



VALIDATION OPINION WIND WORLD (INDIA) LTD.

VALIDATION OF POST REGISTRATION CHANGES OF THE ENERCON WIND FARM (HINDUSTAN) LTD. IN RAJASTHAN

REPORT No. **INDIA-PRC/618.49/2012**

REVISION No.00

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

62/71 Boulevard du Château
92571 Neuilly Sur Seine Cdx - France



VALIDATION OPINION

Date of first issue: 30/11/2013		Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS	
Client: Wind World (India) Ltd.		Client ref.: Mr. Yogesh Mehra	
Project reference No.: 1168	Date of registration: 15/03/2010	Registered PDD version and date Version 11, 17/09/2012	Revised PDD version and date Version 12, 14/11/2013
Monitoring period to which the request applies.: From 01/10/2012 onwards		PRC tracks <input type="checkbox"/> Prior approval track <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Issuance track	
The DOE conducted validation of the changes: <input type="checkbox"/> Prior to commencement of a verification for the project activity or PoA. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> When performing a verification for the project activity or PoA.			
Types of Changes <input type="checkbox"/> A. Temporary deviations from the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD, PoA-DD or generic CPA-DD, or the monitoring methodology <input type="checkbox"/> B. Corrections that do not affect project/ programme design <input type="checkbox"/> C. Change to the start date of the crediting period <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D. Permanent changes from the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD or the monitoring methodology <input type="checkbox"/> E. Changes to the project or programme design of a registered project activity or PoA <input type="checkbox"/> F. Changes specific to afforestation or reforestation project activities			

Report No.: Country-PRC/618.49/2012	Subject Group: CDM
Project title: Enercon Wind Farm (Hindustan) Ltd. in Rajasthan	
Work carried out by: Mr. Anurag Juyal - Team Leader Mr. Prabhavtar Singh - Team Member	
Internal Technical Review carried out by: Mr. Sanjay Patankar	
Date of this revision: 19/12/2013	Rev. No.: 01
Number of pages: 22	

Indexing terms

Work approved by:

Matthieu Martini

- ☒ No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit
- ☐ Limited distribution
- ☐ Unrestricted distribution



Abbreviations

CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reductions
CL	Clarification Request
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Green House Gas(es)
MoV	Means of Verification
MP	Monitoring Plan
PDD	Project Design Document
PLF	Plant Load Factor
PP	Project Participant
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
PRC	Post-Registration Changes
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard



Table of Contents	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.1. Objective	5
1.2. Scope	5
1.3. Validation Team	5
2. METHODOLOGY	5
2.1. Review of Documents	6
2.2. Follow-up Interviews	6
2.3. Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests	6
2.4. Internal Technical Review	7
3. VALIDATION CONCLUSIONS	7
3.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan and/or monitoring methodology (255-256)	8
3.2. Corrections (259)	8
3.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period (261)	8
3.4. Permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or monitoring methodology (267-268)	8
3.5. Changes to the project design of a registered project activity (277-282)	9
4. VALIDATION OPINION	10
5. REFERENCES	11
6. CURRICULA VITAE OF THE DOE'S VALIDATION TEAM MEMBERS	12
APPENDIX A: VALIDATION PROTOCOL FOR POST REGISTRATION CHANGES	14



1. INTRODUCTION

Wind World (India) Ltd. has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to validate the post-registration changes of CDM project Enercon Wind Farm (Hindustan) Ltd. in Rajasthan (hereafter called “the Project”) at Kita and Pithodai Ki Dhani village, in Jaisalmer District in the State of Rajasthan, India.

This report summarizes the findings of the validation of the post-registration changes, performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

1.1. Objective

The objective of a validation is to provide a thorough and independent third party assessment of the post-registration changes. In particular, the changes’ compliance with relevant UNFCCC and host country criteria are validated in order to confirm that the changes meet the applicable CDM requirements and the identified criteria.

1.2. Scope

The validation scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the revised project design document and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against the requirements of paragraph 37 of the CDM M&Ps, the applicability conditions of the selected methodology and guidance issued by the Board.

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

1.3. Validation Team

The assessment team and internal technical reviewer team consist of the following personnel:

FUNCTION	NAME	TA 1.2	TA X.X	TASK PERFORMED*
Team Leader	Mr. Anurag Juyal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DR <input type="checkbox"/> SV <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RI <input type="checkbox"/> TR
Team Member	Mr. Prabhavtar Singh	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SV <input type="checkbox"/> RI <input type="checkbox"/> TR
Internal Technical Reviewer (ITR)	Mr. Sanjay Patankar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> DR <input type="checkbox"/> SV <input type="checkbox"/> RI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TR

*DR = Document Review; SV = Site Visit; RI = Report issuance; TR = Internal Technical Review

2. METHODOLOGY

The overall validation, from Contract Review to Validation Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

VALIDATION OPINION

In order to ensure transparency, a validation protocol was customized for the project, according to the version 05.0 of the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard, issued by CDM Executive Board at its 75th meeting on 04/10/2013 (/6/). The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), means of validation and the results from validating the identified criteria. The validation protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organizes, details and clarifies the requirements the post-registration changes are expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent validation process where the validator will document how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the validation.

The completed validation protocol is enclosed in Appendix A to this report.

2.1. Review of Documents

The Revised Project Design Document (PDD) submitted by Wind World (India) Ltd. and additional background documents related to the project design and monitoring plan were reviewed.

Furthermore, cross checks were made between information provided in the revised PDD and information from sources other than those used.

To address Bureau Veritas Certification corrective action and clarification requests, Wind World (India) Ltd. revised the PDD and resubmitted it on 14/11/2013.

The validation conclusions presented in this report relate to the project as described in the revised PDD version 12.

2.2. Follow-up Interviews

On 16/10/2013, Bureau Veritas Certification performed a site visit and interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of Enercon Wind Farm (Hindustan) Ltd and Wind World (India) Ltd. were interviewed (see References).

2.3. Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the validation is to resolve issues that require further elaboration, research or expansion prior to Bureau Veritas Certification's positive conclusion on the post-registration changes.

A Corrective Action Request (CAR) is raised, if one of the following situations occurs:

- (a) The project participants have made mistakes that will influence the ability of the project activity to achieve real, measurable, verifiable and additional emission reductions;
- (b) The applicable CDM requirements have not been met;

VALIDATION OPINION

(c) There is a risk that emission reductions cannot be monitored or calculated.

A Clarification Request (CL) is raised, if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM requirements have been met.

A Forward Action Request (FAR) may also be raised during validation, to identify issues related to project implementation that require review during the first verification of the project activity.

To guarantee the transparency of the validation process, the issues raised, the responses provided by the project participants, the means of validation of such responses and references to any resulting changes in the PDD or supporting annexes are documented in the Validation Protocol in Appendix A.

2.4. Internal Technical Review

The validation opinion underwent an Internal Technical Review (ITR) before requesting approval of the post-registration changes.

The ITR is an independent process performed to examine thoroughly that the process of validation has been carried out in conformance with the requirements of the validation scheme as well as internal Bureau Veritas Certification procedures.

The Team Leader provides a copy of the validation opinion to the reviewer, including any necessary validation documentation. The reviewer reviews the submitted documentation for conformance with the validation scheme. This will be a comprehensive review of all documentation generated during the validation process.

When performing an Internal Technical Review, the reviewer ensures that:

- The validation activity has been performed by the team by exercising utmost diligence and complete adherence to the CDM rules and requirements.
- The review encompasses all aspects related to the project which includes project design, baseline, additionality, monitoring plans and emission reduction calculations, internal quality assurance systems of the project participant as well as the project activity, closure of CARs and CLs during the validation exercise, review of sample documents.

The reviewer may raise Clarification Requests to the validation team and will discuss these matters with the Team Leader.

After the agreement of the responses to the Clarification Requests from the validation team as well as the PP(s), the finalized validation opinion is accepted for further processing such as uploading via the UNFCCC interface.

3. VALIDATION CONCLUSIONS

In the following sections, the conclusions of the validation are stated.

The findings from the desk review of the revised project design documents and the findings from interviews during the follow up visit are described in the Validation Protocol in Appendix A.

VALIDATION OPINION

The Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Validation Protocol in Appendix A. The validation of the Project resulted in nil CAR(s), nil CL(s) and nil FAR(s).

The CARs and CLs were closed out based on adequate responses from the Project Participant(s) which meet the applicable requirements. They have been reassessed before their formal acceptance and closure.

The number between brackets at the end of each section corresponds to the VVS paragraph.

3.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan and/or monitoring methodology (255-256)

Not Applicable.

3.2. Corrections (259)

Not Applicable.

3.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period (261)

Not Applicable.

3.4. Permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or monitoring methodology (267-268)

Reason

According to the approved PDD version 11.0 dated 17/09/2012, the source of data for net electricity supplied to grid by the project activity is the invoices raised by PP to the Discom and the same was cross checked with the payment Cheque received from the Discoms against the invoices raised.

Due to change in mode of payment, from Cheque to electronic fund the transfer the crosschecking source (payment Cheque) will no longer be available to PP. Hence, the PDD is revised to change the information regarding the source of data & the crosschecking source.

Summary of the changes

Section B.7.1

- (1) For monitoring parameter EGy, the source of data has been changed from Invoices to Monthly generation breakup sheets issued by O&M service provider. And the cross checking source is changed from payment Cheque to Invoices.

**Assessment on the changes**

(a) The proposed revisions ensure that the level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring and verification process is not reduced as a result of the revision.

The proposed changes are only the change of documents for source of information. The actual procedure of measurement, monitoring & recording of data is the same as in the revised PDD version 11.

Validation team has verified the letter (Ref RDPPC/SR.AO/F./D 2488 dated 12/10/2012) by the Rajasthan Discom Power Procurement Centre, directing the wind energy owner to furnish the RTGS/NEFT details for electronic transfer of payment.

(b) The proposed revisions are in accordance with the monitoring methodology.

The source of data for net electricity generation has been revised from Invoices to Breakup sheets, the breakup sheets are prepared by the O&M service provider for the all the wind machines in the wind farm . These monthly generation breakup sheet is submitted to the respective project owner & the respective Discom. Based on these breakup sheets the PP raises the invoice to Discom, the Discom after checking the information in Invoices with Information in the breakup sheet (provided by O&M service provider) release the payment for the electricity supplied. Hence the monthly breakup sheet can be regarded as an appropriate source of data.

The applied methodology ACM0002 Version 6.0, for the monitoring parameter EGy, recommends the crosscheck with the payment receipts /invoices. The invoice raised by PP to Discom for sale of power becomes the basis for payment by DISCOM. Hence the change of crosscheck document from Cheque to Invoices meets the requirement of methodology.

The above changes in the monitoring plan is as of a type listed in Appendix 1 , of project standard Version 5.0, viz. change in practice of monitoring which is not under control of project participant, hence prior approval of the changes in monitoring plan is not needed.

(c) The findings of previous verification reports, if any, have been taken into account.

N.A There is no open issue identified in the validation report and previous verification report of the Project.

3.5. Changes to the project design of a registered project activity (277-282)

Not Applicable.



4. VALIDATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed a validation of post-registration changes of the Enercon Wind Farm (Hindustan) Ltd. in Rajasthan, which is located in Kita and Pithodai Ki Dhani village, in Jaisalmer District in the State of Rajasthan, India. The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, and host country criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The validation consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the project design document and additional background documents; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final validation report and opinion.

The review of the revised project design document, relevant additional information and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided Bureau Veritas Certification with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of stated criteria. In our opinion, the post-registration changes meet all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM and the relevant host country criteria. Bureau Veritas Certification thus requests the approval of post-registration changes of the project activity.

Mr. Sanjay Patankar
Internal Technical Reviewer
19/12/2013

Mr. Anurag Juyal
Team Leader
19/12/2013



5. REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:

Documents provided by project participants that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

- /1/ Approved revised PDD version 11.0 , Dated 17/09/2012
- /2/ Revised PDD version 12.0, Dated 14/11/2013
- /3/ Sample copy of monthly generation Breakup sheet issued by O&M service provider
- /4/ Sample copy of Invoices raised to Discom for sale of power
- /5/ Letter from Rajasthan Discom Power Procurement Centre (Ref RDPPC/SR.AO/F./D 2488 dated 12/10/2012)

Category 2 Documents:

Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents used for cross-check.

- /6/ CDM Validation and Verification Standard Version 5.0 (EB75 Annex 5)
- /7/ CDM Validation Project Standard Version 5.0 (EB75 Annex 4)
- /8/ CDM Project Cycle Procedure Version 01.0 (EB65 Annex 32)
- /9/ Consolidated methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources , version 6.0

Persons interviewed:

Persons interviewed during the validation or persons that contributed with other information that are not included in the documents listed above.

Wind World (India) Ltd.

- /1/ Mr. Puneet Katyal, General Manager, Wind World (India) Ltd.
- /2/ Ms. Anushree Mishra Asst Manager, Wind World (India) Ltd.
- /3/ Mr. Jeetendra Kumar Supervisor MEE, Wind World (India) Ltd.



6. CURRICULA VITAE OF THE DOE'S VALIDATION TEAM MEMBERS

Mr. Anurag Juyal	Bureau Veritas Certification, India	<p>Team Leader, Climate Change Lead Verifier,</p> <p>Mr. Anurag Juyal is a Post-graduate in Energy Systems with around 6 years of experience in the field of climate change services. He is working in Bureau Veritas Certification (India) Pvt. Ltd. as Verifier-Climate Change. Prior to joining Bureau Veritas, he worked on GS/CDM/VCS projects as a consultant. He has received extensive training in CDM validation and verification processes and participated in assessment of CDM projects.</p>
Mr. Prabhavtar Singh	Bureau Veritas Certification, India	<p>Team Member, Climate Change Verifier.</p> <p>He has a Bachelors of Technology degree in Mechanical Engineering and Masters of Business Administration degree in Energy and Finance. Has overall experience of more than 5 years, including 2 years in manufacturing industry in functions like Quality, Process validation and QMS and 3 years in the field of CDM and VCS. Has worked on various Wind, Hydro, Natural gas base CCPP and Biomass CDM projects. He has undergone training related to Clean Development Mechanism. He is working in Bureau Veritas Certification (India) Pvt. Ltd. as Verifier – Climate Change and currently involved in validation and verification of CDM projects</p>
Mr. Sanjay Patankar	Bureau Veritas Certification, India	<p>Technical Reviewer, Climate Change Lead Verifier.</p> <p>Educational qualifications: B.E. (Mech.) M.E. (Mech.)</p> <p>He has over 20 years of experience in engineering manufacturing industry covering various functions like enterprise management, product design, engineering, tool & die design, improvements in the production shop, quality assurance & control and systems planning and implementation, including ISO 9001 based quality management systems. Working for the last 3 years in Bureau Veritas Certification (India) Pvt. Ltd. as Lead</p>



VALIDATION OPINION

		Auditor for ISO 9001, 14001 and OHSAS 18001 standards/specifications.
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------

VALIDATION OPINION

APPENDIX A: VALIDATION PROTOCOL FOR POST REGISTRATION CHANGES

Table 1 Validation requirements based on VVS section 9.5 (EB75 Annex5) and PS section 12.8 (EB75 Annex4)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology					
a. Are there deviations from the registered monitoring plan or methodology?	VVS	251	Not Applicable	OK	OK
b. Do the provisions of appendix 1 of the Project standard apply to the identified deviations?	VVS	252	Not Applicable	OK	OK
c. If the provisions of appendix 1 of the Project standard do not apply, is prior approval from the Board with respect to the acceptability of the deviations sought?	VVS	252	Not Applicable	OK	OK
d. If the deviation will lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of ERs, are conservative assumptions or discount factors applied to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that ERs will not be over-estimated as a result	VVS	253	Not Applicable	OK	OK



VALIDATION OPINION

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
of the deviation?					
e. For cases where a deviation from the monitoring plan may be applicable to the monitoring period under verification, and part of the subsequent monitoring period, is the exact period to which the deviation applies verified?	VVS	254	Not Applicable	OK	OK
2. Corrections					
a. Are the corrections to project information or parameters fixed at validation, as described in the registered PDD, made by PPs in a revised PDD comply with the requirements of the Project standard?	VVS	257	Not Applicable	OK	OK
b. Is the corrected information an accurate reflection of actual project information?	VVS	258 (a)	Not Applicable	OK	OK
c. Are the corrected parameters in accordance with the applied methodology and/or selected monitoring plan?	VVS	258 (b)	Not Applicable	OK	OK



VALIDATION OPINION

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period					
a. Is it ensured that the start date of the crediting period in the registered PDD was not prior to the date of registration?	PS	211	Not Applicable	OK	OK
b. Is it ensured that PPs do not request any changes to the start date of the crediting period of more than two years - not more than four years for project activities hosted by a Least Developed Country?	PS	212	Not Applicable	OK	OK
c. If the change of the start date of the crediting period constitutes a difference of more than one year but less than two years - more than two years but less than four years for project activities hosted by a Least Developed Country, do PPs demonstrate that no changes have occurred to the project activity that would result in a less conservative baseline, and that substantive progress has been made by the PPs to start the project activity?	PS	214	Not Applicable	OK	OK

VALIDATION OPINION

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
4. Permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or monitoring methodology					
a. Is it ensured that the changes to the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD are in compliance with the applied methodology and do not reduce the level of accuracy of the monitoring compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan?	VVS	263	Since the revision in the monitoring plan pertain to only change in source document only. The measurement procedure and calculation method is the same as the approved revised PDD version 11.0. There is no change in the accuracy level of the measuring instruments. Hence prior approval is not needed	OK	OK
b. If the proposed changes refer to a later version of the applied methodology in the registered PDD, does the application of any later version of the applied methodology and tools impact the conservativeness of the monitoring and verification process, including the related emission reduction calculation?	VVS	264	Not Applicable	OK	OK
c. If the PPs are unable to implement the registered monitoring plan and it will not be possible to monitor the registered CDM project activity in accordance with a monitoring plan	VVS	265	Since the revision in the monitoring plan pertain to only change in source document only. The measurement procedure and calculation method is the same as the approved revised PDD version 11.0. There is no change in the accuracy level of the measuring instruments. Hence prior approval is not needed	OK	OK

VALIDATION OPINION

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
that would comply with the applied methodology and any applicable tools or the relevant provisions of appendix 1 of the Project standard, is any guidance (prior approval) requested from the Board concerning the acceptability of the permanent changes?					
d. If the permanent changes will lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of ERs, are conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations applied to the extent required to ensure that ERs will not be over-estimated as a result of the permanent change?	VVS	266	No the permanent changes in monitoring plan will not lead to reduction in accuracy. The proposed changes are only change in the source documents for the parameter EGy. The measurement & monitoring procedures are same as in the approved revised PDD.	OK	OK
5. Changes to the project design of a registered project activity					
a. If the project design in the implementation or operation of the project activity does not conform with the description contained in the registered PDD or the relevant provisions of appendix 1 of the Project standard, is any guidance (prior approval) requested from the Board concerning the acceptability of	VVS	270	Not Applicable	OK	OK



VALIDATION OPINION

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
the proposed or actual changes?					
b. Was an on-site visit conducted in case of actual changes?	VVS	271	Not Applicable	OK	OK
c. Does the revised PDD describe the nature and extent of the proposed or actual changes, including	PS	218	Not Applicable	OK	OK
i. Changes in the effective output capacity due to increased installed capacity or increased number of units, or installation of units with lower capacity or units with a technology which is less advanced than that described in the PDD?	PS	218 (a)	Not Applicable	OK	OK
ii. Addition of component or extension of technology?	PS	218 (b)	Not Applicable	OK	OK
iii. Removal or addition of one site (or more) of a project activity registered with multiple-sites?	PS	218 (c)	Not Applicable	OK	OK
iv. Actual operational parameters which are within the control of PPs differing from the expected parameters?	PS	218 (d)	Not Applicable	OK	OK
v. Any consequential changes to the	PS	218 (e)	Not Applicable	OK	OK



VALIDATION OPINION

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
baseline methodology, including changing or adding another baseline methodology or applying a baseline scenario that is more appropriate as a result of the proposed or actual modifications to the project activity?					
d. Are the impacts of the proposed or actual changes to the registered CDM project activity reported in the revised PDD, including	PS	219	Not Applicable	OK	OK
i. The applicability and application of the applied methodology under which the project activity has been registered?	PS	219 (a)	Not Applicable	OK	OK
ii. Compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodology?	PS	219 (b)	Not Applicable	OK	OK
iii. The level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project activity?	PS	219 (c)	Not Applicable	OK	OK
iv. The additionality of the project activity?	PS	219 (d)	Not Applicable	OK	OK
v. The scale of the project activity?	PS	219 (e)	Not Applicable	OK	OK
e. Are the proposed or actual changes	VVS	273	Not Applicable	OK	OK

VALIDATION OPINION

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
would adversely affect the conclusions of the validation report of the registered PDD with regard to:					
i. Additionality of the project activity?	VVS	273 (a)	Not Applicable	OK	OK
ii. Scale of the project activity?	VVS	273 (b)	Not Applicable	OK	OK
iii. Applicability and application of approved baseline methodology under which the project activity has been registered?	VVS	273 (c)	Not Applicable	OK	OK
iv. The compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied monitoring methodology?	VVS	273 (d)	Not Applicable	OK	OK
f. If the proposed or actual changes affect the additionality of the project activity:	VVS	274	Not Applicable	OK	OK
i. In the case of investment analysis, have PPs only modified the key parameters in the original spreadsheet calculations affected by the proposed or actual changes to the project activity?	VVS	274 (a)	Not Applicable	OK	OK
ii. In the case where only barriers have been claimed to demonstrate	VVS	274 (b)	Not Applicable	OK	OK



VALIDATION OPINION

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
additionality, have PPs demonstrated that the barriers are still valid under the new circumstances?					
g. If the PP applies a later version of the methodology or another methodology that is applicable to the project activity, is it confirmed that the applied methodology and tools do not impact the conservativeness of the monitoring and verification process and the related emission reduction calculations?	VVS	275	Not Applicable	OK	OK
h. Does the revised PDD comply with the applied monitoring methodology and tools or any later version of the methodology or the requirements of another methodology that is applicable to the project activity?	VVS	276	Not Applicable	OK	OK



VALIDATION OPINION

Bookmark

Contract No.	618.49/2012
Project title	Enercon Wind Farm (Hindustan) Ltd. in Rajasthan
UN Ref. No	1168
Revised PDD version	12
Revised PDD date	14/11/2013
Methodology A and version	ACM0002 Version 6.0
Methodology B and version	ACM000X Version XX
Crediting period	15/03/2010 to 14/03/2020
Site visit date	16/10/2013
FVR Sign-off date	19/12/2013
Project owner	Enercon Wind Farm (Hindustan) Ltd
Project buyer	BBB Company
Consultant	Wind World (India) Ltd.
Client	Wind World (India) Ltd.
Project location	Kita and Pithodai Ki Dhani village, in Jaisalmer District in the State of Rajasthan, India
Team Leader	Mr. Anurag Juyal
Team Member	Mr. Prabhavtar Singh
Technical Reviewer	Mr. Sanjay Patankar