




**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**

<b>Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity</b>	Solar Power Project by Fortum FinnSurya Energy Pvt Ltd UNFCCC Reference Number: 10404
<b>Scale of the project activity</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Large-scale <input type="checkbox"/> Small-scale
<b>Version number of the verification and certification report</b>	1.0
<b>Completion date of the verification and certification report</b>	21/09/2019
<b>Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period</b>	First, 06/11/2017 to 01/04/2019 (inclusive of both days)
<b>Version number of the monitoring report to which this report applies</b>	02
<b>Crediting period of the project activity corresponding to this monitoring period</b>	06/11/2017 - 05/11/2024 (Renewable)
<b>Project participants</b>	Fortum FinnSurya Energy Private Limited
<b>Host Party</b>	India
<b>Applied methodologies and standardized baselines</b>	ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources Version 17.0 Standardized baseline: Not applicable
<b>Mandatory sectoral scopes</b>	01 - Energy industries (renewable / non-renewable sources)
<b>Conditional sectoral scopes, if applicable</b>	NA
<b>Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring duration in the registered PDD</b>	248,805 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
<b>Certified amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring period</b>	262,088 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
<b>Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE</b>	Earthood Services Private Limited E-0066
<b>Name, position and signature of the approver of the verification and certification report</b>	 Dr. Kaviraj Singh Managing Director

## SECTION A. Executive summary

>>

The main purpose of this project activity is to generate clean form of electricity through renewable solar energy source. Fortum Finnsurya Energy Private Limited is the promoter of the project activity. The project activity has an installed capacity of 100 MW (AC) (125 MWp) solar power project at Thirumani, Tumkur, Karnataka. The annual average of electricity generation and emission reduction over 7 years of crediting period is 181,417 MWh/year and 177,371 tCO<sub>2</sub>e per year.

Project is operational, and the assessment team verified this during the site visit. The assessment team confirms that the total emission reduction achieved under this monitoring period 06/11/2017 to 01/04/2019 (including both days) is 262,088 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.

### Scope of verification

The scope of the verification was limited to the monitoring period covered under the current monitoring period 06/11/2017 to 01/04/2019 of the registered CDM PA “Solar Power Project by Fortum FinnSurya Energy Pvt Ltd” to determine whether;

The project activity has been implemented and operated as per the registered PDD or any approved revised PDD, and that all physical features (technology, project equipment, and monitoring and metering equipment) of the project are in place;

The monitoring report and other supporting documents provided are complete in accordance with the latest applicable version of the completeness checklist for requests for issuance of CERs, verifiable, and in accordance with applicable CDM requirements;

The actual monitoring systems and procedures comply with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan, any registered monitoring plan, the approved methodology including applicable tool(s) and/or, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline;

The data recorded and stored as per the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the standardized baseline.

### Verification process

The verification process involved following;

- Publication of monitoring report
- Desk review
- Physical on-site inspection
- Issuance of verification findings
- Reporting, calculation checks, QA/QC and resolution of findings
- Issuance of draft verification report
- Independent technical review of the project documentation
- Issuance of the final verification report
- Submission of the request for issuance, as appropriate

### Conclusion

ESPL has performed the verification of the CDM PA “Solar Power Project by Fortum FinnSurya Energy Pvt Ltd” having UNFCCC Ref. Number 10404 for the monitoring period 06/11/2017 to 01/04/2019. The verified emission reductions amount to 262,088 tCO<sub>2</sub>e in the aforesaid monitoring period.

The verification concluded that the registered CDM PA complies with all relevant CDM procedures/standards/guidance and therefore request for issuance is being submitted in accordance with the CDM procedures.

**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.	Team Leader	EI	Takarkhede	Atul	Central Office	Y	Y	Y	Y
2.	Technical Expert (TA1.2)	EI	Takarkhede	Atul	Central Office	Y	Y	Y	Y
3.	Methodology Expert	IR	Garg	Shreya	Central Office	Y	N	N	Y
4.	Local Expert	IR	Garg	Shreya	Central Office	Y	N	N	Y
5.	Verifier	IR	Garg	Shreya	Central Office	Y	N	N	Y

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

**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 error in recording monitored data in JMR sheets	Low	The reading of JMR is being recorded in the presence of representatives of State Electricity Board and O&M contractor. Hence, it is highly unlikely of occurrence of human error while recording the readings.	The practice on site for recording data was confirmed from the responsible team members for compliance with the standard procedure. The JMR data <sup>/09/</sup> for the project activity was cross checked against the controller readings <sup>/10/</sup> /Invoices <sup>/11/</sup> .
2.	Transfer of recorded data to break up sheets and invoices	Low	A dedicated Team is appointed for transfer of recorded data and calculations related to generation by each Feeder. These calculations are performed in excel templates which have adequate control measures to prevent any manual or calculation	The practice on site for data transfer was confirmed from the responsible team members for compliance with the standard procedure.

			error. These sheets are further reviewed for errors by the Electricity Board.	
3.	Error in transferring the recorded data to ER sheet	Medium	The procedure for transferring the recorded break-up sheet readings to the spreadsheet is manual in nature thus increasing the chances of error. However, PP has Implemented internal quality checks to ensure prevention of any such potential error in the prepared ER sheet/8/.	All the monthly reported values in ER sheet <sup>7/</sup> were verified with JMR <sup>9/</sup> .

### 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 spread sheet. There are no material errors, overestimation of ER, omission or misstatement.

## SECTION D. Means of verification

### D.1. Desk/document review

>>

Earthood conducted a desk review as under;

- A review of the data and information presented to verify their completeness;
- A review of the monitoring plan, the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures;
- An evaluation of data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions;

In addition to the monitoring documentation, Earthood has reviewed;

- The registered PDD, Version 04 dated 18/09/2019 and the monitoring plan, including any approved revised monitoring plan and/or changes from the registered PDD, and the corresponding validation opinion;
- The Validation Report Version 02 dated 28/12/2017;
- The applied monitoring methodology (ACM0002, Version 17.0);
- The monitoring report (all versions) to verify that it is as per the standardized format;
- Any other information and references relevant to the project activity's emission reductions (e.g. IPCC reports, data on electricity generation in the national grid or laboratory analysis/calibration and national regulations).

The complete list of documents reviewed is included under Appendix 3.

**D.2. On-site inspection**

Duration of on-site inspection: 24/07/2019				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	An assessment of the implementation and operation of the registered project activity as per the registered PDD or any approved revised PDD;	Thirumani, Tumkur, Karnataka, India	24/07/2019	Dr. Atul Takarkhede
2.	A review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters; Interviews with relevant personnel to determine whether the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan in the PDD;			
3.	A cross check between information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources such as plant logbooks, inventories, purchase records or similar data sources;			
4.	A check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD, the applied methodology including applicable tool(s), and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;			
5.	A review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions;			
6.	An identification of quality control and quality assurance procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters			

**D.3. Interviews**

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Gupta	Rajendra	Plant Manager, Fortum	24/07/2019	Project implementation, ER calculation, monitoring plan, Operation and maintenance Procedures, Calibration, JMR etc.	Dr. Atul Takarkhede
2.	Devaraj	Gopalkrishna	EHS Manager, Fortum		Operation and maintenance	
3.	E.	Narakshimulu	JUWI Renewables		LSC	
4.	Veladandi	Kiran Kumar	Plant Manager, Fortum		Substation monitoring & metering arrangement, calibration	
5.	Kumar	Prakash	EKI Services		MR, ER calculations etc	

**D.4. Sampling approach**

&gt;&gt;

No sampling approach was followed by the assessment team. All reported figures in the MR<sup>/6/</sup> and ER sheet<sup>/7/</sup> were checked from the actual records.

**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	-	CAR 03	-
Compliance of the project implementation and operation with the registered PDD	-	CAR 04	-
Post-registration changes	-	-	-
Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with the methodologies including applicable tools and standardized baselines	-	-	-
Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan	-	-	-
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	-	CAR 07	-
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals	-	CAR 05 CAR 06	-
Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits	-	-	-
Global stakeholder consultation	-	-	-
Others (please specify)	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>

**SECTION E. Verification findings****E.1. Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form**

<b>Means of verification</b>	The monitoring report form used is CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 <sup>/13/</sup> which was the appropriate form and the latest version available at the time of verification, as verified through UNFCCC webpage.
<b>Findings</b>	CAR 03 was raised and resolved.
<b>Conclusion</b>	All the sections of the form were filled as per the guidelines and gave all the relevant details. CAR 03 was raised for inconsistent name of PP inline with HCA and same was rectified by PP in revised MR submitted. The revised final monitoring report <sup>/6/</sup> was found to be in compliance with the applicable latest monitoring report form and instructions therein <sup>/13/</sup> .

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

&gt;&gt;

This is the first verification of the project activity, there are no FARs from last validation report<sup>/02/</sup>.

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	Physical on-site inspection was carried out by the verification team to check the implementation status of the project activity and the instrumentation installed for the project activity.  The commissioning date of the Solar Power plant was verified from the commissioning certificates <sup>/8/</sup> and found that project was commissioned on 02/12/2017(B-31) & 05/12/2017 (B-30). Through validation report <sup>/2/</sup> and PPA <sup>/18/</sup> it was confirmed that PP is in agreement NTPC Ltd. for the sale of electricity to the grid.
------------------------------	--

The verified geographical coordinates of the Solar Power plant have been mentioned below. The same were checked during on-site inspection by using a hand-held GPS instrument.

Project Investor	Location	Latitude	Longitude
Fortum Finnsurya Energy Private Limited	Village Thirumani, Tehsil Pavagada, District Tumkur, Karnataka, India	14° 14' 24.83"N	77° 27' 54.45"E

The locations of SPV plant was verified using a hand held Get-Geo Coordinates app for mobile phones and the data obtained was verified against geo-locations of the plant given in the registered PDD<sup>/1/</sup>. The geo-coordinates reported in the registered PDD<sup>/1/</sup> was not found consistent with the readings of the GPS instrument and hence CAR 04 was raised and closed subsequently.

The installation and specification of the SPV installed were checked with the commissioning certificate<sup>/8/</sup>, name-plates and physical inspection.

The technical specification of the equipment are tabulated below:

Technical detail of the equipment	Plot No. 30	Plot No. 31
Technology	Solar PV Module	Solar PV Module
Solar photovoltaic module	First solar series 4 <sup>TM</sup> PV Module	First solar series 4 <sup>TM</sup> PV Module
No of Modules	115Wp: 543510	112.5 Wp: 88000, 115 Wp:370260, 117.5 Wp: 85360
Make	First Solar	First Solar
No of inverters	50	50
Make	TMEIC	TMEIC
Capacity	1000 KVA	1000 KVA
No. of transformers	13 (ITD) + 2 (PT)	13 (ITD) + 2 (PT)
Technical & Operational Lifetime	25 years	25 years

The single line diagram available at the sub-station and the interviews with the site engineers confirmed that the configuration of the project activity and the location of monitoring instruments is in accordance with the description provided in the registered PDD<sup>/1/</sup>.

In addition to physical inspection, interviews of the personnel were conducted by the verification team which revealed that all the QA/QC procedures listed in the registered PDD<sup>/1/</sup> have been followed while operating the project activity.

As per para 34 of CDM project standard for project activities, version 2.0<sup>/4/</sup>, project activity is type-I activity of Large scale. The emission reduction achieved in this monitoring period are 262,088 tCO<sub>2</sub>e<sup>/6/</sup>, against the estimated ERs – 248,805 tCO<sub>2</sub>e as per approved PDD<sup>/1/</sup>.

The monitoring and metering system, and its compliance with the monitoring plan has been discussed in later sections of the report

For the purpose of verification of implementation of project activity, audit team

	<p>conducted following activities onsite:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An inspection of operational state of Solar Power Plant</li> <li>• Interviews of personnel employed in the functioning of project activity to gauge if the monitoring personnel were well verse of their role and responsibilities</li> <li>• Review of documentation for the monitored data and to cross-check their correct transfer to ER sheet<sup>8/</sup>.</li> </ul> <p>The information relating to the project implementation, provided in the Monitoring Report<sup>6/</sup> is consistent with that stated in the registered PDD<sup>1/</sup>. The data and variables provided in the monitoring report are the same as stated in the registered PDD<sup>1/</sup>.</p>
<b>Findings</b>	CAR 04 was raised and resolved.
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>DOE, inline to para 354-356 of CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities, Version 02<sup>5/</sup>, confirms that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation and operation of project activity has been conducted in accordance with the description contained in registered PDD<sup>1/</sup>.</li> <li>• Physical features of the registered project activity specified in registered PDD<sup>1/</sup> are in place and PP have operated the project activity as per the registered PDD<sup>1/</sup>.</li> </ul> <p>The emission reductions achieved during the current monitoring period are 262,088 tCO<sub>2</sub>e which is higher than the estimated ERs as per registered PDD<sup>1/</sup> 248,805 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.</p>

#### **E.4. Post-registration changes**

##### **E.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents<sup>1</sup>**

Not applicable for present Monitoring period.

##### **E.4.2. Corrections**

The geo-coordinates of the project site mentioned in the registered PDD<sup>1/</sup> and MR<sup>6/</sup> submitted was found incorrect during onsite visit of verification team. CAR 04 was raised in this regard. PP submitted revised PDD with correct geo-coordinates of the project activity. Verification team checked the same and found correct. Revised MR was also submitted by PP with correct geo-coordinates. This editorial permanent change does not have any impact on project design, baseline, scale of project and additionally assumptions and hence accepted by verification team. Detailed validation assessment is provided in validation report for PRC version 02 dated 21/09/2019.

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

Not applicable for present Monitoring 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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.4.6. Changes to the project design**

Not applicable for present Monitoring period.

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

Not Applicable.

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	The review of applied methodology ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources Version 17.0 <sup>/3/</sup> and approved monitoring plan establishes that the plan is consistent with the applied methodology <sup>/3/</sup> . Based on this review it was found the monitoring plan includes all the required parameters to be monitored in the context of project design and description and allows proper determination of emission reductions in accordance with the applied methodology <sup>/3/</sup> .
<b>Findings</b>	No findings
<b>Conclusion</b>	The approved monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology <sup>/3/</sup> and correctly applied by the registered CDM project activity.

**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**

<b>Means of verification</b>	The values considered ex-ante for this monitoring period were cross-checked with registered PDD <sup>/1/</sup> and their respective sources. The summary of all the ex-ante parameters has been given below:		
	<b>Parameter/ Description</b>	<b>Value applied</b>	<b>MoV</b>
	<b>EFgrid,OM,y</b> Operating Margin CO <sub>2</sub> emission factor in year y	0.9941 tCO <sub>2</sub> /MWh	The value of the parameter was checked from registered PDD <sup>/1/</sup> . The value of the parameter was sourced from CEA database version 11 <sup>/14/</sup> .
	<b>EFgrid,BM</b> Build Margin CO <sub>2</sub> emission factor in year y	0.9285 tCO <sub>2</sub> /MWh	The value of the parameter was checked from registered PDD <sup>/1/</sup> . The value of the parameter was sourced from CEA database version 11 <sup>/14/</sup> .
<b>Findings</b>	<b>EFgrid,CM,y</b> Combined Margin CO <sub>2</sub> emission factor in year y	0.9777 tCO <sub>2</sub> /MWh	The value of the parameter was checked from registered PDD <sup>/1/</sup> . The value of the parameter was sourced from CEA database version 11 <sup>/14/</sup> .
	None		
<b>Conclusion</b>	The value in the monitoring report <sup>/6/</sup> and corresponding emission reduction calculations spreadsheet <sup>/7/</sup> are consistent with the registered PDD <sup>/1/</sup> . The applied value is correct and justified.		

**E.6.2. Data and parameters monitored**

<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>EG<sub>PJ,y</sub></b> : Quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project plant/unit to the grid in year y in MWh	
	Measuring/Reading/Recording Frequency	Measured continuously and recorded monthly

	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, the monitoring frequency is in accordance to the monitoring plan <sup>/1/</sup> and monitoring methodology <sup>/3/</sup> .
	Monitoring equipment	The parameter is monitored with a bi-directional energy meter. Details of monitoring meters are provided in Appendix 5 of the report.
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	Accuracy class of the equipment is 0.2s, which is in line to registered PDD <sup>/1/</sup> and consistent with calibration certificate <sup>/15/</sup> as well. Information was found consistent onsite.
	Is the accuracy valid for the entire measuring range or do different accuracy levels apply to different measuring ranges?	Accuracy class is valid for entire range.
	Calibration frequency /interval:	The meters are calibrated by State Utility i.e. BANGALORE ELECTRICITY SUPPLY COMPANY LIMITED (BESCOM) and accredited/State Utility approved external third parties once in five years <sup>/1/</sup> . Details of the calibration are provided in FVR and revised MR.
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	Yes
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	Yes, the meters are calibrated by State Utility i.e. BANGALORE ELECTRICITY SUPPLY COMPANY LIMITED (BESCOM) and accredited/State Utility approved external third parties once in five years <sup>/15/</sup> .
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	The calibration dates are presented in appendix 5 of this report.  The dates have been checked from the calibration certificates. Thus, it is valid for the whole monitoring period.
	Is the calibration carried out for a measuring range comparable with the range for which measurements have been carried out?	Yes
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	A value of Net Electricity export by the project activity for the monitoring period verified from monthly joint meter reading issued by State Utility <sup>/9/</sup> . The value was found to be consistently reported in MR <sup>/6/</sup> and ER sheet <sup>/7/</sup> .

	If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The readings were cross checked with the monthly bills raised by PP to NTPC Vidyut Vyapar Nigam Ltd. <sup>/10/</sup> .
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the calibration of the monitoring meters is done by state utility periodically. Check meters also help in verifying main meter readings.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either i) a deviation been approved by the CDM EB or ii) has the parameter been estimated as stipulated by Appendix 1 to the CDM Project Standard?	No such issues.
<b>Findings</b>	CAR#05 was raised and resolved.	
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>The DOE confirms that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The registered monitoring plan has been properly implemented and followed by the project participants</li> <li>• Monitoring of parameter is implemented in accordance with registered monitoring plan<sup>/1/</sup>.</li> <li>• The equipment used for monitoring the parameter is controlled and calibrated in accordance with registered monitoring plan and applied methodology<sup>/3/</sup>.</li> <li>• Monitoring results are consistently recorded as per approved frequency.</li> <li>• Quality assurance and quality control procedures have been applied in accordance with the registered monitoring plan<sup>/1/</sup>.</li> </ul>	

### E.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan

<b>Means of verification</b>	The verification assessed whether the compliance of the sampling efforts and surveys with the registered sampling plan in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities” if PP had applied a sampling approach to determine data and parameters monitored.
<b>Findings</b>	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
<b>Conclusion</b>	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) report <sup>/9/</sup> 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

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>The energy generation is measured through a tri-vector electronic meters installed on the Pooling sub-station 220/66 KV Karnataka Solar Power Development Corporation Limited (KSPDCL) and 400/220 KV BANGALORE ELECTRICITY SUPPLY COMPANY LIMITED (BESCOM) substation. A back up meter is also installed to measure the data, which can be used as a source of data if the main meter is found to exceed the maximum permissible limit of error during calibration. The calibration frequency for both meters was set as once in five year<sup>/1/</sup>. The details of meters and the dates on which calibration has been conducted are given in appendix 5 of this report.</p> <p>The calibration certificates<sup>/15/</sup> submitted by the PP confirmed the dates listed in appendix 5 and, also revealed that the process has been carried out by State Utility.</p> <p>Calibration and meter arrangement are not in the purview of Project participants and is controlled by the State Utility. To ensure that the readings were accurate, calibration certificates of all meters were checked and were found satisfactory. The verification team observed that there is no delay in calibration for all the meters.</p>
<b>Findings</b>	CAR 07 raised and resolved

<b>Conclusion</b>	The DOE confirms that the calibration is conducted at the frequency as specified by the methodology and the registered monitoring plan.
-------------------	---

## 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

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>The baseline emissions are calculated as per provisions indicated in the registered PDD<sup>/1/</sup> and applied methodology<sup>/3/</sup>.</p> <p>Baseline emissions are calculated as follows:</p> $BE_y = EG_{PJ,y} \times EF_{grid,CM,y}$ <p>Where,</p> <p><math>EG_{PJ,y}</math> = Total quantity of net electricity delivered to the INDIAN grid</p> <p><math>EF_{grid,CM,y}</math> = Baseline emission factor = 0.9777 tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh</p> <p><math>BE_y = 268,066 \times 0.9777</math> = 262,088 tCO<sub>2</sub></p> <p>The value of baseline emission achieved after applying the formulae is 262,088 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (Rounddown value).</p> <p>All the data was made available and have monitored as per required monitoring frequency.</p> <p>The baseline emissions are calculated as per provisions indicated in the registered PDD<sup>/1/</sup> and applied methodology<sup>/3/</sup>. The means of verification for the values of parameters, used for baseline emission calculation, is described in the section E.6.2 of this report.</p> <p>The expressions given in this regard under section E.1 of MR<sup>/6/</sup> were found consistent with the registered PDD<sup>/1/</sup> and applied methodology<sup>/3/</sup>. The explanation of formulae in the MR<sup>/6/</sup> and ER sheet<sup>/7/</sup> is adequate and consistent.</p>
<b>Findings</b>	CAR 05 raised and resolved.
<b>Conclusion</b>	The verification team confirms that appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline emissions have been followed. The assumptions, emission factors and default values that were applied in the calculations are justified.

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	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 <sup>/7/</sup> .
<b>Findings</b>	No findings raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	Project emission is zero as per the requirement of the methodology and registered PDD <sup>/1/</sup> .

### E.8.3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions

<b>Means of verification</b>	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.
<b>Findings</b>	No findings were raised.

<b>Conclusion</b>	The leakage emissions are regarded as zero according to the applied methodology <sup>/3/</sup> and registered PDD <sup>/1/</sup> .
-------------------	--

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	The final verified Emission Reductions in the current monitoring period are as under;	
	Monitoring Period	06/11/2017 to 01/04/2019 (Inclusive of both days)
	Baseline Emissions	262,088 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
	Project Emissions	0 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
	Leakage Emissions	0 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
	<b>Emission Reductions</b>	<b>262,088 tCO<sub>2</sub>e</b>
	The value of baseline emission obtained by applying the equations provided in the registered PDD <sup>/1/</sup> are 262,088 tCO <sub>2</sub> e. The project emissions and leakages for the project activity are considered as zero. Therefore, the final value of net GHG emission reductions obtained is <b>262,088 tCO<sub>2</sub>e</b> .	
<b>Findings</b>	No findings	
<b>Conclusion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A complete set of data for the specified monitoring period was available, on all occasions based on the activity level of the parameters;</li> <li>b) The information provided in the monitoring report<sup>/6/</sup> and corresponding spreadsheet<sup>/7/</sup> has been cross checked;</li> <li>c) The assessment team confirms that the formulae for calculating baseline and project emissions (BE and PE) are in accordance with monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD<sup>/1/</sup> and applied methodology<sup>/3/</sup>.</li> <li>d) There are no leakages in accordance with applied methodology and registered PDD<sup>/1/</sup>.</li> <li>e) The assumptions/emission factors used in emission calculations have been correctly applied and are justified.</li> </ul>	

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	The actual emission reduction achieved in the monitoring period is 262,088 tCO <sub>2</sub> e, whereas the estimated ERs in the registered PDD <sup>/1/</sup> is 248,805 tCO <sub>2</sub> e. Actual emission reduction is 5.34% higher than the emission reductions for the considered monitoring period.
<b>Findings</b>	No findings.
<b>Conclusion</b>	Justification of higher emission reductions have been provided in the section E.6 of the MR <sup>/6/</sup> . The explanation was found satisfactory. Thus, the comparison between the actual GHG emission reductions and the estimated GHG emission reductions was found to be ok.

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	According to the Project participant, the emission reductions have increased from the estimated emission reduction. The increase in ER is due to higher PLF (=Plant Load Factor) & more number of higher sunny days which is evident from the JMR sheets <sup>/9/</sup> . Further, increased PLF during this monitoring period is lower than the benchmark breaching value for the PLF is 5.34% and revised IRR sheet with increased PLF is submitted by PP & found that it does not cross the benchmark value. Hence accepted by verification team.
<b>Findings</b>	CAR 06 was raised and resolved.
<b>Conclusion</b>	The explanation provided by the project participant for the increased emission reductions than estimated was found acceptable.

**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**

<b>Means of verification</b>	The verification team has determined the GHG emission reductions achieved during first commitment period and second commitment period
<b>Findings</b>	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
<b>Conclusion</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks reported up to 31 December 2012: 0 tCO<sub>2</sub>e</li> <li>2. GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks reported from 1 January 2013 onwards: 262,088 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (Monitoring period starting from 01/01/2013)</li> </ol>

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	NA
<b>Findings</b>	NA
<b>Conclusion</b>	NA

**E.10. Global stakeholder consultation**

<b>Means of verification</b>	DOE has submitted the initial version of the monitoring report provided by the PP for this monitoring period to be published on the UNFCCC webpage and same was published on 18/06/2019.
<b>Findings</b>	No comments have been received on the published monitoring report for this monitoring period.
<b>Conclusion</b>	As no comments was received during GSC, no further action required.

**SECTION F. Internal quality control**

The draft verification report that is prepared by verification team is reviewed by an independent technical review team (one or more members) to confirm if the internal procedures established and implemented by Earthood were duly complied with and such opinion/conclusion is reached in an objective manner that complies with the applicable CDM rules/requirements. The technical review team is collectively required to possess the technical expertise of all the technical area/sectoral scope the project activity relates to. All team members of technical review team are independent of the verification team.

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

## SECTION G. Verification opinion

Earthood Services Private Limited (Earthood), contracted by Fortum FinnSurya Energy Private Limited, has performed the independent verification of the emission reductions for the CDM project activity 10404 "Solar Power Project by Fortum FinnSurya Energy Pvt Ltd" in India for the monitoring period 06/11/2017 to 01/04/2019 (including both days) as reported in the Monitoring Report (public) Version 1 dated 11/06/2019 and Monitoring Report (Final) Version 02 dated 18/09/2019. Fortum FinnSurya Energy Private Limited is responsible for the collection of data in accordance with the monitoring plan and the reporting of GHG emissions reductions from the project activity.

Earthood commenced the verification on the basis of the baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources Version 17.0, the monitoring plan contained in the PDD Version 04 dated 18/09/2019, Monitoring Report (public) Version 1 dated 11/06/2019.

Earthood's verification approach is based on the understanding of the risks associated with reporting of GHG emission data and the controls in place to mitigate these. Earthood planned and performed the verification by obtaining evidence and other information and explanations that Earthood considered necessary to give reasonable assurance that reported GHG emission reductions are fairly stated.

The verification team confirms that the project activity was found completely implemented as per the description given in the registered PDD and the actual operation conforms to the description in the registered PDD.

## SECTION H. Certification statement

It is our responsibility to express an independent verification statement on the reported GHG emission reductions from the project activity.

In our opinion the GHG emissions reductions reported for the project activity for the period 06/11/2017 to 01/04/2019 (including both days) are fairly stated in the Monitoring Report (final) Version 02 dated 18/09/2019. The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly on the basis of the approved baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources Version 17.0 and the monitoring plan contained in the PDD Version 04 dated 18/09/2019.

Earthood Services Private Limited is able to certify that the emission reductions from the CDM project activity 10404 "Solar Power Project by Fortum FinnSurya Energy Pvt Ltd" in India during the period 06/11/2017 to 01/04/2019 (including both days) amount to 262,088 tCO<sub>2e</sub>.

### Verified and certified emission reductions (for current monitoring period) as per commitment period:

Commitment period	Amount
Upto 31/12/2012 (1 <sup>st</sup> commitment period)	Nil
From 01/01/2013	262,088 tCO <sub>2e</sub>

## Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
AS	Accreditation Standard
BESCOM	Bangalore Electricity Supply Company Limited
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CDM PCP for PA	Clean Development Mechanism Project Cycle Procedure for Project Activities
CER	Certified Emission Reduction(s)
CL	Clarification Request
CPCB	Central Pollution Control Board
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
DNA	Designated National Authority
EB	Executive Board
Earthood	Earthood Services Private Limited
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse Gas(es)
GOI	Government Of India
IR	Internal Resource
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MOEFCC	Ministry of Environment, Forests & Climate Change
MR	Monitoring Report
MW	Mega Watt
NTPC	National Thermal Power Corporation
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participants
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
QA/QC	Quality Assurance / Quality Control
MP	Monitoring Plan
KSPDCL	Karnataka Solar Power Development Corporation Limited
SEB	State Electricity Board
tCO <sub>2e</sub>	tonnes of Carbon dioxide equivalent
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VCR	Verification and Certification Report



## Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

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

Competence Statement			
<b>Name</b>	Shreya Garg		
<b>Country</b>	India		
<b>Education</b>	M.Sc. (Climate Science & Policy), TERI University		
<b>Experience</b>	6 Years +		
<b>Field</b>	Climate Change		
Approved Roles			
<b>Team Leader</b>	YES		
<b>Validator</b>	YES		
<b>Verifier</b>	YES		
<b>Methodology Expert</b>	AMS.I.A., AMS.I.C., AMS.I.D., AMS.I.F., AMS.II.D., AMS.II.G., AMS.II.J., AMS.III.AV., ACM0002, ACM0012		
<b>Local expert</b>	YES (India)		
<b>Financial Expert</b>	NO		
<b>Technical Reviewer</b>	YES		
<b>TA Expert</b>	YES (TA 1.2, TA 3.1)		
<b>Reviewed by</b>	Abhishek Mahawar	<b>Date</b>	01/03/2018
<b>Approved by</b>	Ashok Gautam	<b>Date</b>	01/03/2018

Competence Statement	
<b>Name</b>	Kaviraj Singh
<b>Country</b>	India
<b>Education</b>	Ph.D. (Environmental Engineering), IIT Delhi Masters (Energy & Environmental), DAVV Indore

<b>Experience</b>	15 Years +		
<b>Field</b>	Climate Change & Environment		
<b>Approved Roles</b>			
<b>Team Leader</b>	YES		
<b>Validator</b>	YES		
<b>Verifier</b>	YES		
<b>Methodology Expert</b>	AMS-I.D., AMS-II.D., ACM0006, AMS-I.A., AMS-I.C., AMS-II.B., AMS-III.H, ACM0002, ACM0001, AM0080		
<b>Local expert</b>	YES (India)		
<b>Financial Expert</b>	YES		
<b>Technical Reviewer</b>	YES		
<b>TA Expert</b>	YES (TA 1.1, TA 1.2, TA 13.1, 13.2)		
<b>Reviewed by</b>	Abhishek Mahawar	<b>Date</b>	01/03/2018
<b>Approved by</b>	Ashok Gautam	<b>Date</b>	01/03/2018

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

### Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1.	Project Proponent	Registered CDM PDD  Revised PDD for Post Registration Changes	Version 03 dated 21/12/2017  Version 04 Dated 18/09/2019	Others
2.	Applus Certification	Validation report	Version 2, dated 28/12/2017	Others
3.	UNFCCC	ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources	Version 17.0	Others
4.	UNFCCC	CDM project standard for project activities	Version 02	Others
5.	UNFCCC	CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities	version 02	Others
6.	Project Proponent	Monitoring Report (Published)  Monitoring Report (Final)	Version: 01 Dated: 11/06/2019  Version: 02 Dated: 18/09/2019	PP
7.	Project Proponent	ER sheet (Final)	Version: 01 Dated: 18/09/2019	PP
8.	KSPDCL	Commissioning certificates	02/12/2017 & 05/12/2017	PP
9.	BESCOM	JMR (monthly credit notes) covering monitoring period	-	PP
10.	Project Proponent	Invoices covering monitoring period	-	PP
11.	Project Proponent	O&M reports for controller meter readings (DGR)	-	PP
12.	Project Proponent	Plant Schematic Diagram	Year 2019	PP
13.	UNFCCC	CDM-MR-FORM	version 7.0	Others
14.	CEA	CEA database	Version 11	Others
15.	BESCOM	Calibration certificates for meters of 220/66kV KV substation  Calibration certificates for meters of 440/220 KV substation	09/07/2018, 09/08/2018 & 20/12/2018  10/08/2018	PP
16.	Project Proponent	Training records for year 2018 & 2019	-	PP
17.	Project Proponent	Breakdown record for the monitoring period	-	PP
18.	NTPC Ltd. (First Party)	Power Purchase Agreement	21/06/2016	PP

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

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

<b>FAR ID</b>	01	<b>Section no.</b>	E.2	<b>Date</b> : 24/06/2019
<b>Description of FAR</b>				
<i>There is no FAR from the validation of the project activity</i>				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date</b> : DD/MM/YYYY
NA				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
NA				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date</b> : DD/MM/YYYY
NA				

Table 2. CL from this verification

<b>CL ID</b>	02	<b>Section no.</b>		<b>Date</b> : 24/06/2019
<b>Description of CL</b>				
NA				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date</b> : DD/MM/YYYY
NA				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
NA				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date</b> : DD/MM/YYYY
NA				

Table 3. CAR from this verification

<b>CAR ID</b>	03	<b>Section no.</b>	E.1	<b>Date</b> : 26/07/2019
<b>Description of CAR</b>				
<i>Name of the Project Proponent is not consistent inline with HCA throughout MR. Corrections requested.</i>				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date</b> : 20/08/2019
<i>Project proponent name has been updated in MR V2</i>				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
MR V2				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date</b> : 29/08/2019
Section A.2 and A.3 of the MR revised and found that name of PP is now consistent as per HCA. CAR closed.				

<b>CAR ID</b>	04	<b>Section no.</b>	E.3 & E.4.2	<b>Date</b> : 26/07/2019
<b>Description of CAR</b>				
<i>Latitude &amp; longitude mentioned in the registered PDD and MR are not matching with actual Latitude &amp; longitude of the project activity. Post registration changes inline with the applicable guidelines shall be proposed.</i>				
<i>Also correction in the actual aerial photograph of the project activity is requested.</i>				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date</b> : 20/08/2019
<i>The correct Latitude and longitude along with the correct aerial photograph of the site is now provided in the MR. Also, the required corrections has been done in the CDM PDD and the same is now provided to the assessment team.</i>				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
MR V2 and PDD V4				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date</b> : 29/08/2019
PP submitted revised PDD with correct geo-coordinates of the. Verification team checked the same and found correct. Revised MR along with revised PDD for post registration changes was also submitted by PP with correct geo-coordinates. This editorial permanent change does not have any impact on project design, baseline, scale of project and additionally assumptions and hence accepted by verification team.				

<b>CAR ID</b>	05	<b>Section no.</b>	E.6.2 & E.8.1	<b>Date :</b> 26/07/2019
<b>Description of CAR</b>				
<i>PP requested to submit Emission reduction calculation sheet for the monitoring period.</i>				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date :</b> 20/08/2019
<i>Emission Reduction sheet has been submitted for the monitoring period.</i>				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
<i>ER sheet</i>				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date:</b> 29/08/2019
PP has submitted ER sheet. JMR values has been checked with the ER sheet and found correct. CAR closed.				

<b>CAR ID</b>	06	<b>Section no.</b>	E.8.6	<b>Date :</b> 26/07/2019
<b>Description of CAR</b>				
<i>PP requested to justify impact of increased PLF on additionality.</i>				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date :</b> 20/08/2019
<i>The PLF observed during the current monitoring period is 21.82%. This observed PLF is used for the IRR calculation and the values found is within breaching values.</i>				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
<i>IRR calculation sheet and MR</i>				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date:</b> 29/08/2019
PP have submitted IRR sheet with increased PLF of 21.82% and found that due to increased PLF, project activity not crossing the additionality benchmark. Thus CAR closed.				

<b>CAR ID</b>	07	<b>Section no.</b>	E.7	<b>Date :</b> 26/07/2019
<b>Description of CAR</b>				
<i>Meter details provided for 220/66 KV substation (SS 6) are not matching with actual metering arrangement. Corrections requested.</i>				
<i>Further, PP requested to submit calibration certificates for the 220/400 KV RRVPNL substation meters.</i>				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date :</b> 20/08/2019
<i>Required corrections has been done in the MR V2 and its now matching with the actual metering arrangement. Meter calibration certificates for the 220/400 KV RRVPNL substation meters is being submitted.</i>				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
<i>MR V2 and calibration certificates.</i>				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date:</b> 29/08/2019
PP have submitted revised MR with corrected meter details for 220/66 KV substation (SS 6) and also meter details for 220/400 KV RRVPNL substation included. Same are found correct with the documents and site visit observations. CAR closed.				

Table 4. FAR from this verification

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

## Appendix 5. Calibration Details

### For 220/66 KV substation

Plot	Phase	Main Meter Serial Number	Check Meter Serial Number	Initial Meter Calibration	Calibration Date	Calibration Date	Meter Make	Accuracy Class
31	T2 F1	X0395942	X0395940	02/12/2017	09/07/2018	20/12/2018	SECURE	0.2s
	T2 F2	X0395935	X0395941	02/12/2017	09/08/2018	20/12/2018	SECURE	0.2s
30	T2 F3	X0395938	X0395937	05/12/2017	09/08/2018	20/12/2018	SECURE	0.2s
	T2 F4	X0395939	X0395936	05/12/2017	09/08/2018	20/12/2018	SECURE	0.2s

The due date for the calibration of main and check meters are 19-12-2023.

### For 220/400 KV substation meters.

Main Meter Serial Number	Check Meter Serial Number	Initial Meter Calibration	Calibration Date	Calibration due Date	Meter Make	Accuracy Class
18039145	18039140	03/07/2017	10/08/2018	10/08/2023	L & T	0.2s

## Document information

Version	Date	Description
03.0	31 May 2019	Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure consistency with version 02.0 of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (CDM-EB93-A05-STAN);</li> <li>Make structural and editorial improvements.</li> </ul>
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

History of the document*						
Version	Date of issue	Nature of Revision	Prepared by		Reviewed by	
			Name	Date	Name	Date
2.0	11/06/2019	Adoption of latest forms	Shreya Garg	11/06/2019	Anshika Gupta	13/06/2019
1.0	04/05/2018	Guidelines updated	Shreya Garg	04/05/2018	Anshika Gupta	04/05/2018
*This table is for ESPL internal document control purpose only						