




**Validation report form for post-registration changes for  
CDM project activities  
(Version 03.0)**

**BASIC INFORMATION**

<b>Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity</b>	<b>Title:</b> Chutak Hydroelectric Project <b>UNFCCC reference number:</b> 2025
<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</b>	02
<b>Completion date of the validation report</b>	31/12/2020
<b>Type(s) of PRCs</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents <sup>1</sup> <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 <input type="checkbox"/> Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes to the project design <input type="checkbox"/> Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities
<b>Version number of PDD to which this report applies</b>	12
<b>Project participants</b>	NHPC Limited
<b>Host Party</b>	India
<b>Applied methodologies and standardized baselines</b>	ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, Version 06 Standardized baseline: NA
<b>Mandatory sectoral scopes</b>	Sectoral scope – 01 Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)
<b>Conditional sectoral scopes, if applicable</b>	NA
<b>Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE</b>	KBS Certification Services Private Limited (KBS) Ref. No. E-0051

<sup>1</sup> Other standards, methodologies, methodological tools and guidelines (to be) applied in accordance with the applied(selected) methodologies are collectively referred to as the other (applied) methodological regulatory documents).

Name, position and signature of the approver of the validation report



Mr. Kaushal Goyal  
Managing Director

**SECTION A. Executive summary**

>>The project activity consists of a hydroelectric run-of-river plant with an installed capacity of 44 MW. It includes four turbines each of the capacity of 11 MW to generate clean and reliable electric power that is transmitted to the Northern Grid. The project displaces power generation using fossil fuels and hence leads to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. NHPC Limited., which is a Government of India Enterprise has developed the project. It is located in Minji Village in Kargil District, Jammu & Kashmir State, India.

The summary of proposed changes are summarized as follows:

<b>Post Registration Changes</b>	
<b>Sl. No.</b>	<b>Corrections in the PDD</b>
1.	Minor spelling/editorial corrections and revising appendix numbers.
2.	Updating various sections of the PDD as per the requirement of the PDD filling guidelines of the latest PDD template.
3.	The commissioning details of the project have been updated in the PDD.
4.	The name of the project participant has been changed from National Hydroelectric Power Corporation Ltd. to NHPC Limited.
5.	The name of "Union Territories of Ladakh" has been included.
6.	The start date of the crediting period has been revised and corrected in accordance with the start date mentioned in the UNFCCC website ( <a href="https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1218186379.41/view">https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1218186379.41/view</a> ) from 01/02/2011 to 31/01/2012.
<b>Sl. No.</b>	<b>Changes to the project design</b>
1.	As per the registered PDD/2/, the length of the head race tunnel is 4,370 m long, the length of Tail Race Tunnel is 50 m long and the power density is 44 MW per 0.135 km <sup>2</sup> i.e. very high 326 W/m <sup>2</sup> , compared to dam-based hydroelectric projects. PP has changed the length of the head race tunnel to 4,767 m long, the length of Tail Race Tunnel to 55 m long and the power density to 44 MW per 0.0481 km <sup>2</sup> i.e. very high 915, compared to dam-based hydroelectric projects.

The scope of the validation is defined as an independent and objective review of the revised project design document, the project's baseline study and monitoring plan and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against the CDM Validation and Verification Standard (version 02) and Project Standard (version 02), Kyoto Protocol requirements and UNFCCC rules. The report is based on the assessment of the revised project design document undertaken through stakeholder consultations, application of standard auditing techniques including but not limited to desk review, follow up actions (e.g., remote audit, electronic (telephone or e-mail) interviews) and also the review of the applicable approved methodological and relevant tools, guidance and CDM decisions.

Validation methodology and process

The validation has been performed as described in the VVS version 02.0 and constitutes the following steps:

- Desk review of the revised PDD and the relevant documents
- Interviews
- Issuance of Validation Report for the post-registration changes

Validation criteria

The following CDM requirements have been considered:

- Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol,
- Modalities and procedures for CDM (Marrakech Accords)
- Subsequent decisions by the COP/MOP and CDM Executive Board
- Host country criteria
- Criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided KBS with sufficient evidence to determine the project's fulfillment of all the stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all applicable UNFCCC requirements for the CDM.

**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/document review	On-site inspection/ Remote audit	Interviews	Validation findings
1.	Team Leader, Technical Expert (1.2) , Local Expert	IR	Kandari	Sanjay	Central office	x	x	x	x
2.	Validator	IR	Dey	Ms. Deboshmita	Central office	x	x	x	x

**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 (TA 1.2)	IR	Chaudhari	Mr. Tushar	Central office
2.	Manager (Technical & Certification)	IR	Chaudhari	Mr. Tushar	Central office
3.	Authorizer	IR	Goyal	Mr. Kaushal	Central office

**SECTION C. Means of validation****C.1. Desk/document review**

&gt;&gt;A desk review is undertaken, involving but not limited to,

- A review of the data and information presented to verify their completeness;
- A review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures;
- An evaluation of data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions.

The list of documents reviewed is included in the section 'Appendix 3' of this report.

## C.2. On-site inspection

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, taking into account the CDM Executive Board announcement to relax mandatory site visits till 30 June 2021/12/, rules of relevant national and local authorities (local to the DOE offices as well as to locality of the site visits), World Health Organization (WHO) recommendations, policies of the DOE and other relevant travel restrictions and guidance (for example, a requirement to self-isolate upon return from specific countries), A DOE may postpone site visits for onsite inspections required by the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities (version 02.0) (VVS-PA)"/09/.

If the site visits cannot be postponed, a proper justification should be provided by the DOE why the site visits cannot be postponed, including the demonstration of a significant impact of delaying the site visits on the DOE, or project participants or coordinating/ managing entity (e.g. commitment/ timeline as per the validation or verification contract, CER delivery commitment by project participants) reliance on applicable force majeure provisions in the validation or verification contracts, if needed.

KBS has contractual commitment for the verification process with PP and therefore, due to contractual obligations, the site visit cannot be postponed for an indefinite period of time. On consideration of the health risks posed by the COVID- 19 pandemic along with the dynamic nature of travel restrictions (throughout India), it has been determined that the physical site visit cannot be conducted in the current circumstances. Since, the site visit cannot be postponed but is not conducted due to the pandemic, DOE has used other standard auditing techniques (recommended by CDM EB) for verification as referred to in sections 9.1.3 of the VVS for PA /09/.

Assessment team has used the following alternative means for its assessment and to justify that they are sufficient for the purpose of validation. Along with desk review, audit team has conducted remote audit interview as follows:

- A complete desk review of the revised PDD.
- Assessment team has performed Zoom application interview with PP in order to check the changes in the project design.
- Cross checks between information provided by interviewed personnel (i.e. by checking sources) to ensure that no relevant information has been omitted.
- Cross-check evaluation, for information received from interviews, under the scope of all information and references provided in revised PDD and supporting documents.

Details of interviewees, topics covered and additional information presented in the below section “C.3 Interviews”.

Duration of on-site inspection: DD/MM/YYYY to DD/MM/YYYY				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.				
...				

## C.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Mohanty	Niroj	Core carbon x	08/07/2020 (Remote audit through Zoom application)	Changes in the project design	Sanjay Kandari and Deboshmita Dey
2.	Sharma	Ravindra	Senior manager, NHPC			

## C.4. Sampling approach

>> Not applicable.

**C.5. Clarification requests (CLs), corrective action requests (CARs) and forward action requests (FARs) raised**

Areas of validation findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance with PDD form	00	00	00
Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents	00	00	00
Corrections	00	00	00
Changes to the start date of the crediting period	00	00	00
Inclusion of a monitoring plan	00	00	00
Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents	00	00	00
Changes to the project design	00	00	00
Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities	00	00	00
Others (please specify)	00	00	00
<b>Total</b>	00	00	00

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

<b>Means of validation</b>	The validation team reviewed the PDD/1/ that was provided by PP as part of proposed PRC and compared them with the current valid templates/form for PDD/11/ as available at UNFCCC website and found that these were consistent.
<b>Findings</b>	No findings raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	The validation team confirms that the proposed post registration changes as included in the revised PDD/1/ were presented by using the registered PDD/2/ and inline with the latest valid version of CDM-PDD-FORM/11/ and is in compliance with the instructions contained therein.

**D.2. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents**

<b>Means of validation</b>	Not applicable.
<b>Findings</b>	Not applicable.
<b>Conclusion</b>	Not applicable.

**D.3. Corrections**

<b>Means of validation</b>	Some editing and restructuring of information has been done by PP, due to change of PDD template from old version to new version. Further, the following corrections are proposed in the revised PDD, which is summarized as follows: <table border="1" data-bbox="448 1585 1442 2051"> <tr> <th colspan="2">Post Registration Changes</th></tr> <tr> <th>S. No.</th><th>Corrections in the revised PDD</th></tr> <tr> <td>1.</td><td>Minor spelling/editorial corrections and revising appendix numbers.</td></tr> <tr> <td>2.</td><td>Updating various sections of the PDD as per the requirement of the PDD filling guidelines of the latest PDD template.</td></tr> <tr> <td>3.</td><td>The exact commissioning details of the project have been added in the PDD since the registered PDD had the expected dates of commissioning. The date was found consistent with the commissioning certificate/05/.</td></tr> <tr> <td>4.</td><td>The name of the project participant has been changed from National Hydroelectric Power Corporation Ltd. to NHPC Limited. as per the revised LoA/13/.</td></tr> <tr> <td>5.</td><td>The name of "Union Territories of Ladakh" has been included.</td></tr> <tr> <td>6.</td><td>The start date of the crediting period has been revised and corrected in accordance with the start date mentioned in the UNFCCC website</td></tr> </table>	Post Registration Changes		S. No.	Corrections in the revised PDD	1.	Minor spelling/editorial corrections and revising appendix numbers.	2.	Updating various sections of the PDD as per the requirement of the PDD filling guidelines of the latest PDD template.	3.	The exact commissioning details of the project have been added in the PDD since the registered PDD had the expected dates of commissioning. The date was found consistent with the commissioning certificate/05/.	4.	The name of the project participant has been changed from National Hydroelectric Power Corporation Ltd. to NHPC Limited. as per the revised LoA/13/.	5.	The name of "Union Territories of Ladakh" has been included.	6.	The start date of the crediting period has been revised and corrected in accordance with the start date mentioned in the UNFCCC website
Post Registration Changes																	
S. No.	Corrections in the revised PDD																
1.	Minor spelling/editorial corrections and revising appendix numbers.																
2.	Updating various sections of the PDD as per the requirement of the PDD filling guidelines of the latest PDD template.																
3.	The exact commissioning details of the project have been added in the PDD since the registered PDD had the expected dates of commissioning. The date was found consistent with the commissioning certificate/05/.																
4.	The name of the project participant has been changed from National Hydroelectric Power Corporation Ltd. to NHPC Limited. as per the revised LoA/13/.																
5.	The name of "Union Territories of Ladakh" has been included.																
6.	The start date of the crediting period has been revised and corrected in accordance with the start date mentioned in the UNFCCC website																

	<a href="https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1218186379.41/view">https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1218186379.41/view</a> )- from 01/02/2011 to 31/01/2012.
	<p>The assessment team confirms that the corrected information is the reflection of actual project information and does not affect any provision of the applied methodology in any manner, as a result, is in accordance with the applied methodology.</p>
<b>Findings</b>	No findings raised.
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>Based on the review of PDD and interview with PP, the validation team has accepted all the proposed corrections in the PDD in accordance with requirements of VVS for project activities (version 02.0). The assessment team confirms that the corrected information is an accurate reflection of actual project information and are in accordance with the applied methodology, the monitoring plan.</p> <p>The validation team confirms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The corrected information is an accurate reflection of actual project information;</li> <li>✓ The corrected information is in accordance with the applied methodology and registered monitoring plan.</li> <li>✓ the proposed revision points have been described, and an assessment has been provided to substantiate the reasons for each of the proposed revision points of the registered PDD, using objective evidence;</li> <li>✓ the proposed revision of the PDD ensures that the level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring and verification process is not reduced as a result of the revisions;</li> <li>✓ the proposed revision of the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved monitoring methodology (ACM0002, Version 06) applicable to the project whilst ensuring the conservativeness of the emission reductions calculation;</li> <li>✓ the information included in the latest PDD template is materially the same as the information in the registered PDD. The changes that are subject of the request for approval are in track change.</li> </ul>

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

<b>Means of validation</b>	Not applicable.
<b>Findings</b>	Not applicable.
<b>Conclusion</b>	Not applicable.

**D.5. Inclusion of a monitoring plan**

<b>Means of validation</b>	Not applicable.
<b>Findings</b>	Not applicable.
<b>Conclusion</b>	Not applicable.

**D.6. Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents**

<b>Means of validation</b>	Not applicable.
<b>Findings</b>	Not applicable.
<b>Conclusion</b>	Not applicable.

**D.7. Changes to the project design**

<b>Means of validation</b>	<p>The changes in the project design is summarized as follows by the PP:</p> <p>The registered PDD/2/ states that the length of the head race tunnel is 4,370 m long, the length of Tail Race Tunnel is 50 m long and the power density is 44 MW per 0.135 km<sup>2</sup> i.e. very high 326 W/m<sup>2</sup>, compared to dam-based hydroelectric projects.</p> <p>PP has changed the length of the head race tunnel to 4,767 m long, the length of</p>
----------------------------	---

Tail Race Tunnel to 55 m long and the power density to 44 MW per 0.0481 km<sup>2</sup> i.e. very high 915, compared to dam-based hydroelectric projects in the revised PDD/01/.

#### **Assessment of the post registration changes:**

The above reported changes were assessed by assessment team in accordance with para 1(d) of Appendix 1 of CDM PS for PAs version 2/10/ which states that:

“Changes to the project design of a registered CDM project activity that do not adversely impact any of the following:

- (i) The applicability and application of the applied methodologies, the applied standardized baselines and the other applied methodological regulatory documents with which the project activity has been registered;
- (ii) The additionality of the project activity; (iii) The scale of the project activity”

The assessments are summarized below:

#### **1. Application and applicability of Methodology:**

As reported in the revised PDD by the PP and verified by assessment team during remote audit and document review, the project installed capacity is still 44 MW which is similar to the registered PDD. Since the project's actual installed capacity is still higher than 15 MWe and comes under large scale project therefore the applicability of methodology ACM0002, version 6.0 is still applicable. Assessment team checked all the applicability criteria of applied methodology ACM0002, version 6 and concluded that the project still hold applicable on the capacity since it is unchanged even due to change in length of the head race tunnel and Tail Race Tunnel.

#### **2. Additionality of the project activity:**

As reported in the revised PDD by the PP and verified by assessment team during remote audit and document review, the project installed capacity is still 44 MW which is similar to the registered PDD. Hence, there is no adverse impact on the additionality of the project since the technology is similar to the previously registered technology in terms of input and output, no changes in the monitoring plan, level of accuracy of the monitoring activity, applied methodology, and regulatory documents have been observed.

#### **3. The scale of the project activity:**

Since the project actual installed capacity is still higher than 15 MWe, it is a large scale project.

The validation team would like to confirm that the changes in the project design in the actual scenario, there is no adverse impact on the Application and applicability of methodology, Additionality and scale of the project activity. Since, the technology is similar to the previously registered technology in terms of input and output, additionality, no changes in the monitoring plan, level of accuracy of the monitoring activity, applied methodology, and regulatory documents have been observed.

Hence, the project does not require prior approval and therefore assessed by the assessment team in accordance with para 1(d) of Appendix 1 of CDM PS for PAs version 2/10/.



	Following the requirements of the CDM VVS for PAs version 02.0, validation team has conducted remote interview and reviewed technical documents along with submitted revised PDD/1/. Based on the above, validation team confirms that the description of the Post Registration Change accurately reflects the implementation, operation and monitoring of the modified project design of the project activity.
<b>Findings</b>	No findings raised.
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>The DOE confirms the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed or actual changes comply with the relevant requirements in the Project standard/10/ and Validation &amp; Verification standard/09/ related to changes to the registered CDM project design of a registered CDM PA.</li> <li>• The proposed revisions comply with the applied methodology/08/ and applied tools.</li> <li>• The additionality and the scale of the PA will not be affected by the changes.</li> <li>• All the changes have been clearly stated in the appropriate sections in the revised PDD/01/.</li> </ul>

#### D.8. Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities

<b>Means of validation</b>	Not applicable.
<b>Findings</b>	Not applicable.
<b>Conclusion</b>	Not applicable.

#### SECTION E. Internal quality control

>> The draft validation report prepared by team leader is reviewed by an independent technical reviewer (having competence of relevant technical area himself/herself or through an independent technical area expert) to confirm the internal procedures established by KBS are duly followed and the validation report/opinion is reached in an objective manner and complies with the applicable CDM requirements.

The independent technical reviewer may approve or reject the draft validation report. The findings may be identified even at this stage, which needs to be satisfactorily resolved, before the request for PRC is submitted to UNFCCC. The final decision is taken by the Manager Technical and Certification. The technical reviewer and Manager (Technical & Certification) can be same person.

The final decision is authorized by Managing Director, KBS once the report is approved by the Manager (Technical & Certification).

#### SECTION F. Validation opinion

>>KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd. has been contracted by 'NHPC Limited.' to undertake independent validation of the post registration changes of the CDM Project activity "Chutak Hydroelectric Project" and UNFCCC Reference Number 2025 to ensure that the post registration changes meet all relevant requirements of the UNFCCC for CDM project activities including CDM VVS.

Validation methodology and process:

The validation has been performed as described in the VVS, version 02.0, and consists of the following steps:

- Review of the Registered PDD, version 11 dated 31/03/2009
- Review of the Revised PDD, Version 12 dated 05/11/2020
- Remote audit Interviews
- Preparation of the Validation Report

It is DOE's opinion that the revised documentation submitted is conforming to the requirements for Post Registration Changes as stipulated in the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard and thus DOE is recommending the approval of the post registration changes

## Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
ACM	Approved Consolidated Methodology
BE	Baseline Emissions
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CDM AS	CDM Accreditation Standard
CDM EB	CDM Executive Board
CERs	Certified Emission Reductions
CL	Clarification Request
CO <sub>2</sub> e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
COP	Conference of Parties
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EF	Emission Factor
EI	External Individuals
ERs	Emission Reductions
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHGs	Greenhouse Gas(es)
ISO	International Organization of Standardization
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IR	Internal Resource
KP	Kyoto Protocol
kWh	Kilo Watt Hour
LE	Leakage Emissions
MR	Monitoring Report
MP	Monitoring Plan
MW	Mega Watt
MWh	Mega Watt Hour
O & M	Operation and Maintenance
PE	Project Emissions
PDD	Project Design Document
PLF	Plant Load Factor
PS	Project Standard
PCP	Project Cycle Procedure
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation & Verification Standard

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

Personnel Name:		Sanjay Kandari	
Qualified to work as:			
Team Leader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Technical Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Validator/Verifier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Technical Reviewer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Expert (India)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Area(s) of Technical Expertise			

Sectoral Scope	Technical Area
Energy Industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation from fossil fuels and biomass including thermal electricity from solar
Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	TA 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energy sources
Energy demand	TA 3.1. Energy Demand
Waste Handling and Disposal	TA 13.1 Waste Handling and Disposal TA 13.2 Manure
Approved by (Manager C & T)	Akhilesh Joshi
Approval date:	11/12/2015

Personnel Name:		Deboshmita Dey	
Qualified to work as:			
Team Leader- Trainee	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Technical Expert	<input type="checkbox"/>
Validator/Verifier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial Expert	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Reviewer	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local Expert	<input type="checkbox"/>
Area(s) of Technical Expertise			
Sectoral Scope		Technical Area	
-		-	
Approved by (Manager C & T)		Sanjay Kandari	
Approval date:		03/11/2020	

Personnel Name:		Tushar Chaudhari	
Qualified to work as:			
Team Leader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Technical Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Validator/Verifier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Technical Reviewer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Expert (India)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Area(s) of Technical Expertise			
Sectoral Scope		Technical Area	
Energy Industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation from fossil fuels and biomass including thermal electricity from solar		
Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	TA 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energy sources		
Energy demand	TA 3.1. Energy Demand		
Waste Handling and Disposal	TA 13.1 Waste Handling and Disposal		
Approved by	Manager Competency & Training		
Approval date:	02/09/2020		

### Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1.	NHPC	Revised PDD, Version 12	05/11/2020	NHPC
2.	NHPC	Registered PDD, Version 11	31/03/2009	UNFCCC website
3.	DNV	Validation Report (Report No. 2007-1990)	31/03/2009	UNFCCC website
4.	NHPC & Power Development Department, Jammu & Kashmir	Power Purchase Agreement	Dated 26/10/2005	NHPC
5.	NHPC	Commissioning certificate	dated 01/02/2013	NHPC
6.	PP	Photographic evidences of the meters, name plates of the equipments etc.	-	PP
7.	UNFCCC	Project webpage	<a href="https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1218186379.41/view">https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1218186379.41/view</a>	Web link
8.	UNFCCC	"Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources"	ACM 0002 Version-6	UNFCCC
9.	UNFCCC	CDM Validation and Verification Standard for PA	version 02	UNFCCC
10.	UNFCCC	Clean development mechanism project standard for PA	version 02	UNFCCC
11.	UNFCCC	CDM-PDD-FORM Project design document form, Version 11	<a href="https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/PDDs_Forms/index.html">https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/PDDs_Forms/index.html</a>	UNFCCC
12.	UNFCCC Secretariat	CDM Executive Board announcement to relax mandatory site visits by designated operational entities (DOEs) till 30 June 2021 due to the continuing COVID-19 pandemic	-	UNFCCC Secretariat
13.	DNA of India	Latest Letter of Approval	Dated 23/12/2019	NHPC

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

Table 1. CLs from this validation

No CLs raised.

CL ID	xx	Section no.	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of CL			

<b>Project participant response</b>	<b>Date:</b> DD/MM/YYYY
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>	
<b>DOE assessment</b>	<b>Date:</b> DD/MM/YYYY

Table 2. CARs from this validation

No CARs raised.

<b>CAR ID</b>		<b>Section no.</b>		<b>Date:</b>
<b>Description of CAR</b>				
<b>Project participant response</b>				
<b>Date:</b> DD/MM/YYYY				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				
<b>Date:</b> DD/MM/YYYY				

Table 3. FARs from this validation

No FARs raised.

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

- - - - -

**Document information**

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
03.0	31 May 2019	Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ensure consistency with version 02.0 of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (CDM-EB93-A05-STAN);</li><li>• Make editorial improvements.</li></ul>
02.0	31 October 2017	Revision to align with the requirements in the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (version 01.0).
01.0	23 March 2015	Initial publication.
Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Form Business Function: Registration Keywords: post-registration change, project activities, validation report		