



VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION REPORT

- 2ND PERIODIC –

VAAYU (INDIA) POWER CORPORATION
PRIVATE LIMITED

VAAYU INDIA WIND POWER PROJECT IN GUJARAT

UNFCCC REF. No. : 4700

Monitoring Period: 2012-03-01 to 2012-12-31
(incl. both days)

Report No: 8109817473 – 13/029

Date: 2013-05-14

TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
JI/CDM Certification Program
Langemarckstraße, 20
45141 Essen, Germany
Phone: +49-201-825-3335
Fax: +49-201-825-2139
www.tuev-nord.de
www.global-warming.de



Verification Report:	Report No.	Rev. No.	Date of 1st issue:	Date of this rev.
	8109817473 – 13/029	0	2013-05-14	2013-05-14
Project:	Title:	Registration date:		UNFCCC-No.:
	Vaayu India Wind Power Project in Gujarat	2011-05-09		4700
	Verification No.:			
	2nd periodic verification			
	Crediting period:	From:	To:	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Renewable (7y) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fixed (10y)	2011-06-01	2021-05-31	
Project Scale:				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Large Scale <input type="checkbox"/> Small Scale				
Project Participant(s):	Client:			
	Vaayu (India) Power Corporation Private Limited			
	Non Annex 1 country:		Annex 1 country:	
	India		NA	
	PP from non Annex 1 country:		PP from Annex 1 country:	
	Vaayu (India) Power Corporation Private Limited		NA	
Applied methodology/ies:	Title:		No.:	Scope(s) / TA(s)
	Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources		ACM0002 ver. 11	1/1.2
Monitoring period and monitoring report	Monitoring period (MP):			Monitoring Report:
	From:	To:	No. of days:	Draft version:
	2012-03-01	2012-12-31	306	2013-02-02
Verification team / Technical Review and Final Approval:	Verification Team:			Technical review:
	Mr. Jimmy Sah (TL) Mr. Prasad Jakkaraju (TM) Mr. Sukanta Das (TM) Mr. Stefan Winter (TM)			Mr. Ingo Klein Mr. Samir Beqqal
				Mr. Ingo Klein
Key dates of verification:	Publication of MR :	DVerR issued:	On-site (from):	On-site (to):
	2013-02-07	2013-03-25	2013-03-14	2013-03-15
Summary of Verification opinion	<p>Vaayu (India) Power Corporation Private Limited has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program to carry out the 2nd periodic verification of the project: "Vaayu India Wind Power Project in Gujarat", with regard to the relevant requirements for CDM project activities.</p> <p>As a result of this verification, the verifier confirms that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> all operations of the project are implemented and installed as planned and described in the validated project design document, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied approved CDM methodology, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the installed equipment essential for measuring parameters required for calculating emission reductions are calibrated appropriately, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the monitoring system is in place and functional. The project has generated GHG emission reductions, and <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements in a conservative and appropriate manner. <p>TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP herewith confirms that the project has achieved emission reductions in the above mentioned reporting period as listed below (verified amount).</p>			



Emission reductions: [t CO _{2e}]	Total verified amount	As per draft MR:	As per PDD:
	87,690	87,690 tCO ₂	88,648 tCO ₂ (Considering the MP)
		ER achieved up to 2012-12-31	ER achieved from 2013-01-01
		87,690	NA
Document information:	Filename:		No. of pages:
	2013-05-14_FVR_vaayu_13-029.docx		83

Abbreviations:

CA	Corrective Action / Clarification Action
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CL	Clarification Request
CO₂	Carbon dioxide
CO_{2eq}	Carbon dioxide equivalent
EIL	Enercon India Limited
ER	Emission Reduction
FAR	Forward Action Request
GEDA	Gujarat Electricity Development Authority
GETCO	Gujarat Energy Transmission Corporation Limited
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
MP	Monitoring Plan
NEWNE	Northern, Eastern, Western, North-Eastern
MR	Monitoring Report
PA	Project Activity
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
QA/QC	Quality Assurance / Quality Control
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VIPCPL	Vaayu (India) Power Corporation Private Limited
VCB	Vacuum Circuit Breaker
WEC	Wind Energy Converter
XLS	Emission Reduction Calculation Spread Sheet

Table of Contents	Page
1.1. Objective	6
1.2. Scope	6
2.1. Technical Project Description	8
2.2. Project Location	12
2.3. Project Verification History	15
3.1. Verification Steps	16
3.2. Contract review	16
3.3. Appointment of team members and technical reviewers	16
3.4. Publication of the Monitoring Report	18
3.5. Verification Planning	18
3.6. Desk review	20
3.7. On-site assessment	20
3.8. Draft verification reporting	22
3.9. Resolution of CARs, CLs and FARs	22
3.10. Final reporting	23
3.11. Technical review	23
3.12. Final approval	23
5.1. Involved Parties and Project Participants	33
5.2. Implementation of the project	33
5.3. Project history	34
5.4. Post registration changes	35
5.5. Compliance with the monitoring plan	35
5.6. Compliance with the monitoring methodology	35
5.7. Monitoring parameters	36
5.8. Monitoring report	38
5.9. Sampling	39
5.9.1. Implementation of the sampling plan	39
5.9.2. Sampling approaches during verification	39
5.10. ER Calculation	39
5.11. Quality Management	40
5.12. Actual emission reductions during the first commitment period and the period from 1 January 2013 onwards	40
5.13. Comparison with ex-ante estimated emission reductions	40
5.14. Overall Aspects of the Verification	41
5.15. Hints for next periodic Verification	41

1. INTRODUCTION

Vaayu (India) Power Corporation Private Limited has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program (CP) to carry out the 2nd periodic verification of the project

“Vaayu India Wind Power Project in Gujarat”

with regard to the relevant requirements for CDM project activities. The verifiers have reviewed the implementation of the monitoring plan (MP) in the registered CDM project.

GHG data for the monitoring period was verified in detailed manner applying the set of requirements, audit practices and principles as required under the Validation and Verification Standard ^{/VVS/} of the UNFCCC.

This report summarizes the findings and conclusions of this 2nd periodic verification of the above mentioned UNFCCC registered project activity.

1.1. Objective

The objective of the verification is the review and ex-post determination by an independent entity of the GHG emission reductions. It includes the verification of the:

- implementation and operation of the project activity as given in the PDD,
- compliance with applied approved methodology and the provisions of the monitoring plan,
- data given in the monitoring report by checking the monitoring records, the emissions reduction calculation and supporting evidence,
- accuracy of the monitoring equipment,
- quality of evidence,
- significance of reporting risks and risks of material misstatements.

1.2. Scope

The verification of this registered project is based on the validated project design document ^{/PDD/}, the monitoring report ^{/MR/}, emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/XLS/}, supporting documents made available to the verifier and information collected through performing interviews and during the on-site assessment. Furthermore publicly available information was considered as far as available and required.

The verification is carried out on the basis of the following requirements, applicable for this project activity:

- Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol ^{/KP/},
- guidelines for the implementation of Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol as presented in the Marrakech Accords under decision 3/CMP.1 ^{/MA/}, and subsequent decisions made by the Executive Board and COP/MOP,
- other relevant rules, including the host country legislation,



- CDM Validation and Verification Standard ^{/VVS/}
- monitoring plan as given in the registered PDD ^{/PDD/},
- Approved CDM Methodology.

2. GHG PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1. Technical Project Description

The project activity involves installation of a 51.2 (64 × 0.80) MW wind power project located at villages Chattar, Narmana, Seth Wadala, Jam Ambardi, Mevasa, Dhun Dhoraji, Sadodar, Bodi, Padavala and Machharda in Jamnagar and Rajkot Districts of Gujarat state in India. The electricity generated is being sold to the grid for which PP has entered into a Power Purchase Agreement^{/PPA/} with Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited (GUVNL). The project thereby reduces GHG emissions by replacing electricity of the NEWNE Grid of India (to which the project is connected to) which predominantly uses fossil fuels.

The project activity includes Enercon windmills (800 kW, E-53) with internal electrical lines connecting the project activity with local evacuation facility. The WECs generates 3-phase electricity at 400 V, which is stepped up to 33 kV. Enercon (India) Limited is responsible for operation and maintenance activities for this project which is also the technology and equipment supplier.

The project activity constitute of various clusters and each cluster has an exclusive metering arrangement and the meter readings taken at these metering points have been provided by the representatives of Enercon to GEDA. Further, the Project is connected to 220KV Sadodar substation at Jamnagar District in Gujarat. The main meter (also known as revenue meter) is located in this substation. There are four main meters connected to four individual transformers having 100MVA rating which are responsible to monitor the electricity export/import to the grid. These meters are responsible to monitor the electricity export/import which is generated by this project activity as well as WECs installed by other project owners. Gujarat Electricity development Authority (GEDA) apportions the net electricity supplied to the grid, monitored by the main meter (220KV) and cluster meter (33KV) to all the project owners after adjusting transmission loss. The meter reading at 220 KV sub-station is being taken jointly by the representatives of Enercon and GEDA/GETCO in the form of JMR. The electricity from Enercon's substation has been finally supplied to the utility's substation at 220 KV Moti Paneli. The net electricity generated by the project owners is being provided by GETCO in the share certificate of electricity generated. The value of the net electricity generated by the project activity has been taken directly from the share certificate provided by GETCO for emission reductions calculation.

The first WEC under the project activity was commissioned on 25/06/2010 and last WEC under the project activity was commissioned on 04/07/2011. The commissioning date^{/CC/} for all the WECs included in the project activity is given in the table below.

<u>Sr. No.</u>	<u>Location No</u>	<u>WTG-ID No.</u>	<u>Commissioning Date</u>
1	3020	EIL/800/10-11/1826	12/07/2010
2	3021	EIL/800/10-11/1827	12/07/2010
3	3022	EIL/800/10-11/1828	12/07/2010
4	3072	EIL/800/09-10/1738	25/06/2010
5	3073	EIL/800/09-10/1739	25/06/2010
6	3075	EIL/800/09-10/1740	25/06/2010
7	3076	EIL/800/09-10/1741	25/06/2010
8	3088	EIL/800/09-10/1742	25/06/2010
9	62	EIL/800/09-10/1766	27/06/2011
10	63	EIL/800/09-10/1767	04/07/2011
11	64	EIL/800/09-10/1768	04/07/2011
12	539	EIL/800/09-10/1789	14/02/2011
13	540	EIL/800/09-10/1790	14/02/2011
14	541	EIL/800/09-10/1791	14/02/2011
15	543	EIL/800/09-10/1792	18/02/2011
16	544	EIL/800/09-10/1793	14/02/2011
17	545	EIL/800/09-10/1794	18/02/2011
18	546	EIL/800/09-10/1795	18/03/2011
19	547	EIL/800/09-10/1796	18/02/2011
20	548	EIL/800/09-10/1797	18/02/2011
21	903	EIL/800/09-10/1747	04/05/2011
22	904	EIL/800/09-10/1748	04/05/2011
23	905	EIL/800/09-10/1749	04/05/2011
24	906	EIL/800/09-10/1750	05/03/2011

<u>Sr. No.</u>	<u>Location No</u>	<u>WTG-ID No.</u>	<u>Commissioning Date</u>
25	907	EIL/800/09-10/1751	05/03/2011
26	908	EIL/800/09-10/1752	05/03/2011
27	909	EIL/800/09-10/1753	05/03/2011
28	910	EIL/800/09-10/1754	05/03/2011
29	912	EIL/800/09-10/1746	14/02/2011
30	926	EIL/800/09-10/1769	10/06/2011
31	927	EIL/800/09-10/1770	10/06/2011
32	928	EIL/800/09-10/1771	10/06/2011
33	929	EIL/800/09-10/1772	10/06/2011
34	931	EIL/800/10-11/1870	10/06/2011
35	932	EIL/800/09-10/1773	10/06/2011
36	933	EIL/800/09-10/1774	10/06/2011
37	934	EIL/800/09-10/1775	10/06/2011
38	935	EIL/800/09-10/1776	10/06/2011
39	936	EIL/800/09-10/1777	27/06/2011
40	937	EIL/800/09-10/1778	27/06/2011
41	938	EIL/800/09-10/1779	27/06/2011
42	939	EIL/800/09-10/1760	24/05/2011
43	941	EIL/800/09-10/1761	24/05/2011
44	942	EIL/800/09-10/1762	24/05/2011
45	943	EIL/800/09-10/1763	24/05/2011
46	944	EIL/800/09-10/1764	24/05/2011
47	945	EIL/800/09-10/1765	24/05/2011
48	947	EIL/800/09-10/1755	06/05/2011
49	948	EIL/800/09-10/1756	06/05/2011

<u>Sr. No.</u>	<u>Location No</u>	<u>WTG-ID No.</u>	<u>Commissioning Date</u>
50	950	EIL/800/09-10/1757	06/05/2011
51	951	EIL/800/09-10/1758	06/05/2011
52	952	EIL/800/09-10/1759	06/05/2011
53	958	EIL/800/09-10/1743	04/05/2011
54	959	EIL/800/09-10/1744	04/05/2011
55	960	EIL/800/09-10/1745	04/05/2011
56	992	EIL/800/09-10/1782	18/03/2011
57	993	EIL/800/09-10/1783	18/03/2011
58	994	EIL/800/09-10/1784	18/03/2011
59	995	EIL/800/09-10/1785	18/03/2011
60	996	EIL/800/09-10/1786	18/03/2011
61	997	EIL/800/09-10/1787	18/03/2011
62	1028	EIL/800/09-10/1788	04/05/2011
63	1045	EIL/800/09-10/1780	04/07/2011
64	1046	EIL/800/09-10/1781	04/07/2011

As the Wind energy is a carbon neutral fuel, the project reduces CO₂ emissions to the extent of equivalent net electricity generated by mostly fossil fuel based power plants connected to the NEWNE grid. In this monitoring period, this project activity exported 95,055.869 MWh of net electricity to grid which leads to emission reductions of 87690 tCO_{2e} in the monitoring period. However the final values may vary considering the Findings raised.

The key parameters of the project are given in Table 2-11:

Table 2-1: Technical data of the project activity

Parameter	Unit	Value
No of Blades	-	3
Rated Power	kW	800
Hub Height	m	75
Rotor diameter	m	53
Cut in wind speed	m/s	2.5

Parameter	Unit	Value
Cut out wind Speed	m/s	28-34
Extreme Wind Speed	m/s	59.5
Operating range rot. speed	rpm	12-29
Rated rotational speed	rpm	32
Gear Type	-	Gearless
Output Voltage	V	400

2.2. Project Location

The details of the project location are given in Table 2-22:

Table 2-2: Project Location

No.	Project Location
Host Country	India
Region:	Gujarat
Project location address:	Chattar, Narmana, Seth Wadala, Jam Ambardi, Mevasa, Dhun Dhoraji, Sadodar, Bodi, Padavala and Machharda in Jamnagar and Rajkot district.
Latitude:	The details of individual WECs are provided below
Longitude:	The details of individual WECs are provided below

The latitude, longitude and the commissioning dates are as follows:

Location No	WEC-ID No.	Village	Latitude	Longitude
3020	EIL/800/10-11/1826	Machharda	N22 [°] 06' 19.0"	E70 [°] 18' 45.7"
3021	EIL/800/10-11/1827	Machharda	N22 [°] 06' 23.5"	E70 [°] 18' 43.7"
3022	EIL/800/10-11/1828	Machharda	N22 [°] 06' 29.7"	E70 [°] 18' 44.6"
3072	EIL/800/09-10/1738	Padavala	N21 [°] 57' 19.6"	E70 [°] 15' 05.0"
3073	EIL/800/09-10/1739	Padavala	N21 [°] 57' 14.9"	E70 [°] 15' 11.7"
3075	EIL/800/09-10/1740	Padavala	N21 [°] 56' 43.1"	E70 [°] 15' 20.6"
3076	EIL/800/09-10/1741	Padavala	N21 [°] 55' 59.2"	E70 [°] 15' 33.7"
3088	EIL/800/09-10/1742	Padavala	N21 [°] 56' 19.3"	E70 [°] 14' 38.0"
62	EIL/800/09-10/1766	Chattar	N22 [°] 07' 40.2"	E70 [°] 15' 10.7"
63	EIL/800/09-10/1767	Chattar	N22 [°] 07' 46.6"	E70 [°] 15' 00.6"
64	EIL/800/09-10/1768	Chattar	N22 [°] 07' 53.3"	E70 [°] 14' 57.1"

Location No	WEC-ID No.	Village	Latitude	Longitude
539	EIL/800/09-10/1789	Seth Wadala	N22° 04' 46.7"	E70° 05' 34.3"
540	EIL/800/09-10/1790	Seth Wadala	N22° 04' 33.3"	E70° 05' 43.1"
541	EIL/800/09-10/1791	Seth Wadala	N22° 04' 27.4"	E70° 05' 47.6"
543	EIL/800/09-10/1792	Seth Wadala	N22° 04' 17.3"	E70° 05' 53.7"
544	EIL/800/09-10/1793	Seth Wadala	N22° 04' 13.5"	E70° 06' 00.7"
545	EIL/800/09-10/1794	Seth Wadala	N22° 03' 31.5"	E70° 05' 32.6"
546	EIL/800/09-10/1795	Jam Ambardi	N22° 03' 40.2"	E70° 05' 31.0"
547	EIL/800/09-10/1796	Jam Ambardi	N22° 03' 45.3"	E70° 05' 31.9"
548	EIL/800/09-10/1797	Jam Ambardi	N22° 03' 50.7"	E70° 05' 34.2"
903	EIL/800/09-10/1747	Mevasa/Hari par	N22° 01' 23.0"	E70° 15' 35.2"
904	EIL/800/09-10/1748	Mevasa/ Haripar	N22° 01' 30.2"	E70° 15' 41.0"
905	EIL/800/09-10/1749	Mevasa/ Haripar	N22° 01' 36.6"	E70° 15' 27.2"
906	EIL/800/09-10/1750	Mevasa/ Haripar	N22° 01' 30.7"	E70° 14' 55.0"
907	EIL/800/09-10/1751	Mevasa/ Haripar	N22° 01' 37.9"	E70° 14' 56.8"
908	EIL/800/09-10/1752	Mevasa/ Haripar	N22° 01' 44.8"	E70° 14' 54.1"
909	EIL/800/09-10/1753	Mevasa/ Haripar	N22° 01' 51.2"	E70° 14' 51.2"
910	EIL/800/09-10/1754	Mevasa/ Haripar	N22° 01' 57.7"	E70° 14' 55.7"
912	EIL/800/09-10/1746	Dhun Dhoraji	N22° 02' 09.1"	E70° 15' 04.4"
926	EIL/800/09-10/1769	Chattar	N22° 06' 57.6"	E70° 16' 33.0"
927	EIL/800/09-10/1770	Chattar	N22° 06' 59.3"	E70° 16' 23.3"
928	EIL/800/09-10/1771	Chattar	N22° 07' 10.0"	E70° 16' 16.5"
929	EIL/800/09-10/1772	Chattar	N22° 07' 15.9"	E70° 16' 11.3"
931	EIL/800/10-11/1870	Chattar	N22° 07' 12.7"	E70° 15' 23.5"
932	EIL/800/09-10/1773	Chattar	N22° 07' 05.5"	E70° 15' 27.2"
933	EIL/800/09-10/1774	Chattar	N22° 06' 59.3"	E70° 15' 31.5"

Location No	WEC-ID No.	Village	Latitude	Longitude
934	EIL/800/09-10/1775	Chattar	N22° 06' 53.9"	E70° 15' 27.9"
935	EIL/800/09-10/1776	Chattar	N22° 06' 46.0"	E70° 15' 22.7"
936	EIL/800/09-10/1777	Chattar	N22° 06' 40.3"	E70° 15' 25.7"
937	EIL/800/09-10/1778	Chattar	N22° 06' 32"	E70° 15' 23.4"
938	EIL/800/09-10/1779	Chattar	N22° 06' 25.7"	E70° 15' 22.1"
939	EIL/800/09-10/1760	Jamvadi	N22° 08' 19.7"	E70° 19' 02.1"
941	EIL/800/09-10/1761	Jamvadi	N22° 08' 07.4"	E70° 18' 58.3"
942	EIL/800/09-10/1762	Jamvadi	N22° 08' 08.6"	E70° 19' 30.2"
943	EIL/800/09-10/1763	Jamvadi	N22° 08' 00.9"	E70° 19' 25.4"
944	EIL/800/09-10/1764	Jamvadi	N22° 07' 53.9"	E70° 19' 26.0"
945	EIL/800/09-10/1765	Jamvadi	N22° 07' 49.5"	E70° 19' 31.4"
947	EIL/800/09-10/1755	Moti Vavdi	N22° 06' 04.0"	E70° 18' 16.9"
948	EIL/800/09-10/1756	Moti Vavdi	N22° 05' 57.0"	E70° 18' 17.8"
950	EIL/800/09-10/1757	Moti Vavdi	N22° 05' 45.7"	E70° 18' 21.5"
951	EIL/800/09-10/1758	Moti Vavdi	N22° 05' 38.3"	E70° 18' 18.4"
952	EIL/800/09-10/1759	Moti Vavdi	N22° 05' 31.6"	E70° 18' 16.9"
958	EIL/800/09-10/1743	Dhun Dhoraji	N22° 02' 32.4"	E70° 16' 42.8"
959	EIL/800/09-10/1744	Dhun Dhoraji	N22° 02' 26.2"	E70° 16' 44.6"
960	EIL/800/09-10/1745	Dhun Dhoraji	N22° 02' 19.0"	E70° 16' 44.4"
992	EIL/800/09-10/1782	Sadodar	N22° 03' 13.6"	E70° 10' 37.3"
993	EIL/800/09-10/1783	Sadodar	N22° 03' 09.5"	E70° 10' 40.0"
994	EIL/800/09-10/1784	Sadodar	N22° 02' 59.6"	E70° 10' 36.4"
995	EIL/800/09-10/1785	Sadodar	N22° 02' 54.2"	E70° 10' 33.5"
996	EIL/800/09-10/1786	Sadodar	N22° 02' 47.4"	E70° 10' 22.2"
997	EIL/800/09-10/1787	Sadodar	N22° 02' 41.3"	E70° 10' 32.4"
1028	EIL/800/09-10/1788	Seth Wadala	N22° 03' 06.0"	E70° 08' 36.9"
1045	EIL/800/09-10/1780	Bodi	N22° 08' 43.4"	E70° 15' 11.4"
1046	EIL/800/09-10/1781	Bodi	N22° 08' 48.8"	E70° 15' 08.5"

2.3. Project Verification History

Essential events since the registration of the project are presented in the following Table 2-33.

Table 2-3: Status of previous Monitoring Periods

#	Item	Time	Status
1	1 st Monitoring period	2011-06-01 to 2012-02-29	Issued
2	2 nd Monitoring period	2012-03-01 to 2012-12-31	Awaiting issuance request

An overview of all Post Registration Changes is given in the following table.

Table 2-3: Overview Post Registration Changes

#	Applicable from – to / as of	MP	Type of post registration change ¹⁾	Description	Status ²⁾ / Date
1	20xx-xx-xx to 20xx-xx-xx		TDfrMP	NA	NA
2	20xx-xx-xx to 20xx-xx-xx		TDfMM	NA	NA
3	2012-03-01	2 nd	CrPDD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change in coordinates for 3 WECs Change in monitoring and organization structure 	Assessment opinion attached
4	2012-03-01	2 nd	PCfrMP	Change in calibration frequency from 1 year to 3 years	Assessment opinion attached
5	20xx-xx-xx		PCfMM	NA	NA
6	20xx-xx-xx		CoPD	NA	NA

- ¹⁾ TDfrMP : Temporary deviation from registered monitoring plan
TDfMM : Temporary deviation from the monitoring methodology
CrPDD : Corrections to the registered PDD
PCfrMP : Permanent changes from registered Monitoring Plan
PCfMM : Permanent changes from Monitoring Methodology
CoPD : Changes to the project design of a registered project activity
- ²⁾ Approval (by EB) or Acceptance (by DOE)

3. METHODOLOGY AND VERIFICATION SEQUENCE

3.1. Verification Steps

The verification consisted of the following steps:

- Contract review
- Appointment of team members and technical reviewers
- Publication of the monitoring report
- A desk review of the Monitoring Report^{/MR/} submitted by the client and additional supporting documents with the use of customised verification protocol^{/CPM/} according to the Validation and Verification Standard^{/VVS/},
- Verification planning,
- On-Site assessment,
- Background investigation and follow-up interviews with personnel of the project developer and its contractors,
- Draft verification reporting
- Resolution of corrective actions (if any)
- Final verification reporting
- Technical review
- Final approval of the verification.

3.2. Contract review

To assure that

- the project falls within the scopes for which accreditation is held,
- the necessary competences to carry out the verification can be provided,
- Impartiality issues are clear and in line with the CDM accreditation requirements

a contract review was carried out before the contract was signed.

3.3. Appointment of team members and technical reviewers

On the basis of a competence analysis and individual availabilities a verification team, consisting of one team leader and 03 additional team members, was appointed.

The list of involved personnel, the tasks assigned and the qualification status are summarized in the Table 3-11 below.

Table 3-1: Involved Personnel

	Name	Company	Function ¹⁾	Qualification Status ²⁾	Scheme competence ³⁾	Technical competence ⁴⁾	Verification competence ⁵⁾	Host country Competence	On-site visit
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Jimmy Sah	TUV India Pvt. Ltd.	TL	LA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Sukanta Das	TUV India Pvt. Ltd.	TM ^{A)}	LA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Prasad Jakkaraju	TUV India Pvt. Ltd.	TM ^{A)}	LA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Stefan Winter	TN Cert	TM ^{A)}	SA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Samir Beqqal	TN Cert	TR ^{B)}	SA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Ingo Klein	TN Cert	TR ^{B)} / FA	SA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

¹⁾ TL: Team Leader; TM: Team Member, TR: Technical review; OT: Observer-Team, OR: Observer-TR; FA: Final approval

²⁾ GHG Auditor Status: A: Assessor; LA: Lead Assessor; SA: Senior Assessor; T: Trainee; TE: Technical Expert

³⁾ GHG auditor status (at least Assessor)

⁴⁾ As per S01-MU03 or S01-VA070-A2 (such as 1.1, 1.2, ...)

⁵⁾ In case of verification projects

A) Team Member: GHG auditor (at least Assessor status), Technical Expert (incl. Host Country Expert or Verification Expert), not ETE

B) No team member

All team members contributed to the review of documents, the assessment of the project activity and to the preparation of this report under the leadership of the team leader.

Technical experts contributed to the assessment of special aspects of the project activity, e.g. technical or host country aspects.

In order to qualify further personnel the project team was accompanied by observers and/or trainees as indicated in the table above. They are usually not considered as team members.

Statements of competence for the above mentioned team members are enclosed in annex 2 of this report.

3.4. Publication of the Monitoring Report

In accordance with the CDM M&P (§ 62) the draft monitoring report, as received from the project participants, has been made publicly available on the dedicated UNFCCC CDM website prior to the verification activity commenced. Comments received are taken into account in the course of the verification, if applicable.

3.5. Verification Planning

In order to ensure a complete, transparent and timely execution of the verification task the team leader has planned the complete sequence of events necessary to arrive at a substantiated final verification opinion.

Various tools have been established in order to ensure an effective verification planning.

Risk analysis and detailed audit testing planning

For the identification of potential reporting risks and the necessary detailed audit testing procedures for residual risk areas table A-1 is used. The structure and content of this table is given in Table 3-22 below.

Table 3-2: Table A-1; Identification of verification risk areas

Table A-1: GHG calculation procedures and management control testing / Detailed audit testing of residual risk areas and random testing				
Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing performed	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including Forward Action Requests)
<i>The following potential risks were identified and divided and structured according to the possible areas of occurrence.</i>	<i>The potential risks of raw data generation have been identified in the course of the monitoring system implementation. The following measures were taken in order to minimize the corresponding risks.</i> <i>The following measures are implemented:</i>	<i>Despite the measures implemented in order to reduce the occurrence probability the following residual risks remain and have to be addressed in the course of every verification.</i>	<i>The additional verification testing performed is described. Testing may include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sample cross checking of manual transfers of data - Recalculation - Spreadsheet 'walk throughs' to check links and equations - Inspection of calibration and maintenance records for key equipment - Check sampling analysis results <i>Discussions with</i>	<i>Having investigated the residual risks, the conclusions should be noted here. Errors and uncertainties are highlighted.</i>

Table A-1: GHG calculation procedures and management control testing / Detailed audit testing of residual risk areas and random testing

Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing performed	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including Forward Action Requests)
			<i>process engineers who have detailed knowledge of process uncertainty/error bands.</i>	

The completed table A-1 is enclosed in Annex 1 (table A-1) to this report.

Project specific periodic verification checklist

In order to ensure transparency and consideration of all relevant assessment criteria, a project specific verification protocol has been developed. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria and requirements, means and results of the verification. The verification protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organises, details and clarifies the requirements a CDM project is expected to meet for verification
- It ensures a transparent verification process where the verifying DOE documents how a particular requirement has been proved and the result of the verification.

The basic structure of this project specific verification protocol for the periodic verification is described in Table 3-33.

Table 3-3: Table A-2; Structure of the project specific periodic verification checklist

Table A-2: Periodic verification checklist

Checklist Item	Reference	Verification Team Comments	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
<i>The checklist items in Table A-2 are linked to the various requirements the monitoring of the project should meet. The checklist is organised in various sections as per the requirements of the topic and the individual project activity. It further includes guidance for the verification team.</i>	<i>Gives reference to the information source on which the assessment is based on.</i>	<i>The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist item in detail. It includes the assessment of the verification team and how the assessment was carried out. The reporting requirements of the VVS shall be covered in this section.</i>	<i>Assessment based on evidence provided if the criterion is fulfilled (OK), or a CAR, CL or FAR (see below) is raised. The assessment refers to the draft verification stage.</i>	<i>In case of a corrective action or a clarification the final assessment at the final verification stage is given.</i>

The periodic verification checklist (verification protocol) is the backbone of the complete verification starting from the desk review until final assessment. Detailed assessments and findings are discussed within this checklist and not necessarily repeated in the main text of this report.

The completed verification protocol is enclosed in Annex 1 (table A-2) to this report.

3.6. Desk review

During the desk review all documents initially provided by the client and publicly available documents relevant for the verification were reviewed. The main documents are listed below:

- the last revision of the PDD including the monitoring plan^{/PDD/},
- the last revision of the validation report^{/VAL/},
- documentation of previous verifications^{/VER/},
- the monitoring report, including the claimed emission reductions for the project^{/MR/},
- the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet^{/XLS/}.

Other supporting documents, such as publicly available information on the UNFCCC website and background information were also reviewed.

3.7. On-site assessment

As most essential part of the verification exercise it is indispensable to carry out an inspection on site in order to verify that the project is implemented in accordance with the applicable criteria. Furthermore the on-site assessment is necessary to check the

monitoring data with respect to accuracy to ensure the calculation of emission reductions. The main tasks covered during the site visit include, but are not limited to:

- The monitoring data were checked completely.
- An assessment of the implementation and operation of the registered project activity as per the registered PDD or any approved revised PDD;
- A review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters;
- The data aggregation trails were checked via spot sample down to the level of the meter recordings.
- Interviews with relevant personnel to determine whether the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan in the PDD;
- A cross check between information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources such as invoice records or similar data sources;
- A check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the selected methodology and corresponding tool(s), where applicable;
- A review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions;
- 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.

Before and during the on-site visit the verification team performed interviews with the project participants to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review.

Representatives of Vaayu (India) Power Cooperation Pvt. Ltd. including the operational staff of the plant were interviewed. The main topics of the interviews are summarised in Table 3-44.

Table 3-4: Interviewed persons and interview topics

Interviewed Persons / Entities	Interview topics
1. Projects & Operations Personnel 2. Operations Personnel- Enercon (India) limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General aspects of the project - Technical equipment and operation - Changes since validation / previous verification - Monitoring and measurement equipment - Remaining issues from validation/ previous verification - Calibration procedures - Quality management system - Involved personnel and responsibilities

Interviewed Persons / Entities	Interview topics
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Training and practice of the operational personnel- Implementation of the monitoring plan- Monitoring data management- Data uncertainty and residual risks- GHG emission reduction calculation- Procedural aspects of the verification- Maintenance

The list of interviewees is included in chapter 7.4.

3.8. Draft verification reporting

On the basis of the desk review, the on-site visit, follow-up interviews and further background investigation the verification protocol is completed. This protocol together with a general project and procedural description of the verification and a detailed list of the verification findings form the draft verification report. This report is sent to the client for resolution of raised CARs, CLs and FARs.

3.9. Resolution of CARs, CLs and FARs

Nonconformities raised during the verification can either be seen as a non-fulfilment of criteria ensuring the proper implementation of a project or where a risk to deliver high quality emission reductions is identified.

Corrective Action Requests (CARs) are issued, if:

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

The verification team uses the term Clarification Request (CL), which is issued if:

- information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM requirements have been met.

Forward Action Requests (FAR) indicate essential risks for further periodic verifications. Forward Action Requests are issued, if:

- the monitoring and reporting require attention and / or adjustment for the next verification period.

For a detailed list of all CARs, CLs and FARs raised in the course of the verification pl. refer to chapter 4.

3.10. Final reporting

Upon successful closure of all raised CARs and CLs the final verification report including a positive verification opinion can be issued. In case not all essential issues could finally be resolved, a final report including a negative verification opinion is issued.

The final report summarizes the final assessments w.r.t. all applicable criteria.

3.11. Technical review

Before submission of the final verification report a technical review of the whole verification procedure is carried out. The technical reviewer is a competent GHG auditor being appointed for the scope this project falls under. The technical reviewer is not considered to be part of the verification team and thus not involved in the decision making process up to the technical review.

As a result of the technical review process the verification opinion and the topic specific assessments as prepared by the verification team leader may be confirmed or revised. Furthermore reporting improvements might be achieved.

3.12. Final approval

After successful technical review an overall (esp. procedural) assessment of the complete verification will be carried out by a senior assessor located in the accredited premises of TÜV NORD.

After this step the request for issuance can be started.

4. VERIFICATION FINDINGS

In the following paragraphs the findings from the desk review of the monitoring report^{/MR/}, the calculation spreadsheet^{/XLS/}, PDD^{/PDD/}, the Validation Report^{/VAL/} and other supporting documents, as well as from the on-site assessment and the interviews are summarised.

The summary of CAR, CL and FAR issued are shown in Table 4-11:

Table 4-1: Summary of CAR, CL and FAR

Verification topic	No. of CAR	No. of CL	No. of FAR
A – Description of project activity	03	01	-
B – Implementation of project activity	01	01	01
C – Description of monitoring system	03	01	-
D – Data and parameters	01	01	-
E - Calculation of Emission Reductions	-	-	-
SUM	08	04	01

The following tables include all raised CARs, CLs and FARs and the assessments of the same by the verification team. For an in depth evaluation of all verification items it should be referred to the verification protocols (see Annex).

Finding	A1		
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Non compliance to EB 70 Annex 11 are identified as follows; 1. The Monitoring report is not in compliance to the prescribed format for reporting the dates (DD/MM/YYYY) as required under the Guideline for completing the monitoring report format version 3.1 2. The relevant dates for project activity and the total GHG emission reductions are missing under the section A.1 of the MR.		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the MR is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	1. The Monitoring report format has been revised as per EB 70 Annex 11. 2. The relevant dates regarding the project activity has been incorporated under section A.1 of the MR.		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s):A.1	New version No.:02
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:

Finding	A1
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	1. The Monitoring report format has been follows the correct format for dates in line with EB 70 Annex 11. CAR is closed. 2. The relevant dates regarding the project activity have now incorporated under section A.1 of the MR and the implementation has been confirmed. CAR is closed.
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed

Finding	A2
Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	The table under section A.3 of the MR is incomplete. Clarification is requested whether the Party involved wishes to be a project participant. Appropriate correction is sought.
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the MR is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	The table under section A.3 of the MR has been corrected as per the registered PDD. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR Section(s):A.3 New version No.:02 <input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS Worksheet(s): New version No.:
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	The section A.3 has been revised, the Party involved does not wish to be a project proponent.
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed

Finding	A3
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR <input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	The MR version 1 does not follow the latest available MR template (version 3.1) at the UNFCCC website. Appropriate correction is sought.
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the MR is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	The MR has been revised to version 2 as per latest template (EB 70 Annex 11). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR Section(s): New version No.: <input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS Worksheet(s): New version No.:

Finding	A3
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	The revised MR version 2 follows the latest MR template version 3.1. CAR is closed
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed

Finding	A4
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR <input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	1. The MR section C refers to appendix 1, however the same is not found in the MR.
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the MR is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	1. Section C of the MR has been corrected accordingly.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR Section(s):C New version No.:02 <input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS Worksheet(s): New version No.:
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	The MR version 2 has been revised considering the editorial issue. CAR is closed.
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed

Finding	B1
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR <input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	The Section B.1 of the MR is not filled as per the requirements of EB 70 annex 11 which requires information regarding the current implementation status, break downs observed, installed technology, technical process and equipment.
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the MR is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections</i>	Section B.1 of the MR has been revised as per the requirements of EB 70 annex 11.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR Section(s):B.1 New version No.:02 <input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS Worksheet(s): New version No.:

Finding	B1
as well as the new version No.	
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	The section B.1 of the revised MR version 2 provides the relevant details regarding the current implementation status, break downs observed, installed technology, technical process and equipment. The implementation has been confirmed during the site visit and is acceptable. CAR is closed.
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed

Finding	B2								
Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR						
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	During the onsite visit the following issues are observed w.r.t to the locations of WTG; Mismatch of Latitude and longitude for the WTG ID of <ul style="list-style-type: none">EIL/800/09-10/1760EIL/800/09-10/1761EIL/800/09-10/1778 Corresponding clarification is requested.								
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the MR is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	For WTG ID <ul style="list-style-type: none">EIL/800/09-10/1760EIL/800/09-10/1761 There was typological error in the PDD. The latitude & longitude of these two locations were interchanged For WTG ID <ul style="list-style-type: none">EIL/800/09-10/1778 The correct lat & long values have been incorporated in the revised MR & in PDD. <table><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR</td><td>Section(s):A.2</td><td>New version No.:02</td></tr><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS</td><td>Worksheet(s):</td><td>New version No.:</td></tr></table>			<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s):A.2	New version No.:02	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s):A.2	New version No.:02							
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:							
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	The locations have been checked to confirm the coordinates. As the locations have minor revisions as compared to the registered PDD, thus procedure for PRC has been applied. A revised PDD is also submitted considering the Post-Registration change in the coordinates. Further the separate Validation opinion for the same has been concluded. Thus CL is closed.								
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed								

Finding	B3		
Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	During the onsite visit for the project activity it was observed that significant numbers of WEGs (31 nos) were not operating due to some issues with the grid. The impact of the same needs to be considered and assessed in the respective monitoring period.		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the MR is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s):	New version No.:
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>			
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed		

Finding	C1		
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Details, make, accuracy class, calibration dates and frequency of the cluster meters are missing in the MR section C as per the requirement of EB70 Annex 11. Appropriate correction is sought.		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the MR is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	The detail of the cluster meters has been incorporated in section C of the MR.		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): C	New version No.: 02
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	The revised MR mentions the details of the cluster meters and the information has been confirmed during the site visit with visual inspection of each meter. CAR is closed.		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed		

Finding	C2		
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Section C of the MR describes that a calibration error has been applied for the delay occurred in the calibration; however the same is not consistent with the calculations as per the emission reduction sheet. Appropriate corrections are requested.		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the MR is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	No error factor has been applied in this monitoring period. There was typological error in the MR. The same has been corrected in section C of the MR.		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s):C	New version No.:02
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	The error in the MR has been corrected. The excel sheet and MR are consistent. No error factor has been applied in emission reduction calculations. CAR is closed.		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed		

Finding	C3		
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	The registered PDD mentions the calibration for the meters (both sub-station and the cluster meter) to be calculated once in every year, however during the site visit and review of the PPA it is observed that the calibration shall be conducted once in 3 years. Appropriate corrections are sought. Further the details for the Master calibrator are required.		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the MR is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	<p>The calibration frequency has been revised in the MR and in the PDD as per the GETCO new regulation on calibration of meters. The letter from GETCO dated 04 Jan 2012 has been submitted to the DOE. This is also inline with the PPA and UNFCCC guideline Appendix 1 of Annex 3 EB 70.</p> <p>Since master calibration detail is under the control of GEDA and not in control of PP, the data has not been submitted to the DOE. The calibration certificate of the meters has been submitted to the DOE which is in accordance with GETCO standard. The reference of the master calibration is mentioned in the calibration report submitted to the DOE.</p> <p>However upon request to GEDA a copy of calibration of the Master calibrator has been provided, the same is submitted to the DOE.</p>		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): C	New version No.: 02
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex</i>	The calibration frequency has been revised in the MR to mention 3 years. This leads to change in the project design as compared to the registered		

Finding	C3
<p>A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</p>	<p>PDD (1 year).</p> <p>Further, calibration of meters in the State of Gujarat is under the responsibility of GETCO and PP has no control on the same. Thus in line with para 5 (a) of appendix 1 of EB 70 annex 2. The change is acceptable and does not require a prior approval from CDM EB.</p> <p>Moreover, the details of the master calibrator has been confirmed with the calibration reports, however during discussion with PP and GETCO, it is observed that only the calibration reports for the project meters are provided, the calibration for the master calibrators are in the purview of GETCO and cannot be shared. However, considering the request from the DOE, GEDA has provided the copy of the calibration certificate for the Master calibrator. The details are checked and confirmed.</p> <p>CAR is closed.</p>
<p>Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed</p>

Finding	C4		
Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	By interviews conducted during onsite visit it has been observed that the operational and management structure currently being followed for the project activity is not in accordance to the registered PDD. Pls. clarify.		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the MR is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	The operational & organizational structure has been revised in the MR & PDD as per the current procedure followed for project activity.		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): C	New version No.: 02
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	The operational and organizational structure being followed for the project has been confirmed during discussions with the PP and the O&M personnel at the site. The change in the structure forms a part of corrections which confirms to para 1, Appendix 1 of EB 70 Annex 2. The change in the project information does not require prior approval by the CDM Executive Board. CAR is closed.		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed		

Finding	D1
---------	----

Finding	D1								
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR						
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>The following issues w.r.t. monitoring parameters as per section D.2 of MR have been identified;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The notation for the parameter $EG_{PJ,y}$ are not in line with the registered PDD. 2. The units for the monitoring parameters (Net electricity Export/Import) are not in line with the registered PDD. 3. The column for "Additional comment" in the parameter table mentions no comments, however the same is not in line with the registered PDD. 								
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the MR is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The notation $EG_{PJ,y}$ has been incorporated in section D.2 of the MR. 2. The Units used for the monitoring parameters has been revised and made consistent as per the registered PDD. 3. The column "additional comments" has been revised as per the registered PDD. <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR</td><td>Section(s): D</td><td>New version No.: 02</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS</td><td>Worksheet(s):</td><td>New version No.:</td></tr> </table>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D	New version No.: 02	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D	New version No.: 02							
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:							
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The notation $EG_{PJ,y}$ has been incorporated in section D.2 of the revised MR. 2. The Units for the parameters has been revised and is now consistent with the registered PDD. 3. The column "additional comments" has been corrected and now provides the information in line with the registered PDD. <p>CAR is closed.</p>								
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed								

Finding	D2		
Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Pls. clarify why section D.2 of the MR provides the information "The data will be stored in hard format..... two years after the completion of the crediting period. "</p>		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details. In case the MR is changed as part of the CA, the PP is requested to indicate the revised sections as well as the new version No.</i>	<p>"The data will be stored in hard format..... two years after the completion of the crediting period. "</p> <p>The above mentioned line was the general information regarding the data storage. The same has been deleted from section D.2 of the MR. The information regarding data storing has been incorporated under section D.2 in column "additional comments" in the revised MR.</p>		

Finding	D2		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR Section(s):D.2 New version No.:02 <input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS Worksheet(s): New version No.:		
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	The change in location of the above information is in line with the registered PDD. Thus CAR is closed.		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed		

5. SUMMARY OF VERIFICATION ASSESSMENTS

The following paragraphs include the summary of the final verification assessments after all CARs and CRs are closed out. For details of the assessments pl. refer to the discussion of the verification findings in chapter 4 and the verification protocol (Annex 1).

5.1. Involved Parties and Project Participants

The following parties to the Kyoto Protocol and project participants are involved in this project activity.

Table 5-1: Project Parties and project participants

Characteristic	Party	Project Participant
Non-Annex 1	India	Vaayu (India) Power Corporation Private Limited
Annex 1	NA	NA

5.2. Implementation of the project

During the verification, a site visit was carried out^{/IM01/}. On the basis of this site visit especially w.r.t. visit of all 52 physical locations of WEC have been checked and the reviewed project documentation^{/CC/,PPA/,TS/} it can be confirmed that w.r.t. the realized technology, the project equipment's, as well as the monitoring and metering equipment, the project has been implemented and operated as described in the registered PDD. There are no changes in the equipment since the registration of the project. The project uses wind energy for electricity generation. These facts have been verified during site visit. Further, during assessment, verification team found that the information regarding the actual operation of the project activity during this monitoring period, including information on special events, for example overhaul times, downtimes of equipment^{/BR/}, exchange of equipment, etc are not mentioned in the webhosted MR. Hence, CAR B1 has been raised.

All necessary monitoring instruments are installed in this project activity. The measuring devices are well known and state of the art. All required instruments and operating procedures for the same have been implemented in an appropriate manner. For the metering purpose, there are four sealed energy meters installed in parallel at the Enercon 220 KV substation. The meter reading is recorded once in every month. As per the registered PDD, the apportioning procedure for the project activity is done by GEDA (Gujarat Energy Development Agency) based on the meters that are connected to the cluster meter of all the project owners (including

project activity) and energy meter reading located at Enercon substation. There are a total of 17 cluster meters for the project activity.

During the onsite visit Mismatch of Latitude and longitude for 3 WECs were observed thus CL B2 has been raised. The locations had minor error and the same has now been corrected as per the differences observed during the site visit. As the change forms a part of para 1 Appendix 1, EB 70 Annex 2, thus prior approval by the CDM EB is not required. The change is acceptable to the DOE. A separate Validation conclusion has been provided along with the Verification report.

Gujarat Electricity Development Authority (GEDA) apportions the net electricity supplied to the grid at the Sadodar substation to all the project owners. The net electricity generated by the project owners is provided by GETCO in the form of share certificate of electricity generated. The value of the net electricity generated by the project activity is taken directly from the share certificate provided by GETCO for calculation of emission reductions, while the net electricity exported and imported at Enercon Substation is used for calculation of transmission loss by GEDA and is not directly used for calculation of emission reductions.

Further during the onsite visit for the project activity it was observed that significant numbers of WEGs (31 nos) were not operating due to some issues with the grid. The impact of the same needs to be assessed in the respective monitoring period, in this regard FAR B3 has been raised.

5.3. Project history

The project activity involves installation and operation of a 51.2 (64 × 0.80) MW wind power project located at villages Chattar, Narmana, Seth Wadala, Jam Ambardi, Mevasa, Dhun Dhoraji, Sadodar, Bodi, Padavala and Machharda in Jamnagar and Rajkot Districts of Gujarat state in India. The electricity generated is being sold to the NEWNE grid.

During validation, assessment team observed that the land clearance issued by Ministry of Environment and Forest for the project activity has been provided in the name of Vish Wind Infrastructure Limited. Hence, validation team had sought a clarification in this regard. Responding to this clarification, project proponent submitted an undertaking issued by Vish Wind Infrastructure Limited to Ministry of Environment and Forest (DNA of India) mentioning that all the formalities to ensure transfer of land lease pertaining to “Vaayu India power project in Gujarat” in favour of VIPCPL will be completed as per prevailing norms. Considering this issue a FAR was raised during the validation process. The PP has taken necessary action in regard to the raised FAR and also confirmed that the implemented project activity is in line with the implementation plan which lead to closure of the FAR in the 1st verification activity. No FARs are pending from 1st verification activity.

5.4. Post registration changes

During the document review and site visit it is observed that the calibration frequency for the Sub-station meters (220KV Sadodar sub-station) and the cluster meters are carried out at a frequency of 3 years which confirms to the signed PPA, however the frequency as mentioned in the registered PDD is annual. CAR C3 has been raised for the same and subsequently closed out as the change in the frequency of calibration is not under the control of the project

Further organizational structure for operation and management of the project is not in-line with the structure as described in the registered PDD, the structure has been revised considering a more interactive O&M personnel and direct contact with the CDM cell of Enercon (India) Limited, i.e. the project participant. The change in the Monitoring structures is considered as corrections as per para 1 of appendix 1, EB 70 annex 2 and does not require prior approval from CDM EB. Thus CL C4 was closed.

No special events with effect on the monitoring of the project have been observed during the monitoring period. However regular maintenance and operational shut downs were observed for the WTGs in the project activity.

Based on the outcome of the resolution of the referred CAR and CL, a total of 3 post registration changes applies to the project, which mainly are;

- Change in coordinates for 3 WECs
- Change in calibration frequency from 1 year to 3 years
- Change in monitoring and organization structure

As the above 3 changes forms a part of appendix 1 EB 70, Annex 2, thus prior approval from CDM EB is not required. Further a separate Validation opinion for the above 3 changes has been attached to this Verification report.

5.5. Compliance with the monitoring plan

The monitoring system and all applied procedures are generally in compliance with the registered monitoring plan. Same has been checked during the verification site, interview with the plant personal and stakeholders and document review. Considering the inconsistencies in the implementation of the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD CAR C3 and CL C4 were raised during the verification process. . The PP clarified the changes and accordingly post registration procedures have been applied..

5.6. Compliance with the monitoring methodology

The monitoring system is in compliance with the applied monitoring methodology 'Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources (ACM0002) Version 11.

5.7. Monitoring parameters

The project activity includes Enercon windmills (800 kW, E-53) with internal electrical lines connecting the project activity with local evacuation facility. The WECs generates 3-phase electricity at 400 V, which is stepped up to 33 kV. Enercon (India) Limited is responsible for operation and maintenance activities for this project which is also the technology and equipment supplier. According to the ACM0002, ver 11, quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project activity to the grid in year y is monitored.

The project activity constitute of various clusters and each cluster has an exclusive metering arrangement and the meter readings taken at these metering points have been provided by the representatives of Enercon to GEDA. Further, the Project is connected to Sadodar substation at Jamnagar District in Gujarat. The main meters (also known as revenue meter) are located at this substation. According to the number of feeder, there are four main parallel meters which are responsible to monitor the electricity exported to the grid which is generated by this project activity as well as WECs installed by other project owners. The meter reading is being taken jointly by the representatives of Enercon and GEDA/GETCO in the form of Joint Meter Reading (JMR). The electricity from Enercon's substation has been finally stepped up and supplied to the utility's substation at Moti Paneli.

Considering the electricity monitored by these main meters, Gujarat Electricity Development Authority (GEDA) apportions the net electricity supplied to the grid for each of the project activity after adjusting transmission losses to the meter readings taken at dedicated cluster meters of different project owners. Considering the data provided by the Enercon, GETCO made the apportioning activity and provides the net electricity generated by the specific project owners in the share certificate^{/GETCO/} of electricity generated. Same data are directly used to generate the invoice^{/INV/} of net electricity supplied by the PP. The apportioning procedure is in line with the monitoring procedure mentioned in the registered monitoring plan and the PPA for the project. Therefore, the value of the net electricity generated by the project activity has been taken directly from the share certificate provided by GETCO for emission reductions calculation. All the metering equipments are under custody of GETCO and they duly inspected & calibrated^{/CAL/} by state utility at a frequency of 3 years. Calibration and meter details for the main meters are as listed below:-

Meter Serial No	Make	Accuracy Class	Calibration Dates		Validity of Calibration
			Previous Calibration 2010	Present Calibration 2012	
GJB01470	Secure	0.2	22/01/2010	17/01/2012	16/01/2015
GJU04175	Secure	0.2	22/01/2010	17/01/2012	16/01/2015
GJU04176	Secure	0.2	22/01/2010	17/01/2012	16/01/2015
KAB11082	Secure	0.2	29/05/2010	17/01/2012	16/01/2015

The cluster meters have been calibrated before installation by the supplier and the next calibration shall be conducted at a frequency of 3 years. The details of the cluster meters are not described in the MR, thus CAR C1 has been raised. However the following meter details have been confirmed during the site visit and the details of the meters are as listed below:-

Meter Serial No	Make	Accuracy Class	Calibration Dates	Validity
10059208	L&T	0.2	24/08/2010	23/08/2013
10059203	L&T	0.2	24/08/2010	23/08/2013
GJU60947	Secure	0.2	03/09/2010	02/09/2013
GJU61707	Secure	0.2	29/01/2011	28/01/2014
GJU61698	Secure	0.2	29/01/2011	28/01/2014
GJU61321	Secure	0.2	05/02/2011	04/02/2014
GJU61313	Secure	0.2	18/12/2010	17/12/2013
GJU61690	Secure	0.2	29/01/2011	28/01/2014
GJU61699	Secure	0.2	29/01/2011	28/01/2014
GJU61322	Secure	0.2	09/12/2010	08/12/2013
GJU61696	Secure	0.2	29/01/2011	28/01/2014
GJU61310	Secure	0.2	18/12/2010	17/12/2013
GJU61701	Secure	0.2	29/01/2011	28/01/2014
GJU61693	Secure	0.2	29/01/2011	28/01/2014
GJU61692	Secure	0.2	29/01/2011	28/01/2014
GJU61696	Secure	0.2	29/01/2011	28/01/2014
GJU60943	Secure	0.2	03/09/2010	02/09/2013

All necessary monitoring instruments operating procedures for the project have been implemented in an appropriate manner. In this project, energy meters with 0.2% accuracy have been installed for monitoring of the electricity export and import. However the MR version 1 mentions that a calibration error of 0.2% has been applied in estimation of Emission reductions, however on review of the emission reduction calculation sheet, the application of error factor was not observed. Thus CAR C2 has been raised. However in the revised MR the statement has been removed and the same is consistent with the emission reduction calculation sheet.

The monitoring for the parameters are in-line with the approach described in the registered PDD. However the parameter table as represented in the MR is not in-line with the registered PDD, i.e. the monitoring units, notations and column of additional comments differ from the registered PDD. Thus CAR D1 was been raised. Further section D.2 of the MR is not in-line with EB 70, Annex 11 thus CL D2 has been raised. However, based on the revised MR and the corrections applied the CAR D1 and CL D2 are closed.

The above 17 cluster meters are connected to 220 KV Sadodar sub-station. There are 4 transformers at the sub-station, however the 4 transformers are connected in parallel thus demarcation as to which line is fed into which transformer cannot be distinguished for the cluster meters.

Moreover, there are four main meters (also known as revenue meters) connected to four individual transformers having 100 MVA rating which are responsible to monitor the electricity export/import to the grid. These meters are responsible to monitor the electricity export/import which is generated by this project activity as well as WECs installed by other project owners connected to the Sadodar substation. Gujarat Electricity development Authority (GEDA) apportions the net electricity supplied to the grid, monitored by the main meter (220KV) and cluster meter (33KV) to all the project owners after adjusting transmission loss. The apportioning is based on the ratio of electricity supplied from individual cluster to the sum of all the cluster meter readings.

During this monitoring period the project activity has exported 95055.869 MWh of net electricity to the NEWNE grid as per the current DVR stage. This was verified by the verification team by checking the electricity share certificates and electricity sales invoice^{/INV/} which is issued by state utility and most authentic and reliable document for this project activity. The JMR is a monthly activity and this reading is used for calculation of transmission loss by GEDA and is not directly used for calculation of emission reductions. Same is in line with the registered monitoring plan.

The value of Grid Emission Factor of NEWNE grid ($EF_{Grid,CM,y}$) has been opted as ex-ante as per registered PDD. For this project, PP used 0.92252 tCO₂/MWh as emission factor for NEWNE grid of India which is the Combined Margin Emission Factor as per the CEA database (version 5) and same is used for emission reduction calculation^{/XLS/}.

During the verification all relevant monitoring parameters (as listed in section B.7.1 of registered PDD) have been verified with regard to the appropriateness of the applied measurement/determination method, the correctness of the values applied for ER calculation, the accuracy, and applied QA/QC measures. The results as well as the verification procedure are described parameter-wise in the monitoring report.

5.8. Monitoring report

A draft monitoring report^{/MR/} was submitted to the verification team by the project participants. The team has made this report publicly available prior to the start of the verification activities. During this tenure no comments were received.

During the assessment, verification team observed that monitoring report template is not in line with EB 70, Annex 11. The dates are not in the prescribed format, further the sections A.1, A.3 does not provide the relevant information. Thus CAR A1 and CL A2 have been raised. Based on the findings and the revised MR which is in compliance to the monitoring report template thus, CAR A1 and CL A2 were closed.

Further the MR does not follow the latest version as available on the UNFCCC website in this regard CAR A3 has been raised. Further the MR has editorial issues

thus CL A4 has been raised. However based on the findings, the PP submitted the revised MR version 2 which confirms to the latest template available on the CDM website and the editorial corrections. Thus CAR A3 and CL A4 have been closed.

Further, during assessment it was also observed that section B.1 of the MR is not in line with the EB 54 annex 34. Hence, CAR B1 has been raised. Based on the findings, the PP revised the MR to mention the implementation details along with the description of breakdowns observed during the monitoring period. Further the implementation has been confirmed during the site visit and is acceptable, thus CAR B1 is closed.

5.9. Sampling

5.9.1. Implementation of the sampling plan

No sampling was required to determine the monitored parameters.

5.9.2. Sampling approaches during verification

No sampling approaches were taken during the verification.

5.10. ER Calculation

The calculation of emission reductions is estimated as the difference of baseline emissions and the sum of project emissions and leakage. As this is a renewable energy project there is no usage of fossil fuel during the project execution and the import of electricity are accounted to calculate the net electricity exported to the grid, project emissions from this project is considered as zero. Further, as per applied methodology, leakage is considered as zero. Thus for the project activity the emission reductions equals to the baseline emissions. The baseline emissions are calculates as the product of net electricity supplied to the grid and the ex-ante fixed emission factor of NEWNE grid.

During the verification site visit and subsequent document review it was observed that the electricity export is being monitored by the four main energy meters and 17 cluster meters.

During the review of emission reduction spread sheet^{/XLS/}, assessment team found that the net generation of electricity from the project activity is matching with the value mentioned in the copy of JMR as received from the officials and crosschecked with scanned copies of invoice^{/INV/} which is submitted to Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited (GUVNL). The invoices copies have the stamping from GUVNL as received by them.

Based on the above the values used in the emission reduction calculation^{/XLS/} are correct and formula and justification used for the calculation is consistent with the registered PDD and applied methodology and related tools. Further the ex ante fixed

values and default values have been applied correctly inline with VVS §245 (e) and 246 (d).

However CAR C2 has been raised due to delay in calibration which is not consistently reflected in the initial emission reduction calculation. In reply the PP confirmed that there is not delay in the calibration and thus the application of error factor is not applicable. However the information was erroneous so has been removed from the MR. Thus CAR C2 is closed.

5.11. Quality Management

Quality Management procedures for measurements, collection and compilation of data, data storage and archiving, calibration^{/CAL/}, maintenance and training of personnel^{/TR/} in the framework of this CDM project activity have been defined. The procedures defined can be assessed as appropriate for the purpose. The organization structure for monitoring differs from the registered PDD, thus CL C4 has been raised. Apart from that no significant deviations thereof have been observed during the verification.

Further, it is evident from the monitoring data that the monitoring system ensures for continuous (except some breakdowns or outage) operation. All internal data are subjected to QA/QC measures. No significant deviations thereof have been observed during the verification. All monitored data are archived appropriately in line with the monitoring plan.

5.12. Actual emission reductions during the first commitment period and the period from 1 January 2013 onwards

The MR includes actual ER values achieved up to 31 December 2012 only.

Table 5-2: Emission reductions before and after the end of 2012

	until 2012-12-31 ¹⁾
Emission reductions [tCO _{2e}]	87,690

¹⁾ Both days included

5.13. Comparison with ex-ante estimated emission reductions

The initial MR includes a comparison of the calculated actual emission reductions for the monitoring period (87,690 tCO_{2e}) with the ex-ante calculated values in the registered PDD (88,648 tCO_{2e}).

The initial calculated value was found to be proportionally lower than the ex-post determined value, thus no further justification is requested.

5.14. Overall Aspects of the Verification

All necessary and requested documentation was provided by the project participants so that a complete verification of all relevant issues could be carried out.

Access was granted to all installations of the plant which are relevant for the project performance and the monitoring activities.

No issues have been identified indicating that the implementation of the project activity and the steps to claim emission reductions are not compliant with the UNFCCC criteria and relevant guidance provided by the COP/CMP and the CDM EB (clarifications and/or guidance).

5.15. Hints for next periodic Verification

One FAR has been raised during the course of 2nd periodic verification which relates to grid breakdown observed during the onsite visit for the project activity.

6. VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

Vaayu (India) Power Corporation Private Limited has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program to carry out the 2nd periodic verification of the project: “Vaayu India Wind Power Project in Gujarat”, with regard to the relevant requirements for CDM project activities. The project reduces GHG emissions due to generation of electricity from wind energy. This verification covers the period from 2012-03-01 to 2012-12-31 (including both days).

In the course of the verification (08) Corrective Action Requests (CAR) and 04 Clarification Requests (CR) were raised and successfully closed. Furthermore 01 FAR is raised to improve the monitoring system in the future. The verification is based on the draft monitoring report, revised monitoring report, the monitoring plan as set out in the registered PDD, the validation report, emission reduction calculation spreadsheet and supporting documents made available to the TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP by the project participant.

As a result of this verification, the verifier confirms that:

- all operations of the project are implemented and installed as planned and described in the validated project design document.
- the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied approved CDM methodology, i.e., ACM0002 ver. 11
- the installed equipment essential for measuring parameters required for calculating emission reductions are calibrated appropriately.
- the monitoring system is in place and functional. The project has generated GHG emission reductions.

As the result of the 2nd periodic verification, the verifier confirms that the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements in a conservative and appropriate manner. TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP herewith confirms that the project has achieved emission reductions in the above mentioned reporting period as follows:

Emission reductions: **87,690** t CO_{2e}

Mumbai, 2013-05-14



Mr. Jimmy Sah

TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification
Program

Verification Team Leader

Essen, 2013-05-14



Mr. Ingo Klein

TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification
Program

Final Approval

7. REFERENCES

Table 7-1: Documents provided by the project participant(s)

Reference	Document
/BR/	Break Down and maintenance Records of the project activity WECs during the monitoring period.
/CAL/	Calibration certificates for the GETCO meters (main meter) under the project activity dated 22/01/2010, 29/05/2010 and 17/01/2012 and for cluster meters as per the details mentioned in section 5.7
/CC/	Commissioning certificate of all 64 WECs involved in the project activity dated 06/07/2010, 11/07/2010, 19/05/2011, 01/04/2011 and 18/06/2011
/GEN/	Generation at the Online meter for individual WECs for specific months covering the entire monitoring period.
/INV/	Invoices raised to GETCO during the monitoring period i.e. 01/03/2012 to 31/12/2012
/ISO/	ISO 9001:2008 of O&M contractor i.e. Enercon (India) Limited dated 08/02/2010 valid till 08/02/2013
/JMR/	Monthly JMR issued by GEDA during the monitoring period i.e. 01/03/2012 to 31/12/2012 which provides the values for the sub-station.
/LS/	Project layout Design and metering cluster arrangement for the project activity.
/MR/	MR Version 01, dated 02/02/2012 based on which project assessment is carried out. MR Version 02, dated 06/04/2013 based on which the final verification is concluded
/O&M/	Operation and maintenance contract signed between Vaayu (India) Power Corporation Private Limited (VIPCPL) and Enercon (India) Limited.
/PPA/	Power Purchase Agreement between the Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam

Reference	Document
	Limited (GUVNL) and Vaayu (India) Power Corporation Private Limited (VIPCPL) dated 09/06/2010, 06/07/2010 and 06/01/2011
/GETCO/	Share certificate issued by GETCO during the monitoring period i.e. 01/03/2012 to 31/12/2012
/TR/	Training records of the personal working onsite for the project activity.
/TS/	Technical specifications of the WECs
/XLS/	Emission reduction calculation sheet for the project activity ver 1, dated 02/02/2012

Table 7-2: Background investigation and assessment documents

Reference	Document
/ACM0002/	ACM0002 ver. 11, "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" and the subsequent tools; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system – Version 02 • Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality – Version 5.2
/CPM/	TÜV NORD JI / CDM CP Manual (incl. CP procedures and forms)
/GLMP/	Guidelines: Completing the monitoring report form (EB 70, Annex 11)
/IPCC/	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book 2. 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book
/KP/	Kyoto Protocol (1997)
/MA/	Decision 3/CMP. 1 (Marrakesh – Accords)
/MRT/	Monitoring Report Form (F-CDM-MR), Version 03.1
/PDD/	Project Design Document for CDM project: "Vaayu India Wind Power Project in Gujarat" version 03, dated 2011-01-19
/PS/	CDM Project Standard (Version 02.1, EB 70, Annex 2)

Reference	Document
/VAL/	Validation Report for CDM project “ <i>Vaayu India Wind Power Project in Gujarat</i> ” version 2, dated 2011-04-09
/VER/	Documents of previous verifications (Monitoring report, verification report, ER calculation sheet) for UNFCCC project No. 4700.
/VVS/	CDM Validation and Verification Standard (Version 03.0, EB 70, Annex 3)

Table 7-3: Websites used

Reference	Link	Organisation
/GEDA/	www.geda.org.in	Gujarat Energy Development Agency
/GETCO/	www.getcoqujarat.com	Gujarat Energy Transmission Corporation
/GUVNL/	www.gseb.com	Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited
/UNFCCC/	http://cdm.unfccc.int	UNFCCC
/IPCC/	www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp	IPCC publications

Table 7-4: List of interviewed persons

Reference	Mol ¹		Name	Organisation / Function
/IM01/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	K D Baria	AGM, Operations Enercon India Limited
/IM01/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Sajil P	Dy. Manager, Enercon India Limited
/IM01/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Jignesh Fultu	Dy. Manager, Enercon India Limited
/IM01/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Puneet Katyal	GM-CDM, Enercon India Limited
/IM01/	V	<input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ms	Anushree Mishra	Assistant Manager – CDM, Enercon India Limited
/IM01/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr.	Amulya Khanna	Asst. Engineer, Enercon India



Reference	Mol ¹		Name	Organisation / Function
		<input type="checkbox"/> Ms		Limited
/IM01/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Kishor Vasara	DM Operations, Enercon India Limited
/IM01/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Sandip Pandya	Supervisor, Enercon India Limited
/IM02/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Saiyed Sarfaraz Sadik	Shift Incharge, GETCO
/IM02/	T	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Dhanwani	Manager, GETCO

¹⁾ Means of Interview: (Telephone, **E**-Mail, **V**isit)

ANNEX

- A1:** Verification Protocol
- A2:** Statements of Competence of
involved Personnel

ANNEX 1: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Table A-1: GHG calculation procedures and management control testing / detailed audit testing of residual risk areas and random testing

Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including <i>Forward Action Requests</i>)
Raw data generation				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of measuring equipment • Dysfunction of installed equipment • Maloperation by operational personnel • Downtimes of equipment • Exchange of equipment • Change of measurement equipment characteristic • Insufficient accuracy • Change of technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of modern and state of the art equipment • Process control automation • Internal data review • Regular visual inspections of installed equipment • Only skilled and trained personnel operates the relevant equipment • Daily raw data checks • Immediate exchange of dysfunctional equipment • Stand-by duty is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate installation / operation of the monitoring equipment • Inadequate exchange of equipment • Change of personnel • Undetected measurement errors • Inappropriateness of Management system procedures w.r.t. monitoring plan requirements (e.g. substitute value strategies) • Non-application of management system procedures • Insufficient accuracy • Inappropriate QA/QC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site – visit • Check of equipment • Check of technical data sheets • Check of suppliers information / guarantees • Check of calibration records, if applicable • Check of maintenance records • Counter-check of raw data and commercial data • Check of CDM management system • Check of CDM related procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Table A-2

Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including <i>Forward Action Requests</i>)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accuracy of values supplied by Third Parties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> organized Training Internal audit procedures Internal check of QA/QC measures of involved Third Parties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> measures of Third Parties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application of CDM management system procedures Check of trainings Check of responsibilities Check of QA/QC documentation / evidences of involved Third Parties 	
Raw data collection and data aggregation				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wrong data transfer from raw data to daily and monthly aggregated reporting forms IT Systems Spread sheet programming Manual data transmission Data protection Responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cross-check of data Plausibility checks of various parameters. Appropriate archiving system Clear allocation of responsibilities Application of CDM Management system procedures Usage of standard software solutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unintended usage of old data that has been revised Incomplete documentation Ex-post corrections of records Ambiguous sources of information Non-application of management system procedures Manual data transfer mistakes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check of data aggregation steps Counter-calculation Data integrity checks by means of graphical data analysis and calculation of specific performance figures Check of management system certification Check of data archiving system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Table A-2



Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including <i>Forward Action Requests</i>)
	(Spreadsheets) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited access to IT systems Data protection procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unintended change of spread sheet programming or data base entries Problems caused by updating/upgrading or change of applied software 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check of application of Management system procedures 	
Other calculation parameters				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emission factors, oxidation factors, coefficients 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The values and data sources applied are defined in the PDD and monitoring plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unintended or intended Modification of calculation parameters Wrong application of values Misinterpretations of the applied methodology and/ or the PDD Missing update of applicable regulatory framework (e.g. IPCC values) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update-check of regulatory framework Countercheck of the applied MP in the MR against the methodology and the PDD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Table A-2
Calculation Methods				

Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including <i>Forward Action Requests</i>)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applied formulae Miscalculation Mistakes in spread-sheet calculation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advanced calculation and reporting tools A CDM coordinator is in charge of the CDM related calculations Usage of tested / counterchecked Excel spreadsheets Involvement of external consultants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The danger of miscalculation can only be minimized. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Countercheck on the basis of own calculation. Spread sheet walk-through. Plausibility checks Check of plots 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Table A-2
Monitoring reporting				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data transfer to the author of the monitoring report Data transfer to the monitoring report Unintended use of outdated versions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An experienced CDM consultant is responsible for monitoring reporting. CDM QMS procedures are defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The danger of data transfer mistakes can only be minimized Inappropriate application of QMS procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Counter check with evidences provided. Audit of procedure application 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Table A-2

Table A-2: (Project specific) Periodic Verification Checklist

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
A. Description of the project activity				
A.1. Purpose and general description of the project activity (EB 70, Annex 11, A.1) <i>Check if section A.1 of the MR includes the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purpose of the PA and the measures taken to reduce GHG emissions - Brief description of the installed technology and equipment - Relevant dates for the project activity (e.g. construction, commissioning, continued operation periods etc.) - Total emission reductions achieved in this monitoring period 	/MR/	<p>The verification team has checked section A.1 of the MR and confirms that the information provided is complete and correct with regards to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purpose of the PA and the measures taken to reduce GHG emissions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brief description of the installed technology and equipments <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Relevant dates for the project activity (e.g. construction, commissioning, continued operation periods etc) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Total emission reductions achieved in this monitoring period <p>In this context the following findings have been identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Monitoring report is not in compliance to the prescribed format for reporting the dates (DD/MM/YYYY) as required under the Guideline for completing the monitoring report format version 3.2. 2. The relevant dates for project activity and the total GHG emission reductions have not been described under the section A.1 of the MR. 	CAR A1	OK CAR A1 closed.
A.2. Location of project activity	/MR/ /PDD/	The verification team has checked section A.2 of the MR and confirms by means of comparison with the information given in		OK

<p>(EB 70, Annex 11, A.2)</p> <p>Check if section A.2 of the MR reflects correctly the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Host Party(ies) - Region / State / Province etc. - City / Town / Community etc. - Physical / geographical location (e.g. Latitude and Longitude) 	/IM01/	<p>the PDD and information gathered during the site visit that the information provided is complete and correct with regards to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Host Party(ies) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Region / State / Province <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City / Town / Community <input type="checkbox"/> Physical / Geographical location <p>In this context the following findings have been identified:</p> <p>The geographical coordinates are found not to be matching with the PDD for 3 Wind turbines, thus CL B2 has been raised.</p>	CL B2	CL B2 closed
<p>A.3. Parties and Project Participants (EB 70, Annex 11, A.3)</p> <p>Check if section A.3 of the MR includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All PPs as displayed on the UNFCCC website - A correctly filled table as per the MR template 	/MR/ /unfccc/	<p>The verification team has checked section A.3 of the MR as well as the UNFCCC website and confirms that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> all PPs as displayed on the project related UNFCCC website are correctly listed <input type="checkbox"/> the table as per the template MR has been correctly filled <p>In this context the following findings have been identified:</p> <p>The table under section A.3 is incompletely filled.</p>	CL A2	OK CL A2 closed
<p>A.4. Reference of applied methodology (EB 70, Annex 11, A.4)</p> <p>Check if section A.4 of the MR correctly describes / includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reference to the applicable version of the methodology - Reference to the applicable version(s) of relevant methodological tools 	/MR/ /PDD/ /unfccc/	<p>The verification team has checked section A.4 of the MR and confirms by means of comparison with the information given in the PDD and displayed on the UNFCCC website that the information provided is complete and correct with regards to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Number, title and version of the applicable CDM Methodology <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Name and version of applicable CDM methodological tools 	OK	OK

- Relevant EB decisions, if applicable		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Relevant EB decisions In this context the following findings have been identified: N/A		
A.5. Crediting period of project activity (EB 70, Annex 11, A.5) Check if section A.5 of the MR correctly includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Start date of the crediting period. In this context please check, if applicable, whether post registration changes to the start date have been accepted by the EB. - Length and type of the crediting period 	/MR/ /unfccc/	The verification team has checked section A.5 of the MR and confirms by means of comparison with the information displayed on the UNFCCC website that the information provided is complete and correct with regards to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Start date of the crediting period. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Type and length of the crediting period In this context the following findings have been identified: N/A	OK	OK
A.6. Publication of the Monitoring Report (EB70, Annex 3, § 207) Check if the monitoring report has been made publicly available on the UNFCCC website before the verification commenced. Check if comments have been received and if yes, how they have been addressed.	/unfccc/	The verification team has ensured and confirms by means of checking the respective project information on the UNFCCC website that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The draft monitoring report, as received from the project participants, has been made publicly available prior to the start of the verification activities. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No comments have been received. In this context the following findings have been identified: N/A	OK	OK
A.7. Compliance with standardized format of the Monitoring Report (EB70, Annex 3, § 212 e)	/MRT/ /MR/	The verification team has checked all sections of the MR and confirms by means of comparison with the MR template that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the standardized MR template has been used 	CAR	OK CAR A3,

<p><i>Check (only) if the latest applicable MR template has been used. For compliance assessment with the MR guideline pl. refer to the respective MR sections.</i></p>		<p>In this context the following findings have been identified:</p> <p>The MR does not follow the latest available MR template at the UNFCCC website.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The MR section C refers to appendix 1, however the same is not found in the MR.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The column for “Additional comment” in the parameter table mentions no comments; however the same is not in line with the registered PDD.</p>	<p>A3</p> <p>CAR A4</p> <p>CL-D2</p>	<p>CAR A4, CL D2 closed</p>
B. Implementation of project activity				
<p>B.1. Description of implemented registered project activity (EB 70, Annex 11, B.1)</p> <p><i>Check if section B.1 of the MR correctly describes / includes the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation status of the PA - Detailed description of installed technology(ies) / technical processes and equipment applied - Diagrams (where appropriate) 	<p>/MR/ /PDD/ /PS/ /IM01/</p>	<p>The verification team has checked section B.1 of the MR and confirms by means of comparison with the information given in the PDD, the project standard and information gathered during the site visit that:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the description of the implementation status of the PA is in line with the applicable provisions of the project standard</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> an appropriate description of the installed technology(ies), technical process and equipment incl. diagrams, where applicable, has been included</p> <p>In this context the following findings have been identified:</p> <p>The Section B.1 of the MR is not filled as per the requirements of EB 70 annex 11 which requires information regarding the current implementation status, break downs observed, installed technology, technical process and equipment.</p>	<p>CAR B1</p>	<p>OK CAR B1 closed</p>
<p>B.1.1. Initial project implementation</p>	<p>/IM01/ /PDD/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The project is implemented as described in the PDD as well as all the physical features of the project are in</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>

<p>(EB70, Annex 3; § 225 a, 226)</p> <p><i>Assess whether the project has been implemented and operated as per the registered PDD and are all physical features of the project in place?</i></p> <p><i>Further focus on the potential phase wise implementation and check the reporting on the corresponding status and starting dates accordingly.</i></p> <p><i>Check if the project is still in compliance with the applicability conditions of the methodology.</i></p> <p><i>Also, discuss – if applicable – the necessity of PRC notifications / approvals.</i></p>	<p>/CC/</p>	<p>place. The project includes 64 WECs from which 41 WECs were commissioned before registration of the project and 23 were installed after the registration of the project i.e. 09/05/2011. The first WEC under the project activity was commissioned on 25/05/2010 and last WEC under the project activity was commissioned on 04/07/2011 which is confirmed from the commissioning certificates.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i> Crosschecked with the physical implementation of project during the site visit. The commissioning dates of the WECs installed before registration have been confirmed with the registered PDD and commissioning certificates and commissioning dates of the WECs installed after registration have been checked with the commissioning certificates and site visit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> There is no change in project implementation since registration of the project activity.</p>		
<p>B.1.2. Technical equipment changes -(EB70, Annex 3; § 225 a, 226)</p> <p><i>Check if relevant technical equipment of the project activity has been exchanged or modified during the monitoring period. Further ensure that consistent notations of key equipment (meters etc.) in PDD, MR and calculation spreadsheet are applied</i></p> <p><i>Consider e.g. interviews with operational personnel, QMS records, maintenance records, instrument specifications.</i></p> <p><i>In case of changes, check whether the project is still in line with the registered PDD and assure that these</i></p>	<p>/IM01/ /PDD/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The project activity consists of 64 WECs of 800 kW capacities each aggregating a total installed capacity of 51.2 MW. Technical equipment of the project activity has not been changed or modified during the monitoring period. The project is in line with the registered PDD in terms of operation.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i> According to the discussions carried out with plant personnel onsite and subsequent document review i.e. technical specification it was confirmed that the project technical lifetime is 20 years.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> No technical equipment in the project has been</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>

<p><i>changes have been considered in the monitoring report and the emission reduction calculation.</i></p> <p><i>In case of post registration changes pl. refer to chapter B.2.</i></p>		changed.		
<p>B.1.3. Operation of the project activity -(EB70, Annex 3; § 225 a, 226)</p> <p><i>Check if relevant operation modes of the project activity have been exchanged or modified during the monitoring period.</i></p> <p><i>Consider e.g. interviews with operational personnel, operation log sheets, data management system records.</i></p> <p><i>In case of changes, check whether the project is still in line with the registered PDD and assure that these changes have been considered in the monitoring report and the emission reduction calculation.</i></p> <p><i>In case of post registration changes pl. refer to chapter B.2.</i></p>	/IM01/ /PDD/	<p><i>Description:</i> The project activity consists of 64 WECs of 800 kW capacities each, and the operation of the project activity is in line with the monitoring plan in terms of operation. The operation mode of the project have not been changed / replaced during the monitoring period.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i> As stated in the interview with the operational personnel no change in the project equipment is observed.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> All the operation modes are as per the registered PDD. During the onsite visit the subsequent documents are cross checked and found ok.</p>	OK	OK
<p>B.1.4. Incidents (EB70, Annex 3; § 225 a, 226)</p> <p><i>Identify if there have been any significant incidents, deviant operation modes and / or downtimes of the equipment?</i></p> <p><i>Consider e.g. interviews with operational personnel, operational log sheets, analysis of performance data.</i></p>	/IM01/ /MR/ /BR/	<p><i>Description:</i> During the onsite visit and discussion with PP, it was found that there were no such significant forced downtime occurred for this monitoring period except for the scheduled maintenance and operational breakdowns.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i> The O&M contractor, Enercon (India) limited maintains the record of the project operation. During the site visit the same was checked and found correct.</p>	OK	OK

		<p><i>Conclusion:</i> There were no significant breakdowns observed for the project activity during this monitoring period.</p>		
<p>B.1.5. Legislation Find out – esp. in the context of methodological requirements - whether relevant legislation with effect on the project activity in the host country has been changed.</p> <p>Assess, in case of changes, whether consequences for the PA with regard to relevant CDM requirements have been accounted for.</p> <p>In case of changes data sources shall be referenced.</p>	<p>/IM01/ /PPA/ /CC/ /VAL/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The legislation has not changed w.r.t projects for which the PPA is already signed and is valid for a period of 20 years from commissioning. No regulation with impact on the project could be identified.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i> The legislation for projects already implemented remains as described in the PPA.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> Relevant legislation associated with this project activity has not changed during this monitoring period.</p>	OK	OK
<p>B.1.6. Open issues from validation -(EB70, Annex 3; § 213)</p> <p><i>Check (esp. in case of 1st periodic verification) whether there are any open issues indicated in the validation report (e.g. FAR)?</i></p>	/VAL/	<p><input type="checkbox"/> There were no open issues addressed in the validation report</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All open issues from the validation have been appropriately addressed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following issues related to the validation have not yet been appropriately addressed:</p>	OK	OK
<p>B.1.7. Open issues from previous verification -(EB70, Annex 3; §§ 213; 284 h)</p> <p><i>Check in case of further periodic verifications whether there are any open issues indicated in previous verification reports (FAR) and take into consideration the guidance as specified in VVS.</i></p>	/VER/	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> There were no open issues addressed in the previous verification report</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> All open issues from the previous verification have been appropriately addressed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following issues related to the previous verification have not yet been appropriately addressed:</p>	OK	OK

B.2. Post registration changes																																						
B.2.1. Are post registration changes applicable to the proposed project activity?		<input type="checkbox"/> No, by means of site visit, document check and interview it could be verified that the project is implemented and operated in line with the registered PDD and the applied methodology. (Please proceed with section C) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, post registration changes have been identified and are assessed in detail in the subsequent steps. (Please proceed with B.2.2.)	OK	OK																																		
B.2.2. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology (TDfrMP; TDfMM) <i>(EB 70, Annex 11, B.2.1; EB70, Annex 3; §§ 251 - 256)</i> <i>Indicate whether any temporary deviations have been applied during this monitoring periods. In cases where approval has been sought from the EB please provide reference. If applied, provide a description of the deviation(s). This should include the reasons for the deviation(s), how it deviates from the monitoring plan and/or applied methodology(ies), the duration for which the deviation(s) is(are) applicable and justification on the conservativeness of the approach. Indicate if the deviation will lead to a reduction in the accuracy and if so, which conservative assumptions and discount factors have been applied.</i>	/PS/ /unfccc/	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td colspan="3">No TDfrMP or TDfMM have been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td colspan="3">The following TDfrMP or TDfMM have been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="4">1</td> <td>Title</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Status</td> <td colspan="2"><input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appr.date</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ref. No.</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="4">2</td> <td>Title</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Status</td> <td colspan="2"><input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appr.date</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ref.No.</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No TDfrMP or TDfMM have been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period			<input type="checkbox"/>	The following TDfrMP or TDfMM have been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC			1	Title			Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved		Appr.date			Ref. No.			2	Title			Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved		Appr.date			Ref.No.			OK	OK
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No TDfrMP or TDfMM have been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period																																					
<input type="checkbox"/>	The following TDfrMP or TDfMM have been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC																																					
1	Title																																					
	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved																																				
	Appr.date																																					
	Ref. No.																																					
2	Title																																					
	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved																																				
	Appr.date																																					
	Ref.No.																																					

<p><i>For deviation(s) that require prior approval by the Board, include the date of approval and reference number.</i></p>		<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>During the verification of the current MP no need for a TDfrMP or TDfMM has been identified. The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the PA</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td> An approval of the following TDfrMP or TDfMM is to be requested from the EB for the current MP as appendix 1 of the project standard does not apply. <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> </td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td> The following TDfrMP or TDfMM for which appendix 1 of the PS is applicable have been applied: <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> </td> </tr> </table> <p><i>In cases of approved TDfrMP or TDfM the EB guidance has been applied as follows:</i></p> <p><i>Detailed description and justification each TDfrMP or TDfM for which appendix 1 is applicable:</i></p> <p>In this context the following findings have been identified: N/A</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	During the verification of the current MP no need for a TDfrMP or TDfMM has been identified. The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the PA	<input type="checkbox"/>	An approval of the following TDfrMP or TDfMM is to be requested from the EB for the current MP as appendix 1 of the project standard does not apply. <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	1	Issue:		2	Issue:		<input type="checkbox"/>	The following TDfrMP or TDfMM for which appendix 1 of the PS is applicable have been applied: <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	1	Issue:		2	Issue:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	During the verification of the current MP no need for a TDfrMP or TDfMM has been identified. The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the PA																					
<input type="checkbox"/>	An approval of the following TDfrMP or TDfMM is to be requested from the EB for the current MP as appendix 1 of the project standard does not apply. <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	1	Issue:		2	Issue:																
1	Issue:																					
2	Issue:																					
<input type="checkbox"/>	The following TDfrMP or TDfMM for which appendix 1 of the PS is applicable have been applied: <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	1	Issue:		2	Issue:																
1	Issue:																					
2	Issue:																					
<p>B.2.3. Corrections (EB 70, Annex 11, B.2.2; EB70, Annex 3; §§ 257 - 259)</p> <p><i>Indicate whether any corrections to project</i></p>	<p>/MR/ /PDD/</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>During the verification of the current MP no need for corrections has been identified.</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	During the verification of the current MP no need for corrections has been identified.		<p>OK CL B2 closed</p>																
<input type="checkbox"/>	During the verification of the current MP no need for corrections has been identified.																					

<p><i>information or parameters fixed at validation have been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report.</i></p> <p><i>In cases where the correction(s) and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, provide the approval date and reference number. Otherwise, provide the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD.</i></p> <p><i>Please check and report that the corrected information is an accurate reflection of the actual project information and that the corrected parameters are in accordance with the applied methodology and the monitoring plan.</i></p>		<table><tr><td rowspan="2"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td colspan="2">The following corrections have been applied:</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td><table><tr><td>Issue:</td><td><p>The location numbers for the following WECs are not in line with the Registered PDD;</p><ul style="list-style-type: none">EIL/800/09-10/1760EIL/800/09-10/1761EIL/800/09-10/1778</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Issue:</td><td></td></tr></table></td></tr></table> <p><i>Detailed description and justification each correction:</i></p> <p>In this context the following findings have been identified:</p> <p>Mismatch of Latitude and longitude for the WEC ID of the following has been observed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">EIL/800/09-10/1760EIL/800/09-10/1761EIL/800/09-10/1778 <p>Appropriate clarification is sought.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The following corrections have been applied:		1	<table><tr><td>Issue:</td><td><p>The location numbers for the following WECs are not in line with the Registered PDD;</p><ul style="list-style-type: none">EIL/800/09-10/1760EIL/800/09-10/1761EIL/800/09-10/1778</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Issue:</td><td></td></tr></table>	Issue:	<p>The location numbers for the following WECs are not in line with the Registered PDD;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">EIL/800/09-10/1760EIL/800/09-10/1761EIL/800/09-10/1778	2	Issue:		CL-B2	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The following corrections have been applied:													
	1	<table><tr><td>Issue:</td><td><p>The location numbers for the following WECs are not in line with the Registered PDD;</p><ul style="list-style-type: none">EIL/800/09-10/1760EIL/800/09-10/1761EIL/800/09-10/1778</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Issue:</td><td></td></tr></table>	Issue:	<p>The location numbers for the following WECs are not in line with the Registered PDD;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">EIL/800/09-10/1760EIL/800/09-10/1761EIL/800/09-10/1778	2	Issue:								
Issue:	<p>The location numbers for the following WECs are not in line with the Registered PDD;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">EIL/800/09-10/1760EIL/800/09-10/1761EIL/800/09-10/1778													
2	Issue:													
<p>B.2.4. Permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology (PCfrMP; PCfMM)</p>	<p>/MR/ /PDD/ /PPA/</p>	<table><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>No PCfrMP or PCfMM have been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period</td></tr></table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No PCfrMP or PCfMM have been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period		<p>OK CAR C3 closed</p>								
<input type="checkbox"/>	No PCfrMP or PCfMM have been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period													

<p>(EB 70, Annex 11, B.2.3; EB70, Annex 3; §§ 262 - 268)</p> <p><i>Indicate whether any permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodologies have been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report.</i></p> <p><i>In cases where the change(s) and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, provide the approval date and reference number. Otherwise, provide the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD.</i></p>		<input type="checkbox"/>	The following PCfrMP or PCfMM have been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC		CAR C3		
			1	Title			
				Status			<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved
				Appr.date			
				Ref. No.			
			2	Title			
				Status			<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved
				Appr.date			
				Ref.No.			
			<input type="checkbox"/>	During the verification of the current MP no need for a PCfrMP or PCfMM has been identified. The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the PA			
			<input type="checkbox"/>	An approval of the following PCfrMP or PCfMM is to be requested from the EB for the current MP as appendix 1 of the project standard does not apply.			
			1	Issue:			
2	Issue:						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The following PCfrMP or PCfMM for which appendix 1 of the PS is applicable have been applied:						
1	Issue:	The calibration frequency as per the PDD is on annual basis, however as per the registered PPA the calibration frequency is once in 3 years.					

		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"> <p><i>In cases of approved PCfrMP or PCfMM the EB guidance has been applied as follows:</i></p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"> <p><i>Detailed description and justification each TDfrMP or TDfM for which appendix 1 is applicable:</i></p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"> <p>In this context the following findings have been identified:</p> <p>The registered PDD mentions the calibration for the meters to be calculated once in every year, however during the site visit and review of the PPA it is observed that the calibration shall be conducted once in 3 years.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	2	Issue:		<p><i>In cases of approved PCfrMP or PCfMM the EB guidance has been applied as follows:</i></p>			<p><i>Detailed description and justification each TDfrMP or TDfM for which appendix 1 is applicable:</i></p>			<p>In this context the following findings have been identified:</p> <p>The registered PDD mentions the calibration for the meters to be calculated once in every year, however during the site visit and review of the PPA it is observed that the calibration shall be conducted once in 3 years.</p>												
2	Issue:																							
<p><i>In cases of approved PCfrMP or PCfMM the EB guidance has been applied as follows:</i></p>																								
<p><i>Detailed description and justification each TDfrMP or TDfM for which appendix 1 is applicable:</i></p>																								
<p>In this context the following findings have been identified:</p> <p>The registered PDD mentions the calibration for the meters to be calculated once in every year, however during the site visit and review of the PPA it is observed that the calibration shall be conducted once in 3 years.</p>																								
<p>B.2.5. Changes to the project design of the registered project activity (CoPD) (EB 70, Annex 11, B.2.4; EB70, Annex 3; §§ 269 - 282)</p> <p><i>Indicate whether any changes to the project design of the project activity have been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report.</i></p> <p><i>In cases where the change(s) and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, provide the approval date and reference number. Otherwise, provide the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD.</i></p>	/MR/ /PDD/ /ACM000 2/	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td colspan="2">No CoPD has been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td colspan="2">The following CoPD has been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="4">1</td> <td>Title</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Status</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appr.date</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ref. No.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">2</td> <td>Title</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Status</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CoPD has been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period		<input type="checkbox"/>	The following CoPD has been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC		1	Title		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved	Appr.date		Ref. No.		2	Title		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved	OK	OK
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CoPD has been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	The following CoPD has been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC																							
1	Title																							
	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved																						
	Appr.date																							
	Ref. No.																							
2	Title																							
	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved																						

		<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Appr.date</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Ref.No.</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		Appr.date			Ref.No.			
			Appr.date							
			Ref.No.							
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> During the verification of the current MP no need for a CoPD has been identified. The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the PA.								
		<input type="checkbox"/> An approval of the following CoPD is to be requested from the EB for the current MP as appendix 1 of the project standard does not apply.								
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	1	Issue:		2	Issue:			
		1	Issue:							
		2	Issue:							
		<input type="checkbox"/> The following CoPD for which appendix 1 of the PS is applicable have been applied:								
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Issue:</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	1	Issue:		2	Issue:			
1	Issue:									
2	Issue:									
<i>In cases of approved CoPD the EB guidance has been applied as follows:</i> <i>Detailed description and justification each CoPD for which appendix 1 of the CDM Project Standard is applicable:</i> In this context the following findings have been identified: N/A										
C. Description of monitoring system										
C.1. Monitoring Plan – PDD Compliance	/MR/ /PDD/	By means of comparison of the MR with the registered PDD (or any revisions thereof) the verification team has checked whether		OK						

<p>(EB 70 Annex 3, §§ 233-236)</p> <p><i>Check if the monitoring plan is in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD (or any accepted revised MP).</i></p> <p><i>Please check esp. if</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>all parameters stated in the MP of the registered PDD have been monitored and updated as applicable</i>- <i>the monitoring equipment has been controlled and calibrated as per the MP</i>- <i>the monitoring results are consistently recorded as per the approved frequency</i>- <i>QA/QC procedures have been applied in accordance with the MP</i>		<p>the MP is in compliance with the registered PDD. The outcome is as follows:</p> <table border="1"><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>The MP is completely in accordance with the registered PDD.</td></tr></table> <p>In this context the following findings have been identified:</p> <p>Details, make, accuracy class, calibration dates and frequency of the cluster meters are missing in the MR section C as per the requirement of EB70 Annex 11. Appropriate correction is sought.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Section C of the MR describes that a calibration error has been applied for the delay occurred in the calibration; however the same is not consistent with the calculations as per the emission reduction sheet. Appropriate corrections are requested.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The registered PDD mentions the calibration for the meters to be calculated once in every year, however during the site visit and review of the PPA it is observed that the calibration shall be conducted once in 3 years.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The MP is completely in accordance with the registered PDD.	<p>CAR C1</p> <p>CAR C2</p> <p>CAR C3</p>	<p>CAR C1, CAR C2 and CAR C3 closed.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	The MP is completely in accordance with the registered PDD.					
<p>C.2. Monitoring Plan – Meth Compliance (EB 70 Annex 3, §§ 229-232)</p> <p><i>Check if the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.</i></p>	<p>/MR/ /PDD/ /ACM000 2/</p>	<p>By means of comparison of the MR with the applied CDM methodology and related tools the verification team has checked whether the MP is in compliance with the MP related requirements of the applied methodology. The outcome is as follows:</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>		

<p><i>In case the methodology references applicable tools it has to be ensured that the MP is also compliant with those tools.</i></p> <p><i>Also please specify if monitoring aspects have been identified that are not specified in the methodology but may enhance the level of accuracy and completeness of the monitoring plan – this esp. applies for SSC PAs.</i></p>	/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The MP is completely in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the CDM project (last registered/approved version of the PDD)					
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The MP is completely in accordance with the applied tools which the methodology references. A breakdown of the referenced tools is as follows:					
		1	Title (of the tool)	Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system				
			Version	02				
			MP compliance	<input type="checkbox"/> full compliance <input type="checkbox"/> findings have been raised <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A (for MP)				
		2	Title (of the tool)	Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality				
			Version	5.2				
			MP compliance	<input type="checkbox"/> full compliance <input type="checkbox"/> findings have been raised <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A (for MP)				
		<p>In this context the following findings have been identified:</p> <p>Regarding aspects that are not specified in the methodology the following issues have been identified which may enhance the level of accuracy and completeness of the MP:</p> <p>N/A</p>						

<p>C.3. Management System (EB 70 Annex 3, § 217 (iii))</p> <p><i>Check if the GHG data monitoring system can be assessed as appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>In case reference is made to a (certified) company quality management system, check if all CDM related monitoring procedures have been fully integrated in the project participant's quality management system.</i></p> <p><i>In case of a stand-alone system, check how the GHG management system has been implemented and effectiveness is ensured.</i></p>	<p>/ISO/ /CAL/ /TR/ /IM01/ /IM02/ /PPA/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Enercon (India) Limited is responsible for maintaining all the monitoring data, recording, reporting, and archiving the data. It is ISO 9001:2008 certified and have management structure for managing the monitoring data. The meter reading is being taken jointly by the representatives of Enercon and GETCO in the form of JMR. The net electricity generated by the project owners is being provided to Enercon by GETCO in form of share certificate of electricity generated. Subsequently Enercon provides the same to individual Project owners.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i> ISO certificate of Enercon (India) Limited is crosschecked along with the calibration reports and interview with the O&M officials to confirm that proper Management systems are being followed. Besides training records by the personnel working at site have been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> GHG data monitoring system is appropriate.</p>	OK	OK
<p>C.4. Metering diagram (EB 70, Annex 11, C; EB 70 Annex 2 §193)</p> <p><i>Check first if the MR includes a metering diagram showing all relevant monitoring points.</i></p> <p><i>Check further if this diagram reflects the actual situation and is in line with the registered PDD and with the requirements of the applied methodology.</i></p>	<p>/IM01/ /MR/ /LS/ /PDD/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The project activity have various clusters and each cluster has exclusive metering arrangement and the meter readings taken at these metering points have been provided by the representatives of Enercon to GEDA. The same has been described in the section C of the MR, which is in line with the approved registered PDD.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i> The metering positions have been confirmed during the physical visit to the site and with the project layout and found correct.</p>	OK	OK

		<p>Conclusion: The diagram presented in the MR reflects the actual situation and is in line with the registered PDD.</p>		
<p>C.5. Roles and Responsibilities (EB 70, Annex 11, C; EB 70 Annex 2 §193)</p> <p><i>Check if all roles and positions of each person in the GHG data management process are clearly defined and implemented as stated in the monitoring plan. Please consider the complete data trail from raw data generation to submission of the final data.</i></p> <p><i>Identify, if relevant personnel w.r.t. monitoring has been exchanged?</i></p> <p><i>If so, have appropriate training measures been carried out.</i></p> <p><i>In case of changes, assure that the implemented monitoring procedures have not been affected.</i></p>	<p>/PS/ /MR/ /ISO/ /TR/ /IM01/</p>	<p>Description: EIL has the operation and maintenance contract for monitoring related to the project. EIL is ISO 9000:2008 certified.</p> <p>Responsibilities for measurements, collection and compilation of data, data storage and archiving, calibration, maintenance and training of personnel are in place.</p> <p>However, by interviews conducted during onsite visit it has been observed that the operational and management structure currently being followed for the project activity is not in accordance to the registered PDD. Pls. clarify.</p> <p>Verifier's action:</p> <p>ISO certificate and Training records are cross-checked and are acceptable. Also during the site visit it was observed that all the data acquired is in the safe custody of the project participant.</p> <p>Conclusion: The role for each person starting from the data archiving to consolidate data is in place for the project activity. The assessment team found it correct and accurate, however pending CL B4.</p>	GL-C4	OK CL C4 closed
<p>C.6. Emergency procedures for the monitoring system (EB 70 Annex 11, C; EB 70 Annex 2 §193)</p> <p><i>Check, as appropriate, whether relevant emergency procedures for the monitoring system have been included in the MR and assess whether these procedures have been implemented, when required</i></p>	<p>/PS/ /IM01/ /IM02/</p>	<p>Description: The emergency procedures have been described in the MR. In case of meter failure, the meter located at the utility sub-station at Moti Paneli shall be considered after application of transmission losses.</p> <p>Verifier's action: During the site visit the procedures have been confirmed with GETCO officials.</p>	OK	OK

		<i>Conclusion:</i> The emergency procedures have been discussed and are acceptable.		
C.7. Data archive and data protection (EB 70 Annex 2 §56 b) Check whether all records of monitoring parameters are archived according to the monitoring plan. Assess further whether appropriate measures have been taken in order to avoid unintended or intended manipulation or loss of the measured data.	/MR/ /IM01/	<i>Description:</i> The data (electricity supplied to the grid) will be archived on electronic media as well as on paper. The archive will be kept for the period up to two years after the completion of the crediting period. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> During the site visit it was observed that the data archiving procedure and data management structure is as per the registered PDD <i>Conclusion:</i> OK, data is archived appropriately.	OK	OK
D. Data and parameters				
D.1. Data and Parameters fixed ex ante				
a) Compliance with registered PDD (EB 70 Annex 11; D1) Check whether the value applied is in compliance with the registered PDD.	/MR/ /PDD/ /CEA/	<i>Description:</i> The project applies three parameters which have been fixed ex ante, i.e. $EF_{grid,OM,y}$, $EF_{grid,BM,y}$ and $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ The values have been confirmed with the registered PDD. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The values have been confirmed with the registered PDD and are matching. Further the value is in line with CEA Version 05. <i>Conclusion:</i> The parameters fixed ex-ante are in line with the values as mentioned in the registered PDD.	OK	OK

<p>b) Compliance with the applied methodology (EB 70 Annex 11; D1)</p> <p><i>Check whether the value applied is in compliance with the applied methodology or any other tool.</i></p>	<p>/MR/ /PDD/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> There are no parameters fixed ex-ante based on the applied methodology</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i> The registered PDD and the applied methodology have been checked to confirm the same.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> No parameter has been fixed based on the applied methodology.</p>	OK	OK
D.2. Data and Parameters monitored				
D.2.1. EG_{PJ,y}		Net Quantity of Electricity exported to the grid		
<p>a) Measurement / Determination method (EB 70 Annex 3, §§ 233, 236)</p> <p><i>Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined.</i></p> <p><i>Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements.</i></p> <p><i>Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</i></p>	<p>/IM01/ /PDD/ /MR/ /PPA/ /XLS/ /GETCO/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The net electricity generated by the project activity has been taken directly from the share certificate issued by GETCO on monthly basis. It has been calculated by GEDA on the basis of GETCO main meter reading and the meter readings taken at individual cluster meters after adjusting transmission loss.</p> <p>The WECs of VIPCPL has been divided into clusters and each cluster has dedicated metering system. Different clusters are connected to different Vacuum Circuit Breaker metering yards (VCB) which ultimately lead to the shared main GETCO meter at the Sadodar substation maintained by Enercon (India) Limited. Data monitoring takes place at the cluster metering points and GETCO main meter at the EIL substation.</p> <p>Subsequently the values have been cross-checked with the invoices raised by PP to the grid.</p> <p>However, the notation for the parameter is not in line with the registered PDD.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i></p>	CAR D1	OK CAR D1 closed

		<p>The measurement procedure has been verified by interview with the O&M team during onsite verification conducted by the verification team. The GEDA certificates of share of electricity and the invoices raised by PP to the grid for the entire monitoring period are verified by the verification team and found to be appropriate.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The verification team concludes that the measurement method of the parameter is in line with the registered monitoring plan and the applied methodology, ACM0002, Version 11.</p>		
<p>b) Accuracy and QA/QC Procedure (EB 70 Annex 3, §§ 237-241)</p> <p><i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i></p> <p><i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i></p>	<p>/CAL/ /ISO/ /O&M/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>This parameter is calculated thus accuracy is not applicable.</p> <p>Further the QA/QC procedures are in line and the O&M contractor Enercon is ISO 9001 certified and has proper process for data management and control.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i></p> <p>As the parameter is calculated thus calibration is not applicable for the parameter. ISO certificate for Enercon (India) limited is available and is valid.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>Proper QA/QC procedures are in place.</p>	OK	OK
<p>c) Correctness (EB 70 Annex 3, §§ 233, 236)</p> <p><i>Determine whether the value given in the monitoring report is correct or determined in a conservative</i></p>	<p>/MR/ /XLS/ /INV/</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Correct <input type="checkbox"/> Not correct (initial assessment)</p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Verification team assessed the values given in the monitoring report and emission reduction calculation sheet and found that</p>	OK	OK

<p><i>manner.</i></p> <p><i>In case of conservative approaches used in lieu of the monitoring as per registered MP detailed assessment of the conservativeness of the approach used should be given.</i></p> <p><i>In case of mistakes / deviations pl. provide details and descriptions of the CARs raised.</i></p>		<p>net generation of electricity from the project activity for the monitoring period is matching with the GEDA certificates and invoice value.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i></p> <p>The GEDA certificates of share of electricity for the entire monitoring period are verified by the verification team.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The value given in the MR is correct.</p>		
D.2.2. EG_{GETCO}, Export		Description: Net Electricity export recorded at Enercon Substation		
<p>a) Measurement / Determination method (EB 70 Annex 3, §§ 233, 236)</p> <p><i>Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined.</i></p> <p><i>Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements.</i></p> <p><i>Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</i></p>	<p>/IM01/ /PDD/ /INV/ /XLS/ /GETCO/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Net Electricity export recorded at Enercon Substation is recorded from the energy meter installed on monthly basis in presence of the representatives of Enercon and GETCO. The same reading is used by GEDA to prepare the monthly Certificate of Share of Electricity Generation. This reading is used for calculation of transmission loss by GEDA and is not directly used for calculation of emission reductions.</p> <p>The energy meters used for the measurement have been found not to be replaced during the monitoring period and no failure of the equipment occurred. The measurement method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</p> <p>However, The unit for the monitoring parameter is not in line with the registered PDD.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i></p> <p>This has been confirmed during onsite verification by interview with the operation and maintenance staff and from document review of calibration and Certificate of Share of Electricity</p>	CAR D1	OK CAR D1 closed

		<p>Generation.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The verification team concludes that the parameter has been monitored as per the procedure defined in the registered PDD and applied methodology ACM0002, version 11. And no relevant key equipment has been changed/ replaced during the monitoring period</p>		
<p>b) Accuracy and QA/QC Procedure (EB 70 Annex 3, §§ 237-241)</p> <p><i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i></p> <p><i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i></p>	<p>/CAL/ /ISO/ /O&M/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>This parameter is monitored by the energy meter located at EIL substation. The meter installed to monitor this data is calibrated once in a year as per the monitoring plan and the accuracy class of this meter is $\pm 0.2\%$.</p> <p>However during the site visit it has been observed that the calibration frequency is once in 3 years. Thus CAR C3 has been raised.</p> <p>Further the QA/QC procedures are in line and the O&M contractor Enercon is ISO 9001 certified and has proper process for data management and control.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i></p> <p>The calibration certificates are checked and found correct. ISO certificate for Enercon (India) limited is available and is valid.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>Proper QA/QC procedures are in place.</p>	<p>CAR C3</p>	<p>OK CAR C3 closed</p>
<p>c) Correctness (EB 70 Annex 3, §§ 233, 236)</p> <p><i>Determine whether the value given in the monitoring</i></p>	<p>/MR/</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Correct <input type="checkbox"/> Not correct (initial assessment)</p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>This value has been monitored from the main meter at Sadodar</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>

<p><i>report is correct or determined in a conservative manner.</i></p> <p><i>In case of conservative approaches used in lieu of the monitoring as per registered MP detailed assessment of the conservativeness of the approach used should be given.</i></p> <p><i>In case of mistakes / deviations pl. provide details and descriptions of the CARs raised.</i></p>		<p>Substation. This reading is used for calculation of transmission loss by GEDA and is not directly used for calculation of emission reductions. The same reading is used by GEDA to prepare the monthly Certificate of Share of Electricity Generation.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i> The monthly Certificate of the Share of the Electricity Generation for the entire of the monitoring period have been verified by the assessment team and the values considered in the monitoring report are found to be consistent.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The verification team concludes that the values given in the monitoring report is correct and justified.</p>		
<p>D.2.3. EG_{PJ,y}</p>		<p>Description: Net Electricity import recorded at Enercon Substation</p>		
<p>a) Measurement / Determination method (EB 70 Annex 3, §§ 233, 236)</p> <p><i>Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined.</i></p> <p><i>Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements.</i></p> <p><i>Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</i></p>	<p>/IM01/ /IM02/ /PDD/ /GETCO/ /CAL/ /CC/ /JMR/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Net Electricity import recorded at Enercon Substation is recorded from the energy meter installed on monthly basis in presence of the representatives of Enercon and GETCO. This value has been taken from the JMR at Enercon Substation. The same reading is used by GEDA to prepare the monthly Certificate of Share of Electricity Generation. This reading is used for calculation of transmission loss by GEDA and is not directly used for calculation of emission reductions.</p> <p>The energy meters used for the measurement been found not to be replaced during the monitoring period and no failure of the equipment occurred. The measurement method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</p> <p>However, The unit for the monitoring parameter is not in line with the registered PDD.</p>	<p>CAR D1</p>	<p>OK CAR D1 closed</p>

		<p><i>Verifier's action:</i> This has been confirmed during onsite verification by interview with the operation and maintenance staff and from document review of calibration and Certificate of Share of Electricity Generation.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The verification team concludes that the parameter has been monitored as per the procedure defined in the registered PDD and applied methodology ACM0002, version 11. And no relevant key equipment has been changed/ replaced during the monitoring period.</p>		
<p>b) Accuracy and QA/QC Procedure (EB 70 Annex 3, §§ 237-241)</p> <p><i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i></p> <p><i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i></p>	<p>/CAL/ /ISO/ /O&M/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>This parameter is monitored by the energy meter located at EIL substation. The meter installed to monitor this data is calibrated once in a year as per the monitoring plan and the accuracy class of this meter is $\pm 0.2\%$.</p> <p>However during the site visit it has been observed that the calibration frequency is once in 3 years. Thus CAR C3 has been raised.</p> <p>Further the QA/QC procedures are in line and the O&M contractor Enercon is ISO 9001 certified and has proper process for data management and control.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i></p> <p>The calibration certificates are checked and found correct. ISO certificate for Enercon (India) limited is available and is valid.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>Proper QA/QC procedures are in place.</p>	<p>CAR C3</p>	<p>OK CAR C3 closed</p>



<p>c) Correctness (EB 70 Annex 3, §§ 233, 236)</p> <p><i>Determine whether the value given in the monitoring report is correct or determined in a conservative manner.</i></p> <p><i>In case of conservative approaches used in lieu of the monitoring as per registered MP detailed assessment of the conservativeness of the approach used should be given.</i></p> <p><i>In case of mistakes / deviations pl. provide details and descriptions of the CARs raised.</i></p>	<p>/MR/ /GETCO/</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Correct <input type="checkbox"/> Not correct (initial assessment)</p> <p><i>Description:</i> This value has been monitored from the main meter at Sadodar Substation. The same reading is used by GEDA to prepare the monthly Certificate of Share of Electricity Generation. This reading is used for calculation of transmission loss by GEDA and is not directly used for calculation of emission reductions.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i> The monthly Certificate of the Share of the Electricity Generation for the entire of the monitoring period have been verified by the assessment team and the values considered in the monitoring report are found to be consistent.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The verification team concludes that the values given in the monitoring report is correct and justified.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>D.3. Sampling</p>				

<p>a) Implementation of sampling plan (EB70 Annex 11; D3)</p> <p><i>Check whether the PP has applied a sampling approach to determine the monitored values (as per section D.2 above).</i></p> <p><i>If this is the case, please provide an assessment whether the PPs have correctly and sufficiently described the implemented sampling plan including</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) Description of the implemented sampling design</i> <i>b) Collected data</i> <i>c) Analysis of collected data</i> <i>d) Demonstration on whether the required confidence/precision has been met.</i> 		<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No sampling approach has been used by the PP to determine the monitored parameters</p> <p>OR.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A sampling approach has been taken for the following monitored parameter:</p> <p>Parameter:</p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	NA	NA
<p>b) Sampling during verification</p> <p><i>In case the VT has applied a sampling approach in the course of the verification the approach shall be described for each parameter.</i></p>		<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No sampling approach has been used by the VT to verify the monitored parameters</p> <p>OR.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A sampling approach has been applied by the VT for the following monitored parameter:</p> <p>Parameter:</p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	NA	NA

E. Calculation of Emission reductions				
E.1. Traceability (EB 70 Annex 3, §§ 212, 214) <i>Assess if the calculation is fully traceable. In case of complex calculations an Excel calculation spreadsheet shall be used. All applied formulae must be visible.</i>	/XLS/ /PDD/ /ACM000 2/ /MR/	<i>Description:</i> The calculation of the emission reduction is traceable. An emission reduction calculation spread sheet is submitted by the project proponent along with the monitoring report. The formulae applied for the emission reduction calculation are clearly correct. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The registered PDD has been checked in order to ensure correctness the formulae applied for the calculation in the emission reduction sheet. The calculation is in line with the applied methodology, i.e. ACM0002. <i>Conclusion:</i> The emission reduction calculations are traceable.	OK	OK
E.2. Parameter consistency (EB 70 Annex 3, § 214) <i>Assess whether all internal and external parameters and data used for calculation are applied consistently in the monitoring report and the calculation spreadsheet?</i> <i>Consider only the correct data exchange between the monitoring report and the calculation spreadsheet (if any). Further ensure the consistency of notations for all parameters in the PDD, MR, calculation spreadsheet.</i>	/XLS/ /MR/ /GETCO/ /INV/	<i>Description:</i> All the internal and external parameters and data used for the calculation are verified by the verification team. All the values are found to be considered correctly. The data between the monitoring report and the emission reduction calculation sheet are also assessed. However, pending CAR C2 <i>Verifier's action:</i> The registered PDD, monitoring report, emission reduction calculation spread sheet are checked by the verification team with the values in the JMR, Share certificates and invoices to confirm the same. <i>Conclusion:</i> The parameters are reported consistently.	CAR C2	OK CAR C2
E.3. Correctness of calculation (EB 70 Annex 3, §§ 235-236)	/XLS/ /MR/	<i>Description:</i> All the emission reduction values are calculated in line with the	OK	OK



<p><i>Check if the applied formulae and methods for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage are in accordance with the monitoring plan and / or the approved methodology.</i></p> <p><i>Assess whether the provided calculations are complete and reflect all requirements of the monitoring plan.</i></p> <p><i>Check especially that no standard or old values have been used for calculation where calculations based on up-to-date data is required.</i></p>	<p>/PDD/ /ACM000 2/</p>	<p>formulae from ACM0002 and the registered PDD. Further as the project is wind power project thus there are no project and leakage emissions.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i></p> <p>The registered PDD, monitoring report, emission reduction calculation spread sheet are checked by the verification team to confirm the applied formulae and methods.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>The calculation for emission reduction estimation is correct and in line with the registered PDD. .</p>		
<p>E.4. Emission reductions table (EB 70, Annex 11, E.4)</p> <p><i>Check if the MR includes a summary table of the emission reductions calculation specifying separately</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Total baseline emissions - Total project emissions: - Total leakage - Total emission reductions. <p><i>Assess whether the values are correct or need to be revised as a consequence of issues identified above.</i></p>		<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The MR includes in section E.4 a summary table of the emission reductions calculation.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The summary table specified the total baseline, project and leakage emissions as well as the total emission reductions separately.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The values as specified in the ER summary table are correct; no issues have been identified during the verification which requires changes in the ER calculation.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> During the verification issues with impact on the ER calculation have been identified. Thus subject to the closure of above listed findings the summary table in E.4 needs to be revised.</p> <p>In this context the following additional findings have been identified: CAR C2 has been raised as the MR mentions application of correction factor due to delay in calibration, however the same is not reflected in the emission reduction sheet.</p>	<p>CAR C2</p>	<p>OK CAR C2</p>

<p>E.5. Comparison with ex-ante determined emission reductions (EB 70, Annex 11, E.5; E.6)</p> <p><i>Check if the MR includes a comparison of actual values of the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered PDD.</i></p> <p><i>Check further whether in case of an increase an appropriate explanation is included in the MR.</i></p> <p><i>Assess in case of a significant increase whether this is due to technical or organisational changes within or outside the control of the PP and – if this is case – whether the PRC have been considered appropriately.</i></p>	<p>/XLS/ /MR/ /PDD/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The MR includes the comparison of values of the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered PDD. The emission reductions during the current monitoring period are lower than the PDD estimates.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i> The values in the MR have been compared with registered PDD and the emission reductions in the current monitoring period are lower than the PDD estimates.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The comparison with ex ante determined values have been provided and the emission reduction values are lower than the PDD estimates.</p>	OK	OK
<p>E.6. ER during the 1st commitment period and the period from 1 January 2013 onwards (EB 70, Annex 11, E.7)</p> <p><i>Check if the MR includes in chapter E.7 a breakdown of the actual ER into</i></p> <p>a) <i>ER up to 2012-12-31 and</i></p> <p>b) <i>ER from 2013-01-01 onwards</i></p> <p><i>The ERs for each period should be determined as per the actual generation. In cases where this is not possible or a cap has been applied a proportional (time related) approach should be chosen.</i></p>		<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The MR in section E.7 includes a summary table of the ER breakdown</p> <p>a) <i>ER up to 2012-12-31 and</i></p> <p>b) <i>ER from 2013-01-01 onwards</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The breakdown of the ERs during the first commitment period and from 2013-01-01 onwards is as follows:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The ER have completely been generated during the first commitment period</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The ERs have completely been generated from 2013-01-01 onwards,</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The ERs have partly been generated during the first commitment period and partly from 2013-01-01</p>	OK	OK



		<p>onwards.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The breakdown of the ERs is correct, considering the applicable guidance.</p> <p>In this context the following additional findings have been identified:</p> <p>N/A</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

ANNEX 2: STATEMENTS OF COMPETENCE OF INVOLVED PERSONNEL

TÜV NORD Certification		
<p>Statement of Competence Appointment and authorization according to the procedures of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program</p>		
<p>Mr. Prasad Jakkaraju</p>		
SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Lead Assessor	2014-02-02
VCS	Lead Assessor	2014-02-02
<p>Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:</p>		
CODE	TECHNICAL AREA	
1.2	Renewable Energies	
2.1	Electricity Distribution	
<p>103 – Rev. 0, Date: 2011-03-25</p>		
<p>103_S01-F003_2011-03-25_rev0</p>		

TÜV NORD Certification		
<p>Statement of Competence Appointment and authorization according to the procedures of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program</p>		
<p>Mr. Jimmy Sah</p>		
SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Lead Assessor	2014-02-03
VCS	Lead Assessor	2014-02-03
<p>Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:</p>		
CODE	TECHNICAL AREA	
1.2	Renewable Energies	
<p>091 – Rev. 1, Date: 2011-07-27</p>		
<p>091_S01-F003_2011-07-27_rev1</p>		

TÜV NORD Certification		
<p>Statement of Competence Appointment and authorization according to the procedures of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program</p>		
<p>Mr. Sukanta Das</p>		
SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Lead Assessor	2014-03-08
VCS/ ISO 14064-2	Lead Assessor	2014-03-08
<p>Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:</p>		
CODE	TECHNICAL AREA	
1.2	Renewable Energies	
<p>089 – Rev. 1, Date: 2012-06-18</p>		
<p>089_S01-F003_2012-06-18_rev1.doc</p>		



Statement of Competence

Appointment and authorization according to the procedures of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program

Mr. Stefan Winter

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification) Technical Reviewer	2014-06-30
VCS	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification) Technical Reviewer	2014-06-30

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA	TR SUBCATEGORIES
1.1	Thermal energy generation	
1.2	Renewable Energy	1.2.1 Hydro 1.2.2 Wind 1.2.3 Geothermal 1.2.4 Solar 1.2.5 Tidal
2.2	Heat distribution	
3.1	Energy demand	
13.1	Waste handling and disposal	13.1.1 Waste management 13.1.2 Waste water management
13.2	Animal waste management	
15.2	Animal waste management	

163 – Rev. 2, Date: 2011-08-10

163_S01-F003_2011-08-10_rev2

S01-F003 rev1 / 2011-08-02



Statement of Competence

Appointment and authorization according to the procedures of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program

Mr. Ingo Klein

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Lead Assessor (Validation, Verification) Technical Reviewer	2013-10-17
VCS	Lead Assessor Technical Reviewer	2013-10-17

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA	TR SUBCATEGORIES
1.2	Renewable Energies	1.2.1 Hydro 1.2.2 Wind 1.2.3 Geothermal 1.2.4 Solar 1.2.5 Tidal

122 - Rev. 1, Date: 2011-08-08

122_S01-F003_2011-08-08_rev1

S01-F003 rev1 / 2011-08-02



Statement of Competence

Appointment and authorization according to the procedures of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program

Mr. Samir Beqqal

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification)	2016-04-15
VCS / ISO 14064-2	Senior Assessor	2016-04-15

110 - Rev. 2, Date: 2013-04-16

110_S01-VA060-F20_2013-04-16_rev2.doc

S01-VA060-F20 rev3 / 2012-10-25