness of monitoring procedure, also keeping compliance with the applied Monitoring Methodology ACM0002 version 12.3.0<sup>/4/</sup>, the following parameters have been updated under section B.7.1 of the revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup>.

S/N	Parameters	Remarks/changes/revisions
1	Net electricity generation supplied to the grid by the Project activity. (EG <sub>facility,y</sub> ) Unit: MWh (Mega-watt hour)	Source of data is described more correctly and transparently. No change in source of data was verified to be involved.  Description of measurements methods and procedures is updated in line with the actual monitoring procedure followed.  QA/QC procedures to be applied are updated in line with the actual procedure followed at the site.
2	Electricity export to the grid by the Project activity. (EG <sub>Export,y</sub> ) Unit: MWh (Mega-watt hour)	Source of data is described more correctly and transparently. No change in source of data was verified to be involved.  Description of measurements methods and procedures is updated in line with the actual monitoring procedure followed.  Monitoring frequency is included as Monthly.  QA/QC procedures to be applied are updated in line with the actual procedure followed at the site.  Purpose of the data is included as to calculate Baseline Emissions.  Additional comment row is added and section numbers are changed in line with the PDD completion guideline.
3	Electricity Import from grid by the Project activity. (EG <sub>Import,y</sub> ) Unit: MWh (Mega-watt hour)	Source of data is described more correctly and transparently. No change in source of data was verified to be involved.  Description of measurements methods and procedures is updated in line with the actual monitoring procedure followed.  Monitoring frequency is included as Monthly.  QA/QC procedures to be applied are updated in line with the actual procedure followed at the site.  Purpose of the data is included as to calculate Baseline Emissions.  Additional comment row is added and section numbers are changed in line with the PDD completion guideline.
4	Electricity export by project activity & non project activity recorded by main meter installed at DISCOM sub-stations (EG <sub>JMR, Export</sub> ) Unit: MWh (Mega-watt hour)	This parameter is removed in the revised PDD <sup>17</sup> .  EG <sub>JMR, Export</sub> parameter for the entire wind farm including non project WEGs is being measured and apportioned by the EPC contractor which is further authorized by DISCOM.  The monitoring and relevant apportioning related to this parameter is not under control of the PP and the data related to non project activity WEGs are also not accessible by them, which remains under the jurisdiction of the EPC contractor. EPC contractor issue the monthly share certificate to the PP containing apportioned net electricity export by the project activity WEGs.
5	Electricity import by project activity & non project activity recorded by main meter installed at DISCOM sub-station (EG <sub>JMR, Import</sub> ) Unit: MWh (Mega-watt hour)	This parameter is removed in the revised PDD <sup>17</sup> .  EG <sub>JMR, Import</sub> parameter for the entire wind farm including non project WEGs is being measured and apportioned by the EPC contractor which is further authorized by DISCOM.  The monitoring and relevant apportioning related to this parameter is not under control of the PP and the data related to non project activity WEGs is also not accessible by them, which remains under

		jurisdiction of the EPC contractor. EPC contractor issue the monthly share certificate to the PP containing apportioned net electricity export by the project activity WEGs.
6	<p>Net electricity generation (Gross Export-Gross Import) by a WEG of project activity or non project activity, as measured at the controller (LCS meter) at project site. Each WEG has exclusive LCS meter that records net electricity generation (Gross Export-Gross Import) from the WEG (project or non project). (<math>EG_{Controller, i}</math>)</p> <p>Where,</p> <p>i is any WEG between 1 to j+k and connected to main meter (JMR/billing meter) at DISCOM substation and backup meter at Enercon substation.</p> <p>j is number of WEGs of project activity connected to main meter (JMR/billing meter) at DISCOM substation and backup meter at Enercon substation.</p> <p>k is number of WEG of non project activity connected to main meter (JMR/billing meter) at DISCOM substation and backup meter at Enercon substation.</p> <p>Unit: MWh (Mega-watt hour)</p>	<p>This parameter is removed in the revised PDD<sup>17</sup>.</p> <p><math>EG_{Controller, i}</math> parameter for the entire wind farm including non project WEGs is being measured and apportioned by the EPC contractor.</p> <p>The monitoring and relevant apportioning related to this parameter is not under the control of the PP and the data related to non project activity WEGs are also not accessible by them, which remains under jurisdiction of the EPC contractor. EPC contractor issue the monthly share certificate to the PP containing apportioned net electricity export by the project activity WEGs.</p>
7	<p>Summation of net electricity generation (Gross Export-Gross Import) by all WEG (i number of WEGs) of project activity (j number of WEGs) and non project activity (k number of WEGs), as measured at the controller (LCS meter)</p>	<p>This parameter is removed in the revised PDD<sup>17</sup>.</p> <p><math>\sum EG_{Controller, i}</math> parameter for the entire wind farm including non project WEGs is being measured and apportioned by the EPC contractor.</p> <p>The monitoring and relevant apportioning related to this parameter is not under control of the PP and the data related to non project activity WEGs are also not accessible by them, which remains under jurisdiction of the EPC contractor. EPC contractor issue the monthly share certificate to the PP containing apportioned net electricity export by the project activity WEGs.</p>

	<p>at project site, Each WEG has exclusive LCS meter that records net electricity generation (Gross Export-Gross Import) from the WEG (project or non project). (<math>\sum EG_{\text{Controller},i}</math>)</p> <p>Where,</p> <p>i is any WEG between 1 to j+k and connected to main meter (JMR/billing meter) at DISCOM substation and backup meter at Enercon substation.</p> <p>j is number of WEGs of project activity connected to main meter (JMR/billing meter) at DISCOM substation and backup meter at Enercon substation.</p> <p>k is number of WEG of non project activity connected to main meter (JMR/billing meter) at DISCOM substation and backup meter at Enercon substation.</p> <p>Unit: MWh (Mega-watt hour)</p>	
8	<p>Summation of net electricity generation (Gross Export-Gross Import) by all the WEGs of project activity (j number of WEGs), as measured at the controller (LCS meter) at project site. Each WEG has exclusive LCS meter that records net electricity generation (Gross Export-Gross Import) from the WEG.</p> <p>j is number of WEGs of project activity connected to main meter (JMR/billing meter) at DISCOM substation and backup meter at WWIL substation. (<math>\sum EG_{\text{Controller},j}</math>)</p>	<p>The description of the parameter is changed to remove non project data.</p> <p>Source of data is described more correctly and transparently. No change in source of data was verified to be involved.</p> <p>Description of measurements methods and procedures is updated in line with the actual monitoring procedure followed.</p> <p>Monitoring frequency is included as continuously.</p> <p>QA/QC procedures to be applied are updated in line with the actual procedure followed at the site.</p> <p>Purpose of the data is included as to calculate Baseline Emissions.</p> <p>Additional comment row is added in line with the PDD completion guideline.</p>

	Unit: MWh (Mega-watt hour)	
--	----------------------------	--

#### Discussion on CAR/CL:

**CAR #1 (Issue 1)** The registered PDD mentioned version 12.1.0 of the methodology ACM0002. However, this is not the latest subversion of the applicable methodology available on the UNFCCC website. The PP was requested to clarify the inconsistency observed. In response, the PP has updated the applicable methodology ACM0002 version 12.3.0. This is found to be appropriate and accepted; hence **CAR #1 (Issue 1)** was closed out.

**CAR #1 (Issue 2)** The PP was requested to complete the PDD in line with the PDD completion guideline. In response, The PP revised the PDD, it was reviewed and found in line with the PDD completion guideline and was accepted; hence **CAR #1 (Issue 2)** was closed out.

**Thus CAR #1 is closed.**

Detailed discussion on above CAR can be referred in Annex 2 of this validation opinion.

**CAR #2 (Issue 1)** The PP has not used the latest registered PDD (approved on 23/05/2013) version 7 dated 06/03/2013 to insert the new revision and the changes were not shown in track change mode. In response, the PP has used the latest registered version 7 of the PDD. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CAR #2 (Issue 1)** was closed out.

**CAR #2 (Issue 2)** The PP was requested to clarify why Section A.2.1 and section A.4 of the revised PDD version 8 were not appropriately filled in line with the PDD completion guideline. In response, The PP has revised the PDD in line with the PDD completion guideline. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CAR #2 (Issue 2)** was closed out.

**CAR #2 (Issue 3)** The PP was requested to clarify why step 6 in section B.6.1 of PDD version 8 has mentioned Andhra Pradesh, when the project is in Rajasthan state. In response, the PP has corrected the name of the state as per the actual location of the current project activity. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CAR #2 (Issue 3)** was closed out.

**CAR #2 (Issue 4)** The PP was requested to clarify why Appendix 6 of revised PDD version 8 does not mention all post registration changes made from the registered PDD version 7 (approved on 23/05/2013). In response, the PP has corrected Appendix 6 including all the post registration changes to be validated. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CAR #2 (Issue 4)** was closed out.

**Thus CAR #2 is closed.**

Detailed discussion on above CAR can be referred in Annex 2 of this validation opinion.

**CAR #3** The PP did not clarify in the revised PDD version 9 whether the PP had any involvement and control on the specified apportioning procedures (Case 1 & Case 2) since four of the parameters ( $EG_{JMR, Export}$ ,  $EG_{JMR, Import}$ ,  $EG_{Controller, i}$ ,  $\sum EG_{Controller, i}$ ) distinctly used for apportioning procedures had been excluded from the project monitoring plan, due to lack of control and access to those data by the PP. The PP was requested to clarify the same. In response, the PP has transparently documented in the revised PDD version 10 that the PP does not have any control on the excluded parameters. However, these parameters are used by the EPC contractor and DISCOM for the apportioning of the electricity. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CAR #3** was closed out.

**Thus CAR #3 is closed.**

Detailed discussion on above CAR can be referred in Annex 2 of this validation opinion.

**CAR #4** In the revised PDD version 10, on Page 2, footnote 2, the web link was not working. The PP was requested to provide a working link. In response, the PP has corrected web link in the revised PDD version 11. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CAR #4** was closed out.

**Thus CAR #4 is closed.**

Detailed discussion on above CAR can be referred in Annex 2 of this validation opinion.

**The proposed changes to the monitoring plan ensures that the level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring and verification process is not reduced as a result of proposed permanent changes (details below).**

The PRC<sup>/1/</sup> has been proposed by PP to provide transparency towards the monitoring system and procedures involved in the determination of the parameter “Net electricity generation supplied to the grid by the Project activity. (EG<sub>facility,y</sub>)”. It does not involve any alteration of the project monitoring equipment nor the emission reduction calculation approach in comparison to the registered monitoring plan. The assessment of the changes is discussed below;

**Permanent Changes from Registered monitoring plan:**

1. The monitoring plan of the project activity is updated in line with the actual site scenario and consistent units and minor corrections to improve the clarity of the description under sections B.7.1 and B.7.3 of revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup>. The parameter-wise updates are already covered in the table above under section 4.1 of this report.

As verified onsite the proposed change is in accordance with the actual site scenario and summarizes the process involved to arrive at the values of “Net electricity generation supplied to the grid by the Project activity. (EG<sub>facility,y</sub>)” for the project activity. The monitoring system is not under the direct control of the PP as the monitoring system is uniform throughout the state and controlled by the state utility (DISCOM). The source of data for all the parameters related still remains the same. Thus, there is no effect on the accuracy of the measurements however; the transparency and completeness of the monitoring system will improve due to the proposed PRC.

2. Also the general QA/QC procedures are provided more transparently in the parameter tables which include more clarity on the calibration procedures regarding the level of control of the PP and the state utility. Further, the data reporting procedures were described more transparently so that the electricity data can be traced from various sources.
3. The parameters EG<sub>JMR, Export</sub>, EG<sub>JMR, Import</sub>, EG<sub>Controller, i</sub>,  $\sum EG_{Controller,i}$  removed in the revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup>. During the site visit, the verification team noted that the parameters EG<sub>Controller, i</sub> and  $\sum EG_{Controller,i}$  are monitored and recorded by the EPC contractor for the purpose of apportioning the electricity supplied to the grid by the individual Wind Turbine Generators of the entire wind farm. This data apportioning is however not under the jurisdiction of the PP since the monitored data also includes electricity generation values of non-project activity wind turbines. Similarly the other two parameters (EG<sub>JMR, Export</sub> and EG<sub>JMR, Import</sub>) for the entire wind farm along with apportioned share for individual promoters is being monitored and recorded by representative of DISCOM and EPC contractor. PP does not have any control of such apportioning and data recording procedure involved.

It is confirmed that there is no change in the monitoring or apportioning procedure of net electricity generation supplied to the grid by the project activity WEGs and the same is adopted from the monthly apportioned share certificate issued by the EPC contractor to the PP. Therefore only parameters available to the PP relevant to project activity are kept in the revised monitoring plan<sup>/1/</sup>.

**The proposed changes to the monitoring plan are in accordance with the approved monitoring methodology applicable to the project activity (details below).**

This permanent change to the registered monitoring plan improves the accuracy of information provided and consistency in the revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup>.

The proposed revision of the monitoring plan<sup>/1/</sup> is verified to be in accordance with the approved monitoring methodology applicable to the project activity. Section III of the applied methodology ACM0002 version 12.3.0<sup>/4/</sup> applies, which requires the “Net electricity generation supplied to the grid by the Project activity. (EG<sub>facility,y</sub>)”. The project activity generates electricity using wind turbines and the proposed PRC is making the monitoring approach of this parameter transparent and simple to understand. It has been further assured that there will be no effect from the revision in the monitoring plan on the original chosen baseline mentioned in the registered PDD<sup>/2/</sup> and it will remain same.



### Possible impacts on emission reduction calculations due to change in monitoring plan:

The “Net electricity generation supplied to the grid by the Project activity. ( $EG_{\text{facility},y}$ )”, which is fed to the grid, represents the realistic quantity of carbon intensive electricity being displaced from the grid system generation mix. Thus accounting of  $EG_{\text{facility},y}$  provides the most accurate and conservative determination of emission reduction calculation for a grid connected renewable energy power plant, such as in the current project activity. The meters installed to measure electricity generated/exported/imported and hence determine  $EG_{\text{facility},y}$  are sealed and maintained (tested & calibrated) by the grid authorities only and the project proponent does not have any input on that procedure.

As per the electricity monitoring system observed in grid connected renewable energy projects, the entire generated electricity is being evacuated to the grid after deducting import from grid. The electricity monitoring is governed by the Terms and Conditions as mentioned in the PPA signed with the respective state utilities. As commonly observed, the parameter  $EG_{\text{facility},y}$  is being monitored through a set of energy meters installed at the grid interface in different arrangements, depending on the state where the WTGs are installed. These energy meters are owned and under control of state electricity authority. As per the conditions of the PPA, project participants cannot intervene into this metering process. The value of  $EG_{\text{facility},y}$  is verified from the JMR Reports<sup>9/</sup> issued by the state utilities (which is as per the registered PDD<sup>2/</sup>) and can be cross checked with credit reports<sup>10/</sup> issued to PP by the state utility towards the values of  $EG_{\text{facility},y}$ . Thus, the determination approach of  $EG_{\text{facility},y}$  is found to be correct and authentic and conservative; hence it is accepted.

It is clear from the above description that the baseline of the project activity would still remain the same. Hence, there will be no change in emission reduction calculation due to change in monitoring plan.

The rest of the project details remain the same as mentioned in the registered PDD<sup>2/</sup> available at the UNFCCC website <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/BVQI1312546277.77/view>. The revised monitoring plan is being submitted with the revised validation opinion.

Thus, the proposed revision improves the transparency of information provided in registered PDD<sup>2/</sup> and the monitoring plan consistent with the actual site scenario.

### 4.2 Corrections that do not affect the project design

1. Name of the company Enercon (India) Ltd (EIL) changed to Wind World (India) Ltd (WWIL), effective from 01/01/2013. Hence, the PP has revised name of EIL to WWIL throughout the revised PDD<sup>1/</sup>. This has been checked from the company website <http://www.windworldindia.com/background-note.jsp>.
2. Web link for CEA database has been corrected. This website site is hosted by Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of Power, Government of India and weblink to the database changes time to time. The latest website link for the CEA database available at the time of revised PDD<sup>1/</sup> submission is updated to provide required information. This is checked and confirm from [http://www.cea.nic.in/installed\\_capacity.html](http://www.cea.nic.in/installed_capacity.html)
3. Under sections A.4, B.5 and B.6 the PP has revised “Annex” to “Appendix”. This is in line with the revised PDD<sup>11/</sup> template version 4.1. Hence, this change does not affect to the content of the registered PDD<sup>2/</sup>.
4. Under section B.6.1 the PP has corrected the state name from “Andhra Pradesh” to “Rajasthan”. This is the actual location of the project activity. This was a typographical error. Hence, this change reflects accurate information of the project activity.
5. Under section B.6.2 the PP has removed the sentence “Calculated as weighted average of OM and BM emission factor”. This sentence was not relevant to the parameter  $EF_{\text{grid},OM,y}$ . Hence, this change does not affect to the content of the registered PDD<sup>2/</sup>.
6. Under section B.7.1 the PP has revised the section number from “B.7.2” to “B.7.3”. This is in line with the revised PDD<sup>11/</sup> template version 4.1. Hence, this change does not affect to the content of the registered PDD<sup>2/</sup>.

7. Section B.7.1 of the revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup> is updated to add the purpose of the data for the emission reduction calculation. This is in line with the revised PDD<sup>/11/</sup> template version 4.1. Hence, this change does not affect to the content of the registered PDD<sup>/2/</sup>.
8. Section B.7.1 of the revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup> is updated to remove “and/or RTGS transaction or cheque copy”. The PP has already discussed the invoices they raise to DISCOM to cross check the export values. Hence, this change does not affect to the content of the registered PDD<sup>/2/</sup>.
9. Section B.7.1 of the revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup> is updated to change from “representative of PP (Enercon) to “EPC Contractor (WWIL)”. The data handling responsibility remains same after correcting the wording. Hence, this change does not affect to the content of the registered PDD<sup>/2/</sup>.
10. Section B.7.3 of the revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup> is updated to change from “KPCPL” to “Vish Wind Infrastructure LLP”. This is the correct information of the project activity. This was a typographical error. Hence, this change does not affect to the content of the registered PDD<sup>/2/</sup>.
11. Section B.7.3 of the revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup> is updated to change from “O&M” to “EPC”. This is changed for more transparency. Hence, this change does not affect to the content of the registered PDD<sup>/2/</sup>.
12. ACM0002 version 12.1.0 was the latest methodology available at the time of registration. However, editorial changes are made in the methodology and ACM0002 version 12.3.0 is available as a latest methodology on the UNFCCC website at the time of verification. The same is confirmed from the UNFCCC website. As per paragraph 13 of EB 61 Annex 25 ‘Changes of an editorial nature will be published on the public website and will become applicable upon date of publication. Hence, PP has revised applicable methodology ACM0002 version 12.3.0 in the revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup>. The revised PDD meets all the requirement provided in the revised applicable methodology ACM0002 version 12.3.0. This is in line with the above guideline and hence accepted by assessment team. In this correction no parameters are changed.

All the minor editorial changes made in the revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup> are in line with the actual scenario observed at the site and represent current scenario at the time of submission of the revised PDD<sup>/1/</sup>. This is in line with paragraph 292-295 of the VVS version 7.0<sup>/6/</sup>. Although these corrections do not require prior approval as per paragraph 1 of Appendix 1 of Project Standard version 7.0<sup>/7/</sup>, they are being submitted with the post registration changes for approval. Further, it is confirmed that, the changes do not affect the project design and are in compliance with appendix 1 of the project standard version 7.0<sup>/7/</sup>.

It is to be noted that this project is registered under the previous regulatory framework (VVM track), and the old information is transferred to the new VVS track form. The assessment team confirms that the material (information) included in the new form is materially the same as the information in the registered PDD<sup>/2/</sup>.

### 4.3 Findings of Previous Verification Reports

As already stated above in section 4.1 of this validation opinion, the revised monitoring plan proposed by the PP is a result of finding (CAR#4) raised during the second periodic verification of the current project activity. The sole objective of the proposed revision in the registered monitoring plan is to bring more transparency and clarity with respect to the actual monitoring system being followed at the project site and transparently document the control over the monitoring process between the PP and the state utilities.

However, as already explained above in section 4.1 of this validation opinion, PP will source the values of parameters “Net electricity generation supplied to the grid by the Project activity. ( $EG_{\text{facility},y}$ )” from JMR Reports as PP don't have control on the monitoring of all parameters required for apportioning procedure. The values of  $EG_{\text{facility},y}$  will be further crosschecked with the credit reports. Same approach has been followed during the previous verifications of the project activity; hence there is no impact of proposed revised monitoring plan on the CERs issued during earlier verifications of the project activity.

The proposed revised monitoring plan (after EB approval) will apply to project from second monitoring period onwards.



## 5. List of Persons Interviewed

Date of site visit	Name	Position	Short description of subject discussed
10/03/2014 and 11/03/2014	Ms. Poorvi Joshi	Wind World India Limited (Representative of Project Participant)	CDM monitoring & reporting documentation Quality Assurance – Management and operating system. Verification of monitoring and data handling procedure (reporting, recording and data archiving)
10/03/2014 and 11/03/2014	Mr. Jeetendra Kumar	Wind World India Limited (Representative of EPC Contractor)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring and measuring system</li> <li>Collection of measurements</li> <li>Observations of established practices</li> <li>Data Verification of monitoring parameters</li> </ul>

## 6. Document References

Category 1 Documents (documents provided by the Client that relate directly to the GHG components of the project, (i.e. the CDM Project Design Document, confirmation by the host Party on contribution to sustainable development and written approval of voluntary participation from the designated national authority):

- /1/ A. Revised PDD version 11 dated 08/07/2014 – Clean mode
- B. Revised PDD version 11 dated 08/07/2014 – track change mode

Version No.	Date	Remarks
7	06/03/2013	Registered PDD approved on 23/05/2013
8	20/05/2014	Methodology version was revised due to CAR #1 Section A was revised due to CAR #1. Section B was revised due to CAR #1
9	04/06/2014	Section A was revised due to CAR #2 Section B was revised due to CAR #2. Appendix 6 was revised due to CAR #2
10	28/06/2014	Section B.7.3 was revised due to CAR #3.
11	08/07/2014	Section A, Foot note 2 web link was corrected due to CAR #4.

Category 2 Documents (background documents used to check project assumptions and confirm the validity of information given in the Category 1 documents and in validation interviews):

- /2/ Registered PDD Version 07 dated 06/03/2013 approved on 23/05/2013,
- /3/ Project Webpage: Validation Report (Report No. INDIA-VAL/366.49/2012, revision 4 dated 21/02/2012  
Validation opinion for post registration changes Report No. PRJC-442304-20130CCS-IND
- /4/ Applied Methodology, ACM0002, version 12.3.0 valid from 27/02/2009  
<http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/MPY3HVJIMTKE5P0UNTYE827D6Q7EHB>
- /5/ Project Webpage: <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/BVQI1312546277.77/view>  
First Verification Report version 01 dated 02/03/2012
- /6/ Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard version 7.0 (EB 79 Annex 4)
- /7/ Clean Development Mechanism Project Standard version 7.0 (EB 79 Annex 3)
- /8/ Clean Development Mechanism Project Cycle Procedure version 7.0 (EB 79 Annex 5)
- /9/ JMR report for current project activity
- /10/ Credit reports for current project activity
- /11/ PDD form for CDM project activities (F-CDM-PDD) template version 4.1 dated 11/04/2012

## Annex 1: Validation Protocols

Checklist Question	Reference	MoV*	Comments	Conclusion / CARs/CLs
<b>A.1. General Requirements</b>				
A.1.1. Is the deviation/revision in the monitoring plan based on a decision by the CDM EB	Project Cycle Procedure Version 7.0	DR	No, The revision in the monitoring plan is not based on a decision by the CDM EB.	OK
A.1.2. Is the deviation/revision based on a decision by CDM EB but also additional revisions are proposed by the PP/DOE	Project Cycle Procedure Version 7.0	DR	The revision in the monitoring plan is not based on a decision by the CDM EB. It is proposed by PP based on the gap in the registered PDD <sup>/2/</sup> with respect to actual monitoring system implemented on site.	OK
A.1.3. Is the need for deviation/revision in monitoring plan spotted during the first monitoring period?	Project Cycle Procedure Version 7.0 Project page on UNFCCC website	DR	Yes, the RMP was identified during second verification of the project by PP/DOE.	OK
A.1.4. Is the revised monitoring plan complete and does the revised monitoring plan follow the registered PDD template?	Registered PDD, Revised monitoring plan in the form of revised PDD	DR	The revised monitoring plan follows the registered PDD <sup>/2/</sup> template <sup>/11/</sup> i.e. F-CDM-PDD version 4.1.	OK
A.1.5. Has the revised monitoring plan been submitted in track change mode for each of the revision point (issue)?	Revised monitoring plan in the form of revised PDD	DR	Yes. The revised monitoring plan has been submitted by the PP in track change mode for each of the revision point (issue).	OK

A.1.6. is there an objective evidence for each of the proposed revision/deviation points (issue)?	Document review		The PRC is based on the monthly JMR provided by DISCOM, data available with the O & M supplier as well as onsite verification of the actual monitoring system implemented onsite.	OK
A.1.7. Does the revised monitoring plan also include the Annex 4 (Annex 5 (VVS)) ?	Registered PDD	DR	Yes, the Annex 4 from the PDD was revised and is updated in the PRC in accordance to revised section B.7.	OK
A.1.8. Does the revised monitoring plan lead/associate to any kind of change in the project registered design?	Project Cycle Procedure Version 7.0, Registered PDD	DR	The proposed revision in the monitoring plan was checked against EB 79 annex 04. The revised monitoring plan does not lead to any kind of change in the project registered design while revising the monitoring plan of the registered PDD.	OK
<b>A.2. Data and Parameters Monitored</b>				
A.2.1. Does the revised monitoring plan in the PDD comply with the approved methodology provided for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for estimation or measuring the emission reductions within the project boundary during the crediting period?	VVS version 7.0 Revised PDD Section B.7	DR	<p>The revised monitoring plan has been found to be in compliance with the approved methodology ACM0002 Version 12.3.0 used for the project. The monitoring plan now includes transparently all necessary parameters and has been clearly described.</p> <p>Implementation of the revised monitoring plan will make the monitoring process more transparent and accurate. This has been confirmed by reviewing the revised monitoring plan and interviewing relevant site personnel during the site visit. The arrangements described in the monitoring plan are found to be feasible within the project design. The process of collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for estimation or measuring the emission reductions within the project boundary are found to be satisfactory. The parameters modified as a part of the revised monitoring plan have been described in detail in revised section B.7 of the revised PDD<sup>1/</sup>.</p>	CAR #1 (Issue 1) raised and closed)
A.2.2. Are the changes in the monitoring plan inline to the applied methodology and tool?	ACM0002 Version 12.3.0	DR	<p>The changes in the monitoring plan are in line with the approved monitoring methodology ACM0002 Version 12.3.0 (latest subversion available on UNFCCC website) which was used in the revised PDD<sup>1/</sup>.</p> <p>As per the applied methodology ACM0002 Version 12.3.0 "Baseline emissions include only CO2 emissions from electricity generation in fossil fuel fired power plants that are displaced due to the project activity". The requirement is duly fulfilled. Thus the PRC is in line with the methodology requirement.</p>	OK

A.2.3. Are the changes affecting the ER calculation (directly/indirectly)?	Revised PDD	DR	<p>As in the registered PDD, the amount of emission reductions will depend on the electricity values on the monthly JMR issued by the respective SEBs where the WTGs are located. The RMP was undertaken to transparently describe the procedures describing how these values are determined.</p> <p>The parameters which were not under PP's control and not available for apportioning are removed from the ER calculations. However, the monitoring plan is transparent; complete and reflects the actual procedure being followed on the site. Changes do not affect the ER calculation in anyway.</p>	OK
A.2.4. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the verification of a proper implementation of the monitoring plan?	PDD (VVM) Section-B.7 PDD (VVS) Section B.7	DR	The proposed revisions in monitoring plan are reflected in table under section B.7.1, the parameters related to this revision are in compliance with the sufficiency of information describing the intentions of the project participants and is detailed enough to assess the appropriateness. The revision is aimed to make the parameter EGfacility,y more transparent and clear.	OK
<p>A.2.5. Has there been an issuance with the original monitoring plan of the registered PDD in the past?</p> <p>A.2.6. if so how did the identified gaps effect the ER calculations for the monitoring periods in the past?</p>	Project page on UNFCCC website	DR	<p>Yes, during first verification 41,170 CERs are issued from the project activity</p> <p>Emission reduction is calculated based on the EGfacility,y and PRC is sought for transparency in calculation of EGfacility,y based on the parameters available with the PP for calculation of emission reduction. In registered PDD parameter used for emission calculation included non project controller data. However, this data is not under PPs control and these parameters are not readily available to the PP for emission reduction calculation. Hence, PRC is sought to remove parameters which are not under PP's control. Further, few changes are made in the parameters table to add more transparency for the emission reduction calculation. However, there is no impact on the emission reduction.</p>	OK
A.2.7. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the delivery of high quality data free of potential for biases or intended or unintended changes in data records?	PDD (VVM) Section-B.7 PDD (VVS) Section B.7	DR	All the information like the type of meters, accuracy class of the meters and frequency of calibration are clearly mentioned in the revised monitoring plan. Same has been checked by the assessment team and found correct.	OK

A.2.8. Is the monitoring approach in line with current good practice, i.e. will it deliver data in a reliable and reasonably acceptable accuracy?	PDD (VVM) Section-B.7 PDD (VVS) Section B.7	DR	Yes, the monitoring approach in line with current good practice, i.e. will it deliver data in a reliable and reasonably acceptable accuracy. All the information like the type of meters, accuracy class of the meters and frequency of calibration are clearly mentioned in the revised monitoring plan. Same has been checked by the assessment team and found correct.	OK
A.2.9. Are all formulae used to determine project emission clearly indicated and in compliance with the monitoring methodology.	PDD (VVM) Section-B.7 PDD (VVS) Section B.7	DR	No project emissions are envisaged in the project activity and this component is not included in the registered PDD.	OK
<b>A.3. Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) Procedures</b>				
A.3.1. Is the selection of data undergoing quality control and quality assurance procedures complete?	VVS version 7.0	DR	Yes the selection of data undergoing quality control and quality assurance procedures as described in section B.7 of the PRC. The means of implementation of the proposed monitoring plan, including the data management and quality assurance, are sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by/resulting from the registered CDM project activity can be reported ex post and verified. This can also be verified from the meters involved in the monitoring also involving multiple parties involved in the monitoring and billing process.	OK
A.3.2. in case, post registration changes are proposed, the impact of the changes should be assessed and it not result in reduced level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring and verification process	VVS version 7.0		Possible impacts of changes are assessed and described in section 4.1 of the report.	OK
A.3.3. Are quality control procedures and quality assurance procedures sufficiently described to ensure the delivery of high quality data?	VVS version 7.0	DR	Yes quality control procedures and quality assurance procedures sufficiently described in PRC.	OK

A.3.4. Is it ensured that data will be bound to national or internal reference standards?	VVS version 7.0	DR	The monitoring data will be clearly reproducible and comparable and will not be dependent on site-specific adjustments.	OK
<b>A.4. Operational and Management Structure</b>				
A.4.1. Is the authority and responsibility of project management clearly described?	PDD (VVM) Section B.7.2/Annex 4 PDD (VVS) Section B.7 and Annex 5	DR	Yes. The responsibility of the project management remains unchanged as compared to the registered PDD Version 7 <sup>2/</sup> .	OK
A.4.2. Is the authority and responsibility for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting clearly described?	PDD (VVM) Section B.7.2/Annex 4 PDD (VVS) Section B.7 and Annex 5	DR	Authority and responsibility for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting clearly described in section A.4.1 above.	OK
<b>A.5. Monitoring Plan (Annex 4) (Annex 5 (VVS))</b>				
A.5.1. Does the monitoring plan completely describe all measures to be implemented for monitoring all parameter required, including measures to be implemented for ensuring data quality?	VVS version 7.0	DR	The monitoring plan has been completely described in the section B.7 and information for all monitoring parameters have been explained in the revised monitoring plan.	OK
A.5.2. Does the monitoring plan provide information on monitoring equipment and respective positioning in order to safeguard a proper installation?	VVS version 7.0	DR	PP has provided a line diagram indicating the metering points in section B.7.2 of the PRC which is consistent with the actual situation at the site.	OK

A.5.3. Is there any change proposed in the specifications of the monitoring equipment or their positioning or installation then the impact of the change due to revision should be assessed and it not result in reduced level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring and verification process	VVS version 7.0		There are no changes proposed in the specifications of the monitoring equipment or their positioning or installation. This was verified onsite by the assessment team.	OK
A.5.4. Are procedures identified for calibration of monitoring equipment?	VVS version 7.0	DR	Yes. Procedures for calibration of monitoring equipment have been identified and the calibration is kept as annual for all the sub-bundles, however, as described in the PRC is also under the purview of the state utilities. This was verified onsite from the O & M personnel as well as the state utility personnel onsite.	OK
A.5.5. Is there any change proposed in the calibration procedures, if yes then the impact of the change due to post registration changes should not result in reduced level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring and verification process	VVS version 7.0		Please refer to section A.5.4 above.	OK
A.5.6. Are procedures identified for day-to-day records handling (including what records to keep, storage area of records and how to process performance documentation)	VVS version 7.0	DR	The procedures for day-to-day records handling have been identified and covered under section B.7 of the PRC.	OK





A.5.7. Are procedures identified for project performance reviews before data is submitted for verification, internally or externally?	VVS version 7.0	DR	Organizational structure and roles and responsibilities are clearly described in section B.7.3 of the PDD.	OK
---	-----------------	----	--	----

## Annex 2: Overview of Findings

### Findings Overview Summary

	CARs	CLs	FARs
Total Number raised	04	00	00

Date:	19/05/2014		Raised by:	Assessment Team		
Type:	CAR	Number:	01		Reference:	Registered PDD
<b>Lead Assessor Comment:</b>				<b>Date:</b> 18/03/2014		
<div>1. The revised PDD has mentioned version 12.1.0 of the ACM0002. However, this is not the latest subversion of the applicable methodology available on the UNFCCC website. Please clarify</div> <div>2. The PP is requested to complete the PDD in line with the PDD completion guideline. Section A.2, Section A.4, section B.7.2 and B.7.3 are not completed in line with the PDD completion guideline.</div>						
<b>Project Participant Response:</b>				<b>Date:</b> 20/05/2014		
<div>1. <i>The version of ACM0002 has been corrected in revised version of PDD.</i></div> <div>2. <i>Section A.2, Section A.4, section B.7.2 and B.7.3 has been corrected in the revised version of PDD.</i></div>						
<b>Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:</b>						
Revised PDD version 8 dated 20/05/2014						
<b>Information Verified by Lead Assessor:</b>						
Revised PDD version 8 dated 20/05/2014						
<b>Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:</b>						
<div>1. The revised PDD has correctly mentioned version 12.3.0 of the applicable methodology ACM0002. This is the latest subversion of the applicable methodology available on the UNFCCC website. The change in the subversion does not affect on the applicability of the project activity. Hence, accepted.</div> <div>2. The PP has revised the PDD in line with the PDD completion guideline. Hence accepted.</div> <div>Thus CAR #1 is closed out.</div>						
<b>Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:</b>				<b>Date:</b> 20/05/2014		

Date:	03/06/2014		Raised by:	Assessment Team		
Type:	CAR	Number:	02		Reference:	TR comments
<b>Lead Assessor Comment:</b>				<b>Date:</b> 03/06/2014		
<div><div>1.</div><div>PP has not used the latest registered PDD (approved on 23/05/2013) version 7 dated 06/03/2013 for further revision and the changes which are changed from latest registered PDD version 7 (approved on 23/05/2013) are not shown in track change mode. Please clarify.</div></div> <div><div>2.</div><div>Section A.2.1 and section A.4 of revised PDD version 8 are not appropriately filled in line with the PDD completion guideline. Please clarify.</div></div> <div><div>3.</div><div>Under step 6 in section B.6.1 of PDD version 8 has mentioned Andhra Pradesh. However, the project is in Rajasthan state, please clarify.</div></div> <div><div>4.</div><div>Appendix 6 of revised PDD version 8 does not mention all post registration changes made in the registered PDD version 7 (approved on 23/05/2013). Please clarify.</div></div> <div><div></div><div>Thus CAR #2 is open</div></div>						
<b>Project Participant Response:</b>				<b>Date:</b> 04/06/2014		
<div><div>1.</div><div>Latest registered PDD (approved on 23/05/2013) version 7 dated 06/03/2013 has been used for further revision and the changes which are changed from latest registered PDD version 7 (approved</div></div>						

on 23/05/2013) are now shown in track change mode.	
2. Section A.2.1 and section A.4 of revised PDD version 9 are now appropriately filled in line with the PDD completion guideline.	
3. In revised version of PDD the location has been corrected to Rajasthan.	
4. In Appendix 6 of revised PDD version 9 all post registration changes made in the revised PDD (approved on 23/05/2013) has been mentioned.	
<b>Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:</b>	
Revised PDD version 9 dated 04/06/2014	
<b>Information Verified by Lead Assessor:</b>	
Revised PDD version 9 dated 04/06/2014	
<b>Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:</b>	
1. The PP has used latest registered PDD version 7 dated 06/03/2013. The changes are presented in the track change mode. Hence accepted.	
2. Section A.2.1 and section A.4 of revised PDD version 9 are corrected appropriately in line with the PDD completion guideline. Hence accepted.	
5. Under step 6 in section B.6.1 of PDD version 9 has corrected state name as "Rajasthan". This is in line with the actual project site. Hence accepted.	
3. The PP has included all the post registration changes under Appendix 6 of revised PDD version 9 hence accepted.	
<b>Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:</b>	<b>Date:</b> 06/06/2014

Date:	26/06/2014	Raised by:	Assessment Team		
Type:	CAR	Number:	03	Reference:	UKTCC comments
<b>Lead Assessor Comment:</b>				<b>Date:</b> 26/06/2014	
Revised PDD ver. 9 dated 04/06/2014 under section B.7.3 has not been clarified whether the PP does have any involvement and control on the specified apportioning procedures (Case 1 & Case 2) since four of the parameters ( $EG_{JMR, Export}$ , $EG_{JMR, Import}$ , $EG_{Controller, i}$ , $\sum EG_{Controller,i}$ ) distinctly used for apportioning procedures has been excluded from the project monitoring plan due to lack of control and access to those data by the PP. Please clarify. Thus CAR #3 is open					
<b>Project Participant Response:</b>				<b>Date:</b> 27/06/2014	
Revised PDD ver. 10 dated 27/06/2014, under section B.7.3 it has been clarified that PP does have any involvement and control on the specified apportioning procedures (Case 1 & Case 2) therefore, four of the parameters ( $EG_{JMR, Export}$ , $EG_{JMR, Import}$ , $EG_{Controller, i}$ , $\sum EG_{Controller,i}$ ) distinctly used for apportioning procedures has been excluded from the project monitoring plan due to lack of control and access to those data by the PP.					
<b>Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:</b>					
Revised PDD Version 10 dated 28/06/2014					
<b>Information Verified by Lead Assessor:</b>					
Revised PDD Version 10 dated 28/06/2014					
<b>Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:</b>					
In the revised PDD, the PP has clearly mentioned that, four of the parameters ( $EG_{JMR, Export}$ , $EG_{JMR, Import}$ , $EG_{Controller, i}$ , $\sum EG_{Controller,i}$ ) which are used for apportioning of the electricity by DISCOM and EPC contractor are removed from the revised PDD. The PP has clarified that the PP has no control on the parameter, however the apportioning procedure is provided in the revised PDD for more transparency only. Hence accepted.  Thus CAR #3 is closed out					
<b>Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:</b>				<b>Date:</b> 28/06/2014	

Date:	08/07/2014		Raised by:	Assessment Team	
Type:	CAR	Number:	04	Reference:	UKCC comments
<b>Lead Assessor Comment:</b>			<b>Date:</b> 08/07/2014		
In the revised PDD version 10, on Page 2, footnote 2, the web link is not working. Please clarify.					
Thus CAR #4 is open					
<b>Project Participant Response:</b>			<b>Date:</b> 08/07/2014		
In the revised PDD version 11, on Page 2, footnote 2, the web link has been changed.					
<b>Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:</b>					
Revised PDD Version 11 dated 08/07/2014					
<b>Information Verified by Lead Assessor:</b>					
Revised PDD Version 11 dated 08/07/2014					
<b>Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:</b>					
The web link on Page 2, footnote 2 of the revised PDD is checked and found to be working. Hence accepted.					
Thus CAR #4 is closed.					
<b>Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:</b>			<b>Date:</b> 09/07/2014		

## Annex 3: Statement of Competence

Name: Vijaybhai Shankarbhai Patel

### Status

- Lead Assessor	x	- Expert	
- Assessor	x	- Financial Expert	
- Local Assessor	India	- Technical Reviewer	

### Scopes of Expertise

<b>1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>2. Energy Distribution</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>3. Energy Demand</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>4. Manufacturing</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>5. Chemical Industry</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>6. Construction</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>7. Transport</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>8. Mining/Mineral Production</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>9. Metal Production</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas)</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>12. Solvent Use</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>13. Waste Handling and Disposal</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>14. Afforestation and Reforestation</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>15. Agriculture</b>	
Technical Area(s):	

Approved Member of Staff by: Siddharth Yadav Date: 23/01/2014

Name: Ravi Kant Soni

#### Status

- Lead Assessor	x	- Expert	x
- Assessor	x	- Financial Expert	
- Local Assessor	India	- Technical Reviewer	x

#### Scopes of Expertise

<b>1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)</b>	<b>x</b>
Technical Area(s): TA 1.2 Energy generation from renewable energy sources	
<b>2. Energy Distribution</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>3. Energy Demand</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>4. Manufacturing</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>5. Chemical Industry</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>6. Construction</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>7. Transport</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>8. Mining/Mineral Production</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>9. Metal Production</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas)</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>12. Solvent Use</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>13. Waste Handling and Disposal</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>14. Afforestation and Reforestation</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>15. Agriculture</b>	
Technical Area(s):	

Approved Member of Staff by: Siddharth Yadav Date: 12/10/2012

Name: Ramkrishna Patil

#### Status

- Lead Assessor	x	- Expert	x
- Assessor	x	- Financial Expert	
- Local Assessor	India	- Technical Reviewer	x

#### Scopes of Expertise

<b>1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)</b>	<b>x</b>
Technical Area(s): TA 1.2 Energy generation from renewable energy sources	
<b>2. Energy Distribution</b>	<b>x</b>
Technical Area(s): TA 2.1 Electricity distribution TA 2.2 Heat distribution	
<b>3. Energy Demand</b>	<b>x</b>
Technical Area(s): TA 3.1 Energy Demand	
<b>4. Manufacturing</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>5. Chemical Industry</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>6. Construction</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>7. Transport</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>8. Mining/Mineral Production</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>9. Metal Production</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas)</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>12. Solvent Use</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>13. Waste Handling and Disposal</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>14. Afforestation and Reforestation</b>	
Technical Area(s):	
<b>15. Agriculture</b>	
Technical Area(s):	

Approved Member of Staff by: Siddharth Yadav Date: 02/07/2012