



**Verification and certification report form for
CDM project activities
(Version 04.0)**

BASIC INFORMATION

Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity	Bundled 9.00 MW wind power Generation project in Rajasthan, India by M/s. Gangadhar Narsingdas Agrawal Group UNFCCC number 7215 ¹		
Scale of the project activity	<input type="checkbox"/> Large-scale <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small-scale		
Version number of the verification and certification report	01		
Completion date of the verification and certification report	22/11/2021		
Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period	Monitoring period No.: 03 02/01/2017 to 31/12/2020 (inclusive of both days)		
Version number of the monitoring report to which this report applies	02		
Crediting period of the project activity corresponding to this monitoring period	01/01/2013 to 31/12/2022 (Fixed)		
Project participants	1. M/s Gangadhar Narsingdas Agrawal, (HUF) (India) 2. Belektron d.o.o. (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) 3. EKI Energy Services Limited (Australia)		
Host Party	India		
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	Methodology: AMS-I.D. Version 17 "Grid connected renewable electricity generation". Standardized Methodology: Not Applicable		
Mandatory sectoral scopes	Sectoral Scope 1: Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable sources)		
Conditional sectoral scopes, if applicable	NA		
Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring duration in the registered PDD	56,116 tCO ₂ e		
Certified amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring period	Amount before 1 January 2013	Amount from 1 January 2013 until 31 December 2020	Amount from 1 January 2021
	0 tCO ₂ e	41,742 tCO ₂ e	0 tCO ₂ e

¹ <https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/SGS-UKL1346942833.5/view>

Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) UNFCCC Ref. No.: E-0032
Name, position and signature of the approver of the verification and certification report	<i>Applus+ Certification CDM Technical Manager</i> Signature: Mr. Augustin Calle de Miguel 

SECTION A. Executive summary

>>

M/s Gangadhar Narsingdas Agrawal, (HUF) has commissioned LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) – Hereinafter referred as Applus+ Certification -to perform 3rd periodic verification of the “Bundled 9.00 MW wind power Generation project in Rajasthan, India by M/s. Gangadhar Narsingdas Agrawal Group” in India. The project activity located in Rajasthan state of India.

The project activity uses renewable energy (wind) as a clean fuel to generate electrical energy through wind turbine generators (WTGs). The project activity envisaged 02 no's WTGs of 2.1 MW each at Ratan ka Bas (RKB) site and 06 no's WTGs of 0.8 MW each at Ugawa site.

The WTGs are located in Belwa Ranaji Village, District Jodhpur and Village Ugawa in District Jaisalmer in Rajasthan state of India. The project is promoted by Gangadhar Narsingdas Agrawal (GNA) and Ferromar Shipping Private Limited (FSPL). All the WTGs are connected to NEWNE grid (now Indian Grid,) which sells generated electrical energy produced to Rajasthan State Electricity Board.

During this monitoring period, 02/01/2017 to 31/12/2020 (First and last date included) the GHGs emissions reductions achieved by the project activity is 41,742 tCO₂e by displacing 44,034 MWh electricity that, in the absence of the project activity, have been supplied by a fossil-fuel dominated electricity grid.

1. Verification Scope:

The verification scope encompasses an independent and objective review and ex-post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions by the DOE. The verification is based on the submitted monitoring report, the validated and registered PDD as well as its validation report, the applied monitoring methodology, relevant decisions, clarifications and guidance from the CMP and the EB and any other information and references relevant to the project activity's resulting emission reductions. These documents are reviewed against the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM Modalities and Procedures and related rules and guidance. Based on the requirements in the CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, Version 03.0 for the project activity, Applus+ Certification has applied a rule-based approach for the verification of the project. The principles of accuracy, completeness, relevance, reliability and credibility were combined with a conservative approach to establish a traceable and transparent verification opinion. The verification considers both quantitative and qualitative information on emission reductions. The verification is not meant to provide any consultancy towards the client. However, stated requests for clarifications, corrective and/or forward actions may provide input for improvement of the monitoring activities.

2. Methodology:

LGA Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) – Hereinafter referred as Applus+ Certification - approach to the verification is a two-stage process.

In the 1st stage, Applus+ Certification completed a strategic review and risk assessment of the project activities and processes in order to gain a full understanding of:

- Activities associated with all the sources contributing to the project emissions and emission reductions, including leakage if relevant;
- Protocols used to estimate or measure GHG emissions from these sources;
- Collection and handling of data;
- Controls on the collection and handling of data;
- Means of verifying reported data; and
- Compilation of the monitoring report.

Applus+ Certification used a Periodical Verification Checklist, based on the risk-based assessment of the parameters and data collection and handling processes for each of those parameters, describes the verification approach and the sampling plan.

3. Desk Review

In the 2nd stage, using the Verification Checklist, Applus+ Certification verified the implementation of the monitoring plan and the data presented in the Monitoring Report for the period in question. This involved a site visit and desk review of the Monitoring Report. This Verification Report describes the findings of this assessment.

The Monitoring Report version 1.0 submitted by the PP was made publicly available on the UNFCCC website before the verification activities started. The published MR was assessed based on all the relevant documents. The aim of the assessment in the desk review was to:

- Verify the completeness of the data and the information presented in the MR;
- Check the compliance of the MR with respect to the monitoring plan depicted in the registered PDD and verify that the applied methodology was carried out. Particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of the metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures was paid;
- Evaluate the data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions.

4. Assessment team

According to the sectoral scope / technical area and experience in the sectoral or national business environment, LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) has composed a project assessment team in accordance with the appointment rules in the internal Quality Management System of LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification).

The composition of audit team shall be approved by the LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) ensuring that the required skills are covered by the team.

The four qualification levels for team members that are assigned by formal appointment rules are as presented below:

- Lead Auditor (LA)
- Auditor (A) / Auditor in Training (AiT)
- Technical Expert (TE)
- Technical Reviewer (TR)

The sectoral scope / technical area knowledge linked to the applied methodology/ies shall be covered by the assessment team.

Name	Role	SS Coverage	TA Coverage	Financial aspect
Dr. Atul Takarkhede	LA/TE	YES	YES	NA
Mr. Simon Shen	TR	YES	YES	NA

The curriculum vitae of the DOE's Verification team members is provided in Appendix 2 of this report.

5. Review of Documentation:

The Monitoring Report version 1.0 submitted by the PP was made publicly available on the UNFCCC website before the verification activities started. The published MR was assessed based on all the relevant

documents. A cross-check between information provided and information from other sources has been done. A complete list of documents reviewed is available in Appendix 3 of this report.

6. On-site Assessment and follow-up Interviews:

As a part of the verification, the remote audit (detailed in section D.2) has been performed by the assessment team. The objective of the on-site assessment is to:

- Confirm the implementation and operation of the project;
- Review the data flow for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters;
- Confirm the correct implementation of procedures for operations and data collection;
- Cross-check the information provided in the MR documentation with other sources;
- Check the monitoring equipment against the requirements of the PDD and the approved methodology, including calibrations, maintenance, etc.
- Review the calculations and assumptions used to obtain the GHG data and ER;
- Identify if the quality control and quality assurance procedures are in place to prevent or correct errors or omissions in the reported parameters.

The details are mentioned in section D.2 of this report.

7. Quality of Evidences

Sufficient evidence covering the full verification period in the required frequency is available to verify the figures stated in the final MR. The source of the evidence will be discussed in Appendix 3 of this report. Specific cross-checks have been done in cases that further sources were available. The monitoring report's figures were checked by the assessment team against the raw data. The data collection system meets the requirements of the monitoring plan as per the methodology.

8. Reporting of Findings

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

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

- a. Modifications to the implementation, operation and monitoring of the registered project activity has not been sufficiently documented by the project participants;
- b. Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions that will impact the quantity of emission reductions;
- c. Issues identified in a FAR during validation to be verified during verification or previous verification(s) have not been resolved by the project participants.

The assessment team shall raise a Clarification Request (CL) if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM requirements have been met.

All CARs and CLs raised during verification shall be resolved prior to submitting a request for issuance.

Forward Action Requests (FARs) may be raised during verification for actions where the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period. All the CARs/CLs/FARs are being discussed in Appendix 4 of this report.

9. Internal Quality Control

As a final step of verification, the final documentation including the verification report has to undergo an internal quality control by the Technical Reviewer. Each report has to be finally approved either by the DOE's Technical Manager or the Deputy Manager. In case one of these two persons is part of the assessment team, the approval can only be given by the person who is not a part of the assessment team. If the

documents have been satisfactorily approved, the request of issuance is submitted to CDM EB along with the requisite documents.

SECTION B. Verification team, technical reviewer and approver

B.1. Verification 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	Interviews	Verification findings
1.	Lead Auditor/ Technical Expert	OR	Takarkhede	Atul	True Quality Certifications Private Limited- Outsourced entity	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

B.2. Technical reviewer and approver of the verification and certification report

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	EI	Shen	Simon	Applus+ Certification
2.	Approver	IR	Calle de Miguel	Agustin	Applus+ Certification

SECTION C. Application of materiality

C.1. Consideration of materiality in planning the verification

No.	Risk that could lead to material errors, omissions or misstatements	Assessment of the risk		Response to the risk in the verification plan and/or sampling plan
		Risk level	Justification	
1	Human errors: Readings from Meters (if not automatic)	LOW	Human error is likely to occur if the monitoring personnel are not trained well or inexperienced in data recording procedures and monitoring processes.	All the personnel are well trained to monitor and collect data and thus, the risk associated with Human error is minimized. Assessment team checked the training records to confirm that all the personnel are well trained to handle the activities related to monitoring. Assessment team checked the training records for the complete monitoring period and confirm that the personnel are well trained to monitor and collect data for the project activity.
	Human error: Quantification of emission reduction	LOW	Use of spreadsheets without adequate data control, changes/updates, version	All the JMR (Joint Meter Report) sheets and the invoices for the complete monitoring

No.	Risk that could lead to material errors, omissions or misstatements	Assessment of the risk		Response to the risk in the verification plan and/or sampling plan
		Risk level	Justification	
			tracking, traceability and security	period are checked and thus the assessment team confirms that the ER value is conservative and correct.

C.2. Consideration of materiality in conducting the verification

>>

In line with Guidelines for Application of materiality in verifications, the verification team has conducted a complete verification of all the information presented in the monitoring report and data monitored as presented in the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet. There are no material errors, overestimation of ER, omission or misstatement.

SECTION D. Means of verification

D.1. Desk/document review

>>

The verification was performed primarily based on the review of the monitoring report and the supporting documentation. This process included review of data and information presented to verify their completeness and review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment used to include calibration requirements, and the QA/QC procedures, and an evaluation of data management and the QA/QC system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reduction.

The initial MR Version 01 submitted by the project participant and additional background documents related to the emission reductions are reviewed as an initial step of the verification process. The subsequent step involved the identification of corrective action requests, clarification requests and Forward action request (CAR, CL and FAR) which are presented in Appendix 4 of this report. As a result of these findings, the MR is revised and submitted to assessment team. A complete list of all documents and records reviewed is as attached in Appendix 03 of this report.

D.2. On-site inspection

>>

No physical verification was conducted by the DOE for this CDM verification due to high threat of COVID-19 in entire country of India, traveling restrictions, Applus+ internal safety policies and the safeguarding of the involved persons' health. Government of India has ordered nationwide lockdown from 25/03/2020². Latter during second wave of pandemic, it was further imposed by various state governments state-wise lockdown and quarantine rules. State of Rajasthan has imposed various restrictions on public activities & travelling.

Hence, in line with the guidance to relax mandatory site visits by DOEs due to COVID 19 pandemic published by UNFCCC, DOE has taken alternative measures to arrive at conservative estimation of emission reductions achieved, applying standard auditing techniques for verification, as referred in section 9.1.3 of the "CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, Version 03". Moreover, as verified from the ERPA provided by PP, PP has commitment of supplying of CERs to buyer by 31/12/2021. So, the site visit cannot be postponed to a later date. Thus, as per guidance to relax mandatory site visits by DOEs due to COVID 19 pandemic, assessment team have conducted remote audit and used standard auditing techniques to verify information and compliance with applicable requirements to the extent possible, to ensure the completeness and credibility of the audit. The remote audit was conducted virtually and audit was attended by Site In-charge the site as well as consultant. Details of attendees are given below in section D.3. The topics discussed during the remote audit are given in below table;

² https://www.mha.gov.in/sites/default/files/MHADOLrDt_3052020.pdf

Duration of remote inspection: 20/10/2021 (Remote Audit)				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	<p>The verification team conducted remote audit to confirm the information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. This involved:</p> <p>1) an assessment of the implementation and operation of the CDM project activity as per the registered PDD</p> <p>2) a review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting of the monitoring parameters</p> <p>3) interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the Monitoring Plan</p> <p>4) a cross-check between information provided in the MR and data from other sources</p> <p>5) a check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance, and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the applied methodology</p> <p>6) a review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and ERs, and</p> <p>7) an identification of QA/QC procedures in place to prevent, or identify and correct, any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters</p>	District - Jodhpur State - Rajasthan, India	20/10/2021 (Through video conference call)	Dr. Atul Takarkhede

As referred above, the objective of the remote assessment was to verify the following issues:

- Confirm the implementation and operation of the project in line with CDM PDD: the project activity is implemented as per the registered PDD and there is no change in capacity or design of the project activity since commissioning. Same was confirmed from commissioning certificates, technical specifications of the WTGs & recent site photographs, PPA, interviews with PP/Site in charge and JMR as well as invoices raised by PP towards state utility;
- Review the data flow for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters: JMR procedures are followed at the project site in line with the state utility practice and are in line with the registered PDD. JMR procedure is confirmed during the interviews with PP and assessment team also checked entire monthly JMRs issued by the state utility for the project activity with the values provided in the ER sheet for the calculations of the emission reductions;
- Confirm the correct implementation of procedures for operations and data collection: during interviews with PP, it was confirmed that implementation of procedures for operations and data collection is in line with registered PDD. Service provider is responsible for the operations, maintenance as well as maintaining other technical data of the project activity. Performance and operation data of each WTG is controlled and maintained by service provider through the dedicated software and made available to the PP as & when required;
- Cross-check the information provided in the MR documentation with other sources: the information provided in the MR was crosschecked with the commissioning certificates, PPA, calibration certificates and JMRs are issued by Statutory authority and invoices are used for cross-checking;

- Check the monitoring equipment against the requirements of the PDD and the approved methodology, including calibrations, maintenance, etc.: monitoring meters are cross checked with the previous verification reports, interviews with PP, current photographs/videos submitted by PP and calibration is checked with the calibration certificates issued by State Utility authorized third parties;
- Review the calculations and assumptions used to obtain the GHG data and ER: calculation procedures and monthly generation data is checked with JMR and crosschecked with invoices;
- Identify if the quality control and quality assurance procedures are in place to prevent or correct errors or omissions in the reported parameters: during interviews with PP, it was confirmed that quality control and quality assurance procedures are in place. Metering arrangements & JMR procedure is defined and controlled by state utility and PP do not have control on it. Assessment team checked all the monthly JMR values as well as crosschecked with the invoices and found that emission reductions are calculated conservatively.

Thus, to verify the implementation of project activity, onsite operation & maintenance, monitoring & management practices; assessment team has conducted virtual interviews with onsite in-charge, O&M team and also had a detail discussion with the PP representative and reviewed third party statutory documents i.e. Commissioning certificates, Power Purchase Agreement, Complete set of JMRs covering monitoring period, Invoice (for cross check of Net electricity supplied to the grid as per revised PDD), training records, breakdown log, O&M schedule, complaint/feedback register and other relevant records.

After virtual interviews with concerned onsite persons, document reviews & site videos/photographs submitted by PP; assessment team concluded that the project activity is implemented and operated in-line with the registered PDD. There is no change in the project design or operation and monitoring practices at site which can alter the applicability of meth or additionality of the project activity. In addition to the interviews with PP, assessment team have checked the commissioning certificate, PPA and JMRs and found that the project activity is implemented as per the PDD, and Monitoring report submitted by the PP for current monitoring period. From review of JMR and invoices assessment team therefore of the opinion that project is implemented as described in the registered PDD and there is no change in monitoring practices as well as all monitoring parameters as envisaged in the PDD. All the monitored values are supported by the evidences i.e. JMRs and found that information provided in the MR is in line with the submitted evidences. Assessment team reviewed all the calibration certificates and found that monitoring meters are calibrated periodically. Detailed assessment provided later in Section E.7 of this report.

D.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Sail	Mr. Manoj	PP Representative	20/10/2021	As mentioned above in section D.2 of this report	Dr. Atul Takarkhede
2.	Gore	Mr. Atul	O&M team - Suzlon	20/10/2021	As mentioned above in section D.2 of this report	
3.	Yadav	Mrs. Neetu	Consultant, EKI Energy	20/10/2021	As mentioned above in section D.2 of this report	

D.4. Sampling approach

>>

No sampling is used for the verification. The verification team has reviewed all the documents like commissioning certificates, JMR (monthly reports) sheets, invoices etc.

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

Areas of verification findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form	00	01	00
Compliance of the project implementation and operation	00	00	00

with the registered PDD			
Post-registration changes	00	00	00
Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with the methodologies including applicable tools and standardized baselines	00	00	00
Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan	00	01	00
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	00	01	00
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals	00	02	00
Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits	00	00	00
Global stakeholder consultation	00	00	00
Others (please specify)	00	00	00
Total	00	05	00

SECTION E. Verification findings

E.1. Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form

Means of verification	The verification team has determined whether the monitoring report was completed using the valid version of the applicable monitoring report form. The verification team has checked whether all the sections of the monitoring report follow the guidelines provided in the template.
Findings	CAR 01 was raised during the verification process. Please refer Appendix 4 of this report for the complete closure of the CAR.
Conclusion	PP used the latest version of the MR template available on the UNFCCC website i.e., version 09.0. The monitoring report has been prepared as per the instructions provided in the template. DOE has made the version 01 of the monitoring report covering the monitoring period 02/01/2017 to 31/12/2020 (inclusive of both dates) publicly available through its dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website on 14/09/2021 i.e., before undertaking the remote audit for the verification. The verification team has concluded that the monitoring report was completed using the valid version of the applicable monitoring report form and is followed the guidelines contained in the template.

E.2. Remaining forward action requests from validation and/or previous verifications

>>

This is 3rd periodic verification of the project activity. No FAR was raised during the previous verification of this project. Same is verified from previous verification report.

E.3. Compliance of the project implementation and operation with the registered project design document

Means of verification	The verification team determined the conformity of the actual implemented project activity and its operation with the registered project design document. DOE has, by means of a desk review and a remote audit, assessed whether all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place, and that the project participants have operated the CDM project activity as per the registered PDD.
Findings	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
Conclusion	The verification team has reviewed the commissioning certificates to conclude that the capacity of the project is same as mentioned in the registered PDD. The capacity does not change after the registration of the project activity as confirmed by the assessment team during verification remote audit. Project activity is in continuous operation. The situation of continuous operation was confirmed during

remote audit and evident from Breakdown log sheets. No major breakdown was found. Scheduled & preventive maintenance were carried out as per manufacturer specification for the power plant. No unforeseen activity observed during the present verification that can alter the applicability or additionality of the applied methodology. The details are checked by the assessment team from the plant log records and found correct.

Assessment team also checked the relevant implementation status of the project activity and confirm that detail as presented in the MR is correct. The project commissioning dates and locations are described below along with the latitude and longitude.

Owners	Site	Location No.	Geo-Coordinates	Commissioning date
GNA	Ratan ka Bas (RKB)	RKB 06	26°28'06.0" N - 72°29'26.2" E	23/03/2010
		RKB 07	26°28'26.7" N - 72°29'29.0" E	17/03/2010
	Ugawa	Location no. 26	26°37'12.0" N - 70°57'09.0" E	05/09/2010
		Location no. 28	26°37'15.0" N - 70°56'51.0" E	05/09/2010
		Location no. 42	26°37'55.0" N - 70°57'31.0" E	05/09/2010
		Location no. 80	26°38'59.0" N - 70°58'28.0" E	05/09/2010
		Location no. 81	26°39'01.0" N - 70°58'20.20" E	05/09/2010
FSPL		Location no. 64	26°38'54.0" N - 70°57'02.0" E	03/09/2010

The assessment team checked the above details during the verification remote audit & review of commissioning certificates. The same are found in-line with registered PDD. The detail also forms the part of Monitoring report and thus acceptable to the assessment team.

Assessment team checked the technical specifications of WTGs during the remote audit. The details are checked from the manufacturer technical specifications as well as live streaming through remote audit. The details as mentioned in the registered PDD are correct and the same is mentioned in the MR version 02. The project activity comprises of 2 WTGs of 2.1MW each (Suzlon S88) and 6 WTGs of 0.8 MW each (Enercon E53). The technical details of the WTGs in the project activity are as under:

Technical details of Suzlon S88 (2.1 MW) WTGs

Particulars	Details
Rotor:	
Diameter	88 m
No. of Rotor Blade	3
Swept area	6082 m ²
Hub Height	80 m
Regulation	Pitch regulated
Operational data	
Start Wind speed	4 m/s
Stop Wind speed	25 m/s
Installed electrical output	2100kW

Gear Box:	
Type	1 planetary stage/two helical stages
Gear ratio	1:98:8
Power	2310 KW
Generator:	
Type	Single fed induction generator with slip-rings, variable rotor resistance with Suzlon- Flexi – Slip control system
Rated output	2100 kW
Reference speed	1545 rpm
Rated voltage	3phase - 690 V AC
Frequency	50 Hz

Technical details of World Wind India E-53 (formerly known as Enercon E-53) 800KW WTGs

Particulars	Details
Rated Power	800KW
Rotor Diameter	52.9m
Hub Height	75m(Concrete)
Turbine Type	Direct driven, horizontal axis wind turbine with variable rotor speed
Power Regulation	Independent pitch system for each blade.
Cut in wind speed	2.5m/s
Rated wind speed	12m/s
Cut out wind speed	28-34m/s
Extreme wind speed	59.5m/s
Rated rotational speed	29 m/s
Operational range rotational speed	12-29m/s
Orientation	Upwind
No. of Blades	3
Blade Material	Fibre glass Epoxy reinforced
Gear box type	Gear Less
Generator type	Synchronous generator
Braking	Aerodynamic
Output Voltage	400V
Yaw System	Active yawing with 4 electric yaw drives with brake motor
Tower	74m(Concrete)

The plant undergone scheduled maintenance as per the manufacturer's specifications and no unforeseen incident observed by the assessment team during the monitoring period. The details are checked by the assessment team from the plant log records and found correct.

Based on the documentary evidence of commissioning certificates and remote verification, DOE concludes that the project was implemented as per the registered PDD.

E.4. Post-registration changes

E.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents³

>>

There are no temporary deviations applied before and also not applicable for present Monitoring period.

³ 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).

E.4.2. Corrections

>>

During previous monitoring period, PP has applied for correction in the registered PDD and Same is approved by EB on 31/07/2015 with PRC ref no. PRC-7215-001⁴. The correction was related to the Section B.7.3 (Monitoring Plan) of the registered PDD.

E.4.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

>>

There is a change in start date of crediting period of project activity. The start date of crediting period is already changed from 10/09/2012 – 09/09/2022 to 01/01/2013 – 31/12/ 2022 and same is verified from project UN web page⁵.

E.4.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan

>>

Not applicable for present Monitoring period.

E.4.5. Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents

>>

There are no permanent deviations applied before and also not applicable for present Monitoring period.

E.4.6. Changes to the project design

>>

No changes applied for the project activity. Thus, not applicable.

E.4.7. Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities

>>

As this is not an AFOLU project thus this section is not applicable.

E.5. Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with applied methodologies, applied standardized baselines, and other applied methodological regulatory documents

Means of verification	The verification team determined whether the registered monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology AMS-I.D. ver. 17 – “Grid connected renewable electricity generation” including applicable tools.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	The verification team is able to confirm that the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the project activity, i.e., AMS-I.D. ver. 17 – “Grid connected renewable electricity generation” and its applicable tools. The same is followed onsite and thus assessment team confirms that project activity comply with the requirement of Approved methodology and registered PDD.

E.6. Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan**E.6.1. Data and parameters fixed ex ante or at renewal of crediting period**

Means of verification	The assessment team checked the registered PDD to confirm the ex-ante fixed parameter mentioned in the current monitoring report. Assessment team also interviewed site personnel whether monitoring has been to check further regarding the ex-ante values used for emission reduction calculation.
Findings	No findings were raised..
Conclusion	EF _{OM} , EF _{BM} , EF _{CO2} are mentioned as ex-ante fixed parameter in the monitoring

⁴ <https://cdm.unfccc.int/PRCContainer/DB/prcp861155628/view>

⁵ <https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/SGS-UKL1346942833.5/view>

	<p>report. Assessment team checked the values, source of data, choice of data, purpose of the data mentioned in the MR from the registered PDD and confirms that the similar approach was considered for the current monitoring period also.</p> <p>The values of EF_{OM}, EF_{BM}, EF_{CO_2} were considered from the CO₂ baseline database (Version 06) published by Central Electricity Authority (CEA). The default value as mentioned in the registered PDD and MR are same. The value of combined margin in India is being given by CEA and thus assessment team conclude that the value is correct and appropriate. The default value in turn is used for baseline calculation as per the formula given in the registered PDD for the current monitoring period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EF_{OM} = 0.994 tCO₂e/MWh (Confirmed and checked as per the registered CDM PDD) • EF_{BM} = 0.812 tCO₂e/MWh (Confirmed and checked as per the registered CDM PDD) • EF_{CO_2} = 0.948 tCO₂e/MWh (Confirmed and checked as per the registered CDM PDD)
--	---

E.6.2. Data and parameters monitored

Means of verification	<p>The assessment team checked the registered PDD to confirm the ex-post parameter mentioned in the current monitoring report. Assessment team also interviewed the personnel onsite to check further regarding the ex-post parameter monitoring and confirms that the same is in line with the registered PDD. AMS-I.D. ver. 17 – “Grid connected renewable electricity generation” which was the applied methodology during the registration of the project is also checked to ensure that monitoring parameter as mentioned in the registered PDD and current MR are in compliance with the methodology.</p>
Findings	<p>CAR 02 was raised during the verification process. Please refer Appendix 4 of this report for the complete closure of the CAR.</p>
Conclusion	<p>As per the approved monitoring plan, following parameters are monitored by the PP:</p> <p>$EG_{facility, y}$ ($EG_{BL, y}$): Quantity of net electricity supplied to the grid as a result of the implementation of the CDM project activity in year y (MWh). This parameter is calculated from power import and export for both $EG_{GNA, y}$ & $EG_{FSPL, y}$. During current monitoring period, the value for this parameter is calculated as 44,034 MWh as mentioned in the MR version 02 and emission sheet is correct and the same is in compliance with the requirement of Para 364 and 395 (e) of the CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, Version 03.0.</p> <p>$EG_{GNA, y}$: Quantity of net electricity supplied to the grid as a result of the implementation of the CDM project activity of GNA in year y</p> <p>The net generation value of all WTGs of GNA is derived from the measured value of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Power export, power import by all WTGs connected at the substation of the RKB site for the WTGs installed at the RKB site and the controller meter reading of each WTG connected to the substation of the RKB site. Please refer to the section C for calculation procedure for arriving at net electricity supplied to the grid 2. Power export, power import by all WTGs connected at the substation of the Ugawa site for the WTGs installed at the Ugawa site and the controller meter reading of each WTG connected to the substation of the Ugawa site. Please refer to the section C for calculation procedure for arriving at net electricity supplied to the grid. Monitored value of 39,873.78 MWh was confirmed based on JMR submitted by PP.

	<p>During current monitoring period, the value for this parameter is calculated as 39,873.78 MWh as mentioned in the MR version 02 and emission sheet is correct and the same is in compliance with the requirement of Para 364 and 395 (e) of the CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, Version 03.0. Assessment team verified the same with Certificate for breakup of net export units issued by SEB. The values were cross checked with invoices submitted by PP and accepted.</p> <p>EG_{FSPL, y}: Quantity of net electricity supplied to the grid as a result of the implementation of the CDM project activity of FSPL in year y</p> <p>This parameter is calculated from the power export, power import by all WTGs connected at the substation of the Ugawa site and the controller meter reading of each WTG connected to the substation of the Ugawa site and the controller meter reading of each WTG connected to the substation of the Ugawa site. Please refer to the section C for calculation procedure for arriving at net electricity supplied to the grid.</p> <p>During current monitoring period, the value for this parameter is calculated as 4160.251 MWh as mentioned in the MR version 02 and emission sheet is correct and the same is in compliance with the requirement of Para 364 and 395 (e) of the CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, Version 03.0. Assessment team verified the same with Certificate for breakup of net export units issued by SEB. The values were cross checked with invoices submitted by PP and accepted.</p> <p>The Assessment team studied the JMR's issued by the State Utility. The Assessment team also cross-verified the Power Exported values with the help of invoices raised by PP and found correct as per the JMR issued. Calibration of the meter is to be carried out once in a three year as per State Utility practice/Registered PDD, however delay in calibration is observed in the scheduled calibration as detailed out in section E.7 below. Same was addressed in line with para 369 & 370 of the CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, Version 03.0.</p> <p>During the verification all relevant monitoring parameters (as listed in section B.7.1 of PDD) have been verified with regard to the appropriateness of the applied measurement / determination method, the correctness of the values applied for ER calculation, the accuracy, and applied QA/QC measures. The Verification team identified that the correct emission factor is reported under the section D.2 of the monitoring report to apply the appropriately report the emission factor. Based on above assessment the verification team confirms that requisite parameters are monitored in line with registered monitoring plan.</p>
--	---

E.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan

Means of verification	The verification assessed whether the compliance of the sampling efforts and surveys with the registered sampling plan in accordance with the "Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities" if PP had applied a sampling approach to determine data and parameters monitored.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	PP did not apply sampling plan to determine data and parameters monitored during this monitoring period. The verification team has checked all the documents such as JMR (Monthly meter Readings) report, invoice etc. and hence sampling plan was not required. The verification team hereby confirms that are checked all the documents

E.7. Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments

Means of verification	The verification team determined whether the calibration of the measuring equipment that has an impact on the claimed emission reductions is conducted by the PP at a frequency specified in the registered monitoring plan
------------------------------	---

Findings	CAR 03 was raised during the verification process and closed successfully. Please refer Appendix 4 of this report for the detail closure of the CAR.																																																								
Conclusion	Assessment team verified the calibration details of the installed meters with copies of calibration certificates and found that meters are calibrated as per the frequency mentioned in the registered PDD for the monitoring period. The calibration details of the meters are given below: Calibration details of installed energy meters are as follows:																																																								
	<table><tr><th>Meter Sr. No and Accuracy class</th><th>Date of Calibration</th><th>Due Date</th><th>Date of Calibration</th><th>Due Date</th><th>Date of Calibration</th><th>Due Date</th></tr><tr><td>RJB00050 (Main meter) 0.2s class</td><td>27/12/2014</td><td>26/12/2017</td><td>25/12/2017</td><td>24/12/2020</td><td>23/12/2020</td><td>22/12/2023</td></tr><tr><td>11068579 (Main meter) 0.2s class</td><td>26/12/2014</td><td>25/12/2017</td><td>25/12/2017</td><td>24/12/2020</td><td>23/12/2020</td><td>22/12/2023</td></tr><tr><td>11068580 (Check meter) 0.2s class</td><td>26/12/2014</td><td>25/12/2017</td><td>25/12/2017</td><td>24/12/2020</td><td>23/12/2020</td><td>22/12/2023</td></tr><tr><td>RJB 323 (Main meter) 0.2s class</td><td>25/04/2014</td><td>24/04/2017</td><td>24/04/2017</td><td>23/04/2020</td><td>21/04/2020</td><td>20/04/2023</td></tr><tr><td>RJB 322 (Check meter) 0.2s class</td><td>25/04/2014</td><td>24/04/2017</td><td>24/04/2017</td><td>22/04/2020</td><td>21/04/2020</td><td>20/04/2023</td></tr><tr><td>RJB00320 (Main meter) 0.2s class</td><td>25/04/2014</td><td>24/04/2017</td><td>24/04/2017</td><td>22/04/2020</td><td>21/04/2020</td><td>20/04/2023</td></tr><tr><td>RJB00319 (Check meter) 0.2s class</td><td>25/04/2014</td><td>24/04/2017</td><td>24/04/2017</td><td>22/04/2020</td><td>21/04/2020</td><td>20/04/2023</td></tr></table>	Meter Sr. No and Accuracy class	Date of Calibration	Due Date	Date of Calibration	Due Date	Date of Calibration	Due Date	RJB00050 (Main meter) 0.2s class	27/12/2014	26/12/2017	25/12/2017	24/12/2020	23/12/2020	22/12/2023	11068579 (Main meter) 0.2s class	26/12/2014	25/12/2017	25/12/2017	24/12/2020	23/12/2020	22/12/2023	11068580 (Check meter) 0.2s class	26/12/2014	25/12/2017	25/12/2017	24/12/2020	23/12/2020	22/12/2023	RJB 323 (Main meter) 0.2s class	25/04/2014	24/04/2017	24/04/2017	23/04/2020	21/04/2020	20/04/2023	RJB 322 (Check meter) 0.2s class	25/04/2014	24/04/2017	24/04/2017	22/04/2020	21/04/2020	20/04/2023	RJB00320 (Main meter) 0.2s class	25/04/2014	24/04/2017	24/04/2017	22/04/2020	21/04/2020	20/04/2023	RJB00319 (Check meter) 0.2s class	25/04/2014	24/04/2017	24/04/2017	22/04/2020	21/04/2020	20/04/2023
	Meter Sr. No and Accuracy class	Date of Calibration	Due Date	Date of Calibration	Due Date	Date of Calibration	Due Date																																																		
	RJB00050 (Main meter) 0.2s class	27/12/2014	26/12/2017	25/12/2017	24/12/2020	23/12/2020	22/12/2023																																																		
	11068579 (Main meter) 0.2s class	26/12/2014	25/12/2017	25/12/2017	24/12/2020	23/12/2020	22/12/2023																																																		
11068580 (Check meter) 0.2s class	26/12/2014	25/12/2017	25/12/2017	24/12/2020	23/12/2020	22/12/2023																																																			
RJB 323 (Main meter) 0.2s class	25/04/2014	24/04/2017	24/04/2017	23/04/2020	21/04/2020	20/04/2023																																																			
RJB 322 (Check meter) 0.2s class	25/04/2014	24/04/2017	24/04/2017	22/04/2020	21/04/2020	20/04/2023																																																			
RJB00320 (Main meter) 0.2s class	25/04/2014	24/04/2017	24/04/2017	22/04/2020	21/04/2020	20/04/2023																																																			
RJB00319 (Check meter) 0.2s class	25/04/2014	24/04/2017	24/04/2017	22/04/2020	21/04/2020	20/04/2023																																																			
	Assessment team confirms that all the energy meters (both main and check meter) installed are of accuracy class of 0.2s and are calibrated as per the national standards followed by the electricity board.																																																								
	Calibration of the meter is to be carried out once in three years, as per registered CDM PDD. However, no delay is observed in the scheduled calibration as detailed out above table. Same was addressed in line with para 366(a) & 367 of the CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, Version 03.																																																								
	The calibration is done by accredited Laboratory from National Accreditation Board for Testing and Calibration, Govt. of India (http://www.nablindia.org) to carry out calibration. Assessment team checked the same and found that the calibration is appropriate and correct as traceability is ensured.																																																								

E.8. Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals

E.8.1. Calculation of baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	The verification team assessed whether the data and calculations of GHG emission reductions achieved resulting from the registered CDM project activity. The verification team has checked whether calculations of baseline GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan.
Findings	CAR 04 & CAR 05 were raised during the verification process and closed successfully. Please refer Appendix 4 of this report for the detail closure of the CAR.
Conclusion	<p>Baseline emissions include only CO₂e emissions from electricity generation with fossil fuel-based power plants by renewable-wind energy. The Calculation of baseline emissions for the monitoring period is presented properly in the MR and the same is checked by the assessment team and found correct. Baseline emission is calculated below as per the formula given in registered PDD.</p> <p>As per the approved methodology AMS-I.D. ver. 17 – “Grid connected renewable electricity generation”, baseline emissions for the project activity are the product of</p>

	<p>electrical energy baseline $EG_{BL, y}$ expressed in MWh of electricity produced by the renewable energy generating unit multiplied by the grid emission factor.</p> <p>$BE_y = EG_{BL, y} \times EF_{CO_2, grid, y}$</p> <p>Where,</p> <p>Emission factor of the grid (combined margin) = 0.948 tCO₂e/MWh</p> <p>Net electricity substituted in the grid during the periodic year y (MWh) = 44,034 MWh</p> <p> $BE_y = EG_{BL, y} \times EF_{CO_2, grid, y}$ $= (EG_{GNA, y} + EG_{FSPL, y}) \times EF_{CO_2, grid, y}$ $= (39873.78 + 4160.251) \text{ MWh} \times 0.948 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh}$ $= 44,034 \times 0.948$ $= 41,742 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e (round down value)}$ </p>
--	--

E.8.2. Calculation of project GHG emissions or actual net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	The verification team assessed whether the data and calculations of GHG emission reductions achieved resulting from the registered CDM project activity. The verification team has checked whether calculations of project GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan.
Findings	No findings were raised
Conclusion	The project emissions are regarded as zero according to the applied methodology and registered PDD.

E.8.3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions

Means of verification	The verification team assessed whether the data and calculations of GHG emission reductions achieved resulting from the registered CDM project activity. The verification team has checked whether calculations of leakage GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	The leakage emissions are regarded as zero according to the applied methodology and registered PDD.

E.8.4. Summary calculation of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	The verification team assessed whether the data and calculations of GHG emission reductions achieved resulting from the registered CDM project activity. The verification team has checked whether calculations of baseline GHG emissions, project GHG emissions and leakage GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	<p>Emission reductions in this monitoring period are:</p> <p>Total Baseline Emissions: 41,742 tCO₂e</p> <p>Total Project Emission: 0 tCO₂e</p> <p>Total Leakage: 0 tCO₂e</p> <p>Total Emission Reduction: Emission reduction calculation is done based on following formula,</p> <p>Emission reduction (ER_y) = Baseline Emission (BE_y) – Project Emission (PE_y) – Leakage Emission (LE_y)</p>

	$= 41,742 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e} - 0 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e} - 0 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$ $= 41,742 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$
--	---

E.8.5. Comparison of actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks with estimates in registered PDD

Means of verification	The verification team has determined the emission reductions achieved during this monitoring period with the estimated value and reason for increase if any.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	<p>The actual emission reduction achieved by the activity is 41,742 tCO₂e. The estimated emission reductions in the registered PDD for 365 days is 14,029 tCO₂e. The current monitoring period contains 1,460 days. The estimated value for the present monitoring period is 56,116 tCO₂e. This value is calculated based on pro-rata basis from the estimated value in the registered PDD. The calculation is checked by the assessment team in the actual emission reduction sheet and found correct.</p> <p>The actual emission reduction is 25.61% lower than the estimated value. The lower generation during the current verification period is due to the lower performance of the wind machines during the current monitoring period. Hence, it is acceptable to DOE.</p>

E.8.6. Remarks on difference from estimated value in registered PDD

Means of verification	The verification team has determined the emission reductions achieved during this monitoring period with the estimated value and reason for increase if any.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	The actual Emission Reduction (ER) value achieved in the monitoring period is 25.61% lower than the estimated emission reductions during the current monitoring period, which is due to the lower performance of the wind machines during the current monitoring period. Hence accepted by verification team.

E.8.7. Actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks during the first commitment period and the period from 1 January 2013 onwards

Means of verification	The verification team has determined the CER achieved during first commitment period and second commitment period
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	<p>1. GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks reported up to 31 December 2012: 0 tCO₂e</p> <p>2. GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks reported from 1 January 2013 to 31 December 2020: 41,742 tCO₂e</p> <p>3. GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks reported from 1 January 2020 onwards: 0 tCO₂e</p>

E.9. Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits

Means of verification	Not applicable for the present monitoring period
Findings	Not applicable for the present monitoring period
Conclusion	Not applicable for the present monitoring period

E.10. Global stakeholder consultation

Means of verification	Not applicable for the present monitoring period
Findings	Not applicable for the present monitoring period
Conclusion	Not applicable for the present monitoring period

SECTION F. Internal quality control

>>

As a final step for Verification assessment, the final documentation, including the Verification Report, has to undergo an internal quality control by the Technical Reviewer(s) to be approved.

Details of the Technical Reviewer(s) are provided within the Verification Report in Section B.2. and Appendix 2 for further references of knowledge and capability to conduct the quality checking.

After the Technical Review process, the final documentation may undergo a final quality checking process called Administrative Review, done by the Applus+ Certification's Project Manager and/or Technical Support. For final approval, the final set of documents are prepared by the DOE's Technical Manager or its deputy and signed by the authorized signatory of the DOE.

In case any of the persons performing this final internal quality, control approval process has acted as a part of the Assessment Team or Technical Review team, the approval can only be given by DOE's authorized personnel who are not part of those teams.

If the final set of documents has been satisfactorily approved, a request of issuance is submitted to the UNFCCC CDM EB along with the relevant documents.

SECTION G. Verification opinion

>>

Applus+ Certification has been engaged by Gangadhar Narsingdas Agrawal, (HUF) (India) to perform 3rd periodical verification of the "Bundled 9.00 MW wind power Generation project in Rajasthan, India by M/s. Gangadhar Narsingdas Agrawal Group" (UN reference number: 7215).

The management of Gangadhar Narsingdas Agrawal, (HUF) (India) is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions on the basis set out within the project's Monitoring Plan in the registered PDD version 10 dated 30/04/2015 and the applied methodology AMS-I.D. ver. 17 – "Grid connected renewable electricity generation", version 17.

Our verification approach was based on the requirements as defined under the Kyoto Protocol, Marrakesh accord, as well as those defined by the CDM Executive Board. Our approach is risk-based, drawing on an understanding of the risks associated with reporting GHG emissions data and the controls in place to mitigate these. The verification can confirm that:

- the project is operated as planned and described in the project design document approved by the EB;
- the monitoring plan is as per the applied methodology;
- the monitoring in Monitoring Report is as per the PDD and the monitoring plan approved by the EB;
- the development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures are in accordance with the registered monitoring plan;
- the installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably, however, delay in calibration observed which is addressed in line with para 366 (a) of CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, version 03.0;
- the monitoring system is in place and generates GHG emission reductions data;
- the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements.

In our opinion, the GHG emission reductions for "Bundled 9.00 MW wind power Generation project in Rajasthan, India by M/s. Gangadhar Narsingdas Agrawal Group" for the monitoring period 02/01/2017 to 31/12/2020; as reported in Monitoring Report, prepared on the basis of the project's Monitoring Plan are fairly stated.

Based on the information we have seen and evaluated, we confirm the following statement:

Reporting period:

From 02/01/2017 to 31/12/2020;

Verified emissions in the above reporting period:

Leakage emissions

0 tCO₂ equivalents

Project emissions

0 tCO₂ equivalents

Baseline emissions

41,742 tCO₂ equivalents

Emission reductions

41,742 tCO₂ equivalents

SECTION H. Certification statement

>>

Same as above

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
CM	Combined Margin
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	Emission Reductions Sheet
FAR	Forward Action Request
JMR	Joint Meter Reading
GHG	Greenhouse Gas(es)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
SLDC	State Load Dispatch Centre
WTG	Wind Turbine Generator

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

1. **Dr. Atul Takarkhede** is Ph.D. (Environmental Sciences) from Institute of Science, RTM Nagpur University, Nagpur, and he has already published different technical papers related to environmental sciences. He counts with more than 11 years of experience in field of Environmental Auditing, consulting and accreditation. He is an expert in ISO 9001-14001, CO2/GHG Reporting, Carbon Foot Print, Energy, Water and Waste Management reporting for organizations' environmental performance. His professional portfolio is mainly related with carrying out EIA, conducting QA/QC of EIA Reports; conducting environmental/water audits; NABET requirements appliance, functional area expert in Water Pollution & Solid & Hazardous Waste management among others. Furthermore, he counts with solid experience on CDM-VCS-GS consultancy and auditing. Currently he is associated with True Quality Certifications Private Limited and empanelled with Applus+ Certification to carry out GHG audits in the aforementioned schemes.
2. **Mr. Simon Shen** (Master's Degree in Thermal Energy Engineering, Bachelor's Degree in Environmental Engineering) is an Auditor appointed by Applus+ LGAI for the GHG project assessment, auditing and technical review. He has more than 6 years of work experience in CDM/GS4GG/VCS project assessment and review with Applus+, apart from the years of experience working as GHG Auditor and ISO 9001/14001 in TUV SUD for 3.5 years before he joined Applus+. Mr. Simon Shen has extensive experience also as former Applus+ Shanghai CDM Technical Manager. Mr. Simon Shen is based in Shanghai, China.

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1.	NA	Commissioning	Commissioning Certificates of the Wind Power	Project

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
		certificates	Project.	participant
2.	NA	Contract of the project participant with the DOE	Contract document signed between PP and DOE	Project participant
3.	NA	CDM Project standard- version 03.0	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, Version 03.0	UNFCCC
4.	NA	Joint Meter Reading (JMR)	Joint Meter Reading (JMR) for the complete monitoring period issued by State Utility	Project participant
5.	NA	Invoices	Invoices for the complete monitoring period raised by PP towards State Utility	Project participant
6.	NA	MR version 01	MR version 01 dated 09/06/2021	Project participant
		MR version 02	MR version 02 dated 20/11/2021	
7.	NA	ER sheet version 01	ER version 01 dated 09/06/2021 ER version 02 dated 20/11/2021	Project participant
8.	NA	Break Down details of plant	Log book records onsite	Project participant
9.	NA	Application of materiality	Guidelines for Application of materiality in verifications version 2.0	UNFCCC
10.	NA	Registered documents of the project activity	Registered PDD version 10.0 dated 30/04/2015	UNFCCC website
11.	NA	Approved methodology	AMS-I.D. ver. 17 - Grid connected renewable electricity generation	UNFCCC
12.	NA	Calibration certificates	Calibration certificates of all meter associated with current monitoring period	PP
13.	NA	PPA	Copy of Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) between State Utility and project proponent	PP
14.	NA	Training record	Training records of the O&M personnel	PP

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

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

FAR ID	xx	Section no.	E.2	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR				
No FAR is remaining from validation or previous verifications.				
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	xx	Section no.		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of CL				
NA				
Project participant response				Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by project participant				
DOE assessment				Date: DD/MM/YYYY

Table 3. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	01	Section no.	E.1	Date: 20/10/2021
Description of CAR				
Following inconsistencies observed during review of the MR:				
1. MR template version 8.0 have been now updated to version 9. Corrective action sought for updating MR in latest MR template.				
2. Following documents are requested for further analysis:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioning certificates of WTGs. • PPA 				
Project participant response				Date: 20/11/2021
1. MR Template version is now updated to version 09.				
2. Following documents are submitted for the further analysis :				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioning certificates of WTGs has been submitted to the assessment team. • PPA has been submitted to the assessment team. 				
Documentation provided by project participant				
1. MR –Version 02				
2. Commissioning certificates				
3. PPA				
DOE assessment				Date: 22/11/2021
1. PP has now updated the MR to version 9 MR template and submitted the revised version 02 MR.				
2. Commissioning certificate and PPA have now been provided by the PP and found correct.				
The findings is now closed.				

CAR ID	02	Section no.	E.6.2	Date: 20/10/2021
Description of CAR				
PP requested to submit all JMR & other supporting documents for all the monitoring parameters and invoices for crosscheck of electricity export/import for the project activity.				
Project participant response				Date: 20/11/2021
All JMR & other supporting documents for all the monitoring parameters and invoices are submitted to the assessment team.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
1. JMRs & Invoices				
DOE assessment				Date: 22/11/2021
The required documents for all monitoring parameters have now been provided by the PP. The finding is now closed.				

CAR ID	03	Section no.	E.7	Date: 20/10/2021
---------------	----	--------------------	-----	-------------------------

Description of CAR	
PP requested to submit calibration details/certificates for cross-checking by the assessment team.	
Project participant response	Date: 20/11/2021
The calibration certificates has been submitted to the assessment team.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
1. Calibration certificates	
DOE assessment	Date: 22/11/2021
The calibration certificates have now been submitted to the DOE. During review, DOE team found monitoring meters are properly calibrated for the complete monitoring period and no delay is observed thus accepted and finding is now closed.	

CAR ID	04	Section no.	E.8.1	Date: 20/10/2021
Description of CAR				
PP requested to submit ER calculation sheet for further assessment of the emission reduction for this monitoring period.				
Project participant response				Date: 20/11/2021
ER calculation sheet has been submitted to the assessment team.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
1. ER sheet				
DOE assessment				Date: 22/11/2021
ER sheet has now been submitted by the PP. The finding is now closed.				

CAR ID	05	Section no.	E.8.1	Date: 20/10/2021
Description of CAR				
Notations of the parameters & the formulae used for baseline emissions, BE _y is not in line with the PDD. Corrective action sought.				
Project participant response				Date: 20/11/2021
Notations of the parameters & the formulae used for baseline emissions is now updated in MR –Version -02				
Documentation provided by project participant				
1. MR –Version 02				
DOE assessment				Date: 22/11/2021
Notation of the parameters and formulae has now been corrected in the revised MR version 02. Revised MR version 02 has been provided by the PP. The finding is closed.				

Table 4. FAR from this verification

FAR ID	xx	Section No.		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR				
NA				
Project participant response				Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by project participant				
DOE assessment				
				Date: DD/MM/YYYY

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
04.0	6 April 2021	Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect the “Clarification: Regulatory requirements under temporary measures for post-2020 cases” (CDM-EB109-A01-CLAR).
03.0	31 May 2019	Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure consistency with version 03.0 of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (CDM-EB93-A05-STAN); • Make structural and editorial improvements.
02.1	11 January 2018	Editorial revision to correct the numbering of appendices in the instructions.
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: Issuance Keywords: project activities, verifying and certifying		