
VALIDATION REPORT

Shahi Exports Pvt. Ltd

8.75 MW BUNDLE WIND POWER PROJECT IN MAHARASHTRA

SGS Climate Change Programme

SGS United Kingdom Ltd
SGS House
217-221 London Road
Camberley Surrey
GU15 3EY
United Kingdom

Date of issue:	Project No.:
02/05/2007	CDM.Val0982
Project title	Organisational unit:
8.75 MW Bundle Wind Power Project In Maharashtra	SGS Climate Change Programme
Revision number	Client:
1.0; 14/05/2007	Shahi Exports Pvt. Ltd

Summary

SGS India Pvt. Ltd., an affiliate of SGS United Kingdom Ltd. has made a validation of the CDM project activity "8.75 MW Bundle Wind Power Project In Maharashtra", on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the CDM Executive Board, as well as the host country criteria. The project falls under small scale category and scope 1. Energy Industries (Renewable/ Non-renewable sources).

The scope of validation is the independent and objective review of the project design document, baseline study and monitoring plan and other relevant document of the project. The information in this document is reviewed against the criteria defined in the Marrakech Accords (Decision 17) and the Kyoto Protocol (Article 12) and subsequent guidance from the CDM Executive Board.

The overall validation process, from Contract Review to Validation Report & Opinion, was conducted using internal procedures (UK.PP.12 issue 3 dated 19/01/2007).

The first output of the validation process is a list of Corrective Actions Requests and New Information Requests (CAR and NIR), presented in Annex 3 of this document. Taking into account this output, the project proponent revised its project design document.

In summary, it is SGS's opinion that the proposed CDM project activity correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology as mentioned in approved methodology adopted for the proposed project activity and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM and the relevant host country criteria.

Subject:		
CDM validation		Indexing terms
Work carried out by		
Mr. Sanjeev Kumar – Team Leader Mr. Vikrant Badve – Assessor Mr. Jimmy Sah – Local Assessor (Trainee)		
Technical review		
Ms. – Irma Lubrecht	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organisational unit
Authorized signatory		
M. van der Linden	<input type="checkbox"/>	Limited distribution
Date of final decision:	Number of pages:	
15-05-2007	40	<input type="checkbox"/> Unrestricted distribution

Abbreviations

CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CEA	Central Electricity Authority
CER	Certified Emission Reductions
CFE	Consent for Establishment
CFO	Consent for Operation
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
COP/MOP	Conference of parties serving as the meeting of parties to Kyoto Protocol
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
DR	Document Review
EIA	Environment Impact Assessment
GHG	Green House Gas(es)
GWh	Giga watt hour
I	Interview
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ISHC	International Stakeholder Consultation
kWh	Kilo watt hour
MEDA	Maharashtra Energy Development Agency
MNES	Ministry of Non Conventional Energy Sources
MoEF	Ministry of Environment and Forest
MoV	Means of Verification
MSEDCL	Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited
MP	Monitoring Plan
MW	Mega watt
MT	Metric Tonne
NIR	New Information Request
NGO	Non Government Organisation
NOC	No Objection Certificate
PDD	Project Design Document
PLF	Plant Load Factor
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change
WACC	Weighted Average Cost of Capital
WTG	Wind Turbine Generators

Table of content

Table of content	4
1 Introduction.....	5
1.1 Objective	5
1.2 Scope	5
1.3 GHG Project Description	5
1.4 The names and roles of the validation team members.....	6
2 Methodology.....	7
2.1 Review of CDM-PDD and additional documentation.....	7
2.2 Use of the validation protocol	7
2.3 Findings.....	7
2.4 Internal quality control	8
3 Determination Findings	9
3.1 Participation requirements.....	9
3.2 Baseline selection and additionality	9
3.3 Application of Baseline methodology and calculation of emission factors	11
3.4 Application of Monitoring methodology and Monitoring Plan.....	11
3.5 Project design.....	12
3.6 Environmental Impacts	13
3.7 Local stakeholder comments.....	13
4 Comments by Parties, Stakeholders and NGOs	14
4.1 Description of how and when the PDD was made publicly available	14
4.2 Compilation of all comments received.....	14
4.3 Explanation of how comments have been taken into account.....	14
5 Validation opinion	15
6 List of persons interviewed.....	16
7 Document references	17

Annex 1: Local assessment

Annex 2: Validation Protocol

Annex 3: Overview of findings

1 Introduction

1.1 Objective

Shahi Exports Pvt. Ltd has commissioned SGS to perform the validation of the project: “8.75 MW Bundle Wind Power Project in Maharashtra” with regard to the relevant requirements for CDM project activities. The purpose of a validation is to have an independent third party assess the project design. In particular, the project’s baseline, the monitoring plan (MP) and the project’s compliance with relevant UNFCCC and host country criteria are validated in order to confirm that the project design as documented is sound and reasonable and meets the stated requirements and identified criteria. Validation is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of Certified Emission Reduction (CER). UNFCCC criteria refer to the Kyoto Protocol criteria and the CDM rules and modalities and related decisions by the COP/MOP and the CDM Executive Board.

1.2 Scope

The scope of the validation is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project’s baseline study and monitoring plan and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against Kyoto Protocol requirements, UNFCCC rules and associated interpretations. SGS has employed a risk-based approach in the validation, focusing on the identification of significant risks for project implementation and the generation of CERs.

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

1.3 GHG Project Description

The proposed CDM project activity is an electricity generation project through wind turbines and supplying the same to the regional grid. The project will result in replacing the same amount of electricity from western regional grid which is dominated by fossil fuel based power plants. The project activity is located at Dhule and Nandurbar district of Maharashtra state in India. The project activity was already commissioned and working in satisfactory condition. The project activity involves installation of 7 wind turbine generators out of the 7(seven) first 3 (three) wind turbines at village Amkhel, Dhule district were commissioned on 9th March 2006 and the remaining 4 (four) at village Gangapur, Nandurbar district were commissioned on 17th April 2006. This was checked during the site visit and cross-checked from commissioning letter issued by MSEDCL.

Baseline Scenario:

Under the baseline scenario, there would have been more direct off-site emissions through burning of fossil fuel in the coal based power plants for meeting electrical energy requirements of the western regional grid.

With Project Scenario:

The project activity will generate and feed the electricity to the western regional grid. This will fulfil the electricity requirement which otherwise would have been fulfilled by the electricity from western regional grid which is fossil fuel dominated. Thus project activity replaces electrical energy from fossil fuel and contributes to conservation of fossil fuel, a non-renewable natural resource and consequently reduces GHG emissions.

Leakage:

As per the methodology AMS I-D version 10 dated 23rd December 2006; applicable for the project activity, leakage is to be considered if the energy generating equipment is transferred from another

activity or if the existing equipment is transferred to another activity. However this is not the case for present project activity and hence no leakage is considered for the present CDM project activity.

Environmental & Social Impacts:

There are no negative environmental and social impacts expected with the project activity, the same has been cross-checked during local stakeholder consultation process by the local assessor during the validation site visit.

1.4 The names and roles of the validation team members

Name	Supplier	Role
Mr. Sanjeev Kumar	SGS India	Team Leader / Lead Auditor
Mr. Vikrant Badve	SGS India	Assessor
Mr. Jimmy Sah	SGS India	Local Assessor (Trainee)
Ms. Irma Lubrecht	SGS Netherlands	Technical reviewer

2 Methodology

2.1 Review of CDM-PDD and additional documentation

The validation is performed primarily as a document review of the publicly available project documents. The assessment is performed by trained assessors using a validation protocol.

A site visit is usually required to verify assumptions in the baseline. Additional information can be required to complete the validation, which may be obtained from public sources or through telephone and face-to-face interviews with key stakeholders (including the project developers and Government and NGO representatives in the host country). These may be undertaken by the local SGS affiliate. The results of this local assessment are summarized in Annex 1 to this report.

2.2 Use of the validation protocol

The validation protocol used for the assessment is partly based on the templates of the IETA / World Bank Validation and Verification Manual and partly on the experience of SGS with the validation of CDM projects. It serves the following purposes:

- 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	Means of verification (MoV)	Comment	Draft and/or Final Conclusion
<i>The various requirements are linked to checklist questions the project should meet.</i>	<i>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.</i>	<i>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.</i>	<i>This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (Y), or a Corrective Action Request (CAR) due to non-compliance with the checklist question (See below). New Information Request (NIR) is used when the validation team has identified a need for further clarification.</i>

The completed validation protocol for this project is attached as Annex 2 to this report

2.3 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 **New Information Request (NIR)** 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:

- I. mistakes have been made with a direct influence on project results;
- II. validation protocol requirements have not been met; or

- III. there is a risk that the project would not be accepted as a CDM project or that emission reductions will not be verified.

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

Observations may be raised which are for the benefit of future projects and future verification or validation actors. These have no impact upon the completion of the validation or verification activity.

Corrective Action Requests and New Information Requests are raised in the draft validation protocol and detailed in a separate form (Annex 3). In this form, the Project Developer is given the opportunity to "close" outstanding CARs and respond to NIRs and Observations.

2.4 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.

3 Determination Findings

3.1 Participation requirements

The host Party for this project is India. India has ratified the Kyoto protocol on 26th Aug 2002. A Letter of Approval from Indian DNA was not submitted by the project proponent. CAR (1) was raised asking project proponent to submit the Letter of approval from Indian DNA. Project proponent has received the Host country approval for the present project activity on 2nd April 2007 issued by the Indian DNA (reference number 4/2/2007-CCC. This letter was checked and the project activity name indicated in the HCA and in section A.1 of the PDD was found same. CAR (1) was closed.

No Annex I Party has been identified in the PDD and therefore no further Letter of Approval was available. It is observed that the CDM EB has agreed that the registration of a CDM project activity can take place without an Annex I Party being involved at the stage of registration although it should be noted that before CER can be transferred to an Annex I Party, a Letter of Approval will need to be submitted.

3.2 Baseline selection and additionality

The project has applied baseline as mentioned in the small scale methodology AMS I-D version 10 dated 23rd December 2006 for "Grid connected Renewable electricity generation" as per Appendix B of the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities. The project activity is generates electricity from wind and thus replaces electricity from fossil fuel and contributes to conservation of fossil fuel, and fall under the category AMS I-D of the appendix B.

The present project activity will generate the electricity by harnessing the wind power. Since in the project activity area i.e. in Maharashtra State; third party sale is not allowed to any project proponent and project proponent did not have their own facility which will utilise this electricity hence they left with only one option i.e. to feed the electricity generated from project activity to the western regional grid. Thus project proponent selected grid connected renewable electricity generation as a baseline for the project activity.

The present CDM project activity will generate and feed the electricity to the western regional grid. This will fulfil the electricity requirement which otherwise would have been fulfilled by the electricity generation from fossil fuel based power plants connected to the western regional grid. The emission reductions achieved because of the project activity will be direct function of the net electricity feed to the grid and grid emission factor for the western regional grid.

The project has adopted the Investment barrier for the present project activity to justify the additionality of the project. In addition to this project proponent has also mentioned Barriers due to prevailing practices, regulatory barriers and a few other barriers like Regulatory risks, Risk due to uncertainty in Power Generation and Risks due to Natural calamities. In order to get all the related documents on the basis of which the project was shown additional, CAR (15) was raised.

The funds for the project activity are made available partly from equity and partly through bank finance. The total project cost is Rs. 4373 lacs and the bank has sanctioned a loan of Rs. 3498 lacs at interest rate of 8.40% and rest amount for the project activity was raised through equity by the project proponent. The interest rate prevailing when the loan was sanctioned for project activity was 8.40% and subsequently it was increased to 10.15% on 06/03/2007 which was mentioned on the banks web-link, <http://www.canbankindia.com/interest/riloansroi-main.htm> this was checked from the website. This information was also cross checked during the discussion with the project proponent and verified from the bank loan documents submitted by the project proponent. Project proponent has submitted excel

spreadsheet giving the detailed calculations for investment analysis and submitted assumptions and data used to calculate the IRR for project activity. Project proponent has calculated IRR for the present project activity considering the CDM revenue and without CDM revenue. The IRR without CDM revenue works out to 11.06% and with CDM revenue was 11.99%. Project proponent compared IRR values with Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) and WACC value was considered as the benchmark value for return from the project activity. The WACC value calculated for the project activity is 11.40%. It is mentioned in the PDD that expected IRR from the project activity without CDM revenue is 11.06% was much less than the WACC for the project activity i.e. 11.40% while the IRR with CDM consideration is 11.99% which crosses the benchmark values. The project proponent has submitted a certificate from the Chartered Accountant who was involved in the preparation of the excel sheet which mentions the project IRR as 11.06% without CDM benefits and 11.99% with CDM benefits. The financial analysis sheet given by the project proponent along with assumptions used during the financial calculations have been discussed with project proponent. The financial figures given in the PDD are checked with excel spreadsheet figures and found correct also it was checked during the discussion with the project proponent. The comments mentioned in the PDD were found correct and are acceptable.

The project proponent has mentioned following web-link against the evidence for the PLF of wind turbines, <http://www.ficci.com/media-room/speeches-presentations/2006/may/may13-elec/PlenaryVI-DG/Ajay.pdf> the link was checked for the PLF value and the range mentioned was 18-30% the same was mentioned in the PDD version 02 and thus it was accepted. Also during validation site visit PLF for the project activity site was discussed with the site engineer and figures mentioned in the PDD were found acceptable. The project proponent submitted the PPA for the project activity, the technical specification mentioned in the PDD version 01 was crosschecked with that mentioned in the PPA and both were found to be matching.

The Board note submitted by the project proponent dated 24th October 2005 was checked for the CDM funds consideration for the project activity and it mentions about CDM benefits required to consider the viability of the project activity. The project proponent also submitted the receipts for the amount of Rs. 2,6250,000 submitted towards the Green Fund to the Suzlon Energy Ltd. This was acceptable.

Based on the above discussion it can be concluded that the project activity without CDM funds is not a financially viable alternative and by putting the project with low IRR project proponent is bearing a financial risk. Hence CAR (15) was closed.

The present project activity uses Wind Turbine Generators (WTG) to generate electricity and supply the same to the western regional grid. CAR (08) was raised asking the project proponent to submit the Purchase orders to cross check the technical specifications as mentioned in the PDD for the project activity. In response the project proponent provided all the Purchase orders and technical specifications from the manufacturer (Suzlon). The specifications as mentioned in the PDD were checked with that provided in the technical specification sheet of Suzlon and they were found acceptable, hence CAR (08) was closed.

NIR (10) was raised and project proponent was asked to provide evidence that monitoring personnel received intensive training at the Suzlon Manufacturing facility in Daman before being appointed at the site to look after the operations as mentioned in the PDD. In response to NIR (10) project proponent rephrased the PDD mentioning that Suzlon who is responsible for monitoring, calibration and O & M of the project is ISO 9001:2000 certified and training is an essential part of ISO certification so the requirements of training is met by the presence of ISO certification. The ISO certificate for Suzlon has been submitted to the validator. This was found accepted during discussion with the project proponent and plant operators during site visit. Hence NIR (10) was closed.

The project proponent is claiming credits from 1st June 2007 or from date of registration whichever is later. The present project activity has chosen ten years fixed crediting period. This was verified during the discussion with the project proponent.

3.3 Application of Baseline methodology and calculation of emission factors

The present project activity was generating wind power and supplying it to western grid. The project has applied baseline methodology as mentioned in the small scale methodology AMS I-D version 10 dated 23rd December 2006 for “Grid connected Renewable electricity generation” as per Appendix B of the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities.

It was mentioned in the PDD version 01 that the present project activity will generate 16192 tonnes of CO_{2e} emission reductions per year. Project proponent has not provided excel spreadsheet for calculation of and baseline as well as project emissions for the project activity. CAR (12) was raised and project proponent was asked to provide the excel spreadsheet for the same. During validation site visit project proponent submitted excel spreadsheet giving Emission reduction calculations which mentions 17063 tonnes of CO_{2e} per annum will be generated due to project activity. Project proponent was asked to correct the emission reduction figure mentioned in PDD version 01 as the same was not reflected in the excel sheet which was checked for the calculations and assumptions used to calculate emission reduction. PDD version 02 was checked for the emission reduction figure and same was found matched with excel spreadsheet figure; hence CAR (12) was closed.

The baseline emission calculations and emission reductions were found to be in order during the desk review and during the local assessments at the site. Project proponent has considered weighted average emission factor for the project activity and same will be fixed for the entire crediting period. The weighted average emission factor value was referred from the CEA database version 1.1 dated 21st December 2006. The value was verified by the local assessor which was found satisfactory and thus accepted. The emission reduction figures would further be checked during verification. As per methodology AMS I-D version 10 dated 23rd December 2006; leakage due to project activity will be consider only when there is an equipment transfer from one place to another but this is not the case with present project activity hence no leakage is considered.

The project proponent’s claim of project activity being a small scale project activity was also checked by the local assessor. A copy of purchase order was submitted by the project proponent for the present project activity. This copy was used to cross-checked the technical description of the project activity and capacity of the present project activity. It was found that the capacity of the present project activity is 8.75 MW which is less than 15 MW and hence project was eligible under small scale category. The documents were used to verify the information given in section A.4.2 under sub-heading Technology to be employed by the project activity in the PDD.

3.4 Application of Monitoring methodology and Monitoring Plan

The present CDM project activity uses monitoring methodology AMS I-D version 10 dated 23rd December 2006 for “Grid connected Renewable Electricity generation”. The PDD clearly mentions that leakage is not consider in present project activity as methodology AMS I-D version 10 mentions leakage due to project activity will be consider only when there is an equipment transfer from one place to another but this is not the case with present project activity hence no leakage is considered. This was acceptable.

During the review of version 1 of the PDD it was found that project proponent as not mentioned about how the data will be archived and in which form. CAR (16) was raised asking the project proponent to discuss about archiving of data. In response the project proponent included the archiving of data under section B.7.2 mentioning that the archiving of data would be of crediting period plus two years while the data will be stored both on paper and electronically. This was accepted and the corrections made were

cross checked with the rephrased version of the PDD and found acceptable, hence CAR (16) was closed.

Project proponent in PDD version 1 did not mention the Management structure along with the roles and responsibilities of each personnel involved in the project activity and thus CAR (17) was raised. The project proponent in his response to CAR (17) explained the Roles and responsibility of the personnel involved in the project activity under section B.7.2 of the revised PDD. The corrections were checked in the revised version of PDD and were acceptable; hence CAR (17) was closed.

3.5 Project design

The PDD of the present project activity have been prepared in accordance with the guidelines for completing CDM-SSC-PDD version 04 and CDM-SSC-PDD template version 03. Thus when PDD was cross checked against these guidelines and template it was found that requirements under the section B.8 are not according to the guidelines for completing CDM-SSC-PDD and hence CAR (07) was raised. Project proponent accepted that the section is not as per the guidelines and corrected same in rephrased PDD. This was cross-checked with rephrased PDD and the name of the person responsible for the baseline and monitoring methodology was mentioned under the section B.8 this was acceptable and hence CAR (07) was closed.

The section A.4.3 was not according to the template version 03 for completing the PDD also the links present in the PDD were not active, hence CAR (06) was raised. In response the project proponent corrected the section A.4.3 and made all the links in the rephrased version of the PDD active. The rephrased version of the PDD was checked and section A.4.3 was corrected as per the template and all the links provided in the rephrased PDD were found active hence CAR (06) was closed.

It was found that section C.1.1 of version 01 of the PDD indicated 27th October 2005 as project activity starting date; but evidence for the same was not provided. NIR (11) was raised asking project proponent to provide an evidence for the starting date of the project activity. In response project proponent provided a copy of purchase order for wind turbines; same was cross-checked and found acceptable and also attached in the audit trail folder and mentioned in section 7 of this report. NIR (11) was closed and 27th October 2005 was accepted as starting date for the project activity. A board resolution dated 24th October 2005 in which the project activity was discussed and CDM benefits for the project activity was considered. This was verified during the discussion with the project proponent.

The project boundary given in version 01 of the PDD was clear on the components included in the project boundary and it mentions clearly that project boundary covers wind turbine generators, step up transformers and grid interconnection point. This was cross-checked during site visit and found acceptable.

Operational lifetime of the project activity was mentioned as 20 years which was found acceptable after reviewing the project technology details mentioned in the purchase order of the project activity component. CAR (09) was raised asking project proponent to provide any documentary evidence that the present project technology will not be substituted or replaced by the more efficient technologies during the crediting period. Project proponent has submitted a letter of undertaking mentioning that the project technology will not be substituted or replaced by more efficient technology during the crediting period. This was accepted and CAR (09) was closed.

Project proponent in the PDD mentioned that project activity has not received any public funding from parties listed in Annex 1. NIR (02) was raised asking the project proponent to provide any documentary evidence that ODA was not used for the project activity. The project proponent has submitted a certificate issued by M/s Ghosh Khanna & CO., Chartered Accountants of Project participant stating that no ODA was used in the project activity. This was acceptable and hence NIR (02) was closed.

The Proposed project activity is a Bundled activity, but the project proponent had not submitted the F – CDM – Bundle form and CAR (13) was raised asking the project proponent to submit the F – CDM – Bundle form. In response the project proponent submitted the F – CDM – Bundle form. The data provided in the rephrased version of F – CDM – Bundle form were same as that provided in the rephrased version of the PDD, and hence CAR (13) was closed.

3.6 Environmental Impacts

The project proponent has mentioned in the PDD that the present project activity does not require EIA to be carried out. NIR (14) was raised asking the project proponent to submit a documentary evidence for the same. In response the project proponent submitted the notification in which the project requiring EIA are listed, and according to the notification wind projects do not require EIA to be carried out. The web-link for the notification is <http://envfor.nic.in/divisions/iass/eia/Annex1.htm> and hence NIR (14) was closed. The project proponent has submitted the necessary government approvals like commissioning letters and NOC from Maharashtra Energy Development Agency (MEDA).

3.7 Local stakeholder comments

The project activity involves setting up of 8.75 MW wind energy based power project for electricity generation and feeding same to western regional grid.

The project proponent identified local communities, farmers, and villagers, as local stakeholders for the project activity. CAR (03) was raised asking project proponent to provide evidence how concern local stakeholders are informed regarding the present CDM project activity by the project proponent. In response the project proponent provided the invitation letters that were given to the stakeholder. The letters have been submitted to the validator and are acceptable and hence CAR (03) can be closed.

Project proponent has conducted local stakeholder consultation as a requirement of CDM project and seeks the comments of local stakeholders through a meeting. Also commissioning certificate from MSEDCL; were submitted to the validator which indicates the government authority approves this project activity. This was acceptable to the validator.

The project proponent was asked to submit the minutes of meeting for the local stakeholder consultation process under CAR (04), and in response the project participant has submitted the minutes of meeting for the local stakeholder consultation process. The local assessor has cross checked the comments during the site visit for the project activity and no negative comments were found, this was acceptable and hence CAR (04) was closed. The project proponent was asked to submit evidence for the summary of local stakeholders comments mentioned in the PDD under CAR (05), and in response the project proponent submitted the minutes of meeting for local stakeholder consultation process. The minutes of meeting were checked as mentioned earlier in the paragraph and hence CAR (05) was closed.

4 Comments by Parties, Stakeholders and NGOs

In accordance with sub-paragraphs 40 (b) and (c) of the CDM modalities and procedures, the project design document of a proposed CDM project activity shall be made publicly available and the DOE shall invite comments on the validation requirements from Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited non-governmental organizations and make them publicly available. This chapter describes this process for this project.

4.1 Description of how and when the PDD was made publicly available

The PDD and the monitoring plan for this project were made available on the SGS website <http://www.sgsqualitynetwork.com/tradeassurance/ccp/projects/project.php?id=208> Comments were invited through the UNFCCC CDM homepage.

4.2 Compilation of all comments received

The project was up loaded for International stakeholder consultation (ISHC) for a period of 30 days and received no comment. Also no adverse comment received during local stakeholder consultation.

4.3 Explanation of how comments have been taken into account

No adverse comment was received for the project activity.

5 Validation opinion

SGS has performed a validation of the project: “8.75 MW Bundle Wind Power Project in Maharashtra”. The Validation was performed on the basis of the UNFCCC criteria and host country criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

Using a risk based approach, the review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided SGS with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of the stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM and all relevant host country criteria. The project will hence be recommended by SGS for registration with the UNFCCC.

SGS has received confirmation by the host Party that the project activity assists it in achieving sustainable development.

By installing grid-connected 8.75 MW Wind Turbines the project will lead to displacement of carbon-intensive electricity by the electricity from a renewable source and thus the project results in reductions of greenhouse gas emissions that are real, measurable and give long-term benefits to the mitigation of climate change. A review of the barrier analysis involving investment barrier and barriers due to prevailing practice associated with project activity demonstrates that the proposed project activity was not a likely baseline scenario. Emission reductions attributable to the project are hence additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity. The project is already commissioned and already supplying the electricity to the grid. The project will likely achieve the estimated amount of emission reductions.

The validation is based on the information made available to SGS and the engagement conditions detailed in the report. The validation has been performed using a risk based approach as described above. The only purpose of this report is its use during the registration process as part of the CDM project cycle. Hence SGS can not be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the validation opinion, which will go beyond that purpose.

6 List of persons interviewed

<i>Date</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Short description of subject discussed</i>
15/03/2007	Mr. Ritesh Batsa	Site Engineer Suzlon Energy Ltd.	Monitoring methodology for the project activity
15/03/2007	Mr. Vijay Gupta	Project proponent	Project additionality
15/03/2007	Mr. Vijayanand	Project Consultant	Project baseline and additionality
15/03/2007	Mr. Siddharth	Local stakeholder	Local stakeholder consultation
15/03/2007	Mr. Subhash Patil	Local stakeholder	Local Stakeholder consultation

7 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/ Letter of Approval from Host Country
- /2/ Modalities of communication
- /3/ PDD version 1 dated 16/01/2007
- /4/ PDD version 2 dated 04/04/2007
- /5/ PDD version 3 dated 07/05/2007
- /6/ Emission reduction calculation sheet
- /7/ Financial Analysis Sheet
- /8/ F-CDM Bundle Form version 1 dated 16/01/2007
- /9/ F-CDM Bundle Form version 2 dated 04/04/2007
- /10/ F-CDM Bundle Form version 3 dated 07/05/2007

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):

- /1/ Purchase Order for present project activity
- /2/ Commissioning Letter for Wind Turbine Generator
- /3/ Board Resolution regarding CDM consideration
- /4/ CA letter regarding Funds Availability for project activity and no-use of ODA
- /5/ Local Stakeholders Comments
- /6/ A copy of PPA between Project Proponent and MSEDCL
- /7/ ISO certificate of Suzlon Energy Ltd.
- /8/ Bank Loan documents
- /9/ Letter of Undertaking for no change in technology
- /10/ Letter of undertaking for no change in capacity of the both the bundles.
- /11/ CA certificate regarding IRR calculation

Annex 1: Local Assessment

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
12.1 To get copy Host Country Approval (HCA) letter from Project Proponent.	PDD	DR	The letter (reference number 4/2/2007-CCC) has been submitted and verified. The name on the HCA is the same as mentioned in the section A.1 of the PDD.	Y	Y
12.2 No ODA has been used for this project and to be confirmed during site visit.	PDD Annex 2	DR/I	Letter form M/s Ghosh Khanna & CO., Chartered Accountants of Project participant stating that no ODA was used in the project activity has been submitted and checked and was found acceptable.	Y	Y
12.3 Invitation for LSC meetig was sent to participate and communicate suggestions regarding the project activity. Documents are required to verify the same.	PDD E.1	DR/I	The project proponent has submitted the invitation letter for local stakeholder meeting. The same was checked for the date and found acceptable.	Y	Y
12.4 The regulatory approval (consent to establish and operate the project) from the Pollution Control Board is required to to verify that local/legal requirements have been met.	PDD	DR	The commissioning letters from MSEDCL and Clearance from MEDA has been submitted and was checked for the details mentioned about the project activity and found acceptable.	Y	Y
12.5 Local stakeholders' comments are required to be verified for any adverse comment. MoM of stakeholder consultation meeting Due account of stakeholder comments received required to be verified..	PDD E.1, E.2 and E.3	DR/I	The minutes of meeting for the stakeholder consultation process have been submitted. It was crosschecked for the comments during site visit and found acceptable. No negative comments received.	Y	Y

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
12.6 Project design engineering documents from the technology supplier are required to be checked. Copy of offer made/ specifications given by technology supplier.	PDD A.4	DR	Purchase orders have been submitted and were verified for the specifications as mentioned in the PDD.	Y	Y
12.7. It is required to be checked whether the project technology used is likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period.	PDD C.1.2	DR	SEPL issued a letter declaring that neither the capacity of project will be increased nor it will be replaced by any other technology during crediting period.	Y	Y
12.8 Proof that EIA is not required for the specific project activity.	PDD D.1	DR/SV	The project does not require EIA to be carried out. This was crosschecked with the guidelines. The web link for the guidance is http://envfor.nic.in/divisions/iass/eia/Annex1.htm	Y	Y
12.9 The monitoring plan required to be checked.	PDD B.7.1	DR	Data archiving has been included in the modified PDD.	Y	Y
12.10 All calibration certificates are required to be checked.	PDD CB.7	DR	According to the section 11.02 of the PPA calibration is to be done annually. Since first three turbines out of 7 for the project activity were commissioned on 9th March so calibration certificates will be available at a later stage. A copy of PPA is attached for reference with the report.	Y	Y
12.11 MoM of board meeting in which CDM was considered for the project activity.	PDD B.5	DR/SV	MoM of board meeting is submitted and was checked for the consideration of CDM and found acceptable.	Y	Y

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
12.12 Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control (QC) procedures for data monitoring.	PDD B.7.2	DR	The monitoring of the project is responsibility of Suzlon as per O&M contract which is ISO certified and QA and QC procedures are taken care off.	Y	Y
12.13 Power purchase agreement between MSEDCL and Project proponent.	PDD B.5	DR	PPA for the project activity has been submitted. The PPA was checked for the technical specifications as mentioned in the PDD and cost at which the power is purchased by the western regional grid. The PPA mentions Rs. 3.50 / KWH. The same is mentioned in the PDD and is acceptable.	Y	Y
12.14 Financial analysis for the project activity.	PDD B.5	DR	The project proponent has submitted the excel sheets along with the assumptions used. The sheet was checked for IRR values and found ok.	Y	Y
12.15 Training module / material used during training programme for the employees.	PDD B.7.2	DR	The monitoring of the project is responsibility of Suzlon as per O&M contract and it has been ISO 9001:2000 certified. Training is an essential part for ISO certification, thus ISO certification suffice for proper QA and QC procedures which include the training of personnel also.	Y	Y

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
12.16 Justification for the delay to approach for CDM	PDD B.5	I	The delay by the project proponent occurred while selecting the consultant for the project activity. This was checked during discussion with the project proponent and found acceptable.	Y	Y
12.17 Documents regarding Green Energy fund as mentioned in the PDD.	PDD B.5	DR	The total deposit receipt for the green fund of Rs 2,62,50,000 has been submitted and checked for the amount as mentioned in the PDD.	Y	Y
12.18 Copy of log book in which data is recorded.			The data is stored both on paper and electronically	Y	Y
12.19 Bundle project form is to be provided.	PDD	DR	The project proponent has submitted the F – CDM – Bundle form for the project activity.	Y	Y
12.20 CEA Data for combined margin not been used for the project activity.	PDD B.5	DR	The project proponent uses the weighted average emissions (in kg CO ₂ equ/kWh) of the current generation mix for Western grid. This is as per the methodology AMS I-D. The value taken is on the conservative side and hence acceptable.	Y	Y
12.21 Details regarding meters.	PDD	DR	The details regarding meters are mentioned under the article 11 of the PPA. The meters would be approved, tested and sealed by the MSEDCL and will be calibrated annually.	Y	Y



Annex 2: Validation Protocol

Table 1 Participation Requirements for Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Project Activities (Ref PDD, Letters of Approval and UNFCCC website) All CDM project activities

REQUIREMENT	Ref	MoV	Comment	Draft finding	Final Concl
1.1 The project shall assist Parties included in Annex I in achieving compliance with part of their emission reduction commitment under Art. 3 and be entered into voluntarily.	PDD	DR	Project will reduce GHG emissions; however no Annex-1 Party is identified by the project proponent so far. This is a unilateral project.	Y	Y
1.2 The project shall assist non-Annex I Parties in achieving sustainable development and shall have obtained confirmation by the host country thereof, and be entered into voluntarily.	PDD	DR	The project activity will contribute to sustainable development. Host Country Approval from Designated National Authority is to be provided by the project proponent.	CAR 1	Y CAR1 closed
1.3 All Parties (listed in Section A3 of the PDD) have ratified the Kyoto protocol and are allowed to participate in CDM projects.	PDD/ UNF CCC Web- site	DR/ UNF CCC Web -site	India has ratified the protocol on 26 th August 2002 and is allowed to participate. http://unfccc.int/parties_and_observers/parties/items/2109.php	Y	Y
1.4 The project results in reductions of GHG emissions or increases in sequestration when compared to the baseline; and the project can be reasonably shown to be different from the baseline scenario.	PDD	DR	The project activity results in reduction of CO ₂ emissions by replacing conventional fossil fuel by use of renewable energy (Wind) in this case.	Y	Y

REQUIREMENT	Ref	MoV	Comment	Draft finding	Final Concl
1.5 Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited NGOs shall have been invited to comment on the validation requirements for minimum 30 days (45 days for AR projects), and the project design document and comments have been made publicly available.	PDD	DR/ UNF CCC Web -site	<p>Yes, the project was listed on UNFCCC website from 14th Feb 2007 to 15th Mar 2007.</p> <p>http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Validation/index.html</p> <p>The project is also listed on SGS climate change website from 14th Feb 2007 to 15th Mar 2007.</p> <p>http://www.sgsqualitynetwork.com/tradeassurance/ccp/projects/project.php?id=208</p> <p>Number of comments received during web-hosting period - 0</p>	Pending	Y No comments were received during International Stakeholder consultation process.
1.6 The project has correctly completed a Project Design Document, using the current version and exactly following the guidance.	PDD	DR	The guidelines for completing the PDD has been followed , except some pending closure of CARs and NIRs	Pending	Y All CARs/ NIRs are closed
1.7 The project shall not make use of Official Development Assistance (ODA), nor result in the diversion of such ODA.	PDD	DR	<p>The project has not received any public funding from Annex I country. The project is a unilateral as mentioned in the PDD.</p> <p>Proof of the same is to be obtained by the project proponent.</p>	NIR 2	Y NIR 2 closed
1.8 For AR projects, the host country shall have issued a communication providing a single definition of minimum tree cover, minimum land area value and minimum tree height. Has such a letter been issued and are the definitions consistently applied throughout the PDD?	PDD	DR	Not relevant as the project is not an AR project	Not applicable	Not Applicable

REQUIREMENT	Ref	MoV	Comment	Draft finding	Final Concl
1.9 Does the project meet the additional requirements detailed in: Table 9 for SSC projects Table 10 for AR projects Table 11 for AR SSC projects	PDD	DR	This is an SSC project which comes under category AMS I - D and hence table 9 is applicable.	Y	Y
1.10 Is the current version of the PDD complete and does it clearly reflect all the information presented during the validation assessment?	PDD	DR	The PDD for the present project activity is complete and it does reflect all the required information clearly except closure of pending CARs / NIRs	Pending	Y All CARs/ NIRs are closed
1.11 Does the PDD use accurate and reliable information that can be verified in an objective manner?	PDD	DR	Pending CARs / NIRs	Pending	Y All CARs/ NIRs are closed

Table 2 **Baseline methodology/ies (Ref: PDD Section B and AM) Normal CDM projects only**

Table 3 **Additionality (Ref: PDD Section B and AM) Normal CDM projects only**

Table 4 **Monitoring methodology (PDD Section B and AM) Normal CDM Projects only**

Table 5 **Monitoring plan (PDD Section B) Normal CDM Project activities only**

Table 6 **Environmental Impacts (Ref PDD Section D and relevant local legislation) Normal CDM Project Activities only**

Table 7 **Comments by local stakeholders (Ref PDD Section E) All CDM Project Activities**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
7.1 Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	PDD	DR	The project proponent has identified relevant stakeholders for the project activity. To be checked during site visit.	Site visit	Y Evidence provided.
7.2 Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?	PDD	DR	The media used to communicate the local stakeholders was in form of letters. Evidence for the same is required.	CAR 3	Y CAR 3 closed
7.3 If a stakeholder consultation process is required by regulations/laws in the host country, has the stakeholder consultation process been carried out in accordance with such regulations/laws?	PDD	DR	Stakeholder consultation process is not required as per regulation/laws in host country. However, the project participant has consulted the stakeholders as a requirement for CDM project. Minutes of meeting for local stakeholder consultation process are to be provided by the project proponent. Evidence needs to be checked during site visit	CAR 4	Y CAR 4 closed
7.4 Is a summary of the stakeholder comments received provided?	PDD	DR	The summary of stakeholder comments is provided in PDD. Evidence needs to be provided.	CAR 5	Y CAR 5 closed

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
7.5 Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	PDD	DR	No negative comments received. To be checked during site visit	Site visit	Y Evidence checked during local stakeholder consultation during site visit

Table 8 Other requirements All CDM project activities

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
8.1 Project Design Document					
8.1.1 Editorial issues: does the project correctly apply the PDD template and has the document been completed without modifying/adding headings or logo, format or font.	PDD	DR	A.4.3 is not as per template. The links provided on page 13 is not functional. The information under the link provided on page 14 is not relevant as mentioned in the PDD.	CAR 6	Y CAR 6 closed
8.1.2 Substantive issues: does the PDD address all the specific requirements under each header. If requirements are not applicable / not relevant, this must be stated and justified.	PDD	DR	The PDD address all the specific requirements under each header. Except for information under section B.8	CAR 7	Y CAR 7 closed
8.2 Technology to be Employed					
8.2.1 Does the project design engineering reflect current good practices?	PDD	DR	The project design reflects current good practices. Same is required to be checked from the purchase order copy for the present project activity.	CAR 8	Y CAR 8 closed
8.2.2 Does the project use state of the art technology or would the technology result in a significantly better performance than any commonly used technologies in the host country?	PDD	DR	The project uses a proven technology for producing electricity by use of Wind Electricity Generators. Evidence needs to be checked during the site visit.	Site visit	Y Evidence provided

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
8.2.3 Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period?	PDD	DR	Project technology will not be substituted by other or more efficient technologies during the crediting period. Evidence needs to be provided by the project proponent.	CAR 9	Y CAR 9 closed
8.2.4 Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to work as presumed during the project period?	PDD	DR	The PDD mentions about initial training being provided to the project participants. Supporting evidence for the same is to be provided by the project proponent.	NIR 10	Y CAR 10 closed
8.3 Duration of the Project/ Crediting Period					
8.3.1 Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?	PDD	DR	The starting date of the project is clearly mentioned but the proof of the same is to be obtained by the project proponent. The operational lifetime is clearly defined as 20 years.	NIR 11	Y CAR 11 closed
8.3.2 Is the assumed crediting time clearly defined and reasonable (renewable crediting period of max. two x 7 years or fixed crediting period of max. 10 years)?	PDD	DR	The assumed crediting time is clearly defined as 10 years. It is fixed crediting period.	Y	Y
8.3.3 Does the project's operational lifetime exceed the crediting period.	PDD	DR	The projects operational lifetime if of 20 years this exceeds the crediting period of 10 years.	Y	Y

Table 9 Additional requirements for SSC project activities only

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
9.1 Does the project qualify as a small scale CDM project activity as defined in paragraph 6 (c) of decision 17/CP.7 on the modalities and procedures for the CDM?	PDD	DR	The present CDM project activity is 8.75 MW Bundle Wind Power Project in Maharashtra. The electricity generated is less than 15 MW, and hence It qualifies as a small scale CDM project activity as defined in paragraph 6 (c) of decision 17/CP .7	Y	Y
9.2 The project conforms to one of the categories listed in Appendix B to Annex II to Decision 21/CP8.	PDD	DR	Yes, AMS I-D version 10, 23 rd December 2006	Y	Y
9.3 The small scale project activity is not a debundled component of a larger project activity?	PDD	DR	The Small scale project activity is not a debundled component of a larger project as mentioned in the PDD. To be checked during the site visit.	Site visit	Y Evidence provided
9.4 PDD has been prepared in accordance with appendix A of Annex II to Decision 21/CP8	PDD	DR	The PDD has been prepared in accordance with the PDD form version 03, except for some pending CARs/NIRs	Pending	Y All CARs/NIRs closed
9.5 The project uses a simplified baseline and monitoring methodology specified in Appendix B. If not, they may propose changes to the meths or a new SSC project category	PDD	DR	The project uses simplified baseline and monitoring methodology AMS – 1D. This is as per Appendix B.	Y	Y

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
9.6 Are the emission reductions determined in accordance with the methodology described?	PDD	DR	The Excel spreadsheet of the calculations needs to be provided by the project proponent.	CAR 12	Y CAR 12 closed
9.7 Is there any bundling of SSC activities into one PDD? If so, does the monitoring plan consider sampling of activities? Refer to para 19 of Annex II. Also, note bundling provisions in SSC Briefing Note and SSC meths I C / I D and III D and Para 22e of Appendix B.	PDD	DR	The Project activity is a bundled project. F – CDM – Bundle form is to be provided by the project proponent.	NIR 13	Y NIR 13 closed
9.8 Is EIA required by host party? If not, none is required irrespective of SHC. If yes, has one been performed consistent with local requirements?	PDD	DR	EIA is not required to be carried out for the concerned project activity as mentioned in the PDD. Evidence of which is to be obtained. Certain impacts were foreseen by the project proponent, which will be checked during the site visit.	NIR 14	Y NIR 14 closed

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<p>9.9 The project results in emission reductions that are additional in accordance with the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Para 26) The project is additional if emissions are reduced below those in the absence of the project. (Para 27) Simplified baseline can be used; if not, baseline proposed shall cover all gases, sectors and sources listed in Annex A to the KP (Para 28) One or more barriers as detailed in attachment A to Appendix B to Annex II will be used to demonstrate that the project would not proceed without the CDM 	PDD	DR	<p>The project will generate electricity using wind energy and will replace the same amount from western regional grid which is dominated by fossil fuel based power plants so emissions will reduce below those would be in the absence of the project activity.</p> <p>The simplified baseline as per AMS.I.D. has been used for the project activity.</p> <p>The barriers due to prevailing practice, Investment barrier and regulatory barrier mentioned in the PDD are not clear.</p> <p>Evidence for the same is required</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>CAR 15</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y CAR 15 closed</p>
<p>9.10 Leakage is calculated according to the provisions of the SSC methodologies in Appendix B.</p>	PDD	DR	<p>No GHG emissions due to project activity are mentioned in PDD. Also there is no equipment transfer from other location in case of present project activity and hence as per SSC methodology AMS I-D version 10, no leakage is being considered.</p> <p>Evidence for leakage emissions need to check during site visit.</p>	Site visit	<p>Y Evidence provided</p>

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
9.11 The project boundary shall be constructed in accordance with the requirements of the SSC meths in Appendix B.	PDD	DR	Project boundary for present project activity mentioned in the PDD needs to check during site visit.	Site visit	Y Evidence provided
9.12 The Monitoring plan shall be consistent with the requirements of the SSC methodology in Appendix B and shall provide for the collection and archiving of data needed to determine project emissions, baseline emissions and leakage.	PDD	DR	Monitoring Plan does not discuss about archiving of data.	CAR 16	Y CAR 16 closed
9.13 The monitoring plan shall present good monitoring practice appropriate to the circumstances of the project activity.	PDD	DR	Management structure is not provided, Roles and responsibility of the personnel's involved in the project activity is not clear.	CAR 17	Y CAR 17 closed
9.14 If project activities are bundled, separate monitoring plan shall be prepared for each of the activities or an overall plan reflecting good monitoring practice will be prepared, consistent with the above requirements.	PDD	DR	The project activities are bundled, the monitoring plan does not discuss about archiving of data. F – CDM – Bundle form is to be provided by the project proponent.	Pending NIR 13	Y NIR 13 closed

Table 10 Additional requirements for AR projects – Not applicable

Table 11 Additional requirements for SSC AR projects – Not applicable

Table 12 Additional information to be verified by local assessors / Site visit – Separate File attached

Annex 3: Overview of Findings

Date: 9th February 2007

Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
1	CAR	Host country approval is to be provided by the project proponent.	1.2
Date: [25/04/2007] The Host country approval has been submitted to DoE.			
Date: [25 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The letter (reference number 4/2/2007-CCC) has been submitted and verified. The name on the HCA is the same as mentioned in the section A.1 of the PDD. CAR can be closed.			
[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [25 th April 2007]			

Date: 9th February 2007

Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
2	NIR	Evidence is required to show that ODA was not utilised for the current project activity.	1.7
Date: [07/04/2007] A certificate dated 9th March 2007 issued by M/s Ghosh Khanna & CO., Chartered Accountants of Project participant stating that no ODA was used in the project activity has been submitted to DoE.			
Date: [18 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The Letter from M/s Ghosh Khanna & CO. has been submitted which states that no ODA was used for the current project activity. NIR can be closed.			
[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [18 th April 2007]			

Date: 9th February 2007

Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
3	CAR	Evidence needs to provide for cross-checking how concern local stakeholders are informed regarding the present CDM project activity by the project proponent.	7.2
Date: [07/04/2007] The invitation letter was issued to identified stakeholders by Project participant and a separate meeting was held on 19/06/2006 at both sites. All related documents have been submitted to DoE.			
Date: [18 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The invitation letters to local stakeholder at both the sites to attend the meeting held on 19/06/2006 was checked for the dates mentioned and was found acceptable. CAR can be closed.			
[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [18 th April 2007]			

Date: 9th February 2007

Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
4	CAR	The project proponent needs to provide the minutes of meeting for the local stakeholders consultation process.	7.3
Date: [07/04/2007] The minutes of meeting has been provided to DoE.			
Date: [18 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The minutes of the meeting for local stakeholders consultation process held on 19/06/2006 has been submitted, the information was crosschecked during site visit by the local Assessor and found acceptable, CAR can be closed.			
[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [18 th April 2007]			

Date: 9th February 2007

Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
5	CAR	Evidence is required for the summary of local stakeholders comments mentioned in the PDD.	7.4
Date: [07/04/2007], The summary of comments are mentioned in minutes of stakeholder consultation meeting and same has been submitted to DoE. There were no negative comments received on the project.			
Date: [18 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The minutes of meeting for the stakeholder consultation process has been submitted, the summary was cross checked by the local assessor during the site visit and no negative comments were found. CAR can be closed.			
[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [18 th April 2007]			

Date: 9th February 2007

Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
6	CAR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Column of table A.4.3 is not according to the template. The link given at page 13 is not functional No relevant information found for the link provided on page 14 as mentioned in the PDD. 	8.1.1
Date: [07/04/2007] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table A.4.3 has been updated according to the template provided in guidelines to complete SSCPDD. The link has been updated for page no. 13, but now the relevant paragraph and reference lies on page no. 16. The link has been updated for page no. 14, but now the relevant paragraph and reference lies on page no. 17. 			

<p>Date: [18th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The Table A.4.3 has been updated in the rephrased version according to the guidelines to complete SSC PDD and is accepted. The link no. 3 provided on page no. 14, link 4 on page 16, link no. 6 and 7 on page 17 and link no. 8 on page 21 are not active, please provide an active link.</p>
<p>Date: [25/04/2007] All required active link has been provided in PDD.</p>
<p>Date: [25th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The links provided in the rephrased version of the PDD have been checked and they are found to be active. CAR can be closed.</p>
<p>[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [25th April 2007]</p>

Date: 9 th February 2007		Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar	
No.	Type	Issue	Ref
7	CAR	The requirements under the header B.8 according to the guidelines for completion of PDD version 04 is not complete.	8.1.2
Date: [07/04/2007] The necessary correction has been made in PDD and same has been submitted to DoE.			
Date: [18 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The revised PDD has been checked and it includes the name of the person responsible for the baseline and monitoring methodology. CAR can be closed			
[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [18 th April 2007]			

Date: 9 th February 2007		Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar	
No.	Type	Issue	Ref
8	CAR	Purchase orders for the WEGs are required to check the specifications as mentioned in the PDD.	8.2.1
Date: [07/04/2007] All purchase orders has been submitted to DoE.			
Date: [18 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The Purchase order along with technical specifications from Suzlon has been submitted and the specification mentioned has been crosschecked with that mentioned in the PDD and same are found acceptable. CAR can be closed.			
[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [18 th April 2007]			

Date: 9th February 2007

Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar

35/40

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
9	CAR	The Project proponent need to provide evidence that the technology used in the current project activity will not be substituted during the crediting period.	8.2.3
Date: [07/04/2007] SEPL issued a letter declaring that neither the capacity of project will be increased nor it will be replaced by any other technology during crediting period. The same letter has been submitted to DoE.			
Date: [18 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] Letter by SEPL declaring that neither the capacity of project will be increased nor will it be replace by any other technology during the crediting period has been submitted and was checked and found acceptable. CAR can be closed.			
[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [18 th April 2007]			

Date: 9th February 2007

Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
10	NIR	Evidence is required for the initial training programme being carried by the project proponent for the specific project activity as mentioned in the PDD.	8.2.4
Date: [07/04/2007] The monitoring of the project is responsibility of Suzlon as per O&M contract and so the mentioned trained personnel are from Suzlon not from Project participant. Project participant has appointed a full time project in-charge to look after all aspect of the project and to coordinate with all parties responsible for smooth functioning of the project.			
Date: [18 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] Provide details about the training mentioned in the PDD.			
Date: [25/04/2007] ISO 9001:2000 standard has been adopted by Suzlon, who is responsible for monitoring, calibration and O & M of the project. Training is an essential part of the ISO system. To comply with the ISO standard the training has to be provided to personnel according there responsibility with in organization. The ISO certificate has been issued by DNV to Suzlon. Same has been now mentioned in PDD.			
Date: [25 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The rephrased version of the PDD describes about ISO certification for Suzlon which is responsible for monitoring, calibration and O&M of the project. Training is an essential part for ISO certification, thus ISO certification suffice for proper QA and QC procedures which include the training of personnel also. Copy of ISO certificate for Suzlon has been provided by the project participant. Hence, NIR can be closed.			
[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [25 th April 2007]			

Date: 9th February 2007

Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
-----	------	-------	-----

11	NIR	The project proponent needs to provide evidence for the start date of project activity.	8.3.1
Date: [07/04/2007] The evidence for start date is the Purchase order to Suzlon Energy Ltd. dated 27/10/2005 from SEPL. The same has been submitted to DoE.			
Date: [18 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The purchase orders have been checked for the start date mentioned as 27/10/2005 and the same is found correct. NIR can be closed.			
[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [18 th April 2007]			

Date: 9th February 2007

Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
12	CAR	The excel spreadsheet for calculation of emission reductions is to be provided by the project proponent.	9.6
Date: [07/04/2007] The excel spread sheet for calculation of emission reduction has been submitted to DoE.			
Date: [18 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The excel sheet has been checked for the values and assumptions and same have been found acceptable. CAR can be closed.			
[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [18 th April 2007]			

Date: 9th February 2007

Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
13	CAR	The project proponent requires submitting the F – CDM – Bundle form as the project is a bundled project activity.	9.7
Date: [07/04/2007] The desired F-CDM-Bundle form has been submitted to DoE.			
Date: [18 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The F – CDM – Bundle form does not match with the information provided in the revised PDD. The total number of emission reduction and units evacuated from the grid mentioned on page 1 do not match with that mentioned in the PDD. Kindly clarify the same.			
Date: [25/04/2007] This was a typing error. Same has been rectified and correct no. of emission reduction and units evacuated to grid has been incorporated in F-CDM-Bundle form.			
Date: [25 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The corrected F-CDM-Bundle form has been submitted. The total number of emission reduction and units evacuated from the grid mentioned in the F-CDM-Bundle form matches with that provided in the PDD. CAR can be closed.			
[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [25 th April 2007]			

Date: 9th February 2007

Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
14	NIR	EIA is not required to be carried out for the specific project activity as mentioned in the PDD. Provide the evidence for the same.	9.8
Date: [07/04/2007] In applicable EIA notification 1994, the projects for which EIA is required are clearly listed. According to that wind power projects does not required to conduct EIA study. A copy of notification has been submitted to DoE or the same can be seen at http://envfor.nic.in/divisions/iass/eia/Annex1.htm			
Date: [18 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The project activity does not require carrying out EIA; this was checked as per the notification and found ok. NIR can be closed.			
[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [18 th April 2007]			

Date: 9th February 2007

Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
15	CAR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide documentary evidence for the barriers discussed under regulatory barriers Investment barrier is not clear, provide IRR calculation sheet along with loan documents. Provide the source of information for return rates in India as mentioned in the PDD. Provide the Board note, showing that CDM was considered during the Planning stage of the project activity. Evidence is required to show the change of rate form 8.40% to 9.40%. Supporting documents are required for the scenarios mentioned in the PDD. The project proponent needs to provide the PPA for the specific project activity. Provide the details of the Green Energy Fund. And how much amount is received from the fund till date. Provide the documents relating to insurance for the project activity. How CDM will mitigate the barriers is not discussed in the PDD. 	9.9
Date: [07/04/2007] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evidence for PLF of wind power in India range from 18 to 30 % has been provided to DoE. http://www.ficci.com/media-room/speeches-presentations/2006/may/may13-elec/PlenaryVI-DG/Ajay.pdf For investment barrier the WACC (Weighted Average Cost of Capital) has been used as 			

38/40

bench mark and investment analysis has been done. The excel spread sheet of IRR working and calculation of WACC has been provided to DoE along with the loan documents.

- WACC benchmark being used instead of equity IRR for better understanding of investment barrier.
- The board note showing CDM consideration during planning stage has been submitted to DoE.
- The evidence for increase in interest rate is the announcement by Canara Bank on its website. They hiked their BPLR to 12.50 % and hence now interest rate is increased to 10.15 %. As per loan agreement document, the interest rate applicable to the project activity is BPLR – 2.35 %. The required change has been made in the PDD.
- The calculation and other documents to support all scenarios mentioned in the PDD has been submitted to DoE.
- The PPA for both sites of project activity has been provided to DoE.
- There is no amount received from the green fund rather project participant to contributed Rs. 131.25 lakhs to the green fund.
- Insurance document has already been submitted to DoE.
- Impact of CDM benefits on the project is collaborated in the PDD.

Date: [18th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor]

- The PLF value is checked and found acceptable.
- The excel sheet was checked for the WACC calculations and was found ok.
- The board note has been submitted by the project proponent and is acceptable.
- Evidence for the change in bank rates is required to be submitted by the project proponent.
- PPA for the project activity has been checked and found acceptable.
- Evidence for the amount contributed to the green fund is required.
- Insurance document has been checked and found acceptable.
- The impacts of CDM benefits have been discussed under section B.5 of the PDD and are acceptable.

Date: [25/04/2007]

- The evidence for increase in interest rate is the announcement by Canara Bank on its website. They hiked their BPLR to 12.50 % and hence now interest rate is increased to 10.15 %. As per loan agreement document, the interest rate applicable to the project activity is BPLR – 2.35 %. Same document has been submitted to DoE.
- Evidence for the amount contributed to the green fund has been submitted to DoE. Total deposit as per receipt is 2,62,50,000 but as per policy 50% of amount will be treated as interest free advance and balance will be contribution to Green fund. So the amount contributed to Green fund is 1,31,25,000.

Date: [25th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor]

The bank documents submitted have been checked for the BPLR which is found to be -2.35% and is acceptable.

The total deposit receipt for the green fund of Rs 2,62,50,000 has been submitted and is acceptable. CAR can be closed.

[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [25th April 2007]

Date: 9 th February 2007		Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar	
No.	Type	Issue	Ref
16	CAR	How is the data being archived? Monitoring Plan does not discuss about archiving of data.	9.12
Date: [07/04/2007] The data will be archived for crediting period + 2 years. The archiving will be done both on paper and electronically.			
Date: [18 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The monitoring plan does discuss about the form in which the data will be archived. Kindly provide the same in the PDD.			
Date: [25/04/2007] The necessary correction has been made in the PDD.			
Date: [25 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The rephrased version of PDD under section B.7.1 mentions that the data archiving will be done on both paper and electronically. CAR can be closed.			
[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [25 th April 2007]			

Date: 9 th February 2007			Raised by: Sanjeev Kumar		
No.	Type	Issue			Ref
17	CAR	Provide the Management structure along with the roles and responsibilities of each personnel involved in the project activity.			9.13
Date: [07/04/2007] The role and responsibility of personnel involved in the project has been discussed in section B.7.2 of the revised PDD.					
Date: [18 th April 2007] [Jimmy Sah] [Comments from Local Assessor] The management structure has been provided in section B.7.2 of the rephrased version of the PDD. CAR can be closed.					
[Acceptance and close out] OK, Sanjeev Kumar [18 th April 2007]					

Sanjeev Kumar

Phone: +91 9871794628/124 2399990-98

Fax Number: +91 124 2399764

e-Mail Address: sanjeev.kumar@sgs.com

SGS India Pvt, Ltd,
250, Udyog Vihar,
Phase IV, Gurgaon
Haryana – 122015 (India)

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

- CDM Validation & Verification
- Energy audit
- Boiler design to convert from oil-fired to briquette/biomass-fired
- Gasifier & MEEs' design

ADVANCED COURSE/TRAINING

- Technical Reviewer training in SGS Netherlands
- CDM verification training at Shanghai
- Advanced EMS (ISO14001:2004) Lead Auditor
- Certified energy auditor from Bureau of Energy Efficiency, Ministry of Power, Govt. of India

EDUCATION

School of Energy & Environmental Studies

D.A.V.V., Indore, Madhya Pradesh

M Tech (Energy Management)

2004

S. D. College of Engineering & Technology

Muzaffarnagar, Uttar Pradesh

BE (Chemical Engg. Specialized in Sugar Tech.)

2001

WORK EXPERIENCE

Feb'05 till date

SGS India Pvt. Ltd.

Gurgaon, India

- Title: Asst. Manager, Climate Change Programme

Hours/Week: 8/5

- **Duties and Accomplishments:**

- **Validation & Verification:** Currently working as technical reviewer and developing validation & verification report; the related works are CDM PDD analysis as a lead auditor, raising CAR & NIR if N/C, site visit and fulfillment of all criteria as per UNFCCC guidelines.
- **Energy Audit:** Carried out energy audit in different type of industries (Vardhman Spinning & General Mills, Govind Rubber Ltd. and DSM Anti-infectives India Ltd.) developed energy audit reports. Worked at the capacity of Team Leader for all the above projects.

Jul'04-Feb'05

Yajna Fuel Services

Mumbai, India

- Title: Engineer, Design Division

Hours/Week: 8/6

- **Duties and Accomplishments:**

- Worked at the capacity of **Designer** of boiler conversion from oil-fired to briquette-fired, gasifiers and multiple effect evaporators. Responsibility included facilitating erection and commissioning. Main clients included Cadbury, Bayer, Color Chem, Pidilite and Pfizer.
 - Worked at the capacity of **Team member** for carrying out energy audit. Main clients included Rama Newsprint and Nirayu (P) Ltd. (Alembic group).
-

■ Title: Lecturer, Chemical Department

Hours/Week: 4/6

■ Subjects:

- Thermodynamics, Heat Transfer
 - Sugar Manufacturing Process, Sugar Factory Practices
 - Unit operations and lab analysis
-

TRAININGS & PROJECTS

- Worked on various projects as 'Performance Evaluation of SPV Systems' with Tata BP Solar India Ltd., 'Energy Auditing' with School of Energy & Env'n. Studies and 'Sugar Industry Project' with S.D College of Engg. & Tech.
- Have gone through training as an energy auditor at Rayon Applied Engineers and Yajna Fuel Services.
- Have gone through training as a chemist at Triveni Engineering & Industries Ltd., Deoband
- Presented a seminar on Co-generation in Industries.

SPECIAL ACHIEVEMENT

- National Renewable Energy Fellowship (2002-04)

COMPUTER KNOWLEDGE

- C, C++, MS Office

EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

- Participate in the general knowledge quiz, cricket tournament and other cultural activities. Actively participated in different training programs related to energy & environment, conducted by **Center for Energy Studies & Research, Indore.**

INTERESTS

- Trekking, Music and Driving

LANGUAGES KNOWN

- English and Hindi

PERSONAL DETAILS

Date of Birth:	05 August 1979
Nationality:	Indian
Marital status:	Married
Passport No.	E – 6030149 (exp date 12 Sep 2013)

I hereby declare that all the information furnished above is true to best of my knowledge

Date: April 2007

Place: Gurgaon

(Sanjeev Kumar)

RESUME

VIKRANT BADVE

B-204, Bakul, Kubera Sankul
Near Sanjeevanee Hospital
Gadital, Hadapsar, Pune - 411028
E-mail: vikrant.badve@sgs.com
Mobile: +91-99670-05290

A. Career Objective:

To put in my utmost efforts in an organization and reach the top of the pyramid through integrity, sincerity and effectiveness thus prove my worth to self and others.

B. Professional Career:

1. Qualifications:

- ◆ M. Tech. (Energy Management)
- ◆ B.E. (Environmental Engineering)
- ◆ Passed Energy Auditor's Exam conducted by BEE, New Delhi and NPC, Chennai

2. Experience:

- a. **Company - SGS India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai**, a leading DOE for Validation and Verification under Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) project activities and Verified Emission Reduction (VER) program

Duration - From 31st July 2006 to till date

Designation- Executive (Climate Change Programme)

Job Profile

- Developing validation and verification reports related to CDM projects as per UNFCCC criteria.
- Developing verification reports related to VER projects as per Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) criteria.
- Developing Client base for Climate Change Program.

Worked/Working on different projects for following sectors,

1. Validation of projects under sectoral scope 1 (Energy Industries (Renewable/Non-renewable)) and 4 (Manufacturing Industries)
2. Verification of Projects under sectoral scope 1 (Energy Industries (Renewable/Non-renewable)) and 4 (Manufacturing Industries)

- b. **Company - Sudnya Industrial Services Pvt. Ltd., Pune**, an Energy Service Company (ESCO) working in industrial and commercial sectors and implement Energy Conservation projects through **Performance Contracting** route.

Duration - From 1st June 2005 to 29th July 2006

Designation- Energy Engineer

Job Profile

- Conduct Walk through and Detailed Energy Audit Studies.
- Analysis of the data collected for Energy Audit Studies.
- Preparing Energy Audit Report.
- Preparing protocol for the baseline measurement.
- Analysis of the data for preparing baseline.

Worked on different projects for following Industrial/ Commercial sectors,

1. Detailed Energy Audit Study of Battery Manufacturing Unit and preparation of measurement protocols for the baseline study of Energy conservation measures suggested in Energy audit report.
2. Detailed Energy Audit Study of Lead Refinery Unit.
3. Energy Audit Study for Nationalized Bank Head Office.
4. Building Energy Management –
Preparation of Handbook on Standard auditing procedure for public buildings in Maharashtra and creating a database of energy efficient technologies to be used in public buildings in Maharashtra

c. Company - Pranam Consultants, Pune, a consultancy firm working in Renewable Energy field

Duration - 1st June 2004 to 31st May 2005

Designation - Energy Engineer

Job Profile

- Responsible for Field Studies
- Analysis of Field data and Report preparation

Worked on projects for following sectors,

1. Integrated Rural Energy Planning.
2. Socio-Economic Impact Assessment Study of Energy Projects.
3. Biomass Availability Study for Biomass based Power Plants.
4. Feasibility study of Biomass based Power Plants and Waste to Energy Plants.
5. Remote Village Electrification Program.

d. Company - MICO, Nashik Plant manufacturing diesel nozzle body and holder.

Duration - 12th Sept. 2001 to 23rd July 2002

Designation - Trainee Engineer, Environmental Projects Department

Job Profile

- Part of Environmental Management Team

Worked on different projects like,

1. Erection and commissioning of the Industrial Waste Treatment Plant and Oil Reclamation Plant.
2. Daily operation and the maintenance of Sewage Treatment Plant, Solid Waste Incinerator.

3. Training Program Attained:

- ◆ Effective Hazard Analysis and Risk Assessment
- ◆ HAZOP
- ◆ Safety Audit
- ◆ CDM and opportunities for Indian Industries
- ◆ Validation and Verification of Emission reduction projects

4. Subjects of Interest:

- ◆ CDM
- ◆ Wealth from waste
- ◆ Energy and Environmental Auditing
- ◆ ESCO

C. Academic Career:

1. Achievements:

Qualification	Year of Passing	Institution / University / Board	Division
M. Tech. (Energy Management)	2004	School of Energy Studies, Devi Ahilya University, Indore	1 st Class with Distinction
B. E. (Environmental Engg)	2001	KIT's. College of Engineering, Shivaji University, Kolhapur	1 st Class with Distinction

Recipient of National Renewable Energy Fellowship for year 2002-04 by MNES, Govt. of India

2. Project Undertaken:

- ◆ Energy Recovery from MSW with emphasis on Landfill Gas: A Case Study for Nagpur City.
- ◆ Energy Audit of Navin Fluorine, Dewas (A Mafatlal Group Unit).
- ◆ Hospital Waste Management through Vermicomposting.
- ◆ Design of wastewater collection and treatment system for a colony.

3. Seminar Delivered:

- ◆ Thermal Power Plant Emissions-A Modeling Approach.
- ◆ Incineration- Technology for Hazardous Waste Management

D. Computer Proficiency:

- ◆ MS – Office
- ◆ Microsoft Visio
- ◆ Programming Languages C and C++

E. Extra - Curricular Activities:

- ◆ Won 1st prize in the National level Technical Essay writing competition in ISTE's 3rd National Convention.
- ◆ Presented Papers on various Technical topics of Civil and Environmental Engineering in National / State level paper presentation contests.
- ◆ Editor of the Technique-2000 and Technique-2001 (KIT College Magazine)

F. Value Added:

- ◆ Keen learner and work efficiently as an individual as well as in group
- ◆ Proactive and enthusiastic approach
- ◆ Willing to take responsibilities
- ◆ Dynamic and result oriented
- ◆ Flexible to undertake multiple tasks
- ◆ Ability to meet deadlines

G. Personal Profile:

1. Address for Correspondence:

B-204, Bakul, Kubera Sankul
Near Sanjeevanee Hospital, Gadital,
Hadapsar, Pune - 411028
E-mail: vikrant_badve@sgs.com
Mobile: +91-99670-05290

- 2. Date of Birth:** 11th Feb.1980
- 3. Languages Known:** English, Hindi, and Marathi
- 4. Marital Status:** Single
- 5. Passport No.:** E7236253
- 6. PAN:** AIUPB7436K

Date: 6th April 2006
Place: Thane

Signature