




**Validation report form for renewal of crediting period for
CDM project activities
(Version 03.0)**

Complete this form in accordance with the instructions attached at the end of this form.

BASIC INFORMATION

| | |
|---|---|
| Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity | Wind Power Project at Jath, Maharashtra (UNFCCC number-9154 ¹) |
| Number and duration of the next crediting period | Second renewable crediting period 01/01/2020 to 31/12/2026 |
| Version number of the validation report | 01 |
| Completion date of the validation report | 12/11/2019 |
| Version number of PDD to which this report applies | 08 |
| Project participants | M/s ReNew Wind Energy (Jath) Private Limited Amsterdam Capital Trading B.V. |
| Host Party | India |
| Applied methodologies and standardized baselines | ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" Version 19.0. |
| Mandatory sectoral scopes | 01 |
| Conditional sectoral scopes, if applicable | NA |
| Estimated amount of annual average GHG emission reductions or GHG removals by sinks in the next crediting period | 159,773 tCO ₂ e |
| Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE | Earthood Services Private Limited UNFCCC Ref. No.: E-0066 |
| Name, position and signature of the approver of the validation report |  Dr. Kaviraj Singh Managing Director |

¹ <https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RINA1356356843.33/view>

SECTION A. Executive summary

M/s ReNew Wind Energy (Jath) Private Limited envisages setting up of 29 numbers of G58/0.85 MW and 30 numbers of G 97/2.0 MW Wind Turbine Generators (WTGs) by ReNew Wind Energy (Jath) Private Limited (RNWEJPL) at Jath Mandal of Sangli district in Maharashtra, India. The total installed capacity of the project activity is 84.65 MW and Gamesha Wind Turbines Private Limited is the supplier of WTGs for this project activity. The decision to increase the capacity of the project from 74.65MW to 84.65MW was taken on 20/11/2012.

The Gamesha Wind Turbines Private Limited make G58/0.85 MW & G 97/2.0 MW WTGs are based its technology on speed control and variable pitch, while incorporating the latest technologies to extract the maximum amount of energy from the wind and to do it as efficiently as possible. The hub heights of WTGs are 65 meter and 90 meter respectively and the rotor diameter is 58 meters and 97 meter respectively. The design lifetime of the project activity is of 20 years . The project is environmentally safe as it uses renewable sources for electricity generation and also technologically sound as it uses latest advanced technology with variable pitch and speed technology maximize energy production.

The project activity is a grid connected renewable energy project that supplies electricity to the NEWNE grid, thus it comes under the Sectoral scope Sectoral Scope : 1 Energy industries (renewable / non-renewable sources). The estimated ERs of the project activity are 159,773 tCO_{2e}.

Validation Scope: The scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document (PDD). The PDD is reviewed against the criteria stated in Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM modalities and procedures as agreed in the Marrakech Accords and the relevant decisions by the CDM Executive Board, including the approved baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" Version 19.0. The validation was based on the requirements in the CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, version 02.0.

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

Scope of validation

M/s ReNew Wind Energy (Jath) Private Limited has contracted ESPL to conduct the validation of the renewal of the crediting period of the project activity "Wind Power Project at Jath, Maharashtra".

The scope of the validation is to establish that:

- the PA is in accordance with all relevant CDM rules and requirements;
- the PA is in accordance with conditions of the latest version of applied methodology ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" Version 19.0;
- the validation of the renewal of crediting period is in accordance with requirements of CDM methodological tool "TOOL11 – Assessment of the validity of the original / current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period" – version 03.0.1.

Validation Process:

The validation process involved the following:

- contract with project proponent for the scope of validation of the renewal of the crediting period of the project activity;
- desk review;
- physical on-site inspection;
- issuance of validation findings;
- reporting, calculation checks, QA/QC and resolution of findings;
- issuance of draft validation report;
- independent technical review of the project documentation;
- issuance of the final validation report;

- submission of the request for renewal, as appropriate

Conclusion

ESPL has performed a validation of the the renewal of the crediting period of the CDM PA “Wind Power Project at Jath, Maharashtra” for second crediting period.

The validation team has confirmed that it is in accordance with all relevant CDM rules and requirements and conditions of the latest version of applied methodology ACM0002 “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” Version 19.0. In addition, it was confirmed that the monitoring system is feasible and the estimated emission reductions are conservatively calculated.

The PA is expected to generate an annual average of 159,773 tCO₂e in the second crediting period.

A site visit has been performed for the validation of the renewal of the crediting period on and 07/11/2019.

Therefore, the request for renewal of the crediting period of the PA is being submitted in accordance with the CDM procedures.

SECTION B. Validation team, technical reviewer and approver

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 | Interview(s) | Validation findings |
| 1. | Team Leader | EI | Takarkhede | Atul | Central Office | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 2. | Technical Expert (TA1.2) | EI | Takarkhede | Atul | Central Office | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 3. | Methodology Expert | IR | Kumar | Sanjeev | Central Office | Y | N | N | Y |
| 4. | Local Expert | IR | Kumar | Sanjeev | Central Office | Y | N | N | Y |
| 5. | Verifier | IR | Kumar | Sanjeev | Central Office | Y | N | N | Y |

B.2. Technical reviewer and approver of the validation report for RCP

| 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 | Gupta | Anshika | Central Office |
| 2. | TA expert to TR | IR | Gupta | Anshika | Central Office |
| | Approver | IR | Singh | Kaviraj | Central Office |

SECTION C. Means of validation

C.1. Desk/document review

A desk review was conducted by the validation team that included:

- a review of the data and information presented to assess its completeness;
- a review of the registered project activity, the applied methodology including applicable tool(s)

and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;

c. a review of supporting documents.

A complete list of documents/evidences reviewed is included as Appendix 3.

C.2. On-site inspection

| Duration of on-site inspection: 07/11/2019 | | | | |
|--|---|---|------------|-----------------|
| No. | Activity performed on-site | Site location | Date | Team member |
| 1. | Opening Meeting: Introduction, scope and objective of work, roles and responsibilities of audit team, resources required, and timetable of the onsite audit including venue for closing meeting and any concerns from PP. | Jath, Sangli District, Maharashtra, India | 07/11/2019 | Atul Takarkhede |
| 2. | - Implementation and operation of project activity (project boundary, technology, project equipment, monitoring and metering equipment) as per registered PDD/previous verification. | | | |
| 3. | - Physical inspection of the project activity and Substation (if applicable): Site visit and interview of personnel | | | |
| 4. | Revalidation checklist: compliance of monitoring procedures, regulations, application of methodology and baseline calculation compared with registered PDD and monitoring methodology. | | | |
| 5. | Review of ex-ante calculation and relevant document in accordance with registered monitoring plan and applied monitoring methodology. | | | |
| 6. | - Compilation of the audit findings. | | | |
| 7. | Closing Meeting: Submission of the audit findings to the client and agreement on the issues raised and agreement on timelines. | | | |

C.3. Interviews

| No. | Interviewee | | | Date | Subject | Team member |
|-----|-------------|------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | Last name | First name | Affiliation | | | |
| 1. | Ithape | Atul | Site Incharge (Jath & Vaspeth) | 07/11/2019 | - Project Implementation - Operation and Maintenance - Calibrations etc. | Atul Takarkhede |
| 2. | Rajpoot | Pankaj | EKI Consultants | 07/11/2019 (Telephonic) | - General aspects - CDM aspects - EF calculation - ER calculation | |

C.4. Sampling approach

The assessment team did not apply any sampling approach for the project activity. The site visit was conducted for complete power plant implemented in the locations as mentioned in the PDD^{3/}.

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

| Area of validation findings | No. of CL | No. of CAR | No. of FAR |
|---|-----------|------------|------------|
| Compliance with PDD form | 01 | 01 | 00 |
| Application and selection of methodologies and standardized baselines | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| Validity of original baseline or its update | 00 | 01 | 00 |
| Estimated emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals | 00 | 01 | 00 |
| Validity of monitoring plan | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| Crediting period | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| Project participants | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| Post-registration changes | 00 | 02 | 00 |
| Others (please specify) | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| Total | 01 | 05 | 00 |

SECTION D. Validation findings

D.1. Compliance with PDD form

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Means of validation | Assessment team checked the PDD version 11.0 forms supplied by the project participant and found that the latest form applicable in the UNFCCC web site is used for the presentation of the PDD. |
| Findings | CL 02 & CAR 03 was raised during the validation process and closed successfully. |
| Conclusion | <p>Assessment team also checked the commissioning certificates^{/2/} (dated 26/09/2012, 09/10/2012, 26/02/2013, 21/03/2013, 03/04/2013, 22/05/2013, 03/07/2013 & 06/08/2013) and found the same to be correct. The actual commissioning date checked from the 3rd party Government documents i.e. MSEDCL and found to be accurate^{/2/}.</p> <p>The latest version of the PDD template (CDM-PDD-FORM – version 11) available at the UNFCCC website has been used^{/5/}. The issues found were all addressed.</p> <p>It has been filled out in accordance with the instructions.</p> <p>No post registration changes is envisaged for the second CP as the project is implemented as per the registered PDD^{/5/} of 1st CP and in continuous operation apart from scheduled maintenance^{/11/} (as per manufacturer specification) and thus there is no scenario observed which can alter the requirement of the methodology^{/7/}. The project activity complies with the applicability criteria of the large scale CDM Project activity category. There is no change in installed capacity of the project as mentioned in registered PDD for 1st CP^{/3/}. The same is checked by the assessment team during onsite visit, document review and found correct.</p> |
| | |

D.2. Application and selection of methodologies and standardized baselines

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Means of validation | <p>The assessment team has validated the documentation referred to in the revised PDD for renewable of crediting period and verified the documentation content for verifying the justification of the applicability of the methodology ACM0002 “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” Version 19.0. and confirmed that the documentation referred to in the PDD is correctly quoted and interpreted. The assessment team has also cross-checked the information provided in the registered PDD of 1st CP with the documentation other than from the PDD based on the local and sectoral knowledge of the assessment team.</p> <p>Following documentation has been reviewed by the assessment team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site visit - Interview with the concerned person mentioned in this report - Technical detail analysis of the power plant from the documents submitted by the manufacturer. - Commissioning certificates of the turbines |
|----------------------------|--|

| | | |
|-------------------|--|---|
| | The assessment of the project's compliance with the applicability criteria of ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" Version 19.0. are documented in detail in section B.2 of the PDD. | |
| Findings | Applicability criteria were explained properly as per the requirement of the applied approved methodology for the present crediting period. No finding was raised on the section. | |
| Conclusion | The applied baseline methodology is justified as it has been demonstrated that the proposed project activity is: | |
| | Applicability Criterion | Project Case |
| | <p>1. This methodology is applicable to grid-connected renewable energy power generation project activities that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Install a Greenfield power plant; (b) Involve a capacity addition to (an) existing plant(s); (c) Involve a retrofit of (an) existing operating plants/units; (d) Involve a rehabilitation of (an) existing plant(s)/unit(s); or (e) Involve a replacement of (an) existing plant(s)/unit(s) | <p>The project activity is a Renewable Energy Project i.e. Wind Power Project which falls under applicability criteria option 1 (a) i.e., "Install a Greenfield power plant". Hence the project activity meets the given applicability criterion.</p> |
| | <p>2. The methodology is applicable under the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The project activity may include renewable energy power plant/unit of one of the following types: hydro power plant/unit with or without reservoir, wind power plant/unit, geothermal power plant/unit, solar power plant/unit, wave power plant/unit or tidal power plant/unit; (b) In the case of capacity additions, retrofits, rehabilitations or replacements (except for wind, solar, wave or tidal power capacity addition projects the existing plant/unit started commercial operation prior to the start of a minimum historical reference period of five years, used for the calculation of baseline emissions and defined in the baseline emission section, and no capacity expansion, retrofit, or rehabilitation of the plant/unit has been undertaken between the start of this minimum historical | <p>The option (a) of applicability criteria 2 is applicable as project is renewable energy wind power project.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | reference period and the implementation of the project activity. | |
| | <p>3. In case of hydro power plants, one of the following conditions shall apply:²</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The project activity is implemented in existing single or multiple reservoirs, with no change in the volume of any of the reservoirs; or (b) The project activity is implemented in existing single or multiple reservoirs, where the volume of the reservoir(s) is increased and the power density calculated using equation (3), is greater than 4 W/m²; or (c) The project activity results in new single or multiple reservoirs and the power density, calculated using equation (3), is greater than 4 W/m²; or (d) The project activity is an integrated hydro power project involving multiple reservoirs, where the power density for any of the reservoirs, calculated using equation (3), is lower than or equal to 4 W/m², all of the following conditions shall apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The power density calculated using the total installed capacity of the integrated project, as per equation (4), is greater than 4 W/m²; (ii) Water flow between reservoirs is not used by any other hydropower unit which is not a part of the project activity; (iii) Installed capacity of the power plant(s) with power density lower than or equal to 4 W/m² shall be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lower than or equal to 15 MW; and b. Less than 10 per cent of the total installed capacity of integrated hydro power project. | Not applicable as the project is installation of new wind based electricity generation plant. |

² Project participants wishing to undertake a hydroelectric project activity that result in a new reservoir or an increase in the volume of an existing reservoir, in particular where reservoirs have no significant vegetative biomass in the catchments area, may request a revision to the approved consolidated methodology.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>4. In the case of integrated hydro power projects, project proponent shall:</p> <p>(a) Demonstrate that water flow from upstream power plants/units spill directly to the downstream reservoir and that collectively constitute to the generation capacity of the integrated hydro power project; or</p> <p>(b) Provide an analysis of the water balance covering the water fed to power units, with all possible combinations of reservoirs and without the construction of reservoirs. The purpose of water balance is to demonstrate the requirement of specific combination of reservoirs constructed under CDM project activity for the optimization of power output. This demonstration has to be carried out in the specific scenario of water availability in different seasons to optimize the water flow at the inlet of power units. Therefore this water balance will take into account seasonal flows from river, tributaries (if any), and rainfall for minimum five years prior to implementation of CDM project activity.</p> | <p>The project is wind power project and thus the criterion is not applicable to this project activity.</p> |
| | <p>5. The methodology is not applicable to:</p> <p>(a) Project activities that involve switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources at the site of the project activity, since in this case the baseline may be the continued use of fossil fuels at the site;</p> <p>(b) Biomass fired power plants/units.</p> | <p>(a) The project activity is Greenfield and there is no switching of fossil fuel to renewable energy. Hence the criteria is not applicable to the project activity</p> <p>(b) The project is not a biomass fired power plant. Hence the criteria is not applicable to the project activity.</p> |
| | <p>6. In the case of retrofits, rehabilitations, replacements, or capacity additions, this methodology is only applicable if the most plausible baseline scenario, as a result of the identification of baseline scenario, is "the continuation of the current situation, that is to use the power generation equipment that was already in use prior to the implementation of the</p> | <p>Not applicable, the wind project is a Green field project activity and this project is not the enhancement or up gradation project.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | project activity and undertaking business as usual maintenance". | |
| | 7. In addition, the applicability conditions included in the tools referred to below apply. ³ | Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system - Version 07.0 (EB 100, Annex 04) have been applied appropriately. |
| | Assessment team confirms that the application of the baseline methodology is transparent and conservative and confirms that the chosen baseline and monitoring methodology i.e. ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" Version 19.0. is applicable to the project activity ^{7/} . | |

D.3. Validity of original baseline or its update

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Means of validation | The baseline scenario as depicted in the updated PDD for renewal of crediting period is checked during document review and also during the interview with the PP. |
| Findings | The baseline is selected as per the requirement of the approved methodology ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" Version 19.0. for the present Crediting period. However, CAR 04 was raised during the validation process and closed successfully. |
| Conclusion | <p>Assessment team referred "Methodological tool (EB 66, Annex 47) "Assessment of the validity of the original / current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period^{9/}" (Version 03.0.1)" and CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, version 02.0" to check the originality of the baseline. Following are the observation of the assessment team regarding selected baseline for the project activity in this present second renewable crediting period:</p> <p><u>Step 1.1 (EB 66, Annex 47): Assess compliance of the current baseline with relevant mandatory national and/or sectoral policies</u></p> <p>The baseline for the project activity is the electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity which would have otherwise been generated by the operation of grid connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources into the grid. The project activity is claiming the emission reductions from the net exported electricity to the grid only. In absence of project activity this quantity of electricity would have been generated from the electricity grid mix (mainly fossil fuel). The Government of India enacted the Electricity Act in the year 2003 to harmonize and rationalize the provisions in the then existing laws. The Act consolidated the laws relating to generation, transmission, distribution, trading and use of electricity. With the Enactment of the act, the then existing laws viz, The Indian Electricity Act 1910, The Electricity Supply Act, 1948 and The Electricity Regulatory Commissions Act, 1998 were repealed. The Electricity Act 2003 was in force at the time of the completion of the baseline study during first crediting period.</p> <p>The baseline remains unchanged for the present, second crediting period since there is no policy been revised and/or is currently in force as well, therefore the baseline scenario is still in compliance with all the relevant mandatory national and/or sectoral policies.</p> <p><u>Step 1.2 (EB 66, Annex 47) : Assess the impact of circumstances</u></p> <p>There are no new circumstances that can impact the original baseline. The</p> |

³ The condition in the "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" that all potential alternative scenarios to the proposed project activity must be available options to project participants; does not apply to this methodology, as this methodology only refers to some steps of this tool.

baseline emission factor value is however updated based on the current data available for the grid.

Step 1.3 (EB 66, Annex 47): Assess whether the continuation of the use of current baseline equipment(s) or an investment is the most likely scenario for the crediting period for which renewal is requested

As per the “Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment”, the remaining lifetime of the equipment is the time for which the existing equipment can continue to operate before it has to be replaced/discarded. As per this Tool, Project participant can use one of the following options to determine the remaining lifetime of the equipment:

- (a) Use manufacturer's information on the technical lifetime of equipment and compare to the date of first commissioning;
- (b) Obtain an expert evaluation;
- (c) Use default value

The project activity started commercial operation in the year 26/09/2012 (Commissioning of first set of WTGs) and since commissioning, the project activity is running satisfactorily. As per Manufacturer specification and Registered PDD, the technical lifetime of WTGs is 20 years (As per 1st CP). Thus the remaining lifetime of equipment's exceeds the crediting period for which renewal is requested. Thus as per manufacturers information, the remaining lifetime of equipment is exceeds crediting period as per option 1 of Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of the Equipment.

The below conditions are fulfilled. (i)The equipment has been operated and maintained according to the recommendations of the equipment supplier; (ii) There are no periodic replacement schedules or scheduled replacement practices specific to the industrial facility, that require early replacement of equipment before the expiry of the technical lifetime; and (iii) The equipment has no design fault or defect and did not have any industrial accident due to which the equipment cannot operate at rated performance levels.

An per option (a), evaluating the remaining lifetime for the type of equipment has been approached and requested to determine the remaining lifetime of the equipment. The assessment of remaining life time of the equipment's had been done and confirmed that the remaining technical lifetime of the equipment of the project activity exceeds the crediting period for which renewal is requested. As the remaining technical lifetime of the equipment is not less than the end of the crediting period or which renewal is requested, the current baseline holds good for this crediting period too.

Step 1.4(EB 66, Annex 47): Assessment of the validity of the data and parameters

This step stipulates that “Where emission factors, values or emission benchmarks are used and determined only once for the crediting period, they should be updated, except if the emission factors, values or emission benchmarks are based on the historical situation at the site of the project activity prior to the implementation of the project and cannot be updated because the historical situation does not exist anymore as a result of the CDM project activity.”

The project chosen **ex-ante default value i.e. Emission Factor**. As per the Guidance given in Tool the emission factor is updated as follows:

1. The operating margin is calculated as per the latest version of CEA “CO₂ Baseline Database” (Version 14) available to the project participant^{/8/}. The operating margin calculation is checked by the assessment team and found correct.
2. The build margin is considered from CEA “CO₂ Baseline Database” version

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>14 as per "Tool to calculate the emission factor for electricity system" version 07. The value considered is checked by the assessment team and found correct.</p> <p>3. The Combined margin calculation is carried out as per "Tool to calculate the emission factor for electricity system" version 07. The value considered is checked by the assessment team and found correct.</p> <p>The emission factor is fixed ex-ante and thus will be used for the complete second renewable crediting period and for entire verification conducted under second renewable crediting period.</p> <p>Application of Steps 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 confirmed that the current baseline is valid for the Second crediting period but data and parameters needs to be updated. Therefore step 2 is used</p> <p>Step 2.1: Update the current baseline This step is applicable since the Steps 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and/or 1.4 showed that the current baseline needs to be updated. As evident from the explanation provided above the baseline scenario remains unchanged.</p> <p>Updated the baseline emissions based on the latest approved version of the methodology applicable to the project activity for the subsequent crediting period, without reassessing the baseline scenario.</p> <p>Step 2.2: Update the data and parameters The updated Data and/or parameter are followed for estimating the baseline emissions</p> <p>Hence as per ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" Version 19.0. (latest Methodology), the baseline of the project is as follows:</p> <p><i>Project activity is the installation of a Greenfield power plant, the baseline scenario is electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity would have otherwise been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources, as reflected in the combined margin (CM) calculations described in the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system".</i></p> <p>The above selected baseline is correct and thus applicable to the project activity and in line with approved methodology for the applied renewable of crediting period.</p> |
|--|---|

D.4. Estimated emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Means of validation | The emission reduction sheet, CEA "CO ₂ Baseline Database" version 14.0 (Latest applicable) and updated PDD is checked by the assessment team. |
| Findings | CAR 05 was raised and closed successfully. |
| Conclusion | <p>The baseline emissions as discussed in section B.6.1 will include emissions that would have occurred in the absence of the project activity. The emission reduction calculation has been done as per the ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" Version 19.0.^{7/}.</p> <p><u>Baseline Emission (BE_y):</u></p> <p>$BE_y = EG_{PJ,y} \times EF_{grid,CM,y}$ Where</p> <p>BE_y = Baseline emissions in year y (tCO₂/yr) EG_{PJ,y} = Quantity of net electricity generation that is produced and fed into the grid as a result of the implementation of the CDM</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>project activity in year y (MWh/yr)</p> <p>$EF_{grid,CM,y}$ = Combined margin CO₂ emission factor for grid connected power generation in year y calculated using the latest version of the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" (tCO₂/MWh)</p> <p>However, inline with the para 44 of the ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" Version 19.0.^{/7/}, the project activity is the installation of a Greenfield power plant, hence:</p> <p>$EG_{PJ,y} = EG_{facility,y}$</p> <p>$EG_{BL,y} = EG_{facility,y}$ is Calculated as Installed Capacity x PLF x Operating hours.</p> <p>PP has estimated the baseline energy generation considering the capacity of the project activity, yearly generation hour and plant load factor. Validation team assessed the technical specification of the promoters of the project activity, Commissioning certificate and found that installed capacity of this project activity is correct^{/2/}.</p> <p>Baseline emission factor is calculated as combined margin, consisting of a combination of operating margin (OM) and build margin (BM) factors according to the procedure prescribed in the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" version 07.0 which is sourced from CEA "CO₂ Baseline Database" version 14.0, Govt. of India and forms the part of emission reduction calculation^{/8/}. The baseline emission factor calculation is checked by the validation team and found that the calculation is transparent and conservative.</p> <p>$BE_y = 1,70,552 \times 0.9368 = 1,59,773 \text{ tCO}_2e$</p> <p><u>Project Emissions:</u> As per the latest applied methodology for Wind power project $PE_y = 0$.</p> <p><u>Leakage Emissions:</u> As per the Methodology requirement Leakage emission is not applicable for renewable project.</p> <p><u>Emission Reductions:</u> The project activity reduces carbon dioxide emissions through displacement of grid electricity generation with predominantly fossil fuel based power plants⁴ by renewable electricity. The emission reduction (ER_y) due to project activity during a given year y is calculated as the difference between baseline emissions (BE_y), project emissions (PE_y) as per the formulae given below:</p> <p>$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y$</p> <p>$ER_y = 159,773 - 0 \text{ tCO}_2e$</p> <p>$ER_y = 159,773 \text{ (Rounded Down)}$</p> |
|--|---|

D.5. Validity of monitoring plan

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Means of validation | Assessment team checked the monitoring practice onsite and also checked the requirement of ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" Version 19.0. and procedure mentioned in the registered PDD of 1 st CP. |
| Findings | No finding raised on the section. |

| Conclusion | <p>Parameters determined ex-ante:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. $EF_{grid,OM,y} = (0.9610 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh})$ = Operating Margin emissions factor for grid connected power generation in year y calculated using the latest version of “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system version 07.” $EF_{grid,OM,y}$ is computed using the Simple Operating margin CO_2 emission factor. Simple Operating margin CO_2 emission factor is calculated from 3-year generation weighted average using data for the years 2015-16, 2016-17 & 2017-18 CO_2 emissions per unit net electricity generation of all power plants serving the system, not including low-cost / must-run. This is in agreement with the guidance provided in the Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system. The value is considered from CEA “CO2 Baseline Database” version 14^{8/}. The value is fixed ex-ante for the entire duration of 2nd crediting period. As the value is sourced from CEA (publicly available document) no further analysis is required. 2. $EF_{grid,BM,y} = (0.8644 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh})$ Build Margin emissions factor for grid connected power generation in year y calculated using the latest version of “Tool to calculate the emission factor version 07 for an electricity system. Build margin emission factor is the generation-weighted average emission factor of all power plants <i>m</i> during the most recent year y for which generation data is available. The value is considered from CEA “CO2 Baseline Database” version 14^{8/}. The value is fixed ex-ante for the entire duration of 2nd crediting period. As the value is sourced from CEA (publicly available document) no further analysis is required 3. $EF_{grid,CM,y} = (0.9368 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh})$ Combined Margin emissions factor for grid connected power generation in year y calculated using the latest version of “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system version 07.” Combined Margin is computed using the official data sources and is in-line with the guidance provided in the tool. The value is considered from CEA “CO2 Baseline Database” version 14^{8/}. The combined margin emissions factor is calculated as follows: $EF_{grid,CM,y} = EF_{grid,OM,y} * W_{OM} + EF_{grid,BM,y} * W_{BM}$ <p>Where:</p> <p>$EF_{grid,BM,y}$ = Build margin CO_2 emission factor in year y (tCO_2/MWh)</p> <p>$EF_{grid,OM,y}$ = Operating margin CO_2 emission factor in year y (tCO_2/MWh)</p> <p>W_{OM} = Weighting of operating margin emissions factor (%) = 75%</p> <p>W_{BM} = Weighting of build margin emissions factor (%) = 25%</p> <p>The above weighing is as per “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system”, version 07.0.0 for other projects (Wind in this case) and for second crediting period. The value is fixed ex-ante for the entire duration of second crediting period. As the value is sourced from CEA (publicly available document) no further analysis is required.</p> <p>Parameters determined ex-post:</p> <p>$EG_{facility,y}$ = Quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project plant/unit to the grid in year y</p> <p>The net electricity supplied to grid is a calculated value and would be determined as the difference between the electricity exported to the grid and the electricity imported from the grid by the project activity. Thus,</p> $EG_{facility,y} = E_{export,y} - E_{import,y}$ <p>The value for the parameter will be sourced from the primary source i.e. Joint Meter Readings (JMR) by Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Co. Ltd. (MSETCL). The monthly energy meter reading is duly signed by both O&M personal and state electricity board official. The primary source will be used for emission reduction</p> |
|------------|--|
|------------|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>calculation for the entire duration of second CP. The practice is as per the first CP registered PDD and approved methodology. The Quantity of net electricity supplied to the grid as a result of the implementation of the CDM project activity in year y is the difference between the measured quantities of the grid electricity export and the import. The electricity export and import will be measured continuously using energy meter installed at the site and the readings will be recorded in the presence of the MSETCL and the PP on the first day of every month. The PP will prepare invoices on a monthly basis based on the quantity of net electricity supplied to the grid. The monthly data will be considered for calculating the annual net electricity exported to the grid by the project activity during the year y.</p> <p>Accepted industry standard: National standard as described in the Power Purchase Agreement.</p> <p>Measurement equipment: Energy meters</p> <p>Calibration frequency: once in 5 years</p> <p>Accuracy of the meters: 0.2 class</p> <p>Measurement interval: continuous measurement, monthly recording</p> <p>The energy meters installed are microprocessor based ABT compliant tri-vector meter. The meters will be calibrated once in 5 years. The data will be archived electronically for a minimum of two years after the end of the crediting period or the last issuance of CERs for this project activity, whichever occurs later.</p> <p>EG_{export,y}: The quantity of electricity supplied by the project plant/unit to the grid in year y</p> <p>The electricity exported by the project activity is monitored through the installed set of energy meters (main and check) at the substation of the project activity. Monthly readings are taken jointly by the representative of State Electricity Transmission Co. Ltd. and site in charge of Project Proponent and a statement is prepared and signed by the representatives of both parties.</p> <p>EG_{import,y}: The quantity of electricity imported by the project plant/unit from the grid in year y</p> <p>The electricity imported by the project activity is monitored through the installed set of energy meters (main and check) at the substation of the project activity. Monthly readings are taken jointly by the representative of State Electricity Transmission Co. Ltd. and site in charge of Project Proponent and a statement is prepared and signed by the representatives of both parties.</p> <p>EG_{WTG}: Daily electricity generation at the WTG controller</p> <p>The data is monitored via project activity WTG Controllers and is recorded daily in Power Generation Reports by the O&M Contractors.</p> |
|--|---|

D.6. Crediting period

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Means of validation | The crediting period is checked as per UN home page (reference number : 9154 and discussion with Client). |
| Findings | No finding raised on this section. |
| Conclusion | This is second renewable crediting period and the duration is 7-year renewable (second CP duration: 01/01/2020 to 31/12/2026). |

D.7. Project participants

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Means of validation | The project participant names were checked from UN homepage https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RINA1356356843.33/view |
| Findings | CAR 06 & CAR 07 was raised and closed successfully. |
| Conclusion | Following are the details of PP (host country) and Annex 1 country. The same is correct and in line with PDD registered under first Crediting period ^{4/3/} as well as |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | MOC obtained from UN home page. The details are true for the second Crediting period as well. | | |
| | Parties involved | Project participants | Indicate if the Party involved wishes to be considered as project participant (Yes/No) |
| | India (Host) | M/s ReNew Wind Energy (Jath) Private Limited Private Entity | No |
| | Netherlands | Amsterdam Capital Trading B.V. | No |

D.8. Post-registration changes

| Type of post-registration changes (PRCs) | Confirmation (Y/N) | Validation report for PRCs | |
|--|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| | | Version | Completion date |
| Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents ⁵ | N | NA | NA |
| Corrections | N | NA | NA |
| Change to the start date of the crediting period | N | NA | NA |
| Inclusion of a monitoring plan | N | NA | NA |
| Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines, or other methodological regulatory documents | N | NA | NA |
| Changes to the project design | Yes ⁶ | CDM-MUM-0062099 Version 03.3 | 31/10/2014 |
| Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities | N | NA | NA |

SECTION E. Internal quality control

The draft validation report that is prepared by validation team is reviewed by an independent technical review team (one or more members) to confirm if the internal procedures established and implemented by ESPL were duly complied with and such opinion/conclusion is reached in an objective manner that complies with the applicable CDM rules/requirements.

The technical review team is collectively required to possess the technical expertise of all the technical area/sectoral scope to which the project activity is related. All members of technical review team are independent of the validation team.

During the technical review process, additional findings may be identified or the closed-out findings may be opened, which needs to be satisfactorily resolved before the request for the renewal of the crediting period is submitted to UNFCCC. The independent technical reviewer may either approve the report as such or reject/return the same, in such case, providing the comments/findings/issues that needs to be resolved by the validation team. The decision taken by the technical reviewer is final and is authorized on behalf of ESPL.

SECTION F. Validation opinion

ESPL, contracted by ReNew Wind Energy (Jath) Private Limited, has performed the independent validation of the renewal of crediting period of the project^{1/} "Wind Power Project at Jath, Maharashtra".

⁵ 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).

⁶ <https://cdm.unfccc.int/PRCContainer/DB/prcp634339889/view>

ESPL commenced the validation based on the baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002 “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” Version 19.0.^{7/}, the registered PDD^{3/} (from previous crediting period) and updated PDD^{5/} (for the second crediting period).

ESPL’s validation approach is based on the understanding of the risks associated with reporting the project activity, estimates of GHG emission data and the controls to be implemented to mitigate these. ESPL planned and performed the validation by obtaining evidence, other information and explanations that ESPL considered necessary to give reasonable assurance that the estimated GHG emission reductions are fairly to be achieved.

The validation team confirms, based on final version of revised PDD for the second crediting period, that:

- the original baseline is still valid as it is given by the applied methodology;
- the project additionality is valid for the renewal of the crediting period. No regulatory surplus has been identified. The project is in accordance with all applicable regulations and legislations;
- the project description is in accordance with the characteristics identified on site;
- the monitoring plan is adequate to the project activity and it is in accordance with the applied methodology;
- at this second crediting period, the project activity is likely to achieve the estimated of 159,773 tCO₂e per year.

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

| Abbreviations | Full texts |
|-------------------|--|
| BM | Build Margin |
| CAR | Corrective Action Request |
| CDM | Clean Development Mechanism |
| CER | Certified Emission Reduction(s) |
| CEA | Central Electricity Authority |
| CL | Clarification request |
| CMS | Central Monitoring system |
| CP | Crediting period |
| CM | Combined Margin |
| CMS | Central Monitoring system |
| CO ₂ | Carbon dioxide |
| CO ₂ e | Carbon dioxide equivalent |
| DNA | Designated National Authority |
| DOE | Designated Operational Entity |
| DR | Document Review |
| EF | Emission Factor |
| ER | External Resource |
| EIA | Environmental Impact Assessment |
| ER | Emission Reductions |
| FAR | Forward Action Request |
| GHG | Greenhouse gas(es) |
| GWP | Global Warming potential |
| IR | Internal Resource |
| MSEDCL | Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited |
| MSETCL | Maharashtra State Electricity Transmmision Company Limited |
| OR | Outside resource |
| OEM | Original Equipment manufacturer |
| OM | Operating Margin |
| PP | Project Participant |

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

| Competence Statement | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|------|------------|
| Name | Atul Takarkhede | | |
| Education | Ph.D. Environmental Science | | |
| Experience | 12 years | | |
| Field | Climate Change and environment | | |
| Approved Roles | | | |
| Team Leader | YES | | |
| Validator | NO | | |
| Verifier | NO | | |
| Methodology Expert | NO | | |
| Local expert | NO | | |
| Financial Expert | NO | | |
| Technical Reviewer | NO | | |
| TA Expert | YES (1.2) | | |
| | | | |
| Reviewed by | Shreya Garg | Date | 24/04/2019 |
| Approved by | Anshika Gupta | Date | 25/04/2019 |

| Competence Statement | | | |
|----------------------|---|------|------------|
| Name | Sanjeev Kumar | | |
| Country | India | | |
| Education | B. Tech. (Chemical Engineering) M.Tech. (Energy Management) | | |
| Experience | 13.5 years + | | |
| Field | Climate Change, Environment, Energy | | |
| Approved Roles | | | |
| Team Leader | YES | | |
| Validator | YES | | |
| Verifier | YES | | |
| Methodology Expert | YES (ACM0002, ACM0006, ACM0004, ACM0009, ACM0012, ACM0001, AMS I.D, AMS I.F, AMS I.C, AMS I.A, AMS II.D, AMS II.E, AMS III.H, AM0009, AM0013, AM0025, AM0056, AM0028, AM0029, AM0008) | | |
| Local expert | YES (India) | | |
| Financial Expert | NO | | |
| Technical Reviewer | YES | | |
| TA Expert | YES (TA 1.1, TA 1.2, 4.1, 13.1) | | |
| | | | |
| Reviewed by | Shreya Garg | Date | 13/12/2018 |
| Approved by | Anshika Gupta | Date | 13/12/2018 |

| Competence Statement | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------|------------|
| Name | Anshika Gupta | | |
| Country | India | | |
| Education | M.Sc. (Climate Science & Policy), TERI University | | |
| Experience | 4 Years + | | |
| Field | Climate Change | | |
| Approved Roles | | | |
| Team Leader | YES | | |
| Validator | YES | | |
| Verifier | YES | | |
| Methodology Expert | AMS-I.A., AMS-II.G., ACM0002, AMS-III.A.V. | | |
| Local expert | YES (India) | | |
| Financial Expert | NO | | |
| Technical Reviewer | YES | | |
| TA Expert | Yes (TA 1.2, TA 3.1) | | |
| | | | |
| Reviewed by | Shreya Garg | Date | 12/03/2019 |
| Approved by | Kaviraj Singh | Date | 12/03/2019 |

| Competence Statement | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------|------------|
| Name | Kaviraj Singh | | |
| Country | India | | |
| Education | Ph.D. (Environmental Engineering), IIT Delhi Masters (Energy & Environmental), DAVV Indore | | |
| Experience | 15 Years + | | |
| Field | Climate Change & Environment | | |
| Approved Roles | | | |
| Team Leader | YES | | |
| Validator | YES | | |
| Verifier | YES | | |
| Methodology Expert | AMS-I.D., AMS-II.D., ACM0006, AMS-I.A., AMS-I.C., AMS-II.B., AMS-III.H, ACM0002, ACM0001, AM0080 | | |
| Local expert | YES (India) | | |
| Financial Expert | YES | | |
| Technical Reviewer | YES | | |
| TA Expert | YES (TA 1.1, TA 1.2, TA 13.1, 13.2) | | |
| | | | |
| Reviewed by | Abhishek Mahawar | Date | 01/03/2018 |
| Approved by | Ashok Gautam | Date | 01/03/2018 |

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

| No. | Author | Title | References to the document | Provider |
|-----|--------|---|---|---------------------|
| 1. | ESPL | Contract of the project participant with the DOE | Contract document signed between PP and DOE | Project participant |
| 2. | MSEDCL | Commissioning Certificates for WTGs | Commissioning phasewise dated 26/09/2012, 09/10/2012, 26/02/2013, 21/03/2013, 03/04/2013, 22/05/2013, 03/07/2013 & 06/08/2013 | Project participant |
| 3. | PP | Registered CDM PDD for first crediting period | Version 06 dated 05/09/2014 | UNFCCC |
| 4. | RINA | Validation Report for first crediting period (Report No. 2012-IQ-MD-32) | Version 1.2 dated 09/04/2013 | UNFCCC |
| 5. | PP | Draft Updated PDD for Renewal of Crediting Period Final updated PDD for Renewal of Crediting Period | Version 07 dated 23/10/2019 Version 08 dated 11/11/2019 | Project participant |
| 6. | PP | Estimated Emission reduction calculation sheet | Version 01 dated 23/10/2019 | Project participant |
| 7. | UNFCCC | ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" Version 19.0. | UNFCCC CDM web site | UNFCCC |
| 8. | NA | Ministry of Environment and forest: www.envfor.nic.in UNFCCC www.cdm.unfccc.int CEA: Central electricity authority www.cea.nic.in | Reference link is provided. | Independent Search |
| 9. | UNFCCC | Tools/ guidelines used in the project activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification on national and/or sectoral policies Para 27 EB 55. Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of the project activity in line with Annex 15 EB 50. Tool to calculate project or leakage CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion, Version 3. Tool to calculate the emission | UNFCCC CDM web site | UNFCCC |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------|---|---|---------------------|
| | | <p>factor for an electricity system version 07.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of the validity of the original / current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period." (Version 03.0.1). | | |
| 10. | MSEDCL & PP | Power Purchase Agreements for the project activity | Total 15 number of PPAs for different capacity for the project activity | Project participant |
| 11. | MSEDCL | Sample JMRs for the project activity | NA | Project participant |

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

Table 1. Remaining FAR from validation and/or previous verification

| | | | | |
|---|----|--------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| FAR ID | 01 | Section no. | E.2 | Date : 07/11/2019 |
| Description of FAR | | | | |
| <i>There is no FAR from the validation/previous verifications of the project activity</i> | | | | |
| Project participant response | | | | Date : DD/MM/YYYY |
| NA | | | | |
| Documentation provided by project participant | | | | |
| NA | | | | |
| DOE assessment | | | | Date: DD/MM/YYYY |
| NA | | | | |

Table 2. CL from this verification

| | | | | |
|--|----|--------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| CL ID | 02 | Section no. | D.1 | Date : 07/11/2019 |
| Description of CL | | | | |
| <i>PP requested to submit commissioning certificates, Sample JMRs and PPA for the project activity.</i> | | | | |
| Project participant response | | | | Date : 11/11/2019 |
| 1. Commissioning Certificates, PPA and Sample JMRs have been submitted to the assessment team. | | | | |
| Documentation provided by project participant | | | | |
| 1. Commissioning Certificates 2. PPA 3. JMRs | | | | |
| DOE assessment | | | | Date: 12/11/2019 |
| PP has submitted commissioning certificates for all the WTGs involved in the project activity. Further, PP has also submitted PPAs for the projects activities and sample JMRs. Thus CAR closed. | | | | |

Table 3. CAR from this verification

| | | | | |
|--|----|--------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| CAR ID | 03 | Section no. | D.1 | Date : 07/11/2019 |
| Description of CAR | | | | |
| <i>Following inconsistencies were observed in the revised PDD:</i> | | | | |
| 1. <i>Date of registered PDD of 1st crediting period not traceable in track change mode in the PDD submitted for renewal of crediting period.</i> | | | | |
| 2. <i>Section A.6 of revised PDD lack brief details of PRC approved during first crediting period.</i> | | | | |
| 3. <i>PP requested to submit revised PDD in track change mode for the sections revised in the registered PDD transferred to new version of PDD form.</i> | | | | |
| Project participant response | | | | Date : 11/11/2019 |
| 1. Date of registered PDD of 1 st crediting period is now traceable in track change mode in the PDD submitted for renewal of crediting period (PDD Version 08). 2. PRC details have now been incorporated in section A.6 of the PDD Version 08. 3. The PDD Version 08 has been submitted in the track change mode for the sections revised in the registered PDD transferred to new version of PDD form along with the proper formatting wherever required. | | | | |
| Documentation provided by project participant | | | | |
| 1. Project Design Document Version 08 | | | | |
| DOE assessment | | | | Date: 12/11/2019 |

| |
|--|
| 1. PP has submitted revised updated PDD for crediting period renewal in track change with clear traceability of dates from registered PDD version to latest one. |
| 2. Details of the Post Registration have been now included in the revised updated PDD appropriately. |
| 3. Updated PDD is now submitted in track changes and updates/revisions are traceable. |
| CAR closed. |

| | | | | |
|--|----|--------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| CAR ID | 04 | Section no. | D.2 | Date : 07/11/2019 |
| Description of CAR | | | | |
| <i>Project boundary diagram showing project activity connected to NEWNE grid however, currently it is Indian Grid. Corrections requested.</i> | | | | |
| Project participant response | | | | Date : 11/11/2019 |
| 1. The required correction has been made in the Project boundary diagram and NEWNE Grid has been updated and changed to Indian Grid accordingly. | | | | |
| Documentation provided by project participant | | | | |
| 1. Project Design Document Version 08 | | | | |
| DOE assessment | | | | Date: 12/11/2019 |
| Project boundary diagram and PDD have been revised for the connected grid. CAR closed. | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|----|--------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| CAR ID | 05 | Section no. | D.4 | Date : 07/11/2019 |
| Description of CAR | | | | |
| <i>Correlation between $EG_{PJ,y}$ and $EG_{facility,y}$ is missing in the PDD.</i> | | | | |
| Project participant response | | | | Date : 11/11/2019 |
| 1. According to the Methodology used (ACM0002 Version 19), The Quantity of net electricity generation that is produced and fed into the grid is represented as $EG_{PJ,y}$. However in the registered PDD the same had been represented as $EG_{facility,y}$. So in order to maintain the consistency $EG_{facility,y}$ has been used in the PPD Version 08. The same clarification has been incorporated in the PDD Version 08 section B.6.1. | | | | |
| Documentation provided by project participant | | | | |
| 1. Project Design document version 08 | | | | |
| DOE assessment | | | | Date: 12/11/2019 |
| Appropriate corrections have been done in Section B.6.1 of the PDD and being greenfield project $EG_{PJ,y} = EG_{facility,y}$ as per the applied methodology. CAR closed. | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|----|--------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| CAR ID | 06 | Section no. | D.7 | Date : 07/11/2019 |
| Description of CAR | | | | |
| <i>Section A.4 of the revised PDD lack details of other parties involved.</i> | | | | |
| Project participant response | | | | Date : 11/11/2019 |
| 1. All the project participants along with the other parties involved have now been incorporate in the PPD Version 08. | | | | |
| Documentation provided by project participant | | | | |
| 1. Project Design Documents Version 08 | | | | |
| DOE assessment | | | | Date: 12/11/2019 |
| Other parties involved are now included in the PDD. CAR closed. | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|----|--------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| CAR ID | 07 | Section no. | D.7 | Date : 07/11/2019 |
| Description of CAR | | | | |
| <i>PP requested to submit updated MOC for the project activity.</i> | | | | |
| Project participant response | | | | Date : 11/11/2019 |
| 1. There has been no change in the MOC since the last crediting period. Hence the latest MoC can be referred from the webpage of the project activity. https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RINA1356356843.33/view | | | | |
| Documentation provided by project participant | | | | |
| 1. CDM 9154: Wind Power Project at Jath, Maharashtra. Web-link: https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RINA1356356843.33/view | | | | |
| DOE assessment | | | | Date: 12/11/2019 |
| As the MOC available on UNFCCC project webpage is valid, new MOC not required. CAR closed. | | | | |

Table 4. FAR from this verification

| FAR ID | 08 | Section No. | Date : DD/MM/YYYY |
|---|----|-------------|-------------------|
| Description of FAR | | | |
| <i>There is no FAR from this verification</i> | | | |
| Project participant response | | | Date : DD/MM/YYYY |
| NA | | | |
| Project participant response | | | |
| NA | | | |
| Project participant response | | | Date: DD/MM/YYYY |
| NA | | | |
| Project participant response | | | |

- - - - -

Document information

| <i>Version</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>Description</i> |
|--|-----------------|---|
| 03.0 | 31 May 2019 | Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure consistency with version 02.0 of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (CDM-EB93-A05-STAN) and version 02.0 of the “CDM project cycle procedure for project activities” (CDM-EB93-A06-PROC);• Make editorial improvements. |
| 02.0 | 31 October 2017 | Revision to align with the requirements of 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: Renewal of crediting period Keywords: crediting period, project activities, validation report | | |