
ASSESSMENT OPINION ON POST-REGISTRATION CHANGES

M/s. A.A. Energy Limited

**Biomass based power generation
project in Maharashtra, India**

UNFCCC Ref. No. 4078

SGS Climate Change Programme

SGS United Kingdom Ltd
SGS House
217-221 London Road
Camberley Surrey
GU15 3EY
United Kingdom

Date of Issue:		Project Number:	
08/05/2014		CDM.VER1227 RAC	
Project Title:			
Biomass based power generation project in Maharashtra, India			
Organisation:		Client:	
SGS United Kingdom Limited		M/s. A.A. Energy Limited	
Subject:			
Assessment Opinion for Request for Approval of Changes:			
	Temporary Deviation from the Monitoring Plan		Distribution/Document Control
[X]	Permanent changes to the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD		
[X]	Correction in the registered PDD		
	Temporary Deviation from the monitoring plan and Permanent changes to the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD		
Validation Team:			
Ravi Kant Soni – Lead Assessor and Local Assessor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Distribution (without permission from the Client or responsible organisational unit)	
Vijaybhai Patel – Assessor			
Tarit Roy – Technical Area Expert (TA 1.1)			
Technical Review:			
Date: 12/05/2014		<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Distribution	
Name: Vikas Bankar			
Authorised Signatory:			
Name: Siddharth Yadav		<input type="checkbox"/> Unrestricted Distribution	
Date: 03/06/2014			
Revision Number:	Date:	Number of Pages:	
0	11/02/2014	29	
1	21/03/2014	35	
2	14/04/2014	35	
3	08/05/2014	34	
4	08/05/2014	34	

Abbreviations

AAEL	M/s A.A. Energy Limited
AMS	Approved Methodology Small-scale
BM	Build Margin
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reductions
CL	Clarification Request
CO ₂ e	Carbon Dioxide equivalent
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EB	CDM Executive Board
EF	Emission Factor
ER	Emission Reductions
GHG	Greenhouse Gas(es)
GPS	Global Positioning System
MP	Monitoring Plan
MW/MWh	Megawatt/ Megawatt hour
NEWNE	North East West and North-East
NCV	Net Calorific Value
OM	Operating Margin
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
SFC	Specific Fuel Consumption
RMP	Revised Monitoring Plan
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard

Table of Content

1. Assessment Opinion	5
2. Introduction	6
2.1 Objective	6
2.2 Scope	6
2.3 GHG Project Description	6
3. Methodology	7
3.1 Review of CDM-PDD and Additional Documentation	7
3.2 Use of the Validation Protocol	7
3.3 Findings	7
3.4 Internal Quality Control	8
4. Validation Findings	9
4.1 Permanent Changes from the monitoring plan	9
4.2 Corrections that do not affect the project design	9
4.3 Application of Monitoring Methodology and Monitoring Plan	11
4.4 Possible impacts on emission reduction calculations due to change in monitoring plan:	14
4.5 Findings of Previous Verification Reports	14
5. List of Persons Interviewed	15
6. Document References	16
Annex 1: Validation Protocols	17
Annex 2: Overview of Findings	25
Annex 3: Statement of Competence	30

1. Assessment Opinion

Section 9.5 "Post Registration Changes" of the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard version 06.0, requires the DOE to assess post registration changes to a project activity.

Section 6.2 "Changes to registered CDM project activity or programme of activities" of the CDM Project Cycle Procedure, Version 06 provides the category and procedure for changes to project activity and, subject the changes to validation by a Designated Operational Entity.

SGS United Kingdom Ltd has been contracted by M/s A.A. Energy Limited (AAEL) to perform such a validation of the post registration changes for the CDM registered project "Biomass based power generation project in Maharashtra, India" UNFCCC ref. no. 4078; The category for the change is "permanent changes to the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD" and "corrections made in the registered PDD".

The purpose of a validation is to have an independent third party assessment of the permanent changes to the monitoring plan and corrections made in the registered PDD. In particular, the DOE should assess whether the changes affect the level of accuracy and/or completeness and the conformity with the applied approved monitoring methodology compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan.

By applying the proposed changes to the registered monitoring plan, the amount of electricity generated using biomass fuels calculated as per paragraph 20 of the applicable methodology AMS I. D. version 15 will be compared with the amount of electricity generated calculated using specific fuel consumption and amount of each type of biomass fuel used. The lower of the two values will be used to calculate emission reductions as per the applied methodology. The actual consumption of all type of fuel will be based on the monitoring values at the project site. Accordingly the ex-ante parameter SFC_{FF} has been included in section B.6.2 of the revised PDD.

Further to improve the transparency and completeness of monitoring procedure and keeping compliance with the applied Monitoring Methodology AMS I.D. version 15 and also due to a revision in the PDD template corrections have been made under section B.6.2 and B.7.1.

All permanent changes made to the monitoring plan, the revisions and corrections have been detailed in the section 4 of this report.

The changes improve the accuracy of information provided and consistency between the registered PDD and the monitoring plan.

Furthermore, we confirm that:

- (a) the proposed changes have been described, and an assessment has been provided to substantiate the reasons for each of the proposed revision points of the registered monitoring plan, using objective evidence;
- (b) the proposed changes to the monitoring plan ensure that the level of accuracy or completeness in the monitoring and verification process is not reduced as a result of the revisions;
- (c) the proposed changes to the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved monitoring methodology applicable to the project activity whilst ensuring the conservativeness of the emission reductions calculation.

Signed on Behalf of the Validation Body by Authorized Signatory

Signature:



Name: Siddharth Yadav

Date: 03/06/2014

2. Introduction

2.1 Objective

Section 9.5 “Post Registration Changes” of the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard version 06^{7/}, require the DOE to assess post registration changes to a project activity.

Section 6.2 “Changes to registered CDM project activity or programme of activities” of the CDM Project Cycle Procedure, Version 06^{9/} provides the categories and procedure for changes to project activity and, subject the changes to validation by a Designated Operational Entity.

SGS United Kingdom Ltd has been contracted by M/s A.A. Energy Limited (AAEL) to perform such a validation of the post registration changes for the CDM registered project “Biomass based power generation project in Maharashtra, India” UNFCCC ref. no. 4078; The category for the change is “permanent changes to the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD” and “corrections made in the registered PDD”.

The purpose of a validation is to have an independent third party assessment of the permanent changes to the monitoring plan and corrections. In particular, the DOE should assess whether the changes affect the level of accuracy and/or completeness and the conformity with the applied approved monitoring methodology compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan.

The Validation was performed in accordance with the UNFCCC criteria for the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) i.e. CDM Validation and Verification Standard version 06 and the Host Country criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

SGS reviewed the project design documentation (proposed post registration changes in the revised PDD), using a risk based approach and conducted follow-up interviews.

2.2 Scope

The scope of the validation is defined as an independent and objective review of the permanent changes to the monitoring plan and corrections. The information in these documents is reviewed against the Kyoto Protocol requirements, the UNFCCC rules and associated interpretations.

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

2.3 GHG Project Description

Refer to <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/SGS-UKL1288172340.56/view>, the project web page. There is no change in the project activity description. The project was registered on 26/01/2011 under UNFCCC ref. no. 4078^{3/}.

3. Methodology

3.1 Review of CDM-PDD and Additional Documentation

The validation is performed primarily as a document review of the publicly available project documents i.e. registered PDD^{/3/} version 05 dated 10/08/2010 and the verification report of the first periodic verification^{/6/}. A revised PDD^{/1/} version 5.1 to 5.5 (final version) and the Specific Fuel Consumption calculation excel spreadsheet^{/2/}, as listed in Section 6 of this report, has also been submitted by the PP as a part of this assessment.

The assessment is performed by trained assessors using a validation protocol.

3.2 Use of the Validation Protocol

The validation protocol used for the assessment is partly based on the templates of the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard version 06:

- it organises, details and clarifies the requirements the project is expected to meet; and
- it documents both how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the validation.

The validation protocol consists of several tables. The different columns in these tables are described below.

Checklist Question	Ref ID	Means of Verification (MoV)	Comment	Draft and/or Final Conclusion
The various requirements are linked to checklist questions the project should meet.	Lists any references and sources used in the validation process. Full details are provided in the table at the bottom of the checklist.	Explains how conformance with the checklist question is investigated. Examples of means of verification are document review (DR) or interview (I). N/A means not applicable.	The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist question and/or the conformance to the question. It is further used to explain the conclusions reached.	This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (Y/OK), or a Corrective Action Request (CAR) due to non-compliance with the checklist question (See below). A Clarification request (CL) is raised if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM requirements have been met.

The validation protocol is attached with the report as Annex 1.

3.3 Findings

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

In general, where insufficient or inaccurate information is available and clarification or new information is required the Assessor shall raise a **Clarification Request (CL)** specifying what additional information is required.

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

- Non-conformities with the monitoring plan or methodology are found in monitoring and reporting, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;
- Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions which will impair the estimate of emission reductions;
- Issues identified in a FAR during validation to be verified during verification have not been resolved by the project participants.

A Forward Action Request (FAR) is raised during verification for actions if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.

The validation process may be halted until this information has been made available to the assessors' satisfaction. Failure to address a CL/FAR may result in a CAR. Information or clarifications provided as a result of a CL/FAR may also lead to a CAR.

Corrective Action Requests, Clarification Requests and Forward Action Requests are raised in the draft validation protocol and detailed in a separate form (Findings Overview). In this form, the Project Developer is given the opportunity to address and "close" outstanding CARs and respond to CLs and FARs. The detailed Finding Overview is attached with this document as Annex 2.

3.4 Internal Quality Control

Following the completion of the assessment process and a recommendation by the Assessment team, all documentation is forwarded to a Technical Reviewer. The task of the Technical Reviewer is to check that all procedures have been followed and all conclusions are justified. The Technical Reviewer will either accept or reject the recommendation made by the assessment team.

Technical Review Team

Name	Role
Vikas Bankar	Technical Reviewer
Gino Bazo Godoy	Technical Area expert (TA 1.1)

4. Validation Findings

4.1 Permanent Changes from the monitoring plan

This current scope of work involves only assessment of the changes to the registered monitoring plan; the changes are permanent in nature and therefore there is no temporary deviation from the monitoring plan. The proposed changes to the registered PDD are not covered under Appendix 1 of the CDM Project Standard^{/8/} and hence require prior approval by the Board.

4.2 Corrections that do not affect the project design

The following corrections and editorial revision have also been made to the information in the registered PDD:

1. The PP has now mentioned the “Purpose of data” for the parameter EF_{CO2} as “baseline emission calculation” in the table in section B.6.2 of the revised PDD. This is due to the change in the PDD template.
2. The PP has revised the number formatting throughout the PDD to make it in line with the requirements of paragraph 21 of the guidelines for completing the CDM-SSC-PDD (EB 66 Annex 9).
3. The font size (11) is now made consistent throughout the PDD.
4. The PP has now correctly completed the rows titled “Purpose of data” and “Additional comment” for the parameters in section B.7.1 of the revised PDD. This is due to the change in the PDD template.
5. The PP has inserted a table in Appendix 6 of the PDD summarizing the post registration changes. The information mentioned the table in appendix 6 is correct. This is due to the change in the PDD template.
6. The PP has correctly referred to the applied methodology as “I.D” instead of “1.D”.
7. For the parameters FC_{i,j,y}; N_{truck,y}; AV_{Dmax,y} in section B.7.1 of the PDD in the row “Value(s) applied”, the PP has revised the term “monitored” to “measured”.
8. For the parameter AV_{Dmax, y} in section B.7.1 of the PDD, the PP has corrected the “Source of data” as plant records.
9. PP has mentioned the UN project webpage link in section F of the PDD.
10. The Web-link for the CEA database in Appendix 7 of the PDD is revised.
11. Project boundary diagram is updated by indicating monitoring locations of all equipments installed in the project boundary.

All the minor editorial changes made in the revised PDD^{/1/} are in line with the actual scenario observed at the site and represent current scenario at the time of submission of the revised PDD^{/1/}. This is in line with paragraph 292-295 of the VVS version 6.0^{/7/}. These corrections do not require prior approval as per paragraph 1 of Appendix 1 of Project Standard version 6.0^{/8/}. However, these corrections are submitted in the revised PDD for approval with the post registration changes. Further, it is confirmed that, the changes do not affect the project design and are in compliance with EB79 annex 3 and in accordance with appendix 1 of the project standard^{/8/}.

Discussion on CAR/CL:

CAR #2 was raised asking the clarification for the following issues:

- **Issue 1:** The PP was requested to clarify why the row titled “Purpose of data” for the parameter **EF_{CO2}** has been left blank. In response, the PP has mentioned the “Purpose of data” for the parameter **EF_{CO2}** as “baseline emission calculation” in the table in section B.6.2 of the revised PDD. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CAR #2 (Issue 1) was closed out.**
- **Issue 2:** The PP was requested to clarify why the number formatting throughout PDD does not meet the requirements of paragraph 21 of the guidelines for completing the CDM-SSC-PDD (EB 66 Annex 9). In response, the PP has revised the number formatting throughout PDD to make it in line with the requirements of paragraph 21 of the guidelines for completing the CDM-SSC-PDD (EB 66 Annex 9). This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CAR #2 (Issue 2) was closed out.**
- **Issue 3:** The PP was requested to clarify why the font size is not consistent throughout the PDD. E.g.: Section B.6.3 on page 24 font size used is 11 and 12. In response, the PP has revised the font size (11) consistently throughout the PDD. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CAR #2 (Issue 3) was closed out.**
- **Issue 4:** The PP was requested to clarify why the rows titled “Purpose of data” and “Additional comment” has not been completed for some parameters in section B.7.1 of the revised PDD.
In response, the PP has correctly completed the rows titled “Purpose of data” and “Additional comment” for the parameters in section B.7.1 of the revised PDD. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CAR #2 (Issue 4) was closed out.**
- **Issue 5:** The PP was requested to clarify the appropriateness of the statement “No post registration changes done during this previous crediting periods.” in Appendix 6 of the revised PDD. Further, the PP was requested to clarify why a summary of the post registration changes not described in appendix 6. In response, the PP has correctly inserted a table in Appendix 6 of the revised PDD summarizing the post registration changes. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CAR #2 (Issue 5) was closed out.**
- **Issue 6:** The PP was requested to clarify the appropriateness of the use of the term “monitored” for the parameter **FC_{i,j,y}**; **N_{truck,y}**; **AVD_{max,y}** in section B.7.1 of the PDD in the row “Value(s) applied”. In response, for the parameters **FC_{i,j,y}**; **N_{truck,y}**; **AVD_{max,y}** in section B.7.1 of the PDD in the row “Value(s) applied” the PP has revised the term “monitored” to “measured”. This is found to be appropriate, hence **CAR #2 (Issue 6) was closed out.**
- **Issue 7:** For the parameter **AVD_{max,y}** in section B.7.1 of the PDD in the row “Source of data”, the PP was requested to clarify how it is Estimated. In response, in section B.7.1 of the PDD in the row “Source of data” the PP has now mentioned plant records. Hence **CAR #2 (Issue 7) was closed out.**
- **Issue 8:** The PP was requested to clarify why the UN webpage is not referred for Host Country approval in section F of the PDD. In response, the PP has now mentioned the UN project webpage link in section F of the PDD. Hence **CAR #2 (Issue 8) was closed out.**
- **Issue 9:** The Web-link for the CEA database in Appendix 7 of the PDD was not working. In response, the PP has revised the web-link for the CEA database in Appendix 7 of the PDD. The web-link is now working. Hence **CAR #2 (Issue 9) was closed out.**

Thus CAR #2 was completely closed out. For detailed discussion please refer to CAR #2 under Annex 2 of this report.

4.3 Application of Monitoring Methodology and Monitoring Plan

The revision in the registered PDD is due to the comment raised by the CDM EB during the Information and Reporting check of the 2nd Verification of this project. In line with the CDM EB comments the following revisions have been made:

- (a) The methodological choice for determination of Net electricity exported to grid due to the project activity has been added under section B.6.1 of the revised PDD, in line with the requirement of para 20 & 22 of the applied methodology AMS I.D Version 15.
- (b) The ex-ante parameter Specific fuel consumption of fossil fuel (**SFC_{FF}**) has been added in section B.6.2 of the revised PDD.

Furthermore to improve the transparency and completeness of monitoring procedure, also keeping compliance with the applied Monitoring Methodology AMS I.D. version 15^{/5/}, and due to a revision in the PDD template the following parameters have been updated under section B.6.2 and B.7.1 of the revised PDD^{/1/}:

S/N	Parameters	Remarks/changes/revisions
1	Not applicable	Equations for baseline emission calculation are included under section B.6.1 of the revised PDD in line with the paragraph 20 and 22 of the applicable methodology AMS I.D. version 15.
2	Fixed ex-ante combined margin emission factor of NEWNE grid derived from the OM and BM values (EF_{CO2}) Unit: tCO ₂ /MWh	Purpose of data is included as "Baseline emission calculation" in section B.6.2 of the revised PDD which was earlier not provided in the registered PDD ^{/3/} . This revision is due to a change in the PDD template.
3	Specific fuel consumption of fossil fuel (SFC_{FF}) Unit: Tonnes of fossil fuel/MWh	SFC was not included as ex-ante parameter in the registered PDD. In the revised PDD, SFC is included as ex-ante parameter under section B.6.2 of the revised PDD ^{/1/} Specific fuel consumption has been specified ex ante based on designed data and this will be ex ante fixed for the crediting period. The PP has submitted an excel spreadsheet ^{/2/} with the calculation of the SFC. The calculation in the spreadsheet is correct.
4	Net electricity exported to the grid from this project activity (EG_{BL, y}) Unit: MWh	The notation of the parameter is changed to " EG_{BL, y} " under section B.7.1 of the revised PDD which was earlier mentioned as " EG_y " in the registered PDD ^{/3/} . Monitoring frequency is changed to "Measuring: Continuously, Reading: Hourly and Recording: Monthly" which was earlier mentioned as "Frequency of measurement: Hourly and Frequency of recording: Monthly" in the registered PDD ^{/3/} . There is no change in actual implemented monitoring frequency.
5	Quantity of biomass (rice husk) used for power generation process in year y (Q_{biomass, y}) Unit: Tonnes/annum	The measurement methods and procedures of the parameter are changed to "The quantity of biomass (rice husk) is weighed on the weighbridge and actual quantity of biomass used in boiler measured through load cell on the conveyor. Out of these two values, the conservative value (i.e. lower value) will be used for emission reduction calculation." under section B.7.1 of the revised PDD. In the registered PDD ^{/3/} , this section was mentioned as "The quantity of biomass (rice husk) weighed in the weighbridge. This data will be recorded for the biomass (rice husk) used and this will indicate the quantity of biomass (rice husk) used in the generation

		<p>process”.</p> <p>The monitoring frequency is included to state “Measuring: Continuously, Reading: Hourly and Recording: Monthly”; this was earlier not provided in the registered PDD^{/3/}.</p> <p>No change in actual implemented monitoring frequency was verified to be involved.</p> <p>QA/QC procedures to be applied for the parameter is changed to “Weighbridge and load cell will be calibrated annually by external agencies approved by government.” under section B.7.1 of the revised PDD; in the registered PDD^{/3/}, this was earlier mentioned as “Weighbridge will be calibrated annually by external agencies approved by government”.</p> <p>The purpose of the data is included as “Calculation of baseline emissions” which was earlier not provided in the registered PDD^{/3/}.</p>
6	<p>Quantity of fuel type i combusted in process j during the year y (FC_{i,j,y})</p> <p>Unit: Tonnes/annum or volume/annum</p>	<p>The notation of the parameter is changed to “FC_{i,j,y}” under section B.7.1 of the revised PDD which was earlier mentioned as “FC_{i,y}” in the registered PDD^{/3/}.</p> <p>The Value(s) applied is (are) included as “Based on monitored value” which was earlier not provided in the registered PDD^{/3/}.</p> <p>Monitoring frequency is changed to “Measuring: Continuously, Reading: Daily and Recording: Daily”; this was earlier mentioned as “Continuously” in the registered PDD^{/3/}.</p> <p>No change in actual implemented monitoring frequency was verified to be involved.</p> <p>The purpose of the data is included as “Calculation of baseline emissions” which was earlier not provided in the registered PDD^{/3/}.</p> <p>Additional comment for the parameter is changed to “Coal shall be used during contingency and such usage of coal during contingency would be recorded.” under section B.7.1 of the revised PDD; in the registered PDD^{/3/}, this was earlier mentioned as “No usage of fossil fuel is envisioned and the PP would generate the power with 100% biomass (rice husk) only, however this has been included only to ensure proper monitoring if fossil fuel usage is unavoidable/during contingency.”. This is in line with the actual implemented process verified on the site.</p>
7	<p>Net calorific value of fossil fuel of type in year y (NCV_{i,y})</p> <p>Unit: TJ/tonne or TJ/volume</p>	<p>The Value(s) applied is (are) included as “Based on source of data” in section B.7.1 of the revised PDD which was earlier not provided in the registered PDD^{/3/}.</p> <p>Against the Monitoring Frequency, the monthly recording has been included for more transparency.</p> <p>The purpose of the data is included as “Data is used for project emission calculation” which was earlier not provided in the registered PDD^{/3/}.</p>
8	<p>Number of truck/vehicle trips from the biomass source to the power plant in year y (N_{truck,y})</p> <p>Unit: -</p>	<p>The Value(s) applied is (are) included as “Based on monitored value” in section B.7.1 of the revised PDD which was earlier not provided in the registered PDD^{/3/}.</p> <p>The purpose of the data is included as “Data is used for calculation of leakage” which was earlier not provided in the registered PDD^{/3/}.</p>

9	Max distance of the Power plant from the Rice husk source in year y ($AVD_{max,y}$) Unit: km	The Value(s) applied is (are) included as “Based on monitored value” in section B.7.1 of the revised PDD which was earlier not provided in the registered PDD ^{/3/} . The purpose of the data is included as “Data is used for calculation of leakage” which was earlier not provided in the registered PDD ^{/3/} .
---	---	--

Discussion on CAR/CL:

CAR #1 was raised asking the clarification for the following issues:

- **Issue 1:** The PP was requested to clarify how the formula on page 19 of the revised PDD i.e. **Gross electricity adjusted using Coal, $EG_{y,FF} = FC_{i,j,y} / SFC_{FF}$** gives the “gross electricity adjusted using coal”. In response, the PP has revised the formula on page 19 of the PDD. The formula **Gross electricity adjusted using Coal, $EG_{y,FF} = (Gross\ electricity\ generation - FC_{i,j,y} / SFC_{FF})$** is corrected in line with paragraph 20 of the applicable methodology AMS I.D version 15. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CAR #1 (Issue 1) was closed out.**
- **Issue 2:** The PP was requested to clarify how the formula **Net electricity exported to grid $EG_y = EG_{BL,y} - Min(EG_{y,ricelhusk} , EG_{y,FF})$** on page 19 of the revised PDD meets the requirements of paragraph 22 of the methodology. In response, the PP has revised the formula on page 19 of the PDD to **Net electricity exported to grid due to the project activity in year y, $EG_y = Min(EG_{y,ricelhusk} , EG_{y,FF})$** . This meets the requirements of paragraph 22 of the methodology of the applicable methodology AMS I.D version 15. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CAR #1 (Issue 2) was closed out.**
- **Issue 3:** The PP was requested to submit the SFC calculation sheet referred in foot note 28 of the registered PDD. In response, the PP has revised the calculation of emission reductions using the approach in the applied methodology, the PP has used SFC of coal based on the design parameters. The calculation of the SFC in the excel spreadsheet has been checked and found to be correct. The sources of the values are appropriate. The SFC calculations for biomass in the spreadsheet are same as that submitted during the registration of the project. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CAR #1 (Issue 3) was closed out.**
- **Issue 4:** In the SEC Calculation excel spreadsheet the PP was requested to clarify the correctness of the units in Cell G31. In response the PP has revised the units in cell G 31 to “Tonne of coal/Tonne of steam”. This is correct and hence **CAR #1 (Issue 4) was closed out.**

Thus CAR #1 was completely closed out. For detailed discussion please refer to CAR #1 under Annex 2 of this report.

The proposed changes to the monitoring plan ensure that the level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring is not reduced compared to the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan (details below).

The revised PDD^{/1/} provides transparency in the implemented monitoring system and procedures involved in the determination of the parameter “Net electricity exported to the grid from this project activity ($EG_{BL,y}$)”. It does not involve any alteration of project monitoring equipment. The assessment of the changes is discussed below:

1. The monitoring plan of the project activity is updated in line with the actual site scenario by including the correct schematic metering diagram and consistent units and corrections to improve the clarity of the description under sections B.7.1 and B.7.2 of revised PDD^{/1/}. The parameter-wise updates are already covered in the table above under current section.

The proposed change is in accordance to the actual site scenario and summarizes the process involved to arrive at the values of “Net electricity exported to the grid from this project activity ($EG_{BL,y}$)” for the project activity. The monitoring system is under the direct control of the PP. The source of data for all the parameters related to the project activity still remains the same. Thus, there is no effect on the accuracy of the measurements; however the transparency and completeness of the monitoring system will improve due to the proposed revised PDD.

2. The PP has clarified in the revised PDD^{/1/} about the Baseline emissions calculation procedure. The procedure described in the registered PDD did not include the explicit calculation procedure for cases where coal is being used in the project activity. The section B.6.1 is elaborated and made in line with the requirements of paragraphs 20 and 22 of the applicable methodology AMS I.D. Version 15.
3. The PP has clarified in the revised PDD^{/1/} about SFC_{FF} parameter. The parameter SFC_{FF} has been included under section B.6.2 as ex-ante parameter. The calculation for SFC for coal based on design parameter has been checked.
4. QA/QC procedure for $Q_{\text{biomass},y}$ is provided more transparently in the parameter tables which include all the instrument involved. This has been checked with the instrument involved in the monitoring for the current project activity.
5. In general monitoring frequency, measurement method, purpose of data and values applied are modified in line with the actual practice followed at the site.

The proposed changes to the monitoring plan are in accordance with the approved monitoring methodology applicable to the project activity (details below).

The permanent change to registered monitoring plan improves the accuracy of information provided and consistency with the applied methodology^{/5/} compared with the registered PDD^{/3/}.

The proposed revision of the monitoring plan^{/1.1/} is verified to be in accordance with the approved monitoring methodology applicable to the project activity.

4.4 Possible impacts on emission reduction calculations due to change in monitoring plan:

The amount of electricity generated using biomass fuels calculated by adjusting electricity generated due to fossil fuels in gross electricity generation as per paragraph 20 of the applicable methodology AMS I. D. version 15 will be compared with the amount of electricity generated calculated using specific fuel consumption and amount of each type of biomass fuel used. The lower of the two values will be used to calculate emission reductions. The actual consumption of the fuel will be based on the monitoring values at the project site.

The rest of the project details remain the same as mentioned in the registered PDD available at UNFCCC website <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/SGS-UKL1288172340.56/view>.

The revisions to the registered PDD do not impact the ERs calculations described in the registered PDD.

The methodological choice for determination of Net electricity exported to grid due to the project activity has been added under section B.6.1 of the revised PDD in line with the applied methodology which ensures that any usage of fossil fuel is accounted during the calculation of ex-post emission reductions. However, since no fossil fuel is envisaged to be used, the ER calculations in the registered PDD are not impacted. The estimated annual average ERs over the 10 year crediting period is 49,766 tCO₂e.

This permanent change improves the accuracy of information provided and consistency in registered PDD and the monitoring plan.

Discussion on CAR/CL:

CAR #3 was raised since all revisions / addition made to the information in the registered PDD was not in track change mode in the revised PDD. In response the PP has submitted the revised PDD in clean as well as track change mode. The assessment team has checked the track change revised PDD and confirms that all revisions / addition to the information in the registered PDD are in track change mode. Hence accepted and CAR #3 was closed out. For details please refer to CAR #3 in the discussion of findings in Annex 2 of this report.

4.5 Findings of Previous Verification Reports

No FARs were observed in the verification report for the first monitoring period^{/6/}.

The proposed revised PDD (after EB approval) will apply to the project from the second monitoring period onwards.

5. List of Persons Interviewed

Date of site visit	Name	Position	Short description of subject discussed
19 th and 20 th July 2012	Mr. Swapnil Agrawal	A. A. Energy Limited	<p>This site visit was carried out for the 2nd verification of this project. The revision in the registered PDD is due to the comments raised by the EB during the Information and Reporting check during the 2nd periodic Verification. The observations of the assessment team during this site visit are being considered as a basis for this opinion.</p> <p>Subjects discussed during the site visit included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Design and Implementation • Monitoring procedure • MR and ER calculations • Methods and formulae for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage. • Technical equipment and operation • Data uncertainty • QA/QC procedures • Calibration • Implementation of procedures for operation and data collection •
	Mr. Amit Gupta	Consultant, Emergent Ventures India	
N/A	Mr. Swapnil Agrawal	A. A. Energy Limited	The issue of non conformance of the monitoring plan in the registered PDD with the applied methodology was discussed telephonically during the desk review.
N/A	Mr. Amit Gupta	Consultant, Emergent Ventures India	The issue of non conformance of the monitoring plan in the registered PDD with the applied methodology was discussed telephonically during the desk review.

6. Document References

Category 1 Documents (documents provided by the Client that relate directly to the GHG components of the project, (i.e. the CDM Project Design Document, confirmation by the host Party on contribution to sustainable development and written approval of voluntary participation from the designated national authority):

/1/ Revised PDD	
/1.1/	Version 5.1 dated 16/12/2013
/1.2/	Version 5.2 dated 17/01/2014
/1.3/	Version 5.3 dated 10/03/2014
/1.4/	Version 5.4 dated 18/03/2014
/1.5/	Version 5.5 dated 06/05/2014
/2/ Specific Fuel Consumption Calculation Excel Spreadsheet (For parameter SFC _{FF})	

Category 2 Documents (background documents used to check project assumptions and confirm the validity of information given in the Category 1 documents and in validation interviews):

/3/ Registered PDD version 5.0 dated 10/08/2010 available on project webpage: http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/SGS-UKL1288172340.56/view	
/4/ Validation report: Project number CDM.VAL2304 version 2 dated 04/10/2010	
/5/ <u>Applied Methodology, AMS I. D.</u> version 15	
/6/ Verification report: Project number CDM.VER1227 MP1 version 2 dated 05/03/2012	
/7/ Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard Version 06.0	
/8/ Clean Development Mechanism Project Standard Version 06.0	
/9/ Clean Development Mechanism Project Cycle Procedure Version 06.0	

Annex 1: Validation Protocols

Checklist Question	Reference	MoV*	Comments	Conclusion/ CARs/CLs
A.1. General Requirements				
A.1.1. Is the deviation/revision in the monitoring plan based on a decision by the CDM EB	VVS Version 6	DR	No, The revision in the monitoring plan is not based on a decision by the CDM EB.	OK
A.1.2. Is the deviation/revision based on a decision by CDM EB but also additional revisions are proposed by the PP/DOE	VVS Version 6	DR	The RMP was identified during second verification of the project by PP on the basis of the comments received from the EB during the Information and Reporting check of the second verification of this project.	OK
A.1.3. Is the need for deviation/revision in monitoring plan spotted during the first monitoring period?	VVS Version 6 Project page on UNFCCC website	DR	The RMP was identified during second verification of the project by PP on the basis of the comments received from the EB during the Information and Reporting check of the second verification of this project.	OK
A.1.4. Is the revised monitoring plan complete and does the revised monitoring plan follow the registered PDD template?	Registered PDD	DR	The revised monitoring plan is complete and follows the registered PDD template i.e. F-CDM-SSC-PDD version 4.1. The following issues were observed: 1. The number formatting throughout PDD does not meet the requirements of paragraph 21 of the guidelines for completing the CDM-SSC-PDD (EB 66 Annex 9). 2. The font size is not consistent throughout the PDD. E.g: Section B.6.3 on page 24 font sizes used are 11 and 12.	CAR #2 raised and closed out. OK

			<p>3. The following statement “No post registration changes done during this previous crediting periods.” in Appendix 6 of the revised PDD does not seem appropriate. Why is a summary of the post registration changes not described in appendix 6?</p> <p>4. Please clarify why the UN webpage is not referred for Host Country approval in section F of the PDD.</p> <p>5. The Web-link for the CEA database in Appendix 7 of the PDD is not working.</p> <p>Hence CAR #2 was raised.</p> <p>CAR #2 was closed out based on the responses provided by the PP. For details please refer to the discussion of findings in Annex 2 of this report.</p>		
A.1.5.	Has the revised monitoring plan been submitted in track change mode for each of the revision point (issue)?	Revised monitoring plan	DR	<p>Yes. The revised monitoring plan has been submitted by the PP in track change mode for each of the revision point (issue).</p>	OK
A.1.6.	Is there an objective evidence for each of the proposed revision/deviation points (issue)?	Revised PDD	DR	<p>The revisions in the registered PDD consist of the following:</p> <p>(1) The description for the calculation of EGBL_y has been revised to make it consistent with the methodology. This revision is solely based on the applied methodology. No separate objective evidence is required.</p> <p>(2) The PP had added the ex-ante parameter SFC_{FF} in the revised PDD. An excel spreadsheet has been submitted by the PP showing the calculation of the parameter.</p> <p>(3) Information on the Monitoring frequency; Purpose of data were mentioned in section B.7.1 of the revised PDD to meet the requirements of the revised PDD template and to make it consistent with the methodology. The descriptions of some parameters were revised for clarity. This has been checked during the site visit for the 2nd Verification, No separate objective evidence is required.</p>	OK
A.1.7.	Does the revised monitoring plan also include the Annex 4 (VVM) (Appendix 5 (VVS)) ?	Registered PDD and Registered PDD	DR	<p>Yes, the Annex 6 from the PDD was revised and is updated in the revised PDD in accordance to revised section B.7.</p>	OK
A.1.8.	Does the revised monitoring plan lead/associate to any kind of change in the project registered design?	Registered PDD & CDM PCP Version 6.0	DR	<p>The revised monitoring plan does not lead to any kind of change in the project registered design.</p>	OK

A.2. Data and Parameters Monitored					
A.2.1.	Does the revised monitoring plan in the PDD comply with the approved methodology provided for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for estimation or measuring the emission reductions within the project boundary during the crediting period?	VVS para 131 Revised MP Section B.7	DR	<p>The revised monitoring plan has been found to be in compliance with the approved methodology AMS I.D. Version 15 used for the project. The monitoring plan now includes transparently all necessary parameters and has been clearly described.</p> <p>Implementation of the revised monitoring plan will make the monitoring process more transparent and accurate. This has been confirmed by reviewing the revised monitoring plan and interviewing relevant site personnel during the site visit. The arrangements described in the monitoring plan have been verified are found to be feasible within the project design. The process of collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for estimation or measuring the emission reductions within the project boundary are in compliance with the applied methodology. The parameters introduced as a part of the revised monitoring plan have been described in detail in revised section B.6.2 and B.7.1 of the revised PDD.</p>	OK
A.2.2.	Are the changes in the monitoring plan inline to the applied methodology and tool?	AMS I.D Version 15	DR	<p>The changes in the monitoring plan are in line with the approved monitoring methodology AMS I.D. Version 15 which was used in the registered PDD.</p> <p>Thus the revised PDD is in line with the methodology requirement and applicable tools.</p> <p>The formula on page 19 of the revised PDD i.e. Gross electricity adjusted using Coal, $EG_{y,FF} = FC_{i,j,y} / SFC_{FF}$ does not give the “gross electricity adjusted using coal”. CAR #1 raised.</p> <p>The following formula Net electricity exported to grid $EG_y = EG_{BL,y} - \text{Min}(EG_{y,ricehusk} , EG_{y,FF})$ on page 19 of the revised PDD does not meet the requirements of paragraph 22 of the methodology. CAR #1 raised.</p> <p>The row titled “Purpose of data” for the parameter EF_{CO2} has been left blank. CAR #2 raised</p> <p>The rows titled “Purpose of data” and “Additional comment” have not been completed for some parameters in section B.7.1 of the revised PDD. CAR #2 raised.</p> <p>CAR #1 and CAR #2 raised and closed out. For detailed discussion please refer the discussion of the findings in Annex 2 of this report.</p>	<p>CAR #1 and CAR #2 raised and closed out.</p> <p>OK</p>
A.2.3.	Are the changes affecting the ER calculation (directly/indirectly)?	Revised MP	DR	<p>The calculation of the Baseline Emissions have been revised and the ex-ante parameter SFC_{FF} has been added to make the monitoring plan in line with the methodology. These are the revisions relevant to the ER calculations.inf</p>	OK

			<p>These revisions have made the emission reduction calculations in line with the applied methodology. These revisions ensure that any usage of fossil fuel is accounted for in the calculation of the baseline emissions. However, since no fossil fuel is envisaged to be used, as was the case in the registered PDD also, the ER calculations in the registered PDD are not impacted.</p> <p>Hence the revisions do not affect the ER calculations.</p>	
<p>A.2.4. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the verification of a proper implementation of the monitoring plan?</p>	<p>PDD (VVM) Section-B.7 PDD (VVS) Section B.7</p>	DR	<p>The proposed revisions in monitoring plan are reflected in table under section B.6.2 and B.7.1, the parameters related to this revision are in compliance with the sufficiency of information describing the intentions of the project participants and is detailed enough to assess the appropriateness. The revision is aimed to make the calculation of the parameter EG_{BL,y} in line with the methodology.</p> <p>The SFC calculation sheet referred in footnote 28 of the PDD has not been submitted. CAR #1 raised.</p> <p>For the parameter FC_{i,j,y}; Ntruck,y; AVDmax,y in section B.7.1 of the PDD in the row "Value(s) applied" please clarify the appropriateness of the use of the term "monitored". CAR #2 raised</p> <p>For the parameter AVDmax,y in section B.7.1 of the PDD in the row "Source of data" please clarify how it is Estimated? CAR #2 raised.</p> <p>CAR #1 and #2 were raised and closed out. For detailed discussion please refer the discussion of the findings in Annex 2 of this report.</p> <p>The assessment team confirms that the information given for each monitoring variable by the table in section B.7 of the revised PDD is sufficient to ensure the verification of a proper implementation of the monitoring plan.</p>	<p>CAR #1 and CAR #2 raised and closed out.</p> <p>OK</p>

A.2.5.	Has there been an issuance with the original monitoring plan of the registered PDD in the past?	Project page on UNFCCC website	DR	Yes, during the first verification 10,346 CERs are issued from the project activity. The 1 st monitoring period was for a duration of 2 months and 6 days. Emission reduction is calculated based on the $EG_{BL,y}$ and RMP is sought for addition of SFC_{FF} as ex-ante parameter. In the registered PDD, the ex-ante parameter used for calculation are not mentioned hence RMP is sought to add parameter which will add more transparency for the emission reduction calculation. During the first monitoring period actual consumption of fossil fuel was considered, in the calculation of project emission, as defined in the registered PDD. This approach has been accepted and credits have been issued for the 1 st Monitoring Period. As per the approach in the proposed revised PDD, the electricity generated due to fossil fuel is used to arrive at the value of baseline emissions. This is in line with the methodology. The assessment team also confirms that the lower value of EG_y , as defined the approach in the proposed revised PDD, has been used for the ER calculations in MP1 However, there is no impact on the emission reduction.	OK
A.2.7.	Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the delivery of high quality data free of potential for biases or intended or unintended changes in data records?	PDD (VVM) Section-B.7 PDD (VVS) Section B.7	DR	All the information like the type of meters, accuracy class of the meters and frequency of calibration are clearly mentioned in the revised monitoring plan. Some details of the monitoring variables in the presented tables in Section B.7 have been revised for transparency and completeness of monitoring. These revisions will ensure the delivery of high quality data.	OK
A.2.8.	Is the monitoring approach in line with current good practice, i.e. will it deliver data in a reliable and reasonably acceptable accuracy?	PDD (VVM) Section-B.7 PDD (VVS) Section B.7	DR	Yes, the monitoring approach in line with current good practice, it will deliver data in a reliable and reasonably acceptable accuracy. All the information like the type of meters, accuracy class of the meters and frequency of calibration are clearly mentioned in the revised monitoring plan. Some details of the monitoring variables in the presented tables in Section B.7 have been revised for transparency and completeness of monitoring. These revisions are in line with the good practice guidelines and will deliver reliable data.	OK
A.2.9.	Are all formulae used to determine project emission clearly indicated and in compliance with the monitoring methodology.	PDD (VVM) Section-B.7 PDD (VVS) Section B.7	DR	The formula used to calculate project emissions are envisaged in the project activity and this component is now clearly included under section B.6.2 of the revised PDD.	OK
A.3. Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) Procedures					
A.3.1.	Is the selection of data	VVS para 269e	DR	Yes the selection of data undergoing quality control and quality assurance procedures as described in section B.7 of the revised PDD.	OK

	undergoing quality control and quality assurance procedures complete?			The means of implementation of the proposed monitoring plan, including the data management and quality assurance, are sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by/resulting from the registered CDM project activity can be reported ex post and verified. This can also be verified from the multiple meters involved in the monitoring process.	
A.3.2.	in case, post registration changes are proposed, the impact of the changes should be assessed and it not result in reduced level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring and verification process	VVS para 253, 258, 266, 280 (a)	DR	Possible impacts of changes are assessed and described in section 4 of the report	OK
A.3.3.	Are quality control procedures and quality assurance procedures sufficiently described to ensure the delivery of high quality data?	VVS para 269e	DR	Yes quality control procedures and quality assurance procedures sufficiently described in RMP.	OK
A.3.4.	Is it ensured that data will be bound to national or internal reference standards?	VVS para 269c and e	DR	The monitoring data will be clearly reproducible and comparable and will not be dependent on site-specific adjustments.	OK
A.4. Operational and Management Structure					
A.4.1.	Is the authority and responsibility of project management clearly described?	PDD (VVM) Section B.7.2/Annex 4 PDD (VVS) Section B.7 and Annex 5	DR	Yes. The responsibility of the project management remains unchanged as compared to the registered PDD.	OK
A.4.2.	Is the authority and responsibility for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting clearly described?	PDD (VVM) Section B.7.2/Annex 4 PDD (VVS) Section B.7 and Annex 5	DR	Authority and responsibility for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting clearly described in section A.4.1 above.	OK
A.5. Monitoring Plan (Annex 4 (VVM)) (Appendix 5 (VVS))					
A.5.1.	Does the monitoring plan completely describe all measures to be implemented for monitoring	VVS para 131	DR	The monitoring plan has been completely described in the section B.7 and information for all monitoring parameters has been explained in the revised monitoring plan.	OK

	all parameter required, including measures to be implemented for ensuring data quality?				
A.5.2.	Does the monitoring plan provide information on monitoring equipment and respective positioning in order to safeguard a proper installation?	VVS para 131	DR	PP has provided a line diagram indicating the metering points in section B.3 of the revised PDD which is consistent with the actual situation at the site.	OK
A.5.3.	Is there any change proposed in the specifications of the monitoring equipment or their positioning or installation then the impact of the change due to revision should be assessed and it not result in reduced level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring and verification process	VVS para 253, 258, 266, 280 (a)		No change is proposed for specifications of the monitoring equipment.	OK
A.5.4.	Are procedures identified for calibration of monitoring equipment?	VVS para 131	DR	Yes. Procedures for calibration of monitoring equipment have been identified and the calibration is kept as annual for all the measuring equipments by external agencies approved by Government and maintained as per industry standards.	OK
A.5.5.	Is there any change proposed in the calibration procedures, if yes then the impact of the change due to post registration changes should not result in reduced level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring and verification process	VVS para 253, 258, 266, 280 (a)		No change is proposed for calibration of the monitoring equipment	OK
A.5.6.	Are procedures identified for day-to-day records handling (including what records to keep, storage area of records and how to process	VVS para 131	DR	The procedures for day-to-day records handling have been identified and covered under section B.7.3 of the revised PDD	OK



performance documentation)				
A.5.7. Are procedures identified for project performance reviews before data is submitted for verification, internally or externally?	VVS para 131	DR	Organizational structure and roles and responsibilities are clearly described in section Appendix 5 of the revised PDD.	OK

Annex 2: Overview of Findings

	CARs	CLs	FARs
Total Number raised	3	-	-

Date:	17/01/2014	Raised by:	Assessment Team		
Type:	CAR	Number:	#1	Reference:	Revised PDD
Lead Assessor Comment:				Date: 17/01/2014	
1. PP is requested to clarify how the formula on page 19 of the revised PDD i.e. Gross electricity adjusted using Coal, $EG_{y,FF} = FC_{i,j,y} / SFC_{FF}$ gives the “gross electricity adjusted using coal”?					
2. The P Pis requested to clarify how the following formula Net electricity exported to grid $EG_y = EG_{BL,y} - \text{Min}(EG_{y,ricehusk} , EG_{y,FF})$ on page 19 of the revised PDD meets the requirements of paragraph 22 of the methodology.					
3. Please submit the SFC calculation sheet referred in foot note 28.					
Project Participant Response:				Date: 17/01/2014	
1. Formula on page 19 is now corrected in revised PDD.					
2. The formula is corrected and now in line with the para 22 of the methodology.					
3. SFC calculation sheet submitted to DOE.					
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:					
1. Revised PDD dated 17/01/2014					
2. SFC calculation sheet					
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:					
The revised PDD version 5.2 dated 17/01/2014 has been checked for the revisions made by the PP. The excel spreadsheet has been checked for the SFC calculations.					
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:					
1. The PP has revised the formula on page 19 of the PDD. The formula Gross electricity adjusted using Coal, $EG_{y,FF} = (\text{Gross electricity generation} - FC_{i,j,y} / SFC_{FF})$ is now in line with paragraph 20 of the methodology. Hence accepted and closed out.					
2. The PP has revised the formula on page 19 of the PDD to Net electricity exported to grid due to the project activity in year y, $EG_y = \text{Min} (EG_{y,ricehusk} , EG_{y,FF})$. This meets the requirements of paragraph 22 of the methodology. Hence accepted and closed out.					
3. For the calculation of ERs using the approach in the applied methodology, the PP has used SFC of coal based on the design parameters. The calculation of the SFC in the excel spreadsheet has been checked and found to be correct. The sources of the values are appropriate. The SFC calculations for biomass in the spreadsheet are same as that submitted during the registration of the project.					
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor: Closed				Date: 27/01/2014	
				Re-opened on 07/03/2014 to address TR comments	
Lead Assessor Comment:				Date: 07/03/2014	
4. In the SEC Calculation excel spreadsheet, please clarify the correctness of the units in Cell G31.					
CAR #1 is open					
Project Participant Response:				Date: 10/03/2014	
The unit is corrected in cell G31 of SEC calculation sheet.					
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:					
Revised excel sheet					

Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
The revised excel spreadsheet has been checked for the revisions made by the PP	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	
4. The PP has revised the units in cell G 31 to "Tonne of coal/Tonne of steam". This is correct and hence accepted. CAR #1 closed out	
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:	Date: 18/03/2014

Date:	17/01/2014	Raised by:	Assessment Team		
Type:	CAR	Number:	#2	Reference:	Revised PDD
Lead Assessor Comment:				Date: 17/01/2014	
<div>1. The row titled “Purpose of data” for the parameter EF_{CO2} has been left blank.</div> <div>2. The number formatting throughout PDD does not meet the requirements of paragraph 21 of the guidelines for completing the CDM-SSC-PDD (EB 66 Annex 9).</div> <div>3. The font size is not consistent throughout the PDD. E.g.: Section B.6.3 on page 24 font size used is 11 and 12.</div> <div>4. The rows titled “Purpose of data” and “Additional comment” have not been completed for some parameters in section B.7.1 of the revised PDD.</div> <div>5. Please clarify the appropriateness of the following statement “No post registration changes done during this previous crediting periods.” in Appendix 6 of the revised PDD. Why is a summary of the post registration changes not described in appendix 6?</div>					
Project Participant Response:				Date: DD/MM/YYYY	
<div>1. The details filled in row “Purpose of Data” for the parameter EFCO₂.</div> <div>2. The formatting made in line with para 21 of the guidelines for completing the CDM-SSC-PDD (EB 66 Annex 9).</div> <div>3. The font size is made consistent throughout the PDD.</div> <div>4. The rows “Purpose of data” and “Additional comment” are completed in section B.7.1 of the revised PDD.</div> <div>5. The summary of the post registration changes is now included in appendix 6 of the revised PDD.</div>					
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:					
1. Revised PDD dated 17/01/2014					
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:					
The revised PDD version 5.2 dated 17/01/2014 has been checked for the revisions made by the PP. The excel spreadsheet has been checked for the SFC calculations.					

Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	
<p>1. The PP has now mentioned the “Purpose of data” for the parameter EF_{CO2} as “baseline emission calculation” in the table in section B.6.2 of the revised PDD. This is correct. Hence accepted and closed out.</p> <p>2. The PP has revised the number formatting throughout PDD to make it in line with the requirements of paragraph 21 of the guidelines for completing the CDM-SSC-PDD (EB 66 Annex 9). Hence accepted and closed out.</p> <p>3. The font size (11) is now consistent throughout the PDD. This has been checked and hence accepted.</p> <p>4. The PP has now correctly completed the rows titled “Purpose of data” and “Additional comment” for the parameters in section B.7.1 of the revised PDD. Hence accepted and closed out.</p> <p>5. The PP has now inserted a table in Appendix 6 of the PDD summarizing the post registration changes. The information mentioned the table in appendix 6 is correct. Hence accepted and closed out.</p> <p>CAR #2 closed out</p>	
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor: Closed	Date: 27/01/2014 Re-opened on 07/03/2014 to address TR comments
Lead Assessor Comment:	Date: 07/03/2014
<p>6. For the parameter FCI,j,y; Ntruck,y; AVDmax,y in section B.7.1 of the PDD in the row “Value(s) applied” please clarify the appropriateness of the use of the term “monitored”.</p> <p>7. For the parameter AVDmax,y in section B.7.1 of the PDD in the row “Source of data” please clarify how it is estimated?</p> <p>8. Please clarify why the UN webpage is not referred for Host Country approval in section F of the PDD.</p> <p>9. The Web-link for the CEA database in Appendix 7 of the PDD is not working.</p> <p>CAR #2 is open</p>	
Project Participant Response:	Date: 10/03/2014
<p>6. The terms are suitably revised in revised PDD.</p> <p>7. The description is revised suitably in revised PDD.</p> <p>8. Now UN page is referred in section F of the PDD.</p> <p>9. The web-link is corrected.</p>	
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:	
Revised PDD (version 5.3 dated 10/03/2014)	
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
<p>The revised RDD version 5.3 dated 10/03/2014 has been checked for the revisions made by the PP.</p> <p>Note: The version number of the revised PDD was wrongly mentioned as 5.2 in the cell “Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:” above. It was correct to 5.3 by the assessment team.</p>	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	
<p>6. For the parameters FCI,j,y; Ntruck,y; AVDmax,y in section B.7.1 of the PDD in the row “Value(s) applied” the PP has revised the term “monitored” to “measured”. This is found to be appropriate. Hence accepted and closed out.</p> <p>7. For the parameter AVDmax,y in section B.7.1 of the PDD in the row “Source of data” the PP has now mentioned plant records. Hence accepted.</p> <p>8. As per the PP response above the UN webpage is referred in section F. However, no reference to the UN webpage is observed in section F. Hence open.</p> <p>9. The PP has revised the weblink for the CEA database in Appendix 7 of the PDD. The weblink is now working. Hence closed out.</p> <p>CAR #2 open</p>	
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor: Open	Date: 18/03/2014

Project Participant Response:	Date: 18/03/2014
8. Now UN page is referred in section F of the PDD.	
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:	
Revised PDD (version 5.4 dated 18/03/2014)	
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
The revised PDD Version 5.4 dated 18/03/2014 has been checked for the revisions made by the PP	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	
8. The PP has now mentioned the UN project webpage link in section F of the PDD. Hence closed out. CAR #2 closed out	
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor: Closed	Date: 18/03/2014

Date:	02/05/2014	Raised by:	Assessment Team		
Type:	CAR	Number:	#3	Reference:	UK CC Comments
Lead Assessor Comment:			Date: 02/05/2014		
All revisions / addition made to the information in the registered PDD is not in track change mode. Please clarify.					
Project Participant Response:			Date: 07/05/2014		
The revised PDD version 05.5 dated 06/05/2014 is submitted to DOE.					
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:					
Revised PDD version 05.5. dated 06/05/2014					
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:					
The following revised PDDs submitted by the PP have been checked for the revisions made: 1. VVS track PDD Version 5.5 dated 06/05/2014 (details from registered PDD VVM track PDD transferred to VVS track PDD template) 2. Revised VVS track PDD Version 5.5 dated 06/05/2014 in track change mode 3. Revised VVS track PDD Version 5.5 dated 06/05/2014 in clean mode					
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:					
The assessment team has checked the revised PDDs submitted by the PP. All additions or revisions to the information present in the registered PDD is present in track change mode. CAR #3 closed out					
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor: Closed			Date: 07/05/2014		

Annex 3: Statement of Competence

Name: Ravi Kant Soni

Status

- Lead Assessor	x	- Expert	x
- Assessor	x	- Financial Expert	
- Local Assessor	India	- Technical Reviewer	x

Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)	x
Technical Area(s): TA 1.2 Energy generation from renewable energy sources	
2. Energy Distribution	
Technical Area(s):	
3. Energy Demand	
Technical Area(s):	
4. Manufacturing	
Technical Area(s):	
5. Chemical Industry	
Technical Area(s):	
6. Construction	
Technical Area(s):	
7. Transport	
Technical Area(s):	
8. Mining/Mineral Production	
Technical Area(s):	
9. Metal Production	
Technical Area(s):	
10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas)	
Technical Area(s):	
11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride	
Technical Area(s):	
12. Solvent Use	
Technical Area(s):	
13. Waste Handling and Disposal	
Technical Area(s):	
14. Afforestation and Reforestation	
Technical Area(s):	
15. Agriculture	
Technical Area(s):	

Approved Member of Staff by:

Siddharth
Yadav

Date:

12/10/2012

Statement of Competence

Name: Vijaybhai Shankarbhai Patel

Status

- Lead Assessor		- Expert	
- Assessor	x	- Financial Expert	
- Local Assessor	India	- Technical Reviewer	

Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)	
Technical Area(s):	
2. Energy Distribution	
Technical Area(s):	
3. Energy Demand	
Technical Area(s):	
4. Manufacturing	
Technical Area(s):	
5. Chemical Industry	
Technical Area(s):	
6. Construction	
Technical Area(s):	
7. Transport	
Technical Area(s):	
8. Mining/Mineral Production	
Technical Area(s):	
9. Metal Production	
Technical Area(s):	
10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas)	
Technical Area(s):	
11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride	
Technical Area(s):	
12. Solvent Use	
Technical Area(s):	
13. Waste Handling and Disposal	
Technical Area(s):	
14. Afforestation and Reforestation	
Technical Area(s):	
15. Agriculture	
Technical Area(s):	

Approved Member of Staff by: Siddharth Yadav Date: 08/11/2012

Statement of Competence

Name: Tarit Roy

Status

- Lead Assessor	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Assessor	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Financial Expert	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Local Assessor	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Technical Reviewer	<input type="checkbox"/>

Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s): <i>TA 1.1 Thermal energy generation from fossil fuels and biomass including thermal electricity from solar</i>	
2. Energy Distribution	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
3. Energy Demand	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
4. Manufacturing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s): <i>TA4.3 Iron and steel, TA4.n</i>	
5. Chemical Industry	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
6. Construction	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
7. Transport	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
8. Mining/Mineral Production	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
9. Metal Production	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
12. Solvent Use	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
13. Waste Handling and Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
14. Afforestation and Reforestation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
15. Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	

Approved Member of Staff by:

Siddharth
Yadav

Date:

22/03/2013

Statement of Competence

Name: Vikas Bankar

Status

- Lead Assessor	x	- Expert	x
- Assessor	x	- Financial Expert	
- Local Assessor	India	- Technical Reviewer	x

Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)	x
Technical Area(s): TA 1.2 Energy generation from renewable energy sources	
2. Energy Distribution	x
Technical Area(s): TA 2.1 Electricity distribution TA 2.2 Heat distribution	
3. Energy Demand	x
Technical Area(s): TA 3.1 Energy Demand	
4. Manufacturing	
Technical Area(s):	
5. Chemical Industry	
Technical Area(s):	
6. Construction	
Technical Area(s):	
7. Transport	
Technical Area(s):	
8. Mining/Mineral Production	
Technical Area(s):	
9. Metal Production	
Technical Area(s):	
10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas)	
Technical Area(s):	
11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride	
Technical Area(s):	
12. Solvent Use	
Technical Area(s):	
13. Waste Handling and Disposal	
Technical Area(s):	
14. Afforestation and Reforestation	
Technical Area(s):	
15. Agriculture	
Technical Area(s):	

Approved Member of Staff by:

Siddharth
Yadav

Date:

17/07/2012

Statement of Competence

Name: Gino Bazo

Status

- Lead Assessor	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Assessor	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Financial Expert	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Local Assessor	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Technical Reviewer	<input type="checkbox"/>

Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s): <i>TA 1.1 Thermal energy generation from fossil fuels and biomass including thermal electricity from solar</i>	
2. Energy Distribution	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
3. Energy Demand	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
4. Manufacturing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
5. Chemical Industry	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
6. Construction	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
7. Transport	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
8. Mining/Mineral Production	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
9. Metal Production	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
12. Solvent Use	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
13. Waste Handling and Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
14. Afforestation and Reforestation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	
15. Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Area(s):	

Approved Member of Staff by:

Siddharth
Yadav

Date:

02/03/2012