




**Verification and certification report form for
CDM project activities
(Version 03.0)**

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

BASIC INFORMATION

Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity	50.4 MW wind power project by EN Renewable Energy Pvt. Ltd (UNFCCC Ref. No. 4364)
Scale of the project activity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Large-scale <input type="checkbox"/> Small-scale
Version number of the verification and certification report	01
Completion date of the verification and certification report	02/04/2021
Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period	Monitoring period No.: 04 01/04/2018 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 April 2018 - 31 March 2025
Project participants	EN Renewable Energy Limited (India, Private Entity)
Host Party	India
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	Methodology: ACM0002:Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, Version 20.0 Standardized Methodology: Not Applicable
Mandatory sectoral scopes	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	290,056 tCO ₂ e
Certified amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring period	GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks reported up to 31 December 2012: 0 tCO ₂ e GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks reported from 1 January 2013 onwards: 216,375 tCO ₂ e
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	Mr. Agustín Calle de Miguel <i>Applus+ Certification CDM Technical Manager</i> Signature: 

SECTION A. Executive summary

EN Renewable Energy Limited ("ENRE") has installed 50.4 MW wind power project consisting of 63 wind energy converters (WECs) of Enercon. The project activity supplying electricity generated to Electricity Distribution Company (DISCOM) which are connected to national grid. The electricity generated from the wind farm displaces an equivalent amount of power from the grid which is fed mainly by fossil fuel fired power thereby marginally contributing to reducing the energy demand supply gap in the state of Karnataka, diversification of grid supply and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The project activity primarily aims at reducing Green House Gas (GHG) emissions through utilization of renewable energy technology for generation of electrical energy. The project activity is in line with the sustainable development priority of the country.

During the reported monitoring period from 01/04/2018 to 31/12/2020 (inclusive of both the dates) the project activity has supplied 229,722 MWh of electricity, and thus contributing to the GHG reductions of 216,375 tCO_{2e}.

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 02.0 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:

LGAI 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 projects 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
Mr. Pankaj Kumar	LA/TE	YES	YES	NA
Mr. Simon Shen	TR	YES	YES	NA

The curriculum vitae of the DOE's Verification team members are 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 on-site inspection 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 evidences 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	Kumar	Pankaj	True Quality Certifications Private Limited- Outsourced entity	Yes	Yes	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	Simon	Shen	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.
2	Human error: Quantification of emission reduction	LOW	Use of spreadsheets without adequate data control, changes/updates, version tracking, traceability and security	All the JMR (Monthly meter report) sheets and the invoices for the complete monitoring 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 1 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 to MR Version 2. A complete list of all documents and records reviewed is as attached in Appendix 03 of this report.

D.2. On-site inspection

Duration of on-site inspection: 19/03/2021				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	<p>The verification team conducted site visit to confirm the information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. This involved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) an assessment of the implementation and operation of the CDM project activity as per the registered PDD 2) a review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting of the monitoring parameters 3) interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the Monitoring Plan 4) a cross-check between information provided in the MR and data from other sources 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 6) a review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and ERs, and 7) an identification of QA/QC procedures in place to prevent, or identify and correct, any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters 	Karnataka	19/03/2021	Pankaj Kumar

D.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Jadi	Mahesh	PP representative	19/03/2021	As mentioned above in section D.2 of this report	Mr. Pankaj Kumar
2.	Kumar	Prakash	Consultant ,EKI		As mentioned above in section D.2 of this report	
3.	Shetty	Shivanand	Local Stakeholder		As mentioned above in section D.2 of this report	
4..	Gowda	Ramesh	Local Stakeholder		As mentioned above in section D.2 of this report	

D.4. Sampling approach

No sampling is used as the verification team has visited site along with the substations. 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	00	00
Compliance of the project implementation and operation with the registered PDD	00	00	00
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	00	00
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	00	00	00
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals	01	00	00
Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits	00	00	00
Global stakeholder consultation	00	00	00
Others (please specify) – -Regarding Double Counting - Breakdown Details	02	00	00
Total	03	00	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 follows the guidelines provided in the template.
Findings	No CAR/CL raised in this section.
Conclusion	The MR was web hosted in version 07.0 of the MR form, which is the current and active version in the UN platform. PP used the latest version of the MR template available on the UNFCCC website i.e. version 07.0. The monitoring report has been prepared as per the instructions provided in the template. DOE has made the version 1 of the monitoring report covering the monitoring period 01/04/2018 to 31/12/2020(inclusive of both dates) publicly available through its dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website on 09/02/2021 i.e. before undertaking the site visit 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 4th periodic verification of the project activity. No FAR was raised during the previous verification of this project.

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 an on-site visit, 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	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 site visit. Project activity is in continuous operation. The situation of continuous operation is confirmed during site visit and evident from plant operation log sheets. No major breakdown was found. Scheduled & preventive maintenance was 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 locations are described below along with the latitude and longitude.							
	Sr. No.	Location Number	Village	Taluka		District	Latitude (N)	Longitude (E)
1	HH01	Deshnur	Bailhongal		Belgaum	15°55'50.9"	74°42'2.9"	31.03.2011
2	HH02	Deshnur	Bailhongal		Belgaum	15°55'56.6"	74°42'1.3"	31.03.2011

3	HH03	Deshnur	Bailhongal	Belgaum	15°56'5.8"	74°42'2.3"	31.03.2011
4	HH04	Deshnur	Bailhongal	Belgaum	15°56'10.9"	74°42'0.3"	31.03.2011
5	HH06	Deshnur	Bailhongal	Belgaum	15°56'15"	74°42'31.4"	31.03.2011
6	HH07	Deshnur	Bailhongal	Belgaum	15°56'21"	74°42'31.2"	31.03.2011
7	HH08	Deshnur	Bailhongal	Belgaum	15°56'27.6"	74°42'26.6"	31.03.2011
8	HH11	Deshnur	Bailhongal	Belgaum	15°56'35.4"	74°42'36.8"	31.03.2011
9	HH12	Deshnur	Bailhongal	Belgaum	15°56'41.3"	74°42'35.5"	31.03.2011
10	HH13	Deshnur	Bailhongal	Belgaum	15°56'47.7"	74°42'35.5"	31.03.2011
11	HH14	Deshnur	Bailhongal	Belgaum	15°56'53.9"	74°42'36.2"	31.03.2011
12	HH15	Deshnur	Bailhongal	Belgaum	15°56'58.2"	74°42'18.8"	31.03.2011
13	HH16	Deshnur	Bailhongal	Belgaum	15°57'2.8"	74°42'13.7"	31.03.2011
14	HH17	Deshnur	Bailhongal	Belgaum	15°57'15.6"	74°43'5.0"	31.03.2011
15	H1	Ganginahall	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'26.4"	74°32'44.3"	16.02.2011
16	H2	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'20.1"	74°32'44.2"	16.02.2011
17	H3	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'13.6"	74°32'42.7"	16.02.2011
18	H4	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'4.5"	74°32'39.6"	16.02.2011
19	H5	Sunahatti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'57.6"	74°32'42.7"	16.02.2011
20	H6	Sunahatti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'51.5"	74°32'44.3"	16.02.2011
21	H7	Sunahatti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'44.6"	74°32'43.3"	16.02.2011
22	H8	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'38"	74°32'38.1"	16.02.2011
23	H9	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'30.9"	74°32'38.3"	16.02.2011
24	H10	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'58.1"	74°31'55.5"	16.02.2011
25	H11	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'37.4"	74°32'2.5"	16.02.2011
26	H12	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'31.9"	74°32'7.4"	16.02.2011
27	H13	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'24.2"	74°32'30.9"	16.02.2011
28	H14	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'17.8"	74°32'30.4"	16.02.2011
29	H15	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'12.2"	74°32'33.7"	16.02.2011
30	H16	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'14.5"	74°32'1.4"	16.02.2011
31	H17	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'4.1"	74°32'19.1"	16.02.2011
32	H18	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°55'58.2"	74°32'20.9"	16.02.2011
33	H19	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°55'53"	74°32'24."	16.02.2011

				m		4"	
34	H20	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°55'47.5"	74°32'29.4"	16.02.2011
35	H21	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°55'38.3"	74°32'32.7"	16.02.2011
36	H22	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°55'36.7"	74°32'15.8"	16.02.2011
37	H23	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°55'41.9"	74°32'10.9"	16.02.2011
38	H24	Kakti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°55'40"	74°33'20.6"	16.02.2011
39	H27	Kanabargi	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°55'24.7"	74°33'47.1"	16.02.2011
40	H28	Kanabargi	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°55'57.2"	74°34'39.6"	31.03.2011
41	H41	Baramanahatti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'20"	74°35'6.3"	16.02.2011
42	H42	Baramanahatti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'26.6"	74°34'54.8"	16.02.2011
43	H43	Baramanahatti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'32.7"	74°34'46.1"	16.02.2011
44	H44	Baramanahatti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'38.2"	74°34'42.1"	16.02.2011
45	H45	Baramanahatti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'46.1"	74°34'40.5"	16.02.2011
46	H46	Baramanahatti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'53.4"	74°34'38.4"	11.03.2011
47	H47	Baramanahatti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'46.9"	74°34'19.4"	11.03.2011
48	H48	Baramanahatti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'52.8"	74°34'17.7"	11.03.2011
49	H49	Nandi	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°56'60"	74°34'19.3"	11.03.2011
50	H50	Nandi	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'6.6"	74°34'21"	11.03.2011
51	H51	Nandi	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'12.8"	74°34'21.1"	11.03.2011
52	H52	Nandi	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'19.9"	74°34'22.8"	11.03.2011
53	H53	Nandi	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'26.3"	74°34'23.6"	11.03.2011
54	H54	Nandi	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'33.3"	74°34'25.2"	11.03.2011
55	H55	Nandi	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'41.3"	74°34'28.5"	11.03.2011
56	H56	Nandi	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'48.1"	74°34'30.1"	11.03.2011
57	H57	Nandi	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'54.5"	74°34'30.4"	11.03.2011
58	H58	Nandi	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'34.2"	74°35'8"	11.03.2011
59	H59	Nandi	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'27.7"	74°35'7.3"	31.03.2011
60	H60	Baramanahatti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'21.9"	74°35'9.5"	11.03.2011
61	H61	Baramanahatti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'11.8"	74°35'21"	11.03.2011
62	H62	Baramanahatti	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'24.5"	74°35'25.6"	31.03.2011
63	H63	Nandi	Belgaum	Belgaum	15°57'31.3"	74°35'26.5"	31.03.2011

The assessment team checked the above details during the verification site visit & 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 specification and details of the power plant during the onsite visit. The details are checked from the manufacturer technical specification as well as from the physical visit. The detail as mentioned in the registered PDD is correct and the same is mentioned in the MR version 2. The details are as follow:

The technical specifications of the WTGs are as below:

Turbine model	Enercon E- 53
Rated power	800 KW
Rotor diameter	53 m
Hub height	75 m
Turbine Type	Gearless horizontal axis wind turbine with variable rotor speed
Power regulation	Independent electromechanical pitch system for each blade.
Cutin windspeed	2.5 m/s
Rated wind speed	12 m/s
Cutout Windspeed	28-34 m/s
Extreme Wind Speed	59.5 m/s
Rated rotational speed	32 rpm
Operating range rot. speed	12-29 rpm
Orientation	Upwind
No of Blades	3
Blade Material	Glass Fibre reinforced Epoxy
Gear box type	Gear less
Generator type	Synchronous generator
Braking	Aerodynamic
Output Voltage	400 V
Yaw System	Active yawing with 4 electric yaw drives with brake motor and friction bearing
Tower	74 m 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 physical 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 documents¹

Not applicable for present Monitoring period.

¹ 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

Not applicable for present Monitoring period.

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

There is no change to the start date of crediting period.

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

Not applicable for present Monitoring period.

E.4.6. Changes to the project design

Not applicable for present Monitoring period.

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

Not applicable for present Monitoring period.

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 ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, Version 20.0
Findings	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
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. ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", Version 20.0. 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	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
Conclusion	<p>$EF_{grid,CM}$, $EF_{grid,BM,y}$, $EF_{grid,OM,y}$ were mentioned as ex-ante fixed parameter. 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 $EF_{grid,OM,y}$, $EF_{grid,BM,y}$, $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ were considered from the CO₂ baseline database (Version 08) 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</p>

	<p>current monitoring period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $EF_{OM,y} = 0.9622 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/MWh}$ (Confirmed and checked as per the registered CDM PDD) • $EF_{BM,y} = 0.8811 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/MWh}$ (Confirmed and checked as per the registered CDM PDD) • $EF_y = EF_{grid,CM,y} = 0.9419 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/MWh}$ (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 and ACM0002-“Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources”, Version 20.0, 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>There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.</p>
Conclusion	<p>As per the approved monitoring plan, following parameters are monitored by the PP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EG_y - Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project Activity. The value monitored is 229,722.66 MWh. 2. G_{pe} - Electricity Export recorded at the meter(s) connected 63 machines of the project activity. The value monitored is 233,767.205 MWh. 3. G_{pi} - Electricity Import recorded at the meter(s) connected 63 machines of the project activity. The value monitored is 123.606 MWh. 4. Li - Transmission loss between the metering point for the project activity feeding the pooling substation of Enercon and the metering point at EB Substation/Switching Station. The value monitored is 3902.400 MWh. <p>The primary source of data is the JMR Statements / Statements on Break-up of Net Export Units prepared by the O&M Service provider and signed by State electricity official.</p> <p>In case of any discrepancy between the calculated net electricity exported and the total net electricity exported reported in invoices / JMR Statements / Statements or Break-up of Net Export Units prepared by the O&M Service provider, the conservative value has been applied. The Total Net Electricity exported as per calculations is lesser than that mentioned in JMRs/Breakup sheet for the current monitoring period and hence the same has been used for Emission reduction calculations.</p> <p>The meter reading is taken during a fixed billing cycle of every month and representative of state electricity board and Operation and maintenance personnel onsite present during the process. Assessment team checked all the values of the electricity exported and electricity imported from the JMR issued by Enercon. The net electricity exported to the grid is then calculated from the difference of export & import value. The value of export & import is then cross-checked from the invoices raised by the project participant, which is in accordance with approved methodology and registered PDD.</p>

E.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan

Means of verification	<p>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</p>
------------------------------	---

	had applied a sampling approach to determine data and parameters monitored.
Findings	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
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	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.				
Conclusion	Assessment team checked the calibration details of the installed meters and found that meters are calibrated as per the frequency mentioned in the registered PDD for the monitoring period. During the current monitoring period, energy meters calibrated annually and delay in calibration occurred during the month of Feb-2019, therefore error factor equivalent to accuracy class has been applied to the Feb-2019 month.				
	The calibration details of the meters are given below:				
	Capacity (MW)	11.2		39.2	
	No. of M/C	14		49	
	Site	Deshanur Hanumanhatti		Hulevannur	
	District	Belgaum		Belgaum	
	Meter Type	Main Meter	Check Meter	Main Meter	Check Meter
	Meter Sr. no.	9142441	9142578	9142435	9142603
	Accuracy class	0.2s	0.2s	0.2s	0.2s
	Calibration Frequency	One Year			
	Calibration date	5-Feb-2018	5-Feb-2018	5-Feb-2018	5-Feb-2018
	Calibration date	13-Feb-2019	13-Feb-2019	13-Feb-2019	13-Feb-2019
	Calibration date	21-Oct-2019	21-Oct-2019	21-Oct-2019	21-Oct-2019
	Calibration date	08-Jul-2020	08-Jul-2020	08-Jul-2020	08-Jul-2020
	Due date of Calibration	07-Jul-2021	07-Jul-2021	07-Jul-2021	07-Jul-2021
	Assessment team confirms that all the energy meters (both main and check meter) installed at the substation are of accuracy class of 0.2s and are calibrated as per the national standards followed by the electricity board, but they are calibrated at least once each year (As per the registered PDD). Verification team observed that there was delay in calibration of meter in 2019, hence correction factor of 0.2% applied for the electricity generation value of Feb. 2019. Verification team checked and verified the ER sheet and found the calculation of net electricity generation as appropriate and conservative.				
Assessment team observed that Meter calibrations frequency was followed completely for the current monitoring period. The calibration of the energy meters installed at HT side of the transformer were carried out by State Utility through approved third party agencies i.e (Enercon) and the same is acceptable to the assessment team & thus traceability of the calibration is also confirmed by the assessment team.					

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	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
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 ACM0002:Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", Version 20.0, baseline emissions for the project activity are the product of electrical energy baseline EGBL, y expressed in MWh of electricity produced by the renewable energy generating unit multiplied by the grid emission factor.</p> $BE_y = EG_y * EF_{grid, CM, y}$ <p>Where:</p> <p>BE_y = Baseline emissions in year y (tCO₂e/yr) EG_y = Quantity of net electricity generation that is produced and fed into the grid as a result of the implementation of the CDM project activity in year y (MWh/yr) EF_{grid,CM,y} = Combined margin CO₂e emission factor for grid connected power generation in year y calculated using the latest version of the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" (tCO₂e/MWh)</p> <p>Baseline emissions (BE_y) = 229,722 (MWh) * 0.9419 (tCO₂e/MWh) = 216,375 tCO₂e</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 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 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	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	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
Conclusion	<p>Emission reductions in this monitoring period are:</p> <p>Total Baseline Emissions: 216,375 tCO₂e</p> <p>Total Project Emission: 0 tCO₂e</p> <p>Total Leakage: 0</p> <p>Total Emission Reduction: Emission reduction calculation is done based on following formula,</p> $\text{Emission reduction (ER}_y\text{)} = \text{Baseline Emission (BE}_y\text{)} - \text{Project Emission (PE}_y\text{)} - \text{Leakage Emission (L}_y\text{)}$ $= 216,375 \text{ tCO}_2 - 0 - 0 \text{ tCO}_2$ $= 216,375 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$

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	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
Conclusion	<p>The actual emission reduction achieved by the activity is 216,375 tCO₂e. The estimated emission reductions in the in the registered PDD for 365 days is 1,05,239 tCO₂e. The current monitoring period contains 1006 days. This value is calculated based on pro-rata basis from the estimated value in the registered PDD. The estimated value for the present monitoring period is this 290,056 tCO₂e. The calculation is checked by the assessment team in the actual emission reduction sheet and found correct.</p> <p>The actual emission reduction is 25.40% lower than the estimated value. The generation of electricity depends upon many other climatic conditions, which are not within the control of the project participant. The lower generation during the current verification period is due to certain natural conditions. 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	CL 01 was raised and successfully closed.
Conclusion	The actual Emission Reduction (ER) value achieved in the monitoring period is 25.40% lower than the estimated emission reductions during the current monitoring period. Such variation has been due to lower electricity generation based on low wind availability. 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.
Findings	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
Conclusion	1.GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks reported up to 31 December 2012: 0 tCO ₂ e 2.GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks reported from 1 January 2013 onwards: 216,375 tCO ₂ e

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 of verification, the final documentation including the verification report has to undergo an internal quality control by the Technical Reviewer. Then each report has to be finally approved either by the DOE's Technical Manager or the Deputy. 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. Internal quality control ensures impartiality and quality of the report.

SECTION G. Verification opinion

Applus+ Certification has been engaged by EN Renewable Energy Limited to perform the 1st periodical verification of the "50.4 MW wind power project by EN Renewable Energy Pvt. Ltd" (UN reference number: 4364).

The management of EN Renewable Energy Limited 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 7 dated 11/09/2020 and the applied methodology ACM0002:Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", Version 20.0.

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 02.0;
- 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 "50.4 MW wind power project by EN Renewable Energy Pvt. Ltd" for the monitoring period 01/04/2018 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 01/04/2018 to 31/12/2020;

Verified emissions in the above reporting period:

Leakage emissions	0 tCO ₂ equivalents
Project emissions	0 tCO ₂ equivalents
Baseline emissions	216,375 tCO ₂ equivalents
Emission reductions	216,375 tCO ₂ 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
WTG	Wind Turbine Generator

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

1. **Mr. Pankaj Kumar** worked as team leader – Bihar for South Asia Climate Proofing and Growth Development (CPGD) – Climate Change Innovation Programme (CCIP) supported by DFID that seeks to mainstream climate change resilience into planning and budgeting at the national and sub-national level in India, Pakistan, Nepal, and Afghanistan. Pankaj Kumar has worked previously with IL&FS Infrastructure Development Corporation and BUIDCO (Bihar Urban Infrastructure Development Corporation), Govt. Of Bihar as Environmental Specialist for WB & ADB funded projects. Prior to this, he worked with Carbon Check (UNFCCC accredited DoE), Johannesburg, RSA as Team Leader for validation, verification of around 100 GHG projects in Asia, Africa, USA, Asia Pacific & Americas. Pankaj is accredited Lead Auditor, Validator, Verifier and Technical Expert for Sectoral Scope/Technical Area – 1.1, 1.2, 3.1 & 13.1 by UNFCCC DoE (Designated Operational Entity), APPLUS, Spain. He is also member of task force on climate change & human health, Health Department, GoB and on roster of UNICEF's WASH experts. He is an experienced, qualified and result oriented Environment Professional having more than 14 yrs. Of relevant experience in Climate Change (Mitigation & Adaptation), Environmental Due Diligence, Disaster Risk Reduction, Validation and Verification of GHG project under CDM, Verified Carbon Standard, Gold Standard & Social Carbon Standard, Brazil. He provides technical support for environmental investigative, consultative and remedial projects involving air, water and soil, Waste management, EIA, Environmental Compliance, ISO 14001, OHSAS 18001, GHG accounting (ISO 14064) and Carbon foot printing. Pankaj Kumar is Masters in Environment Management from Forest Research Institute (University), I.C.F.R.E, Dehradun, which is Centre of Excellence in South East Asia for Forestry education & research and PGDEL from National Law School of India University, Bangalore (India).

2. **Mr. Simon Shen** (Master Degree in Thermal Energy Engineering, Bachelor Degree in Environmental Engineering) is a Lead Auditor appointed by Applus+ LGAI for the GHG project assessment. He is based in Shanghai. He has several years of work experience in environmental protection field. Before he joined Applus+ LGAI, he had been worked for TÜV SÜD as a GHG Validator/Assessment team and ISO 9001/14001 Lead Auditor for 5 years.

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1.	NA	Commissioning certificates	Commissioning Certificates of the Wind Power Project.	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 02.0	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, Version 02.0	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 02	MR version 1 dated 02/02/2021 MR version 2 dated 23/03/2021	Project participant
7.	NA	ER sheet version 01 ER sheet, version 02	ER version 01 dated 02/02/2021 ER sheet, ver. 02 dated 23/03/2021	Project participant
8.	NA	Actual geo-coordinates	Actual coordinates for the project activity via GPS meters	Project participant
9.	NA	Break Down details of plant	Log book records onsite	Project participant
10.	NA	Application of materiality	Guidelines for Application of materiality in verifications version 2.0	UNFCCC
11.	NA	Registered documents of the project activity	Registered PDD version 07 dated 11/09/2020	UNFCCC website
12.	NA	Approved methodology	ACM0002 : Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, Version 20.0	UNFCCC
13.	NA	Calibration certificates	Calibration certificates of all meter associated with current monitoring period	PP
14.	NA	PPA	Copy of Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) between State Utility and project proponent	PP
15.	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.	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR			
<i>No FAR is remaining from validation or previous verifications.</i>			
Project participant response			Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by project participant			
DOE assessment			Date: DD/MM/YYYY

Table 2. CL from this verification

CL ID	01	Section no.	A.1	Date : 22/03/2021
Description of CL				
1. In section A.1 of MR, estimated emission reduction/ year mentioned as 104,878 which is not consistent with the value mentioned in sec. A.1 of registered PDD (i.e. 105,239). PP shall clarify.				
Project participant response				Date : 23/03/2021
Inconsistent values have been revised thoroughly over the ER and MR				
Documentation provided by project participant				
ER V2 and MR V2				
DOE assessment				Date: 23/03/2021
PP has now corrected the value of estimated emission reduction/year which is 105,239 in section A.1 of registered PDD of revised MR version 2. Hence, Comment closed.				

CL ID	02	Section no.	B.1	Date : 22/03/2021
Description of CL				
1. In section B.1, the weblink provided for the verification of turbine model is not functional. Hence, PP is requested to provide functional weblink. 2. PP shall provide an undertaking regarding no double counting of emission reductions claimed for this monitoring period.				
Project participant response				Date :
1. The weblink and details have been upgraded therefore, link has been removed from the MR. A technical description document is being provided to support the WTG technical description. 2. An undertaking regarding no double counting is being provided.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
WTG technical document and no double counting declaration.				
DOE assessment				Date: 23/03/2021
1. PP has provided a technical document for the verification of turbine model, which is checked by the DOE and found correct. Hence, comment closed. 2. PP has provided undertaking for no double counting document, which is checked by the DOE and found correct. Hence, comment closed.				

CL ID	03	Section no.	C	Date : 22/03/2021
Description of CL				

1. PP shall provide breakdown details in the monitoring period.

Project participant response	Date : 23/03/2021
<i>Major breakdown details are being submitted.</i>	
Documentation provided by project participant	
MR V2 and Major Breakdown sheet	
DOE assessment	Date:23/03/2021
PP has provided the document related to breakdown details which is checked by the DOE and found correct. Hence, comment closed .	

Table 3 FAR from this verification

FAR ID	xx	Section No.	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR			
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>
03.0	31 May 2019	Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure consistency with version 02.0 of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (CDM-EB93-A05-STAN);• 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		