




**Verification and certification report form for CDM project activities**  
(Version 01.0)

**VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION REPORT**

<b>Title of the project activity</b>	Roaring 40's Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited
<b>Reference number of the project activity</b>	3142
<b>Version number of the verification and certification report</b>	02
<b>Completion date of the verification and certification report</b>	16/05/2017
<b>Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period</b>	Monitoring period number-03 01/01/2013 to 01/11/2016 (both days are included)
<b>Version number of monitoring report to which this report applies</b>	03
<b>Crediting period of the project activity corresponding to this monitoring period</b>	Fixed, 14/10/2010-13/10/2020, 10 years
<b>Project participant(s)</b>	CLP Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited
<b>Host Party</b>	India
<b>Sectoral scope(s), selected methodology(ies), and where applicable, selected standardized baseline(s)</b>	Sectoral Scope 1 - Energy industries (renewable/ non-renewable sources) ACM0002, Version 10
<b>Estimated GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals for this monitoring period in the registered PDD</b>	111,903 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
<b>Certified GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals for this monitoring period</b>	120,730 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
<b>Name of DOE</b>	Earthood Services Private Limited
<b>Name, position and signature of the approver of the verification and certification report</b>	 Dr. Kaviraj Singh Managing Director

**SECTION A. Executive summary**

&gt;&gt;

**Brief summary of the project activity:**

The project activity involves electricity generation by wind electric convertors and supplying the generated electricity to the Indian Grid. The project being a renewable energy generation activity, it leads to removal of fossil fuel dominated electricity generation. The project activity results in reductions of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that are real, measurable, and verifiable and plays beneficial role in the mitigation of climate change.

The project activity is Phase I of the 50.4 MW wind farm developed by CLP Wind Farms (Khandke) Pvt.. Ltd. (CLPWFK), and consists of 21 WTGs (0.8 MW capacity each), making the total installed capacity to be 16.8MW in the at Khandke site, Ahmednagar district in Maharashtra, India. The other two phases are registered as separate CDM projects. The WTGs are of Enercon (E-48) make. Enercon India Limited is the supplier of WTGs and the O&M contractor for the project activity. It is to be noted that name of company "Enercon India Limited" is changed as "Wind World (India) Limited from 01/01/2013 onwards, the same is verified through the name change consent issued by Government of India/18/.

The WTGs have been commissioned between 27/06/2007 and 19/12/2007. The same was verified against the commissioning certificates/13/.

All 21 WTGs are fully functional and the assessment team verified this during the site visit. The assessment team confirms that the total emission reductions achieved under this monitoring period 01/01/2013 – 01/11/2016 (including both days) is 120,730 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.

The basic details of the project activity are mentioned below:

Project title	Roaring 40's Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited
UNFCCC registration number	3142
Date of registration	14/10/2010
Sectoral scope	1 - Energy industries (renewable/ non-renewable sources).
Methodology/ies applied	Approved consolidated baseline methodology ACM0002, Version 10
Project participant	CLP Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited
Location of Project Activity	Ahmednagar district, Indian State of Maharashtra

**Scope of verification:**

CLP Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited has contracted Earthood Services Private Limited (Earthood) to conduct the verification and certification of emission reductions reported for the CDM project activity 3142 "Roaring 40's Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited" in India for the period 01/01/2013 to 01/11/2016 (including both days).

The verification is the periodic independent review and *ex post* determination by Earthood of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions that have occurred because of the registered CDM project activity during the defined monitoring period.

The scope of the verification is to establish/verify that:

- The project activity has been implemented and operated as per the registered 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;

- Contract with CLP Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited for the scope of verification;
- 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

Major verification milestones are stated below;

Monitoring report publication:	13/12/2016
Desk review:	15/01/2017- 20/01/2017
On-site assessment:	23/01/2017
Reporting, calculation checks and QA/QC:	24/01/2017 – 16/04/2017
Draft Verification Report	17/04/2017
Final Verification Report (after internal quality check)	16/05/2017

### Conclusion:

Earthood has performed the third verification of the CDM project “Roaring 40’s Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited” having UNFCCC Ref. Number 3142. The verification includes confirming the implementation of the monitoring plan of the PDD and the application of the monitoring methodology as per ACM0002 Version 10. Earthood confirms that the monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements. The emission reductions from the CDM project activity 3142 “Roaring 40’s Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited” in India during the period 01/01/2013-01/11/2016 (including both days) amount to 120,730 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.

## 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 review	On-site inspection	Interview(s)	Verification findings
1.	Team Leader, Methodological Expert and Local Expert (India)	IR	Soni	Ravi Kant	Central Office	Y	Y	Y	Y
2.	Verifier	IR	Soni	Ravi Kant	Central Office	Y	Y	Y	Y
3.	Technical Expert (TA1.2)	IR	Soni	Ravi Kant	Central Office	Y	Y	Y	Y
4.	Financial/ Other Expert	NA	-	-	Not required	NA	NA	NA	NA
5.	Trainee	NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**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	Garg	Shreya	Central Office
2.	Technical Expert (TA1.2)	IR	Garg	Shreya	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.	Omissions and misstatements in data transfer from the JMR to ER calculation sheet.	Low	Ineffective quality control of data transfer due to unclear QA/QC procedure.	Quality procedure followed at site was checked. Relevant site personnel were interviewed to confirm whether procedures have been followed. The data reported in the ER sheet is cross-checked from appropriate sources.
2.	Calculation errors while data compilation.	Low	The monitoring plan defines the formulas for the calculation of various parameters. Apportioning is performed by the State utility board and issues the monthly credit breakup sheets.	All the reported values in the ER sheet were checked and cross checked during verification

**C.2. Consideration of materiality in conducting the verification**

&gt;&gt;

In accordance with CDM VVS Version 9 para 361 the prescribed thresholds for materiality for CDM PAs (materiality is not applicable for CDM PoAs as per 359 (a) of CDM VVS Version 9) are as under;

Emission Reductions (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)/year	500,000 or more	300,001 to 499,999	300,000 or less	Small Scale CDM PAs	Micro Scale CDM PAs
Materiality Threshold (para 361)	0.5%	1.0%	2.0%	5.0%	10.0%

The applicable materiality threshold is 2% as project activity.

Particulars / Monitoring Report	MR Version (Public)	MR Version (Revised/Final)
Emission Reductions Achieved (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)	1116,573 tCO <sub>2</sub> e	120,730 tCO <sub>2</sub> e

Particulars / Monitoring Report	MR Version (Public)	MR Version (Revised/Final)
in this monitoring period		
Applicable Threshold (%) as per para 361 of CDM VVS Version 9	2%	2%

The verification team has identified the impact of errors observed and those were corrected by PP during verification for all monitoring parameter at individual level. The extrapolated impact on ERs is also provided for parameters individually and in aggregated manner in the end.

Monitored Parameter (Symbol / Description*)	Reporting Frequency	Number of Discrete Data (Total)	Sample selected for verification	Type of error identified	Impact on ERs	
					ERs impacted (Sample)	ERs impacted (Population based on extrapolation)
EG <sub>f2,JMR,export</sub> and EG <sub>f3,JMR,export</sub>	Monthly	46(100%)	46(100%)	No errors were identified during the verification of data from there source.	No impact	No impact
EG <sub>f2,JMR,Import</sub> and EG <sub>f3,JMR,Import</sub>	Monthly	46(100%)	46(100%)	No errors were identified during the verification of data from there source.	No impact.	No impact
EG <sub>f2,y</sub> and EG <sub>f3,y</sub>	Monthly	46(100%)	46(100%)	No errors were identified during the verification of data from there source.	No impact.	No impact
EG <sub>y</sub>	Monthly	46(100%)	46(100%)	1 manual error related to transfer of data from the JMR to ER calculation sheet. (Ref: CAR #5)	Impact Not Significant (less than 1%).	No Impact as the complete reported data was verified.

\*Description of monitoring parameters is provided under section E.6.2 of this report.

Based on the above table it can be confirmed that the materiality threshold is not breached applicable for the registered PA as per CDM VVS.

**SECTION D. Means of verification****D.1. Desk review**

&gt;&gt;

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 06 dated 24/09/2010 , and the monitoring plan;
- The Validation Report Version 03 dated 11/10/2010;
- The applied monitoring methodology (ACM0002 Version 10);
- 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 and national regulations).

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

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

Duration of on-site inspection: 23/01/2017				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	<p>An assessment of the implementation and operation of the registered project activity as per the registered PDD or any approved revised approved PDD;</p> <p>A review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters;</p> <p>Interviews with relevant personnel to determine whether the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan in the PDD;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>A review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions;</p> <p>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</p>	Khandke	23/01/2017	Ravi Kant Soni

**D.3. Interviews**

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Das	Sumit	CLP Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited	23/01/2017	Electricity Generation Records (monthly energy statements, Invoices and break up sheets), Reliability & accuracy of readings considered for emission reduction calculations, Calibration procedure	Ravi Kant Soni
2.	Tandon	Nitin	CLP Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited	23/01/2017	Monitoring and measuring system, Collection of measurements, Observations of established practices and	Ravi Kant Soni

**CDM-VCR-FORM**

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
					Data Verification of monitoring parameters	
3.	Barvekar	Atul	WWIL	23/001/2017	Calibration procedure of meters	Ravi Kant Soni
4.	Kumar	Shravan	WWIL	23/01/2017	QA/QC procedures, data management, internal audits to maintain data quality & reliability, maintenance Practices Consideration of monitoring period, monitoring methodology, project documentation and emission reduction calculations	Ravi Kant Soni

**D.4. Sampling approach**

Not applicable.

**D.5. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests raised**

Areas of verification findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form	-	-	-
Compliance of the project implementation with the registered PDD	-	CAR #3	-
Post-registration changes	-	-	-
Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool and standardized baseline	CL #1	CAR #5	-
Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan	-		-
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	-	CAR #4	-
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals	CL #2	-	-
Others (Inconsistencies, typo errors))	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</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 05.1, which was the appropriate form, and the latest version available at the time of verification. All the sections of the form were filled as per the guidelines and gave all the relevant details.
<b>Findings</b>	No issues were identified
<b>Conclusion</b>	The monitoring report is found to be complying with the monitoring report form.



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

This is third verification of the project activity. There are no FAR(s) from validation/2/ or previous verification that needs to be closed during this verification.

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>This project activity is the generation of electricity from WTGs supplying the generated electricity to the NEWNE grid of India. The project is located at Ranjani, Ratadgaon, Agadgaon and Bardari villages in Khandke Taluk of Ahmednagar District of Maharashtra state in India. and has an installed capacity of 16.8 MW (21 WTGs x 0.8 MW/WTG). This was confirmed from document review of commissioning certificates /13/.</p> <p>The commercial operation of the project activity had been started on 27/06/2007 – 19/12/2007, which was verified vide commissioning certificates/13/ and corroborated by monthly JMRs/10/ issued by state utility, indicating the start date of commercial operation.</p> <p>The technical specifications of WTGs were verified through the nameplate details (imprinted/placed at the bottom of WTG tower) available at the WTGs physically checked during the site visit and were found to be consistent with the details provided in the registered PDD.</p> <p>The project is located between 19°, 3.5' to 19°, 11' N and longitude 74°, 49' to 74°, 56'E. Location of the project was verified through Latlong.net (<a href="http://www.latlong.net/logo.png">http://www.latlong.net/logo.png</a>) and found consistent with the same mentioned in the registered PDD and MR.</p> <p>The location of the project activity also verified physically during the site visit and the assessment team hereby confirms the location information about the project in the PDD and MR is correct.</p> <p>It was observed during the site visit that, the project activity WTGs are connected to WWIL substation (33kV/132 kV) located at Mehekari village through step-up transformers (400V to 33kV), these transformers are consecutively connected to two feeders and that ultimately lead to two-step up transformers (33kV to 132 kV) via two separate lines at WWIL substation/19/.</p> <p>The rated capacities of transformers were also indicated at the metering points located in the WWIL substation/19/ and the same was found to be consistent with description given in the registered PDD. Furthermore, capacity of transformers verified through the specifications mentioned at the name plate of transformers/20/ and found consistent with registered PDD/01/ and MR.</p> <p>It is noted that WTGs of other promoters (not belongs to project) are also connected to the feeder 02 and feeder 03 at WWIL substation. Hence the electricity export and import from the WTGs connected to the feeder 2 and feeder 3 is apportioned based on the on LCS meter readings available from the individual WTGs.</p> <p>The PP has signed PPA/14/ with state utility for the sale of electricity to the grid and has been supplying electricity in compliance with the PPA as confirmed from the monthly invoices /11/. The project was registered as a CDM project on 14/10/2010 /16/. The PP has considered a fixed crediting period for the project activity from 14/10/2010 to 13/10/2020. This is the third verification of the project activity covering the period from 01/01/2013 to 01/11/2016.</p> <p>All 21 WTGs were fully functional and the assessment team verified this during the site visit/20/. In addition to the physical inspection of the site, the following</p>
------------------------------	--

	<p>documents have been reviewed by the assessment team during the site visit to verify the project implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Commissioning certificates</li> <li>ii. Power Purchase Agreement</li> <li>iii. Invoices raised by the PP to State utility</li> <li>iv. Testing certificates of all energy meters</li> </ul> <p>The information relating to the project implementation, provided in the Monitoring Report/05/ is consistent with that stated in the registered PDD/1/. The data and variables provided in the monitoring report are the same as stated in the registered PDD. Total emission reductions achieved under this monitoring period 01/01/2013 to 01/11/2016 (including both days) is 120,730 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.</p>
<b>Findings</b>	CAR #3 was raised and resolved
<b>Conclusion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In view of the information's verified during the site visit, the verification team is able to confirm that all physical features (technology, project equipment, and monitoring and metering equipment) of the registered CDM project activity are in place and that the project participants have operated the project activity as per the registered PDD.</li> <li>• No information with regards to data and variables was identified leading to unreasonable quantity of ERs in the registered PDD.</li> <li>• The emission reductions achieved during the current monitoring period are 120,730 tCO<sub>2</sub>e, slightly higher than the estimated quantity (111,903 tCO<sub>2</sub>e) in the registered PDD for the comparable period. Appropriate justification for increase in actual emission reductions is provided by the PP and it is further described under section E.8.6 of this report.</li> </ul>

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

##### **E.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline**

There are no temporary deviations from registered monitoring plan or applied methodology. It was verified and confirmed from the registered PDD/1/; the applied methodology/3/ and the on-site verification.

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

There were no corrections identified in the registered PDD during the current monitoring period.

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

There is no change to the start date of the crediting period. It was verified and confirmed from the UNFCCC project webpage/16/.

##### **E.4.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan to a registered project activity**

Not applicable

##### **E.4.5. Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline**

There were no permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan identified during the current monitoring period.

##### **E.4.6. Changes to the project design of a registered project activity**

Not applicable

**E.4.7. Types of changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities**

Not applicable

**E.5. Compliance of monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool and standardized baseline**

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>The monitoring plan as contained in the registered PDD/01/ was reviewed against the monitoring requirements of the applied methodology ACM0002 version 10. Based on the review it was found the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD includes all the required parameters to be monitored in the context of project design and description, allows proper determination of emission reductions in accordance with the PDD /01/, and applied methodology ACM0002 version 10 /03/. It was observed during the site visit that, the WTGs belonging to the project activity are connected to the grid through a power evacuation system inline to the PPA.</p> <p>Monitoring and metering system arrangement as presented in the line diagram under section C of the MR is physically verified during the site visit and found consistent with the registered PDD. The apportioning procedure to calculate the Net Electricity supplied to the grid (<b>EG<sub>y</sub></b>) by the WTGs of the project activity has been correctly described in section C of the MR is found consistent with the same mentioned under section</p>
<b>Findings</b>	CAR #5 was raised and resolved
<b>Conclusion</b>	The monitoring plan outlined in the registered PDD is in accordance with the applied methodology /03/ 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****E.6.1.1. Operating Margin Emission Factor of Western Regional Electricity Grid, now part of the NEWNE Grid ( $EF_{OM,y}$ , tCO<sub>2</sub>e/MWh)**

<b>Means of verification</b>	The value of this parameter is considered as 0.99455. This was checked with the registered PDD /01/ and CO2 Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector", version 1.1 published by the Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of Power, Government of India /15/.
<b>Findings</b>	No finding was raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	The value in the monitoring report /05/ and corresponding emission reduction calculations spreadsheet /07/ are consistent with the registered PDD (page 24). The applied value is correct and justified.

**E.6.1.2. Build Margin emission Factor of Western Regional Electricity Grid, now part of the NEWNE Grid ( $EF_{BM,y}$ , tCO<sub>2</sub>e/MWh)**

<b>Means of verification</b>	The value of this parameter is considered as 0.77722. This was checked with the registered PDD /01/ and CO2 Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector", version 1.1 published by the Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of Power, Government of India /15/.
<b>Findings</b>	No finding was raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	The value in the monitoring report /05/ and corresponding emission reduction calculations spreadsheet /07/ are consistent with the registered PDD (page 25). The applied value is correct and justified.

**E.6.1.3. Combined Margin Emission Factor of Western Regional Electricity Grid, now part of the NEWNE Grid ( $EF_y$  or  $EF_{CM,y}$ ,  $tCO_2e/MWh$ )**

<b>Means of verification</b>	The value of this parameter is considered as 0.94022. This was checked with the registered PDD /01/ and CO2 Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector", version 1.1 published by the Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of Power, Government of India /15/.
<b>Findings</b>	No finding was raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	The value in the monitoring report /05/ and corresponding emission reduction calculations spreadsheet /07/ are consistent with the registered PDD (page 25). The applied value is correct and justified.

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

**E.6.2.1. Electricity exported by all the Turbines connected to feeder 2 and feeder 3 (Turbines included in the project activity and Turbines that are not part of the project activity) at main (14796488 -feeder 2 and 14796497- feeder 3) and the check meter (14796490- feeder 2 and 14796478- feeder 3) at 33 kV. ,  $EG_{f2,JMR,export}$  and  $EG_{f3,JMR,export}$  (MWh)**

Means of verification	Criteria/Requirements	Assessment/Observation
	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	The parameter is continuously monitored and monthly recorded.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes. The reporting frequency is in line with the monitoring plan as outlined in the registered PDD/01/ and monitoring methodology/03/.
	Monitoring equipment	Bidirectional electronic meters of accuracy class 0.2s are used.
	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?	The accuracy of the monitoring equipment used to measure the values is 0.2s, which is as per the registered PDD/01/ which is as per the norm defined in the PPA/14/.
	Is the accuracy valid for the entire measuring range or do different accuracy levels apply to different measuring ranges?	Yes. The accuracy of monitoring equipment is valid for the entire range.
	Calibration frequency /interval:	Calibration frequency of the meters is annual.
	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. The calibration frequency is in line with the monitoring plan as outlined in the registered PDD/01/.

	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	Yes the calibration is conducted by MSEDCL which NABL Accredited Government institution/12/.
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Delay in calibration of meters identified during the current monitoring period and appropriately addressed (please refer section E.7 of this report for further details).
	Is the calibration carried out for a measuring range comparable with the range for which measurements have been carried out?	Yes. The calibration is carried out appropriately.
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	<p>Monthly value of the parameters for entire monitoring period is reported in the monitoring report and ER calculation sheet. The monthly values were verified from the JMRs issued by state utility and found to be consistent.</p> <p>Value of this parameter for the current monitoring period was verified as</p> <p>Feeder 2: 166,965.08 MWh</p> <p>Feeder-3: 125,727.40 MWh</p>
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	<p>The monthly reported values were further crosschecked with the monthly invoices/11/.</p> <p>However, as indicated in the registered PDD, this parameter is directly not used for calculation of emission reductions and the values recorded in the invoices are part of this parameter.</p> <p>Therefore, the assessment team has matched the monthly electricity generations of all the WTGs (including non-project WTGs) connected to the feeders maintained at site office/10.1/ with values of this parameter reported in JMRs and found comparable, hence accepted.</p>
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	<p>Yes, all the stakeholders, namely, the Grid Authority (MSEDCL), the PP and the WWIL (O&amp;M Contractor), implemented the adequate QA/QC procedures. The data transfer process for the said parameter is as follows:</p> <p>The Joint meter reading at all the metering points at DISCOM substation is taken by the representatives of MSEDCL in the presence of CLP officials in the form of JMRs.</p> <p>Based on the data recorded in the JMRs, electricity supplied to the grid by the</p>

		project activity is calculated by MSEDCL, using the apportioning procedure and energy breakup sheets for each project developer is prepared.
	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 #4 and CAR #5 was raised and resolved	
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>The parameter has been monitored appropriately, in accordance with the registered monitoring plan (as per measurement methods and procedures to be applied) and applied methodology. The monitoring results were recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>The verification team is able to confirm that the project is implemented as per the registered PDD and there is no discrepancy observed between the actual monitoring system and the monitoring plan set out in the registered PDD.</p> <p>The emission reduction calculation for the project activity is estimated based on the electricity supplied by the project WTGs. Monthly values of electricity exported to the grid inserted in the ER sheet was verified with the energy breakup sheets provided by the project participant/10/. Since 100% data was verified, the team could ascertain that the values taken for emission reduction calculation are free from material errors.</p>	

**E.6.2.2. Electricity imported by all the Turbines (Turbines included in the project activity and Turbines that are not part of the project activity) connected to feeder 2 & feeder 3 at main (14796488 -feeder 2 and 14796497- feeder 3) and the check meter (14796490- feeder 2 and 14796478- feeder 3) at 33 kV.  $EG_{f2,JMR,Import}$  and  $EG_{f3,JMR,Import}$  (MWh)**

Means of verification	Criteria/Requirements	Assessment/Observation
	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	The parameter is continuously monitored and monthly recorded.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes. The reporting frequency is in line with the monitoring plan as outlined in the registered PDD/01/ and monitoring methodology/03/.
	Monitoring equipment	Bidirectional electronic meters of accuracy class 0.2s are used.

	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?	The accuracy of the monitoring equipment used to measure the values is 0.2s, which is as per the registered PD/01/ which is as per the norm defined in the PPA/14/.
	Is the accuracy valid for the entire measuring range or do different accuracy levels apply to different measuring ranges?	Yes. The accuracy of monitoring equipment is valid for the entire range.
	Calibration frequency /interval:	Calibration frequency of the meters is annual.
	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. The calibration frequency is in line with the monitoring plan as outlined in the registered PD/01/.
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	Yes the calibration is conducted by MSEDCL which NABL Accredited Government institution/12/.
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Delay in calibration of meters identified during the current monitoring period and appropriately addressed (please refer section E.7 of this report for further details).
	Is the calibration carried out for a measuring range comparable with the range for which measurements have been carried out?	Yes. The calibration is carried out appropriately.

	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	<p>Monthly value of the parameters for entire monitoring period is reported in the monitoring report and ER calculation sheet. The monthly values were verified from the JMRs issued by state utility and found to be consistent.</p> <p>Value of this parameter for the current monitoring period was verified as</p> <p>Feeder 2: 40.28 MWh</p> <p>Feeder-3: 45.41 MWh</p>
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	<p>The monthly reported values were further crosschecked with the monthly invoices/11/.</p> <p>However, as indicated in the registered PDD, this parameter is directly not used for calculation of emission reductions and the values recorded in the invoices are part of this parameter.</p> <p>Therefore, the assessment team has matched the monthly electricity generations of all the WTGs (including non-project WTGs) connected to the feeders maintained at site office/10.1/ with values of this parameter reported in JMRs and found comparable, hence accepted.</p>
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	<p>Yes, all the stakeholders, namely, the Grid Authority (MSEDCL), the PP and the WWIL (O&amp;M Contractor), implemented the adequate QA/QC procedures. The data transfer process for the said parameter is as follows:</p> <p>The Joint meter reading at all the metering points at DISCOM substation is taken by the representatives of MSEDCL in the presence of CLP officials in the form of JMRs.</p> <p>Based on the data recorded in the JMRs, electricity supplied to the grid by the project activity is calculated by MSEDCL, using</p>



		the apportioning procedure and energy breakup sheets for each project developer is prepared.
	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 #4 and CAR #5 was raised and resolved	
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>The parameter has been monitored appropriately, in accordance with the registered monitoring plan (as per measurement methods and procedures to be applied) and applied methodology. The monitoring results were recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>The verification team is able to confirm that the project is implemented as per the registered PDD and there is no discrepancy observed between the actual monitoring system and the monitoring plan set out in the registered PDD.</p> <p>The emission reduction calculation for the project activity is estimated based on the electricity supplied by the project WTGs. Monthly values of electricity exported to the grid inserted in the ER sheet was verified with the energy breakup sheets provided by the project participant/10/. Since 100% data was verified, the team could ascertain that the values taken for emission reduction calculation are free from material errors.</p>	

**E.6.2.3. Net Electricity supplied to the grid by the WTGs of the project activity connected to feeder 2 & feeder 3.  $EG_{f2,y}$  and  $EG_{f3,y}$  (MWh)**

<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Criteria/Requirements</b>	<b>Assessment/Observation</b>
	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	The parameter is calculated and recorded on monthly basis, however, the input values used to calculate the value of $EG_y$ are continuously monitored, hourly measured and monthly recorded.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes. The reporting frequency is in line with the monitoring plan as outlined in the registered PDD/01/ and monitoring methodology/03/.
	Monitoring equipment	<p>No monitoring equipment is used as this parameter is calculated using the measured values.</p> <p>The WTGs belongs to project activity are connected to 2</p>

		<p>different feeders, however WTGs of other project (non-project activity) are also connected to these feeders.</p> <p>There is one main meter and check meter is installed at each feeder.</p> <p>The electricity generated by all the WTGs (project and non-project) is been fed to the NEWNE grid and monthly generation of all the WTGs at each feeder reading is recorded by the representatives MSEDCL in the presence of CLPWFPL officials in the form of JMR.</p> <p>Based on the data recorded in the JMRs, and generation recorded by LCS meters at each WTGs, electricity supplied to the grid by the project activity is calculated by MSEDCL, using the apportioning procedure and breakup sheets/10/ for each project developer is prepared.</p>
	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?	Not applicable
	Is the accuracy valid for the entire measuring range or do different accuracy levels apply to different measuring ranges?	Not applicable
	Calibration frequency /interval:	Not applicable
	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?	Not applicable

	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	Not applicable
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Not applicable
	Is the calibration carried out for a measuring range comparable with the range for which measurements have been carried out?	Not applicable
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	<p>Monthly values for entire monitoring period are reported in the monitoring report and in the ER calculation sheet. The monthly values were verified from the breakup sheets/10/ issued by state utility and found to be consistent.</p> <p>Value of this parameter for the current monitoring period was verified as:</p> <p>Feeder 2: 93,498.73 MWh</p> <p>Feeder-3: 34,907.97 MWh</p>
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The monthly reported values were further crosschecked with the monthly invoices raised by the PP /11/ to state utility and found to be consistent.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	No separate QA/QC procedures required to be followed.
	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 #4 and CAR #5 was raised and resolved	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The parameter has been monitored appropriately, in accordance with the registered monitoring plan (as per measurement methods and procedures to be applied) and applied methodology. The monitoring results were recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.	

	<p>The verification team is able to confirm that the project is implemented as per the registered PDD and there is no discrepancy observed between the actual monitoring system and the monitoring plan set out in the registered PDD.</p> <p>The emission reduction calculation for the project activity is estimated based on the electricity supplied by the project WTGs. Monthly values of electricity exported to the grid inserted in the ER sheet was verified with the energy breakup sheets provided by the project participant/10/. Since 100% data was verified, the team could ascertain that the values taken for emission reduction calculation are free from material errors.</p>
--	---

**E.6.2.4. Net electricity supplied to the grid by the WTGs of the project activity EG<sub>y</sub> (MWh)**

Means of verification	Criteria/Requirements	Assessment/Observation
	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Calculated on a monthly basis as the sum of the net exports to the grid on feeder numbers 2 and 3 by the project WTGs.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes. The reporting frequency is in line with the monitoring plan as outlined in the registered PDD/01/ and monitoring methodology/03/.
	Monitoring equipment	No monitoring equipment is used as this parameter is calculated using the measured values.
	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?	Not applicable
	Is the accuracy valid for the entire measuring range or do different accuracy levels apply to different measuring ranges?	Not applicable
	Calibration frequency /interval:	Not applicable
	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	Not applicable

	specifications?	
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	Not applicable
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Not applicable
	Is the calibration carried out for a measuring range comparable with the range for which measurements have been carried out?	Not applicable
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	<p>Monthly value of EG<sub>y</sub> for entire monitoring period is reported in the monitoring report, and in the ER calculation sheet. The monthly values were verified from the breakup sheets/10/ issued by state utility and found to be consistent.</p> <p>Value of this parameter for the current monitoring period was verified as 128,406.70 MWh.</p>
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The monthly reported values of EG <sub>y</sub> were further crosschecked with the monthly invoices raised by the PP /11/ to state utility and found to be consistent.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	No separate QA/QC procedures required to be followed.
	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 #4 and CAR #5 was raised and resolved	
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>The parameter has been monitored appropriately, in accordance with the registered monitoring plan (as per measurement methods and procedures to be applied) and applied methodology. The monitoring results were recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>The verification team is able to confirm that the project is implemented as per the registered PDD and there is no discrepancy observed between the actual monitoring system and the monitoring plan set out in the registered</p>	

	<p>PDD.</p> <p>The emission reduction calculation for the project activity is estimated based on the electricity supplied by the project WTGs. Monthly values of electricity exported to the grid inserted in the ER sheet was verified with the energy breakup sheets provided by the project participant/10/. Since 100% data was verified, the team could ascertain that the values taken for emission reduction calculation are free from material errors.</p>
--	--

### E.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan

<b>Means of verification</b>	Not applicable
<b>Findings</b>	Not applicable
<b>Conclusion</b>	Not applicable

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

Means of verification

As per the monitoring plan in the registered PDD/01/ the meters are to be tested and calibrated annually.

The project activity metering has been physically inspected during the site visit. The details of monitoring equipment's involved in the project activity and their calibration dates are mentioned in Section C of the MR/05/ and are summarised in the tables below. All the meters are of accuracy class of 0.2s and calibration frequency of once in a year.

Wind World (India) Limited- 132/33 kV substation:

Meter Location	Meter type	Meter Sr.No-	Date of recent calibration	Calibration Delay (Y/N)
Feeder 02	Main Meter	14796488	10/08/2012, 30/07/2013, 18/07/2014, 06/08/2015 and 05/10/2016	Y Calibration delay period: <b>Year 2015:</b> From 17/07/2015 to 05/08/2015 <b>Year 2016:</b> from 05/08/2016 04/10/2016
	Check Meter	14796490	10/08/2012,30/07/2013, 18/07/2014, 06/08/2015 and 05/10/2016	
Feeder 03	Main Meter	14796497	10/08/2012,30/07/2013, 18/07/2014, 06/08/2015 and 05/10/2016	Y Calibration delay period: <b>Year 2015:</b> From 17/07/2015 to 05/08/2015 <b>Year 2016:</b> from 05/08/2016 04/10/2016
	Check Meter	14796478	10/08/2012,30/07/2013, 18/07/2014, 06/08/2015 and 05/10/2016	

The above meter details have been verified through the following means:

i. Physical inspection of the meters during the site visit

- ii. Interviewing the staff at the sub-station
- iii. The CMS of the O&M service provider located at the site
- iv. Calibration certificates

The installation and working condition of the meters were checked during the on-site inspection and it was found to be satisfactory. These meters are duly approved, installed, tested, sealed and in the custody of the state utility. The PP has no control over the same.

**Assessment on delay in calibration:**

It is evident from the above table that calibration for all monitoring equipment involved in the project activity is not carried out as per the frequency mentioned in the registered monitoring plan.

Delayed calibration period	Maximum Permissible error	Error applied	Remark
From 18/07/2015 to 05/08/2015 and from 06/08/2016 to 04/10/2016	+/- 0.2%	- 0.2% to export values and + 0.2% to import (sourced from monthly energy breakup sheets)	Since the billing cycle starts from 1 <sup>st</sup> day of and ends on 1 <sup>st</sup> day of consecutive month in the delayed period. Hence the error factor is applied for the entire month of July 2015, August 2015, August 2016, September 2016 and October 2016.

The assessment team has checked the latest calibration certificates of energy meters and confirmed that meter was working satisfactorily and error within the permissible limits. Accordance with the guidelines outlined under paragraph 395(a) of VVS version 09, an error factor had to be applied for both export & import i.e. the measured values in the delayed calibration period.

The PP has demonstrated the application of the error factor on the measured values/7/ of electricity export and import measured through energy meters and recorded in the JMRs/10/, however these measured values are not directly used in the emission reductions calculation, hence does not have any impact on emission reductions.

Since the monthly values of electricity exported and imported by the project activity used in calculation of  $EG_y$ , subsequently for emission reductions are calculated using apportioning procedure and directly sourced from energy breakup sheets issued by the state utility/10/, hence the error factor – 0.2% is applied to the calculated export values and +0.2% to import values. The approach followed by the PP was found to be conservative and appropriate, hence accepted.

It is verified through the registered PDD and PPA signed by the PP with state utility that the state utility (MSEDCL) is the buyer of generated electricity and sole entity responsible for calibration of meters.

Accordance with the guidelines as state under section 3.2.3 of CEA Notification No. 502/70/CEA/DP&D dated 17/03/2006/19/ which is considered as national standard "All interface meters shall be tested at least once in five years." Hence, the calibration frequency of once in a year, mentioned in the registered PDD for the meters is appropriate.

	It is verified that the PP receives payment, for the electricity supplied to the grid, from the state utility (which is a Government Organisation and a 3 <sup>rd</sup> party with respect to this CDM project). This electricity supplied to the grid is obtained using directly measured values at the energy meters. Hence, the state utility ensures that the energy meters are in proper working condition, since it has to make payments based on these meter readings.
<b>Findings</b>	CAR #4 was raised and resolved
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>Based on the above mentioned means of verification, the assessment team confirms that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The meter details are correctly mentioned in the MR</li> <li>• The meter details are consistent throughout all verified documents</li> <li>• The entire metering system is in the custody of the state utility. The PP has no control on the same</li> <li>• The responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting are in accordance with what is stated in the monitoring plan.</li> <li>• The accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is in accordance with the relevant guidance provided by the CDM Executive Board</li> <li>• The monitoring equipment are controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan in the registered PDD.</li> </ul> <p>As per paragraph 390 (c) to (e) of the VVS, version 9.0, the verification team confirms that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The equipment used for monitoring is in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology, Board guidance, local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's.</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 monitoring plan</li> </ul>

## 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 the product of net electricity exported to the grid <math>EG_y</math> expressed in MWh of electricity produced by the renewable generating unit multiplied by the grid emission factor. Baseline emission factor is calculated as combined margin, consisting of a combination of operating margin (OM) and build margin (BM) factors.</p> $BE_y = EG_y * EF_y$ <p>Where:</p> <p><math>BE_y</math>: Baseline Emissions in year y; t CO<sub>2</sub></p> <p><math>EG_y</math> : Net Electricity supplied to the grid in year y</p> $EG_y = EG_{f2,y} + EG_{f3,y}$ <p><math>EF_y</math> = Combined margin CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor (tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh)</p> <p>As per the registered PDD, combined margin emission factor is 0.94022 tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh. Hence the baseline emissions for the project activity for the current monitoring period are as follows.</p> $BE_y = 128,406.70 * 0.94022 = 120,730 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$ <p>Note:</p> <p>During the current monitoring period, it is noted that end date of each month overlaps with the start date of consecutive month, however despite of overlapping there is no double counting of data. The reason for the same is that ABT Meters stored the generation data (cumulatively) and during joint meter reading engineer from state utility used to download the generation data from the energy meter for</p>
------------------------------	---



	<p>the last month. For example, generation for the period 01/10/2015 to 01/11/2015 would denote generation data from 00:00 hr of 01/10/2015 to 00:00 hrs of 01/11/2015. These date and timing are also reflected in the Joint Meter Reading prepared by State Utility based on which ER calculation has been prepared.</p> <p>The verification team verified and cross verified the complete set of data for the entire monitoring period was available for the monitoring period and the verification of each monitoring parameter is elaborated under Section E.6.2 of this report. The complete monitoring data is also presented in the corresponding ER sheet /07/ of final Monitoring Report /05/.</p> <p>The baseline emissions calculations as presented in the corresponding ER sheet of final Monitoring Report were checked and found to be consistent with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan and the applied methodology. All assumptions used in the emission calculations were found appropriate and therefore justified</p> <p>No standardized baseline was prescribed in the revised approved PDD and therefore it has not been applied.</p> <p>No pro-rate approach (para 402(g) of CDM VVS Version 09) was applied in the current monitoring period as entire monitoring period falls into period that is after the end of first commitment period of Kyoto Protocol.</p>
<b>Findings</b>	CL #2 was raised and resolved
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>The verification team confirms that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The complete data was available and is duly reported;</li> <li>b) As indicated above, the description with regard to cross-check of reported data is included under respective parameter (refer Section E.6.2 of this report);</li> <li>c) Appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals were followed;</li> <li>d) Appropriate emission factors and other reference values were correctly applied.</li> <li>e) No pro-rate approach (para 403(e) of CDM VVS Version 09) was applied in the current monitoring period as entire monitoring period falls into period that is after the end of first commitment period of Kyoto Protocol.</li> <li>f) The start date of the current monitoring period is inline to the end date of the previous monitoring period.</li> </ul>

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	The registered PDD/1/ and applied monitoring methodology/3/ does not prescribe any project emissions to be considered. The onsite visit and project design also did not reveal any potential source to be considered in this regard.
<b>Findings</b>	No finding was raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	No project emissions were required to be calculated.

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	The registered PDD and applied monitoring methodology does not prescribe any leakage emissions to be considered. The onsite visit and project design also did not reveal any potential source to be considered in this regard.
<b>Findings</b>	No finding was raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	No project emissions were required to be calculated

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	As elaborated above, the entire emission reductions from the project activity were based on baseline emissions. The calculations presented in this regard in the final monitoring report and corresponding ER calculation sheet were found appropriate
------------------------------	--

	and complying with the provisions prescribed in the registered monitoring plan of registered PDD and applied methodology. The verification team confirms that an audit trail that contains the evidence and records that validated the stated figures were checked and found acceptable.
<b>Findings</b>	No finding was raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>The verification team confirms that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The complete data was available and is duly reported;</li> <li>b) As indicated above, the description with regard to cross-check of reported data is included under respective parameter (refer Section E.6.2 of this report);</li> <li>c) Appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals, project emissions and leakage emissions were followed;</li> <li>d) Appropriate emission factors and other reference values were correctly applied.</li> <li>e) There is no pro-rate approach (para 403(e) of CDM VVS Version 09) was applied in the current monitoring period as entire monitoring period falls into period that is after the end of first commitment period of Kyoto Protocol.</li> </ul> <p>The total number of ERs achieved during the current monitoring period is 120,730 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.</p>

#### **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>	As verified and evident from the final Monitoring Report /05/ and corresponding ER sheet /07/, the actual emission reductions achieved by the project activity in the current monitoring period are higher than (7.89% higher) the estimated quantity in the registered PDD/1/ for the comparable period. PP has clarified that the higher emission reductions is due to a higher PLF obtained during the monitoring period. the project activity harnesses wind energy and therefore a higher PLF was not in the hands of the PP.
<b>Findings</b>	CL #2 was raised and resolved
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>The actual emission reductions achieved by the project activity are 7.89% higher than the estimated quantity of ERs in the registered PDD. Increase in the actual ERs is due to high PLF achieved during the current monitoring period.</p> <p>Since the PLF is solely influenced by wind availability and not under control of PP, hence the verification team accepted it.</p>

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>The actual emission reductions were higher than the estimation in the registered PDD for an equivalent length of the monitoring period. This is largely due to the high PLF achieved by the project activity during the monitoring period. PLF estimated at the time of validation was 21.07%, however actual PLF achieved during the current monitoring period is verified as 22.71 % ( around 7.78% greater than the estimated). The current monitoring period 01/01/2013 to 01/11/2016 covers four peak wind seasons (May to September), however in year 2016, 2 months of lean wind season are not covered, hence PLF achieved is higher than estimated.</p> <p>It is to be noted that PLF is completely governed by the availability of wind, which is natural phenomenon and it is beyond the control of PP. The assessment team reviewed the registered PDD and the validation report to check the impact of the increased PLF on the additionality of the project. The registered documents indicated that the sensitivity analysis on PLF has been performed considering a 10% increase in PLF. Even with a 10% increased PLF the IRR of the project is well</p>
------------------------------	--

	within the benchmark limit. Therefore, an increased PLF observed during the current monitoring period does not impact the additionality of the project; hence, the assessment team has concluded the increase in emission reduction of the project activity is justified and acceptable.
<b>Findings</b>	CL #2 was raised and resolved
<b>Conclusion</b>	The actual ERs are higher than the estimated quantity of ERs as given in the registered PDD. Since the increase in the ERs does not have any impact on additionality; hence, the assessment team has concluded that the increase in emission reductions of the project activity are justified and 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 assessment team is able to certify that the emission reductions from the CDM project activity 3142 "Roaring 40's Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited " in India during the period 01/01/2013 to 01/11/2016 (including both days) is 120,730 tCO <sub>2</sub> e.
<b>Findings</b>	No finding was raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	Actual GHG emission reductions achieved during period starting from 1 <sup>st</sup> January 2013 onwards was verified as 120,730 tCO <sub>2</sub> e .

#### **SECTION F. Internal quality control**

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 reviews a draft verification report that is prepared by verification team. 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 by the Managing Director on behalf of Earthood Services Private Limited.

#### **SECTION G. Verification opinion**

Earthood Services Private Limited (Earthood), contracted by CLP Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited, has performed the independent verification of the emission reductions for the CDM project activity 3142 "Roaring 40's Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited" in India for the monitoring period 01/01/2013 - 01/11/2016 (including both days) as reported in the Monitoring Report (public) Version 1 dated 05/12/2016. The CLP Wind Farms (Khandke) 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 based on the baseline and monitoring methodology ACM 0002 Version 10, the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD Version 06 dated 24/09/2010, Monitoring Report (public) Version 1 dated 05/12/2016.

ESPL confirms that the monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements. This verification report has been prepared using the latest available template specified by UNFCCC and complies with the instructions to follow as per para 406 and 407 of CDM VVS Version 9.

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.
- The actual operation conforms to the description in the registered PDD.

## **SECTION H. Certification statement**

Earthood Services Private Limited (Earthood), contracted by CLP Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited, has performed the independent verification of the emission reductions for the CDM project activity 3142 "Roaring 40's Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited" in India for the monitoring period 01/01/2013 - 01/11/2016 (including both days) as reported in the Monitoring Report (Final) Version 03 dated 10/03/2017. The CLP Wind Farms (Khandke) 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. It is our responsibility to express an independent verification statement on the reported GHG emission reductions from the project activity

Earthood commenced the verification based on the baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002 Version 10, the monitoring plan contained in the PDD Version 06 dated 24/09/2010, Monitoring Report (public) Version 1 dated 05/12/2016 as per the methodology described under Section D of this report.

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.

In our opinion the GHG emissions reductions reported for the project activity for the period 01/01/2013 - 01/11/2016 are fairly stated in the Monitoring Report (final) Version 03 dated 10/03/2017. The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly based on the approved baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002 Version 10 and the monitoring plan contained in the PDD Version 06 dated 24/09/2010.

Earthood Services Private Limited is able to certify that the emission reductions from the CDM project activity 3142 "Roaring 40's Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited" in India during the period 01/01/2013 - 01/11/2016 (including both days) amount to 120,730 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.

### **Verified and certified emission reductions as per commitment period:**

<b>Commitment period</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Upto 31/12/2012	Nil
From 01/01/2013 onwards	120,730 tCO <sub>2</sub> e

## Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
ABT	Availability Based Tariff
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CDM PCP	Clean Development Mechanism Project Cycle Procedure
CDM PS	Clean Development Mechanism Project Standard
CDM VVS	Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard
EB	Executive Board
EF	Emission Factor
EPC	Engineering, Procurement and Construction
ER	Emission Reductions
CEA	Central Electricity Authority
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CL	Clarification Request
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
DNA	Designated National Authority
EIL	Enercon(India) Limited
ESCOM	Electricity Supply Company
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse Gas(es)
GOI	Government of India
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
JMR	Joint Meter Reading
MP	Monitoring Plan
MR	Monitoring Report
MSEDCL	Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company
MWh	Megawatt hour
PDD	Project Design Document
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
PP	Project Participant
PRC	Post Registration Changes
PS	Project Standard
RMP	Revised Monitoring Plan
TR	Technical Review
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard
UID	Unique Identification number
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WTG	Wind Turbine Generator
WEC	Wind Energy Converter
WWIL	Wind World India Limited

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

Competence Statement			
<b>Name</b>	Ravi Kant Soni		
<b>Country</b>	India		
<b>Education</b>	B. Tech. (Mechanical Engineering) M. Tech. (Energy Management)		
<b>Experience</b>	7 Years		
<b>Field</b>	Energy and Climate Change		
Approved Roles			
<b>Team Leader</b>	YES		
<b>Validator</b>	YES		
<b>Verifier</b>	YES		
<b>Methodology Expert</b>	AMS-I.D., AMS-I.C., ACM0002		
<b>Local Expert</b>	YES(India)		
<b>Financial Expert</b>	NO		
<b>Technical Reviewer</b>	YES		
<b>TA Expert (1.2)</b>	YES		
<b>Reviewed by</b>	Abhishek Mahawar	<b>Date</b>	09/09/2016
<b>Approved by</b>	Kaviraj Singh	<b>Date</b>	09/09/2016

Competence Statement			
<b>Name</b>	Shreya Garg		
<b>Country</b>	India		
<b>Education</b>	M.Sc. (Climate Science & Policy), TERI University		
<b>Experience</b>	4 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.D., AMS-II.D., ACM0002		
<b>Local expert</b>	YES (India)		
<b>Financial Expert</b>	NO		
<b>Technical Reviewer</b>	YES		
<b>TA Expert (1.2)</b>	YES		
<b>Reviewed by</b>	Abhishek Mahawar	<b>Date</b>	08/09/2016
<b>Approved by</b>	Ashok Gautam	<b>Date</b>	08/09/2016

### Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1	PP	Registered PDD	Version 06 ,Dated 24/09/2010	Other
2	Det Norske Veritas(DNV)	Validation report	Rev.03 ,Dated 11/10/2010	Other
2.1	Lloyd's Register Quality Assurance Limited	Verification report for the period from 14/10/2010 to 31/12/2011	Version 02.3, dated 28/01/2013	Other
3	UNFCCC	Approved Consolidated Methodology ACM0002	Version 10	Other
4	PP	Monitoring Report (publication)	Version 01,dated 05/12/2016	PP
4.1	PP	Monitoring Report	Version 02, dated 20/02/2017	PP
5	PP	Monitoring Report (final)	Version 03, dated 10/03/2017	PP
6	PP	ER Spread sheet (initial version)	Version 01, dated 05/12/2016	PP
7	PP	ER spread sheet (final)	Version 02, dated 10/03/2017	PP
8	UNFCCC	CDM VVS	Version 09	Other
9	UNFCCC	CDM PS	Version 09	Other
10	MSEDCL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monthly JMRs issued by state utility</li> <li>Monthly breakup sheets issued by state utility</li> </ul>	For the period from 01/01/2013 to 01/11/2016	PP
10.1	WWIL	Monthly generation records maintained at site office	For the period from 01/01/2013 to 01/11/2016	PP
11	PP	Monthly invoices raised by the PP to state utility	For the period from 01/01/2013 to 01/11/2016	PP
12	MSEDCL	Calibration certificates of main meters and check meters	-	PP
13	MSEDCL	Commissioning certificates (for all 21 WTGs)	-	PP
14	MSEDCL	Power Purchase Agreement between	-	PP

		MSEDCL and CLP Wind Farms (Khandke) Private Limited		
15	CEA	CO <sub>2</sub> Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector	Version 1.1, dated 21/12/2006	Others
16	UNFCCC	UNFCCC webpage for the project activity	<a href="https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1258623990.3/view">https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1258623990.3/view</a>	Others
18	Ministry of corporate Affairs, GOI	Name change consent issued by Government of India	dated 01/01/2013	PP
19	CEA	CEA Notification No. 502/70/CEA/DP&D	dated 17/03/2006	Others
20	ESPL	Site visit observation and photographs	Dated 23/01/2017	-

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

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

FAR ID	Section no.	Date :DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR		
N/A		
Project participant response		Date :DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by project participant		
DOE assessment		Date: DD/MM/YYYY

Table 2. CL from this verification

CL ID	Section no.	Date : DD/MM/YYYY
01	E.5	28/01/2017
Description of CL		
Version of applied methodology ACM0002 indicated at project webpage is inconsistent with the same mentioned in the registered PDD and MR. Please clarify the inconsistency observed. (Ref: para 373 VVS v.9)		
Project participant response		Date : 20/02/2017



During project registration, version 5 dated 05/09/2009 of the PDD was submitted to UNFCCC for registration. The version of the methodology considered in version 5 of the PDD was version 9. During the registration process, the project came under review in April 2010. During resubmission of the PDD (Version 6 dated 24/09/2010) for registration, the version of the methodology was changed to version 10. The change in the methodology from version 9 to 10, does not impact the project activity. The change in version impacts only those project activities that retrofit or replace renewable energy power generation units, to restore the installed power generation capacity to or above its original level. Since this project activity is a green field activity, the change has no implication on the project.

The version of the methodology in the revised monitoring report has been changed to version 10 to reflect the version appearing in the registered PDD.

**Documentation provided by project participant**

MR version 02, dated 20/02/2017

**DOE assessment**

**Date:** 28/02/2017

Version of methodology mentioned in the monitoring report is consistent with the registered PDD. The assessment team has confirmed that there is no impact on emission reduction calculations due to change in version of the methodology ACM0002 from version 09 to 10.

CL #1 is closed.

CL ID	02	Section No.	E.6	Date :	28/02/2017
<b>Description of CL</b>					
Actual emission reductions achieved during the current monitoring period are higher than the estimated ERs in the registered PDD for same period. Kindly clarify the reason.					
<b>Project participant response</b>					<b>Date :</b> 10/03/2017
Actual emission reductions achieved during the current monitoring period are 7.89% higher than the envisaged value mentioned in the registered PDD for the equivalent period. This is due to higher availability of wind at site. As availability of wind is a natural phenomenon, thus, same is beyond the control of CLP.					
Further, during project registration 21.07% PLF has been considered to demonstrate the project additionality. However, during this monitoring period, project has achieved 22.71% of PLF (128,267.75 MWh) which is 1.64% higher than the envisaged PLF value. Furthermore, sensitivity analysis mentioned in registered PDD clearly mentioned that project would be additionality even if PLF increased upto 10%. Thus, increase in generation observed in this monitoring period would not affect the project design.					
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>					
MR version 03, dated 10/03/2017					
<b>DOE assessment</b>					<b>Date:</b> 30/03/2017
The actual emission reduction achieved during the current monitoring period are 7.89% greater than the estimated amount of emission reductions at the time of validation, which is due to the high PLF achieved by the project activity during the monitoring period. PLF estimated at the time of validation was 21.07%, however actual PLF achieved during the current monitoring period is verified as 22.71 % (around 7.78% greater than the estimated).					
It is to be noted that PLF is completely governed by the availability of wind, which is natural phenomenon and same is beyond the control of PP. Furthermore, the assessment team checked the registered PDD and verified that in the sensitivity analysis, increase in PLF is well within the sensitivity analysis margin of 10% assumed in the financial calculation and does not have any impact on additionality, hence the assessment team has concluded the increase in emission reduction of the project activity is justified and acceptable.					
CL #2 is closed.					

**Table 3. CAR from this verification**

CAR ID	03	Section no.	E.3	Date :	28/01/2017
<b>Description of CAR</b>					
Section A.1 of MR: It is stated that the project contributing towards reduction in the energy demand supply gap in state of Karnataka, however the project is located in Maharashtra. Please clarify the appropriateness of the statement. (Ref: para 373 VVS v.9)					
During the site visit it is known that name of O&M contractor has been changed, please clarify why the same is not updated in the MR.					
<b>Project participant response</b>					<b>Date :</b> 20/02/2017
Project is located in Maharashtra. Thus, section A.1 of MR has been revised appropriately.					

Enercon, India and Wind World (India) Limited are same entity. From 01/01/2013 onwards, Enercon, India changed its name and renewed name of the entity is Wind World (India) Limited.	
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised monitoring report, version 02, dated 20/02/2017</li> <li>Fresh Certificate of Incorporation Consequent upon change of name issued by Registers of companies, Govt. India</li> </ul>	
<b>DOE assessment</b>	<b>Date:</b> 28/02/2017
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location of the project activity is correctly mentioned in section A.1 of the revised MR.</li> <li>Name of entity Enercon(India) Limited is changed as Wind World India Limited from 01/01/2013, this is verified through the fresh Certificate of Incorporation Consequent upon change of name issued by Registers of companies, Govt. India. The PP has updated this information in the relevant sections of the MR appropriately.</li> </ul>	
CAR #3 is closed.	

<b>CAR ID</b>	04	<b>Section no.</b>	E.5	<b>Date :</b> 25/01/2017
<b>Description of CAR</b>				
Section C of MR: As per the registered monitoring plan, there is one set of meters (main meter and check meter) installed at 33 Kv side of substation, however only 2 main meters are reported in the MR. Please clarify why check meters details are not reported.				
Please clarify the reason if there were some meter replacements occurred during the current monitoring period and also submit the meter replacement certificates issued by responsible authority. (Ref: para 383 VVS v.9)				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date :</b> 20/02/2017
Details of all main and check meters for both the feeders are now incorporated in the revised monitoring report.				
In this project, meters were replaced on 31/07/2012. Post that replacement, all the meters are working accurately. Thus, no further, replacement happened. As the meter replacements are not effecting this monitoring period, thus, same has not been reported in the MR. Further, meter replacement report has been attached with this submission.				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
Revised monitoring report, version 02, dated 20/02/2017 Meter replacement report.				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date:</b> 28/02/2017
PP has provided the details of main and check meters for both the feeders in section C of the monitoring report, the same is found consistent with calibration certificates and as verified physically during the site visit. It is verified that calibration of meters were delayed during the current monitoring period, please clarify why this information is not provided in the monitoring report /ER sheet.				
CAR #4 is open.				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date:</b> 10/03/2017
Delay in calibration has now been incorporated in revised monitoring report.				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
Revised monitoring report version 03, dated 10/03/2017				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date:</b> 30/03/2017
During the current monitoring period calibration of the meters was delayed from 18/07/2015 to 05/08/2015 and from 06/08/2016 to 04/10/2016; hence the PP has applied an error factor -0.2% to the values electricity export and +0.2% to import for the entire month of July 2015, August 2015 and August 2016 to October 2016.				
This approach is found conservative and in line with the guidance provided under paragraph 395 (a) of VVS version 09, hence accepted.				
CAR #4 is closed.				

<b>CAR ID</b>	05	<b>Section no.</b>	E.6	<b>Date :</b> 28/01/2017
<b>Description of CAR</b>				
Description of the parameters $EG_{f2,y}$ , $EG_{f3,y}$ and $EG_y$ provided in section D.2 of the MR is not consistent with the same outlined under registered PDD. (Ref: para 373 VVS v.9)				
Values of parameter $EG_y$ for the months May 2015, July 2015, November 2015, August 2016, September 2016 and October 2016 were not found consistent with the invoices for respective months.				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date :</b> 20/02/2017
Description of the parameters $EG_{f2,y}$ , $EG_{f3,y}$ and $EG_y$ have been revised in line with registered PDD.				

Values of parameter E <sub>Gy</sub> have been appropriately revised.	
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>	
Revised monitoring report	
<b>DOE assessment</b>	<b>Date:</b> 28/02/2017
Description of parameters E <sub>G<sub>r2,y</sub></sub> , E <sub>G<sub>r3,y</sub></sub> and E <sub>Gy</sub> is appropriately updated in section D.2. Please address the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Values of E<sub>Gy</sub> for both feeders (November 2015) as reported in ER sheet are still inconsistent with invoice.</li> <li>• Feb 2016: Values of E<sub>Gy</sub> are directly reported in column DJ, however as per the monitoring plan, it is calculated parameter.</li> <li>• In the JMR (Feb 2016), it is indicated that the reading was taken on 01/03/2016 but billing period mentioned in ER sheet as 01/02/2016 to 10/03/2016. Please clarify the inconsistency.</li> </ul>	
CAR #5 is open	
<b>Project participant response</b>	<b>Date:</b> 10/03/2017
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Values of E<sub>Gy</sub> for both feeders for the month of November 2015 have been corrected now. Thus, ER sheet and monitoring report have now been revised accordingly.</li> <li>• Generation values for Feb 2016 have now been revised accordingly in revised ER and MR</li> <li>• Billing period for Feb 2016 has been revised accordingly in ER sheet</li> </ul>	
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised monitoring report, version 03, dated 10/03/2017</li> <li>• Revised ER sheet</li> </ul>	
<b>DOE assessment</b>	<b>Date:</b> 30/03/2017
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Values of E<sub>Gy</sub> for both feeders for the month of November 2015 have been corrected in the revised MR, ER sheet and found consistent with JMR.</li> <li>• Formula used to calculate values of E<sub>Gy</sub> for Feb 2016 is correctly inserted in the revised ER sheet.</li> <li>• Billing period for Feb 2016 has been updated in the ER sheet, consistent with JMR.</li> </ul>	
CAR #5 is closed.	

Table 4. FAR from this verification

FAR ID	NA	Section No.	NA	Date :DD/MM/YYYY
<b>Description of FAR</b>				
No FAR raised during the verification.				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date :DD/MM/YYYY</b>
NA				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
NA				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date: DD/MM/YYYY</b>
NA				

-----

## Document information

Version	Date	Description
01.0	23 March 2015	Initial publication.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Form Business Function: Issuance Keywords: project activities, verifying and certifying		