



# Validation report form for post-registration changes for CDM project activities

(Version 01.0)

Complete this form in accordance with the "Attachment: Instructions for filling out the validation report form for post-registration changes for CDM project activities" at the end of this form.

## VALIDATION REPORT ON POST-REGISTRATION CHANGES (PRCs)

<b>Title and reference number of the project activity</b>	Korea Midland Power Co., LTD. (KOMIPO) Boryeong Small Hydroelectric Power Plant Project UNFCCC Ref. 2225
<b>Process track</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Prior approval <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Renewal of crediting period
<b>Version number of the validation report on PRCs</b>	1.0
<b>Completion date of the validation report on PRCs</b>	30 August 2016
<b>Type(s) of PRCs</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corrections <input type="checkbox"/> Changes to the start date of the crediting period <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion of a monitoring plan to a registered project activity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline <input type="checkbox"/> Changes to the project design of a registered project activity <input type="checkbox"/> Types of changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities
<b>Version number of PDD to which this report applies</b>	2.0
<b>Project participant(s)</b>	Korea Midland Power Co., LTD. (KOMIPO)
<b>Host Party</b>	Republic of Korea
<b>Sectoral scope(s), selected methodology(ies), and where applicable, selected standardized baseline(s)</b>	Scope 1 : Energy industries AMS-I.D. version. 13
<b>Name of DOE</b>	Deloitte Tohmatsu Evaluation and Certification Organization (Deloitte-TECO)
<b>Name, position and signature of the</b>	Hiroshi Inanaga, CEO

approver of the validation report on PRCs

*Hiroshi Imanaga*

**SECTION A. Executive summary**

&gt;&gt;

**Brief Summary**

The Project consists of two hydroelectric power plants in OCheon-Myon, Boryeong city, Chungcheongnam-do, Republic of Korea. The project utilizes hydropower, which generates zero GHG emissions into the atmosphere. Korea Midland Power Co., LTD. (KOMIPO) Boryeong Small Hydroelectric Power Plant Project consists of six small hydroelectric turbine and generator units, which has a capacity of 1.25 MW each; the total capacity of the six hydropower units is 7.5 MW.

Korea Midland Power Co., LTD. (KOMIPO) Boryeong Small Hydroelectric Power Plant Project has two hydroelectric power plants. #1 hydroelectric power plant consists of four turbine and generator units and #2 hydroelectric power plant consists of two turbine and generator units. As this assessment was carried out as part of the 1st verification of the project activity. More details can be referred from the verification report.

**Scope of validation**

The purpose of this validation is to assess the validity of Corrections and Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan and whether the changes impact on the emission reductions and the changes are in line with the valid version of the applicable methodology. The validation consisted of checking, the project's compliance with relevant UNFCCC and host country criteria in order to confirm that the project design, monitoring plan as documented is sound and reasonable and meets the stated requirements and identified criteria.

This report summarizes the findings of the validation of the PRC under issuance track wherein Deloitte-TECO has employed a risk-based approach in the validation based on the recommendations in the VVS (Version 09.0), focusing on validity and applicability of the changes as documented in the revised PDD version 2.0.

**SECTION B. Validation team, technical reviewer and approver**

&gt;&gt;

**B.1. Validation team member**

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)	Involvement in			
						Desk review	On-site inspection	Interview(s)	Validation findings
1.	Team Leader	IR	Park	Yong Tae	Deloitte-TECO	Y	Y	Y	Y
2	Team Member	EI	Hayashi	Toshio	Deloitte-TECO	Y	-	-	-

**B.2. Technical reviewer and approver of the validation report on PRCs**

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)
1.	Technical Reviewer	IR	Otani	Yuichi	Deloitte-TECO
2.	Approver	IR	Inanaga	Hiroshi	Deloitte-TECO
3.	Assessment Committee Chair	EI	Ichikawa	Masahiko	Deloitte-TECO

4.	Chief Executive Officer	IR	Inanaga	Hiroshi	Deloitte-TECO
----	-------------------------	----	---------	---------	---------------

## **SECTION C. Means of validation**

### **C.1. Desk review**

>>

During the desk review all documents initially provided by the client and publicly available documents relevant for the verification were reviewed. The main documents are listed below:

- The last revision of the PDD including the monitoring plan
- The last revision of the validation report,
- The monitoring report and ER calculation sheet,

Other supporting documents, such as publicly available information on the UNFCCC website and background information were also reviewed.

**C.2. On-site inspection**

Duration of on-site inspection: 9 May 2016 to 10 May 2016				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Opening meeting with the PPs               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Verification purpose, methods, and schedule</li> <li>- Understand the background of the project</li> </ul> </li> <li>-</li> <li>· Site inspection               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Verify the installed equipment</li> <li>- Verify the installed measurement equipment</li> </ul> </li> <li>· Document review with the PPs.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review of monitoring and reporting procedures</li> <li>- Cross-check all data and parameters monitored</li> <li>- Calibration records of measuring instruments</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Boryoung, Republic of Korea	9 May 2016	Park Yong Tae
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Document review with the PPs               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cross-check all data and parameters monitored</li> <li>- Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions</li> </ul> </li> <li>· Closing meeting with PPs               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Summary of CAR, CL, and FAR in the verification checklist</li> <li>- Actions after the on-site assessment</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Boryoung, Republic of Korea	10 May 2016	Park Yong Tae

**C.3. Interviews**

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Han	Seung Mi	Korea Midland Power Co., LTD. (KOMIPO)	9-10 May 2016	· Implementation and operation of the project · Monitoring structure · Information flows for generating, aggregating, and reporting the monitoring parameters · QA/QC to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions · Monitoring equipment, including calibration	Park Yong Tae
2	Kim	Hye Seoung				
3	Kim	Won Shik		10 May 2016		
4	Park	Ji Eun		10 May 2016		
5	Jeong	Da Jeong	Ecoeye Co., Ltd.	9-10 May 2016	· Project design and implementation · Monitoring plan · Monitoring data and monitoring report · GHG calculations · Cross-check between information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources	

**C.4. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests raised**

Areas of validation findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance with PDD form	-	-	-
Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline	-	-	-
Corrections	1	1	-
Changes to the start date of the crediting period	-	-	-
Inclusion of a monitoring plan to a registered project activity	-	-	-
Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline	1	-	-
Changes to the project design of a registered project activity	-	-	-
Types of changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities	-	-	-
Others (please specify)	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	

**SECTION D. Validation findings****D.1. Compliance with PDD form**

<b>Means of validation</b>	The project participants used a later version of the PDD form for the revised PDD than the version of the PDD form of the registered PDD. By means of checking updated PDD with the latest applicable and available PDD template form the DOE can confirm that the information transferred to the later version of the PDD form is materially the same as that in the registered PDD besides those changes highlighted and assessed under this report.
<b>Findings</b>	-
<b>Conclusion</b>	The updated PDD is in line with the latest applicable PDD form.

**D.2. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline**

<b>Means of validation</b>	<p>299. If the DOE identifies that the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have deviated from the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology, and/or the applied standardized baseline, and where the provisions of the appendix to the Project standard do not apply, the DOE shall seek prior approval from the Board with respect to the acceptability of the deviations in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.</p> <p>300. The DOE shall determine whether the deviation is likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions. In cases where the DOE considers that the deviation will lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions, the DOE shall request the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity to apply conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions will not be overestimated as a result of the deviation.</p> <p>301. For cases where a deviation from the registered monitoring plan may be applicable to the monitoring period under verification, and part of the subsequent monitoring period, the DOE shall determine the exact period to which the deviation applies.</p>
<b>Findings</b>	-
<b>Conclusion</b>	Not applicable

**D.3. Corrections**

<b>Means of validation</b>	<p>304. If the DOE identifies that the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have made corrections to project or programme information or parameters fixed at validation, the DOE shall determine whether:</p> <p>(a) The corrected information is an accurate reflection of actual project or programme information; and/or</p> <p>(b) The corrected parameters are in accordance with the applied methodology, the registered monitoring plan and/or the applied standardized baseline.</p>
----------------------------	--

Findings	<p>DOE found out two issues which were not in accordance with the registered PDD.</p> <p>- Correction of technical specifications of installed equipment</p> <p>There are some technical specifications of installed equipment described in the registered PDD that were not in accordance with the specification of actual installed equipment. (CAR 01 was issued.)</p> <p>- Correction of management and operational structure for monitoring</p> <p>Management and operational structure for monitoring described in the registered PDD was not in accordance with the specification of actual installed equipment. (CL 01 was issued)</p>																																																																																						
Conclusion	<p>The Deloitte-TECO confirmed by performing on-site assessment that some technical specifications are not in accordance with those in the registered PDD. Especially, the output power is stated “110% of maximum generating power from turbine” in the registered PDD.</p> <p>Equipment technical specification in the registered PDD and actual implementation of project are shown below.</p> <p>#1 hydroelectric power plant</p> <table><tr><th colspan="2"></th><th>PDD</th><th>Actual equipment</th></tr><tr><td rowspan="6">Turbine</td><td>Type</td><td>Kaplan-1.5</td><td>Kaplan-1.5</td></tr><tr><td>Rated Output</td><td>1,250 kW</td><td>1,250 kW</td></tr><tr><td>Flux</td><td>25 m³/sec</td><td>25 m³/sec</td></tr><tr><td>Efficiency</td><td>Over 85%</td><td>89.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Rotation</td><td>150 rpm</td><td>150 rpm</td></tr><tr><td>Rated head</td><td>5.75 m</td><td>5.75 m</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="5">Generator</td><td>Type</td><td>Three-phase alternating current induction generator</td><td>Three-phase alternating current induction generator</td></tr><tr><td>Output power</td><td>110% of maximum generating power from turbine</td><td>1,250 kW</td></tr><tr><td>Rated output voltage</td><td>3.3 kV</td><td>3.3 kV</td></tr><tr><td>Power factor</td><td>Over 0.95</td><td>90 %</td></tr><tr><td>Frequency</td><td>60 Hz</td><td>60 Hz</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Generator efficiency</td><td>Over 95%</td><td>90%</td></tr></table> <p>#2 hydroelectric power plant</p> <table><tr><th colspan="2"></th><th>PDD</th><th>Actual equipment</th></tr><tr><td rowspan="6">Turbine</td><td>Type</td><td>Kaplan-1.5</td><td>Kaplan-1.5</td></tr><tr><td>Rated Output</td><td>1,250 kW</td><td>1,250 kW</td></tr><tr><td>Flux</td><td>25 m³/sec</td><td>25 m³/sec</td></tr><tr><td>Efficiency</td><td>Over 85%</td><td>85.5%</td></tr><tr><td>Rotation</td><td>150 rpm</td><td>150 rpm</td></tr><tr><td>Rated head</td><td>5.75 m</td><td>5.75 m</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="5">Generator</td><td>Type</td><td>Three-phase alternating current induction generator</td><td>Three-phase alternating current induction generator</td></tr><tr><td>Output power</td><td>110% of maximum generating power from turbine</td><td>1,250 kW</td></tr><tr><td>Rated output voltage</td><td>3.3 kV</td><td>3.3 kV</td></tr><tr><td>Power factor</td><td>Over 0.95</td><td>Over 0.90</td></tr><tr><td>Frequency</td><td>60 Hz</td><td>60 Hz</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Generator efficiency</td><td>Over 95%</td><td>95%</td></tr></table> <p>According to the registered PDD, it was stated that “110% of maximum generating power from turbine” for the output power of generator, which means that the maximum capacity of each turbine and generator unit is calculated as 1,375 MW under the paragraph 99. (a) of latest PS ver. 09.0.</p>			PDD	Actual equipment	Turbine	Type	Kaplan-1.5	Kaplan-1.5	Rated Output	1,250 kW	1,250 kW	Flux	25 m³/sec	25 m³/sec	Efficiency	Over 85%	89.1%	Rotation	150 rpm	150 rpm	Rated head	5.75 m	5.75 m	Generator	Type	Three-phase alternating current induction generator	Three-phase alternating current induction generator	Output power	110% of maximum generating power from turbine	1,250 kW	Rated output voltage	3.3 kV	3.3 kV	Power factor	Over 0.95	90 %	Frequency	60 Hz	60 Hz		Generator efficiency	Over 95%	90%			PDD	Actual equipment	Turbine	Type	Kaplan-1.5	Kaplan-1.5	Rated Output	1,250 kW	1,250 kW	Flux	25 m³/sec	25 m³/sec	Efficiency	Over 85%	85.5%	Rotation	150 rpm	150 rpm	Rated head	5.75 m	5.75 m	Generator	Type	Three-phase alternating current induction generator	Three-phase alternating current induction generator	Output power	110% of maximum generating power from turbine	1,250 kW	Rated output voltage	3.3 kV	3.3 kV	Power factor	Over 0.95	Over 0.90	Frequency	60 Hz	60 Hz		Generator efficiency	Over 95%	95%
		PDD	Actual equipment																																																																																				
Turbine	Type	Kaplan-1.5	Kaplan-1.5																																																																																				
	Rated Output	1,250 kW	1,250 kW																																																																																				
	Flux	25 m³/sec	25 m³/sec																																																																																				
	Efficiency	Over 85%	89.1%																																																																																				
	Rotation	150 rpm	150 rpm																																																																																				
	Rated head	5.75 m	5.75 m																																																																																				
Generator	Type	Three-phase alternating current induction generator	Three-phase alternating current induction generator																																																																																				
	Output power	110% of maximum generating power from turbine	1,250 kW																																																																																				
	Rated output voltage	3.3 kV	3.3 kV																																																																																				
	Power factor	Over 0.95	90 %																																																																																				
	Frequency	60 Hz	60 Hz																																																																																				
	Generator efficiency	Over 95%	90%																																																																																				
		PDD	Actual equipment																																																																																				
Turbine	Type	Kaplan-1.5	Kaplan-1.5																																																																																				
	Rated Output	1,250 kW	1,250 kW																																																																																				
	Flux	25 m³/sec	25 m³/sec																																																																																				
	Efficiency	Over 85%	85.5%																																																																																				
	Rotation	150 rpm	150 rpm																																																																																				
	Rated head	5.75 m	5.75 m																																																																																				
Generator	Type	Three-phase alternating current induction generator	Three-phase alternating current induction generator																																																																																				
	Output power	110% of maximum generating power from turbine	1,250 kW																																																																																				
	Rated output voltage	3.3 kV	3.3 kV																																																																																				
	Power factor	Over 0.95	Over 0.90																																																																																				
	Frequency	60 Hz	60 Hz																																																																																				
	Generator efficiency	Over 95%	95%																																																																																				

	<p>However, the Deloitte-TECO confirmed that the requirement of PS was not available during the validation stage of this project. After request for registration, the EB clarification was announced that “the SSC WG agreed to clarify that the maximum or rated/installed capacity for small scale CDM hydro-electric project can be determined using one of the following options (in the order of preference): a) Nameplate/rated capacity of the turbine i.e., based on turbine manufacturer’s specification and b) Generator capacity in MW (which is an equivalent of name plate/rated capacity in MVA times the name plate/rated power factor, specified by the manufacturer).” paragraph 32 of the meeting report of the SSC WG 21. The Deloitte-TECO concluded that rated output of turbine and generator unit, 1,250 kW, in the registered PDD was appropriate at the validation stage with the description of “110% of maximum generating power from turbine”.</p> <p>The Deloitte-TECO confirmed by performing on-site inspection (including nameplates and reviewing “Electricity equipment inspection reports before operation” (Attachment 1) and “Electricity equipment regular inspection reports (issued in 2012)” that the rated output of generator is considered as 1,250 kW, not of 110% of maximum generating power from turbine. Also, the Deloitte-TECO confirmed that #2 hydroelectric power plant was installed and commenced its operation during the validation stage and the installed generator has 1,250 kW rated output and #1 hydroelectric power plant was also installed as plan. The PP decided to implement PRC for correction about equipment information in the PDD.</p> <p>The Deloitte-TECO confirmed that there was no equipment change after installation and during the monitoring period. The Deloitte-TECO concluded that the PRC for correction for generator output rate and other minor information do not affect the project design. The Deloitte-TECO confirmed the MR and PDD were correctly revised. (CAR 01 was closed)</p> <p>The Deloitte-TECO confirmed by interviewing the PP and reviewing the revised CDM monitoring procedure that the managing and operating system for monitoring in the PDD was changed and the staff in the registered PDD were also changed to new staff under the regular position changes during the monitoring period. Monitoring and operation system was functioning in accordance with the registered PDD, but the responsibilities and authorities were transferred to the other team. The managing and operating system for monitoring during the monitoring period was updated in the MR and in the registered PDD. Staff names were not stated in the revised PDD. The Deloitte-TECO confirmed that the PP correctly revised PDD and MR for the PRC. (CL 01 was closed)</p>
--	---

#### D.4. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

Means of validation	Not applicable as no changes to the registered PDD were necessary.
Findings	-
Conclusion	Not applicable

#### D.5. Inclusion of a monitoring plan to a registered project activity

Means of validation	<p>309. The DOE shall confirm that the registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD does not contain the information related to the monitoring plan and states the decision of the project participants or coordinating/managing entity to delay the submission of the monitoring plan.</p> <p>310. The DOE shall follow the relevant requirements related to validation of the monitoring plan in section 7.11.9.2 above to validate the monitoring plan in the revised PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD.</p>
Findings	-
Conclusion	Not applicable

#### D.6. Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline

Means of validation	313. The DOE shall determine whether the changes to the registered monitoring plan described in the revised PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD are in compliance with the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline and
---------------------	---



	<p>do not reduce the level of accuracy of the monitoring compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan.</p> <p>314. In cases where the proposed changes refer to a later valid version of the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline in the registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD, the DOE shall determine whether the application of all the requirements in any later valid version of the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline does not impact the conservativeness of the monitoring and verification process, including the related emission reduction calculations.</p> <p>315. The DOE shall determine whether the permanent changes are likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions. In cases where the DOE considers that the permanent changes will lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions, the DOE shall request the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity to apply conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions will not be overestimated as a result of the permanent change.</p>
<b>Findings</b>	<p>The Deloitte-TECO found out that the PP cannot control calibration frequency of EG<sub>in</sub> meters consistent with the registered PDD because the EG<sub>in</sub> meters are owned by the KEPCO and not within the control of PP. The PP claimed to change calibration frequency of EG<sub>in</sub> meter from once a year to once in seven years (CL 02 was issued.)</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>The Deloitte-TECO found out that the PP cannot control calibration frequency of EG<sub>in</sub> meters consistent with the registered PDD because the EG<sub>in</sub> meters are owned by KEPCO and the meters are not within the control of PP.</p> <p>According to "Act on operation of electricity market" (Attachment 2) issued by KPX, the regulated calibration frequency is three years and six months <math>\pm</math> six months for meter more than 1 MW and exemption for meters less than 1 MW. The Deloitte-TECO confirmed that the contract demand for electricity of EG<sub>in</sub> meter in the project is 120 kW for #1 hydroelectric power plant and 80 kW for #2 hydroelectric power plant, which are less than 1,000 kW. The Deloitte-TECO confirmed that the PP cannot guarantee to calibrate EG<sub>in</sub> meter every year or even once in three years and six months <math>\pm</math> six months under this circumstance.</p> <p>According to additional local regulation, "Measures Act" (it was translated as "Law regarding measurement" in the registered PDD) (Attachment 3), the Deloitte-TECO confirmed that the valid period for the authorized certification of electricity meter is seven years and the meter has to be calibrated before the expiration date, if electrical power supplier wants to use it for more than seven years.</p> <p>The Deloitte-TECO concluded that the calibration frequency of EG<sub>in</sub> meters change from once in three years to once in seven years is appropriate in this circumstance. (CL 02 was closed)</p>

#### D.7. Changes to the project design of a registered project activity

<b>Means of validation</b>	<p>318. In case of actual changes, the DOE shall, by means of an on-site inspection and review of the submitted revised PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, which describes the nature and extent of the actual changes, determine whether this description accurately reflects the implementation, operation and monitoring of the modified CDM project activity, PoA or CPA.</p> <p>319. The DOE shall conduct an on-site inspection to assess the impacts of the actual changes on the compliance of the monitoring plan, the level of accuracy of the monitoring activity, the applied monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and/or, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline.</p> <p>320. The DOE shall, by means of reviewing the revised PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD against applicable additionality and methodological requirements, determine whether the proposed or actual changes would adversely affect the conclusions of the validation report of the registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD with regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Additionality of the registered CDM project activity or PoA;</li> <li>(b) Scale of the registered CDM project activity or included CDM CPA;</li> <li>(c) Applicability and application of the approved baseline methodology and, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline under which the CDM project</li> </ul>
----------------------------	--

	<p>activity, PoA or CPA has been registered or included; or</p> <p>(d) The compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied monitoring methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;</p> <p>(e) The eligibility criteria of the registered CDM PoA.</p> <p>321. If the proposed or actual changes affect the additionality of the registered CDM project activity, then the DOE shall confirm that:</p> <p>(a) If investment analysis has been used to demonstrate additionality, project participants have only modified the key parameters in the original spreadsheet calculations affected by the proposed or actual changes to the project activity;</p> <p>(b) If only barriers have been claimed to demonstrate additionality, project participants have demonstrated that the barriers are still valid under the new circumstances.</p> <p>322. The following applies to a registered CDM project activity using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes additionality instead of paragraph 321 above: If the proposed or actual changes affect the additionality of the project activity, then the DOE shall confirm that the project activity complies with the positive list of the applied standardized baseline in the registered PDD.</p> <p>323. The DOE shall confirm that the applied methodology including applied tools and/or the applied standardized baseline do not impact on the conservativeness of the monitoring and verification process and the related emission reduction calculations in cases where:</p> <p>(a) The proposed or actual changes impact on the implementation of the registered CDM project activity or PoA or the included CDM CPA;</p> <p>(b) The original methodology and/or the original standardized baseline would no longer be applicable;</p> <p>(c) The project participant or the coordinating/managing entity applies all the requirements in:</p> <p>(i) Any later valid version of the methodology and/or the standardized baseline; or</p> <p>(ii) Another methodology and/or another standardized baseline that is(are) applicable to the registered CDM project activity or PoA.</p> <p>324. The DOE shall assess whether the revised PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD complies with all the requirements in:</p> <p>(a) The applied methodology, tools and/or standardized baseline;</p> <p>(b) Any later valid version of the methodology and/or the standardized baseline; or</p> <p>(c) Another methodology and/or another standardized baseline that is(are) applicable to the registered CDM project activity or PoA.</p>
<b>Findings</b>	-
<b>Conclusion</b>	Not applicable

#### D.8. Types of changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities

<b>Means of validation</b>	329. In case of actual changes, the DOE shall, by means of an on-site inspection(s), interviews with relevant personnel and/or desk review of the revised PDD submitted by the project participants, which describes the nature and extent of the actual changes, determine whether this description accurately reflects the implementation, operation or monitoring of the modified registered CDM project activity.
<b>Findings</b>	-
<b>Conclusion</b>	Not applicable

### SECTION E. Internal quality control

>>

The draft and final validation assessment opinion were subject to Deloitte-TECO's internal quality control reviews. A technical review was performed by a technical reviewer meeting Deloitte-TECO's qualification standards for CDM validation and verification as follows:

#### Engagement Quality Assurance Review System

		Objective	【IN】	【OUT】	Detail
Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Information	Reports	Comments
1	Certification Director/GH G Group	1)Validation Review the validation was implemented	1)Validation PDD(Monitoring plan)	1)Validation Completion of correction	1)Validation /Verification Checkmark

	Manager	effectively and efficiently from an independent standpoint, in conformity with the required step. Validation check list (Internal review). 2) Verification Review the reduction of GHG. Verification check list (internal review).	Audit plan document Validation/verification report DR DR report VVS(mainly section A, C, and E) 2) Verification Monitoring report, verification report and related documents	requested Confirmation of evidence for VVS Abstract of Audit outcome Witness Review Sheet Validation internal review checklist 2) Verification Review Sheet Verification internal review checklist	Add comments to the abstract Comments to the materiality and uncertainty, consistency of reports, etc.
	In case that Certification Director/GHG Group Manager does not have expertise, include a technical review.	1) Validation Review technically the additionality, baseline methodology, and monitoring methodology. 2) Verification Review the reduction of GHG.	1) Validation The latest approved methodologies PDD(Monitoring plan) Request for review VVS(mainly section B and D) 2) Verification Monitoring report, verification report and related documents	1) Validation Appropriateness of applied methodologies *3 Confirmation of accuracy and reliability of data and equations, Review Sheet 2) Verification Review Sheet	1) Validation/Verification Comments to the materiality and uncertainty, consistency of reports, etc.
	English proof reader	Review and check English grammar, spelling and imprecision of expressions.	Draft report of Validation/Verification/certification	Corrections to the grammar, spelling mistakes and expressions.	File the result of English proofreading
2	Engagement Quality Assurance Reviewer	Review the appropriateness of the process from ordering the CDM project to requesting registration and issuance to EB, based on "Operational Management Procedure CDM (Validation/Verification)	Statement on procedure Abstract of Audit outcome Witness	Engagement Quality Assurance statement for Operational procedure OMP sheet	Fill concerns in the comment field
3	Judgment Committee	Perform the Engagement Quality Assurance Review for the determination of submission to register CDM project and/or the response to the request for review from CDM EB, in order to judge under objective and fair rules, based on the steps (1) and (2).	PDD(Monitoring plan) Draft report of Validation/Verification/Certification	Minutes from of Judgment Committee	Add comments to the minutes
4	Chief Executive Officer	Express the final opinion, based on (1)(2) and (3), for Validation/Verification/Certification	Engagement Quality Assurance statement for Operational procedure	Expression of opinion (Validation/Verification/certification report)	Need to comment if it is an adverse opinion

\*1 Competency of reviewers shall be equal or higher than an audit team leader.

\*2 An audit team leader, an audit director and Engagement Quality Assurance Reviewer shall not be served concurrently by the same personnel.

\*3 Title(s) of evidential document for important expressions specifically representing numeric values and conclusions shall be clearly indicated in reports and VVS checklists.

## SECTION F. Validation opinion

>>

Deloitte-TECO was contracted by Korea Midland Power Co., LTD. (KOMIPO) to verify GHG emission reductions reported by "Korea Midland Power Co., LTD. (KOMIPO) Boryeong Small

Hydroelectric Power Plant Project (ref. 2225)" for the period from 01 August 2009 to 31 July 2014. Deloitte-TECO performed the validation of the Post registration changes included in the revised PDD, version 2.0 with verification for 1<sup>st</sup> monitoring period. The validation was performed on the basis of the specific criteria as per the latest version of VVS (version 09.0), PS (version 09.0), PCP (version 09.0) and other relevant requirements.

The Deloitte-TECO concluded that the correction and permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan do not affect the design of the project activity, accuracy level of monitoring plan based on the applied methodology (AMS.I-D version 13), and local/national standards. The Deloitte-TECO also concluded that the revised PDD (30 August 2016, version 2.0) accurately reflected the changes. Therefore, the post-registration change for correction and permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan were properly conducted with the request of issuance without the need for prior approval by the board based on Appendix 1 of CDM PS.

30 August 2016



---

Hiroshi Inanaga  
Chief Executive Officer  
Deloitte Tohmatsu Evaluation and Certification Organization  
Tokyo, JAPAN

Relevant Documents

- Attachment 1: Relevant part of Electricity equipment inspection reports before operation
- Attachment 2: Relevant part of Act on operation of electricity market
- Attachment 3: Relevant part of Measures Act

## Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
ACM	Approved Consolidated Methodology
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CL	Clarification
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon Dioxide
Deloitte-TECO	Deloitte Tohmatsu Evaluation and Certification Organization
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EB	CDM Executive Board
EF	Emission Factor
EG	Electricity Generation
ER	Emission Reduction
ECOEYE	Energy and Environment Consultancy Company
GWP	Global warming potential
KOMIPO	Korea Midland Power Co., LTD.
KEPCO	Korea Electric Power Corporation
KPX	Korea Power Exchange
KTC	Korea Testing Certification
FAR	Forward Action Request
FSR	Feasibility Study Report
GHG	Greenhouse Gas(es)
GSC	Global Stakeholder Consultation
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
MR	Monitoring Report
PCP	CDM Project Cycle Procedure
PDD	Project Design Document
PO	Project Owner
PP	Project Participant(s)
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
PRC	Post Registration Change
PS	CDM Project Standard
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
SCADA	Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard

## Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

### ➤ Team Leader

<b>Name:</b>	PARK, Yong Tae	
<b>Position:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Lead Auditor <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Auditor <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Technical Expert	
<b>Fields of</b>	<b>Sectoral Scopes (SS)</b>	<b>Technical Areas (TA)</b>

<b>Expertise:</b>	SS 1: Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TA 1.2: Renewables
	SS 2: Energy distribution	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 2.1: Electricity distribution
	SS 3: Energy demand	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 3.1: Energy demand
	SS 4: Manufacturing industries	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 4.1: Cement and Lime Production
	SS 5: Chemical industry	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 5.1: Chemical process industries
		<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 5.2: Caprolactam, nitric and adipic acid
	SS 6: Construction	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 6.1: Construction
	SS 7: Transport	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 7.1: Transport
	SS 8: Mining/mineral production	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 8.1: Mining and mineral Production
	SS 9: Metal production	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 9.1: Aluminum and magnesium production
		<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 9.2: Iron steel and Ferro-alloy production
	SS 10: Fugitive emissions from fuels (solid, oil and gas)	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 10.1: Fugitive emissions from oil and gas
	SS 11: Fugitive emissions from production and consumption of halocarbons and sulphur hexafluoride	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 11.1: Emissions of fluorinated gases
		<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 11.2: Refrigerant gas production
	SS 12: Solvents use	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 12.1: Chemical industries
	SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater
		<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 13.2: Manure
SS 14: Afforestation and reforestation	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 14.1: Afforestation and reforestation	
SS 15: Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 15.1: Agriculture	
SS 16: Carbon capture and storage of CO2 in geological formations	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 16.1: Carbon Capture and Storage	
<b>Approved by:</b>	INANAGA, Hiroshi, Chief Executive Officer of Deloitte-TECO		

NOTE: In accordance with Deloitte-TECO's "Auditor's List with Technical Areas of Sectoral Scopes"

➤ Team member

<b>Name:</b>	HAYASHI, Toshio		
<b>Position:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Lead Auditor <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Auditor <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Technical Expert		
<b>Fields of Expertise:</b>	<b>Sectoral Scopes (SS)</b>		<b>Technical Areas (TA)</b>
	SS 1: Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TA 1.2: Renewables
	SS 2: Energy distribution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TA 2.1: Electricity distribution
	SS 3: Energy demand	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TA 3.1: Energy demand
	SS 4: Manufacturing industries	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 4.1: Cement and Lime Production
	SS 5: Chemical industry	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TA 5.1: Chemical process industries
		<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 5.2: Caprolactam, nitric and adipic acid
	SS 6: Construction	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 6.1: Construction
SS 7: Transport	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 7.1: Transport	

	SS 8: Mining/mineral production	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 8.1: Mining and mineral Production
	SS 9: Metal production	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 9.1: Aluminum and magnesium production
		<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 9.2: Iron steel and Ferro-alloy production
	SS 10: Fugitive emissions from fuels (solid, oil and gas)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TA 10.1: Fugitive emissions from oil and gas
	SS 11: Fugitive emissions from production and consumption of halocarbons and sulphur hexafluoride	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 11.1: Emissions of fluorinated gases
		<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 11.2: Refrigerant gas production
	SS 12: Solvents use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TA 12.1: Chemical industries
	SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater
		<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 13.2: Manure
	SS 14: Afforestation and reforestation	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 14.1: Afforestation and reforestation
SS 15: Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 15.1: Agriculture	
SS 16: Carbon capture and storage of CO2 in geological formations	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 16.1: Carbon Capture and Storage	
<b>Approved by:</b>	INANAGA, Hiroshi, Chief Executive Officer of Deloitte-TECO		

NOTE: In accordance with Deloitte-TECO's "Auditor's List with Technical Areas of Sectoral Scopes"

➤ Technical Reviewer

<b>Name:</b>	OTANI, Yuichi		
<b>Position:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Lead Auditor <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Auditor <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Technical Expert		
<b>Fields of Expertise:</b>	<b>Sectoral Scopes (SS)</b>	<b>Technical Areas (TA)</b>	
	SS 1: Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TA 1.2: Renewables
	SS 2: Energy distribution	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 2.1: Electricity distribution
	SS 3: Energy demand	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 3.1: Energy demand
	SS 4: Manufacturing industries	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 4.1: Cement and Lime Production
	SS 5: Chemical industry	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 5.1: Chemical process industries
		<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 5.2: Caprolactam, nitric and adipic acid
	SS 6: Construction	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 6.1: Construction
	SS 7: Transport	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 7.1: Transport
	SS 8: Mining/mineral production	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 8.1: Mining and mineral Production
	SS 9: Metal production	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 9.1: Aluminum and magnesium production
		<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 9.2: Iron steel and Ferro-alloy production
	SS 10: Fugitive emissions from fuels (solid, oil and gas)	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 10.1: Fugitive emissions from oil and gas
	SS 11: Fugitive emissions from production and consumption of halocarbons and sulphur	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 11.1: Emissions of fluorinated gases
<input type="checkbox"/>		TA 11.2: Refrigerant gas production	

	hexafluoride		
	SS 12: Solvents use	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 12.1: Chemical industries
	SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater
		<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 13.2: Manure
	SS 14: Afforestation and reforestation	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 14.1: Afforestation and reforestation
	SS 15: Agriculture	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TA 15.1: Agriculture
	SS 16: Carbon capture and storage of CO2 in geological formations	<input type="checkbox"/>	TA 16.1: Carbon Capture and Storage
<b>Approved by:</b>	INANAGA, Hiroshi, Chief Executive Officer of Deloitte-TECO		

NOTE: In accordance with Deloitte-TECO's "Auditor's List with Technical Areas of Sectoral Scopes"



### Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1	KOMIPO	Monitoring Report (Final version)		PP
2	KOMIPO	Monitoring Report for GSC (version 1.0)		PP
3	KOMIPO	ER Calculation sheet (Initial)		PP
	KOMIPO	ER Calculation sheet (Final)		PP
4	KOMIPO	Revised PDD (Version 2.0)		PP
5	KOMIPO	The latest CDM Monitoring Manual		PP
6	Doosan Heavy Industry	Construction completion report		Others
7	Korea Electricity Safety Corporation	Electricity equipment inspection report before operation		Others
8	Korea Electricity Safety Corporation	Electricity equipment regular inspection reports		Others
9	KPX	Hydropower plant Initial parallel In, Synchronizing notification		Others
10	Doosan Heavy Industry	Hydro power plant electrical power facilities electricity line diagram		Other
11	KPX	Electricity trade record confirmation (Records of electricity supplied to the grid during the monitoring period)		Other
12	KEPCO	Record of imported electricity data of KEPCO's internal data and ISMART during the monitoring period	Monthly	Others
13	KOMIPO	Business license		PP
14	Calibration entities	Calibration reports of meters (electricity exported meter)	KCT	Others
15	KEPCO	Internal document for electricity meter maintenance		Others
16	KOMIPO KPX	Meter Registrations for EG <sub>out</sub> meters		PP and Other
17	KOMIPO	Notification of electricity meter calibration for #2 hydropower plant (Internal document, on 17 Feb 2010)		PP
18	KOMIPO KPX	Evidence of Application for meter unsealing and sealing (for calibration of 17 February 2010)	KPX website	Other
19	KOMIPO	Tax statement for calibration of 17 February 2010		PP
20	Korea electric engineering association	Certificate of electricity safety control training course		Others
21	Korea electric engineering association	Certificate of electricity safety manager assignment		Others
22	KOMIPO	Overhaul, downtime and equipment exchange report	During the monitoring period	PP
23	KOMIPO	Procedure for environmental emergency		PP

24	KOMIPO	Procedure for safety/health management		PP
25	KOMIPO	Emergency treatment manual for fire and incident.		PP
26	Korea Standards Association	ISO Certificate (QMS, EMS)		Other
27	CDM Executive Board	AMS-I.D. (ver. 13) – Grid connected renewable electricity generation	CDM Web site	Others
28	CDM Executive Board	Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, ver. 02	CDM Web site	Others
29	CDM Executive Board	Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption	CDM Web site	Others
30	CDM Executive Board	Registered PDD (Version 1.4 18 August 2008)	CDM Web site	Others
31	CDM Executive Board	Registered Validation Report	CDM Web site	Others
32	KPX	Act on operation of electricity market	Web site	Others
33	Ministry of Trade, Industry and Energy	Measures Act	Web site	Others
34	Ministry of Trade, Industry and Energy	Enforcement Decree of the Measures Act	Web site	Others

## Appendix 4. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests

Table 1. CL from this validation

CL ID	01	Section no.	D.3	Date: 10 May 2016
<b>Description of CL</b>				
<i>DOE confirmed that the managing and operating system for monitoring the registered PDD and MR were not in accordance with the actual implementation.</i>				
<b>Project participant response</b>				Date: 23 June 2016
<i>The structure was changed to the actual situation in the monitoring period. It was reflected on the section C of MR.</i>				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
- The revised MR				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				Date: 26 July 2016
<p>The Deloitte-TECO confirmed by interviewing with the PP and reviewing the revised CDM monitoring procedure that the managing and operating system for monitoring in the PDD was changed and the staffs in the registered PDD were also changed to new staffs based on the regular position changes during the monitoring period.</p> <p>Monitoring and operation system was functioned in accordance with the registered PDD but the responsibilities and authorities were transferred to the other team. The managing and operating system for monitoring during the monitoring period was updated in the MR and in the registered PDD. Staff's names were not stated in the revised PDD. The Deloitte-TECO concluded that the managing and operating system for the monitoring period was correctly revised in the MR. This CL was closed.</p>				

CL ID	02	Section no.	D.6	Date: 10 May 2016
<b>Description of CL</b>				

<i>The PP regulated calibration frequency once a year in the registered PDD. However, the PP claimed to change the calibration frequency of EGi<sub>n</sub> meter from once a year to once in seven years. The meter was owned by KEPCO, a national grid, and is not within the control of the PP. The PP cannot implement and control calibration of the meter. Documentary evidence, that demonstrates calibration frequency change to once in seven years is appropriate, such as local regulation, needs to be provided.</i>	
<b>Project participant response</b>	<b>Date:</b> 26 July 2016
<i>The watt-hour meter for electricity imported from the grid is not within the control of project participants and calibration frequency of the watt-hour meter in national standard is once in seven years. Therefore, post-registration change need to be conducted.</i>	
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Act on operation of electricity market</li> <li>- Measures Act</li> <li>- The revised MR and revised PDD</li> </ul>	
<b>DOE assessment</b>	<b>Date:</b> 12 August 2016
<p>The Deloitte-TECO found out that the PP cannot control calibration frequency of EG<sub>in</sub> meters in consistent with the registered PDD because the EG<sub>in</sub> meters are owned by the KEPCO and the meters are not within the control of PP.</p> <p>According to "Act on operation of electricity market" issued by KPX, the regulated calibration frequency is three years and six months ± six months for meter over 1MW and exemption for meter less than 1MW. The Deloitte-TECO confirmed that the contract demand electricity of EG<sub>in</sub> meter in the project is 120 kW for #1 hydroelectric power plant and 80 kW for #2 hydroelectric power plant, which are less than 1MW. The Deloitte-TECO confirmed that the PP cannot guarantee to calibrate EG<sub>in</sub> meter every year or even once in three years and six months ± six months under this circumstance.</p> <p>According to additional local regulation, "Measures Act", the Deloitte-TECO confirmed that the valid period for the authorized certification is seven years and the meter has to be calibrated before the expiration date. The Deloitte-TECO concluded that calibration frequency of EG<sub>in</sub> meter change from once a year to once in seven years is appropriate in this circumstance. PRC for "Permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or monitoring methodology" was conducted with request for issuance. The Deloitte-TECO confirmed that the relevant part of the PDD was revised properly for PRC. This CL was closed.</p>	

Table 2. CAR from this validation

<b>CAR ID</b>	01	<b>Section no.</b>	D.3	<b>Date:</b> 10 May 2016
<b>Description of CAR</b>				
<i>The Deloitte-TECO confirmed by performing on-site assessment there are some technical specifications that are not in accordance with those in the registered PDD. Especially, the output power is stated "110% of maximum generating power from turbine" in the registered PDD.</i>				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date:</b> 5 July 2016
<i>Specification of small scale hydro power equipment was incorrectly stated as the specification of generator and turbine in the registered the PDD. Actual specification and value are confirmed from "Electricity equipment regular inspection reports". Therefore, specification of actual generator and turbine was revised in MR and reflected in the revised the PDD. Total capacity is not changed in the PDD registration. PRC for correction is implemented.</i>				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Electricity equipment inspection reports before operation</li> <li>- Electricity equipment regular inspection reports (issued in 2012)</li> <li>- Nameplate of turbine and generation units</li> <li>- The meeting report of the SSC WG 21</li> <li>- The revised PDD and MR</li> </ul>				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date:</b> 12 August 2016

According to the registered PDD, it was stated that “110% of maximum generating power from turbine” for the output power of generator, which means that the maximum capacity of each turbine and generator unit is calculated as 1,375 MW under the paragraph 99. (a) of latest PS ver. 09.0.

However, the Deloitte-TECO confirmed that the requirement of PS was not available during the validation stage of this project. After request for registration, the EB clarification was announced that “the SSC WG agreed to clarify that the maximum or rated/installed capacity for small scale CDM hydro-electric project can be determined using one of the following options (in the order of preference): a) Nameplate/rated capacity of the turbine i.e., based on turbine manufacturer’s specification and b) Generator capacity in MW (which is an equivalent of name plate/rated capacity in MVA times the name plate/rated power factor, specified by the manufacturer).” paragraph 32 of the meeting report of the SSC WG 21. The Deloitte-TECO concluded that rated output of turbine and generator unit, 1,250 kW, in the registered PDD was appropriate at the validation stage with the description of “110% of maximum generating power from turbine”.

The Deloitte-TECO confirmed by performing on-site inspection (including nameplates and reviewing “Electricity equipment inspection reports before operation” and “Electricity equipment regular inspection reports (issued in 2012)” that the rated output of generator is considered as 1,250 kW, not of 110% of maximum generating power from turbine. Also, the Deloitte-TECO confirmed that #2 hydroelectric power plant was installed and commenced its operation during the validation stage and the installed generator has 1,250 kW rated output and #1 hydroelectric power plant was also installed as plan. The PP decided to implement PRC for correction about equipment information in the PDD.

The Deloitte-TECO confirmed that there was no equipment change after installation and during the monitoring period. The Deloitte-TECO concluded that the PRC for correction for generator output rate and other minor information do not affect the project design. The Deloitte-TECO confirmed the MR and PDD were correctly revised. This CAR is closed.

**Table 3. FAR from this validation**

<b>FAR ID</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>Section no.</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>Date: -</b>
<b>Description of FAR</b>				
-				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date: -</b>
-				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
-				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date: -</b>
-				