



**Verification and certification report form for
CDM project activities
(Version 04.0)**

BASIC INFORMATION

Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity	GEI Wind Power Project in Karnataka, India		
Scale of the project activity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Large-scale <input type="checkbox"/> Small-scale		
Version number of the verification and certification report	1.1		
Completion date of the verification and certification report	11/11/2021		
Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period	04 Monitoring period: 01/01/2020 to 31/12/2020 (Including both dates)		
Version number of the monitoring report to which this report applies	1.2		
Crediting period of the project activity corresponding to this monitoring period	01/04/2011 – 31/03/2021 (Fixed)		
Project participants	Generacion Eolica India Limited		
Host Party	India		
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	ACM0002 "Consolidated methodology for grid- connected electricity generation from renewable sources", Version 11 Standardized Baseline: N/A		
Mandatory sectoral scopes	Sectoral Scope 1 : Energy industries (renewable/ non-renewable sources)		
Conditional sectoral scopes, if applicable	NA		
Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring duration in the registered PDD	64,095 tCO ₂ e		
Certified amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring period	Amount before 1 January 2013	Amount from 1 January 2013 until 31 December 2020	Amount from 1 January 2021
	0	37,592 tCO ₂ e	0
Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE	KBS Certification Services Private Limited (KBS) Ref. No. E-0051		

**Name, position and signature of the approver
of the verification and certification report**



Mr. Kaushal Goyal
Managing Director

SECTION A. Executive summary

KBS Certification Services Private Limited has been commissioned by “Generacion Eolica India Limited” to perform an independent verification of its registered CDM project, “GEI Wind Power Project in Karnataka, India”, UNFCCC Reference No. 4144, for the reported GHG emission reductions for the given monitoring period 01/01/2020 to 31/12/2020 (both dates included). The CDM projects must undergo independent third-party verification and certification of emission reductions as the basis for issuance of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs).

The objectives of this verification exercise are, by review of objective evidence, to establish that:

- The project activity has been implemented and operated as per the registered PDD and that all physical features (technology, project equipment, and monitoring and metering equipment) of the project are in place;
- Monitoring report and other supporting documents are complete;
- The actual monitoring systems & procedures and monitoring report conforms with the requirements of the registered PDD and the approved monitoring methodology;
- The data is recorded and stored as per the monitoring methodology and registered PDD.

Scope:

The scope of the verification is the independent and objective review and ex post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emission by the project activity. The verification is based on review of monitoring report, supporting information and:

- a) The registered PDD, including the monitoring plan and the corresponding validation opinion(s);
- b) Previous verification reports, deviation requests, requests for revision of monitoring plan;
- c) Monitoring report for the monitoring period under verification including CER calculations sheets and all supporting documents;
- d) The applied monitoring methodology;
- e) Relevant decisions, clarifications and guidance from the CMP and the CDM Executive Board;
- f) All information and references relevant to the project activity's resulting in emission reductions
- g) The project is assessed against the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM Modalities and Procedures and related rules and guidance.

KBS has, based on the recommendations in the latest version of CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activity, employed a rule-based approach in the verification, focusing on the identification of significant reporting risks and the reliability of project monitoring.

Description of project:

The project activity consists of wind power generation with an installed capacity of 31.2 MW in the state of Karnataka, India. The electricity generated by the project activity is sold to Hubli Electricity Supply Company Limited (HESCOM), to be exported to grid, under a long-term power purchase agreement /7/, which is valid for the monitoring period. The project reduces anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG's), by displacing equivalent amount of electricity from the generation- mix of power plants connected to the electricity grid (Indian Grid), which is mainly dominated by thermal/fossil fuel (Non-renewable) based power plants. Generacion Eolica India Limited (hereinafter referred as GEIL) is the promoter of the project activity located in Villages Harthi, Kurtakoti and Malasamudra, district Gadag in the state of Karnataka, India.

Methodology:

KBS follows a rule-based verification approach, wherein, as a first step, the contract review is undertaken as per latest version of CDM Accreditation Standard. Subsequently, after the contract is signed, the monitoring report of the project activity is made publicly available at UNFCCC website as per CDM procedures. A desk review of the project documentation is undertaken, which is followed by a remote audit by the members of verification team in accordance with the latest version of CDM VVS. The verification protocol is filled by the verification team that is based on standard auditing practices and version 03 of CDM VVS for project activities, to capture the assessment of applicable CDM requirements viz., version 03 of CDM Project Standard for project activities, registered PDD, applied methodology, applied standardized baseline and/or tools and recent decisions. The verification protocol provides transparent means to record the observations and compliances by the verification team members and the nonconformities, if any. The verification protocol is an internal document, and is available on request. Following are the major milestones for the verification under consideration.

Verification contract	01/09/2021
Remote audit (Microsoft Teams meeting)	29/09/2021
Draft Verification Report	26/10/2021
Final Verification Report	11/11/2021

KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd. confirms that the monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements.

Based on the information seen and evaluated, we confirm that the implementation of the project has resulted in 37,592 tCO₂e emission reductions during period 01/01/2020 to 31/12/2020 (Including both the days).

SECTION B. Verification team, technical reviewer and approver**B.1. Verification team member**

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)	Involvement in			
						Desk/document review	On-site inspection	Interviews	Verification findings
1.	Team Leader, Technical Expert & Local Expert	IR	Kandari	Sanjay	Central office	x	Remote audit	x	x
2.	Verifier	EI	Kumar	Sayali	Central office	x	Remote audit	x	x

B.2. Technical reviewer and approver of the verification and certification report

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)
1.	Technical reviewer	IR	Sharma	Anjana	Central office
2.	Manager (Technical & Certification)	IR	Chaudhari	Tushar Eknath	Central office
3.	Approver	IR	Goyal	Mr. Kaushal	Central office

SECTION C. Application of materiality**C.1. Consideration of materiality in planning the verification**

No.	Risk that could lead to material errors, omissions or misstatements	Assessment of the risk		Response to the risk in the verification plan and/or sampling plan
		Risk level	Justification	
1.	The data monitoring is done through electronic meters and errors can be perceived during the information transfer from the source to the emission reduction sheet.	High	There are total 4 monitoring parameters i.e. EG _y , Gp _e , Gp _i and L _i . However, two monitoring parameters i.e. Gp _e and Gp _i are monitored through the electronic meters and the other two parameters i.e. EG _y and L _i are calculated parameters. These parameters are used for calculation of baseline emissions.	The complete dataset for the project activity was checked and it can be confirmed that the values are consistent with their sources/08//09/. Other necessary cross-checks have also been considered to ensure plausibility of the data provided in the ER Sheet.
...				

C.2. Consideration of materiality in conducting the verification

>> The prescribed thresholds for materiality, as per §326 of “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” Version 03.0/15/.

Prescribed range of ERs/annum	500,000+	300,000+ to 500,000	300,000	SSC PAs	MSC PAs
Prescribed Threshold	0.5%	1.0%	2.0%	5.0%	10.0%

The identified/selected materiality threshold for the project activity under current monitoring period is 2% as project activity is large scale project activity lower than 300,000 ERs/annum.

	MR Version (Draft)/01/	MR Version (Final)/02/
Emission reductions	37,839 tCO ₂ e	37,592 tCO ₂ e
Identified Threshold	5%	5%

There has been a change in the emission reduction during the verification process due to the unavailability of old calibration report as well as delay in calibration that is explained in section E.7 below.

The impact of errors observed during verification for each monitoring parameter on the emission reduction calculation is provided below:

Parameter	Population size	Sample size	Type of error identified	Impact on ERs	
				Population size (Qty and %)	Within Threshold
EG _y	12	12	No error identified	Not applicable. The whole data was checked.	Yes
Gp _e	12	12	No error identified	Not applicable. The whole data was checked.	Yes
Gp _i	12	12	No error identified	Not	Yes

				applicable. The whole data was checked.	
L_i	12	12	Error Identified	Entire data checked	Yes

The complete dataset for the project activity was checked and it can be confirmed that the values are consistent with their sources. The assessment team confirms that the reported emission reductions are free from material errors, omissions or misstatements.

SECTION D. Means of verification

D.1. Desk/document review

>> A desk review is undertaken, involving but not limited to,

- A review of the data and information presented to verify their completeness;
- A review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures;
- An evaluation of data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions.

The list of documents reviewed is included in the section 'Appendix 3' of this report.

D.2. On-site inspection

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, taking into account the CDM Executive Board announcement to relax mandatory site visits till 31 December 2021 /20/, rules of relevant national and local authorities (local to the DOE offices as well as to locality of the site visits), World Health Organization (WHO) recommendations, policies of the DOE and other relevant travel restrictions and guidance (for example, a requirement to self-isolate upon return from specific countries), A DOE may postpone site visits for onsite inspections required by the "CDM validation and verification standard for project activities (version 03.0) (VVS-PA)" /15/.

If the site visits cannot be postponed, a proper justification should be provided by the DOE why the site visits cannot be postponed, including the demonstration of a significant impact of delaying the site visits on the DOE, or project participants or coordinating/ managing entity (e.g. commitment/ timeline as per the validation or verification contract, CER delivery commitment by project participants) reliance on applicable force majeure provisions in the validation or verification contracts, if needed.

For this project activity, PP has contractual commitment for the verification process with KBS and site visit was not undertaken due to COVID-19 travel restrictions. Moreover, PP also submitted a ERPA and it has delivery deadlines. The ERPA has the penalty clauses too, therefore delaying/postponing the site visit was not possible. Hence, the DOE has skipped the on-site visit. However, as per the CDM EB, the DOE may use other standard auditing techniques for validation or verification as referred to in sections 9.1.3 of the VVS for PA /15/.

Verification team has used the following alternative means for its assessment and to justify that they are sufficient for the purpose of verification. Along with desk review, audit team has conducted remote audit interview as follows:

- A complete desk review of the MR, registered PDD/14/, Joint Meter Reading (Form B) /08/, Invoices/09/, Power Purchase Agreement/07/, commissioning certificates/05/, calibration certificates/06/ etc. as well as all applicable country legal requirement and supportive evidences have been checked by the verification team.
- Verification team has performed Microsoft teams application interview with PP in order to check implementation, project boundary, current situation, evaluation of data management, QA/QC system, monitoring and metering equipment, monitoring procedures, calibration etc. Interview questions were filled as per Verification team interview checklist and also videos were captured.

- Cross checks between information provided by interviewed personnel (i.e. by checking sources) to ensure that no relevant information has been omitted.
- Cross-check evaluation, for information received from interviews, under the scope of all information and references provided in MR and supporting documents.

D.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Sanghal	Atul	Consultant	29/09/2021	CDM Requirements	Sanjay Kandari
2.	Jadi	Mahesh	CDM PP	29/09/2021	Project Implementation, Operation, Calibration, Grid Connectivity, Monitoring etc,	Sanjay Kandari Sayali A Kumar

D.4. Sampling approach

>> No Sampling Approach is used during verification.

D.5. Clarification requests (CLs), corrective action requests (CARs) and forward action requests (FARs) raised

Areas of verification findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form	CL-01	CAR-01	-
Compliance of the project implementation and operation with the registered PDD	-	-	-
Post-registration changes	-	-	-
Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with the methodologies including applicable tools and standardized baselines	-	-	-
Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan	-	CAR-02, CAR-03	-
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	CL-03	-	-
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals	CL-02, CL-04	CAR-04	-
Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits	-	-	-
Global stakeholder consultation	-	-	-
Others (please specify)	-	-	-
Total	4	4	

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

Means of verification	Verification team checked the monitoring report/2/ with “Instructions for filling out the monitoring report form” mentioned as attachment to Monitoring report form (version 09.0)/18/.
Findings	CL-01 and CAR-01 were raised and successfully closed out. Refer to Appendix 4 for further details.
Conclusion	In accordance with §352 of CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, Version 03.0 /16/, verification team confirms that final monitoring report /2/ is completed using the latest valid version of the applicable monitoring report form /18/.

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

>> The current verification is for the fourth monitoring period of the project activity. All raised CARs and CLs were successfully closed during validation and previous verification. There is no pending FAR from validation and third verification to address during this monitoring period, as verified from the registered documents /14/.

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

Means of verification	<p>The project activity consists of 39 WTGs of Enercon make (E-53 model) of 800 kW capacity each and thus total capacity of 31.2 MW. The turbines generate 3-phase power at 400V, which is stepped up to 33 KV at the project site and further stepped up to 220 KV at the Receiving sub- station of the KPTCL/HESCOM. The generated power is sold to the State utility, HESCOM as per the Power Purchase Agreement /7/.</p> <p>The project activity is located at Harthi, Kurtakoti and Malasamudra villages in Bailhongal and Belgaum Taluk, Belgaum District, Karnataka, India.</p> <p>The promoter of the project activity is Generacion Eolica India Limited, as confirmed during the remote interview. The project was commissioned on 10/10/2008, as confirmed from the commissioning certificate /5/. The project activity involves electricity generation using clean renewable energy source.</p> <p>The team has conducted a remote audit on 29/09/2021 and found that all the WTGs installed are Enercon E53 model which are in line with the description as per the registered PDD /14/.</p> <p>Based on visual inspection, interview and document review, the verification team confirms that all physical features of the CDM project activity including technology, data collection systems and storage systems have been implemented in accordance with the registered PDD /14/.</p> <p>The technical specification of the project activity is verified from the remote audit interview/photographs and the manufacturer brochure /10/. The important specifications are mentioned below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="513 1081 1410 2027"> <thead> <tr> <th>Technical detail of the equipment</th><th>Remark</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Turbine model</td><td>E-53</td></tr> <tr> <td>Rated power</td><td>800 kW</td></tr> <tr> <td>Rotor diameter</td><td>53m</td></tr> <tr> <td>Hub Height</td><td>75m</td></tr> <tr> <td>Turbine Type</td><td>Gearless horizontal axis wind turbine with variable rotor speed</td></tr> <tr> <td>Power regulation</td><td>Independent electromechanical pitch system for each blade</td></tr> <tr> <td>Cut in wind speed</td><td>2.5 m/s</td></tr> <tr> <td>Rated wind speed</td><td>12 m/s</td></tr> <tr> <td>Cut out wind speed</td><td>28-34 m/s</td></tr> <tr> <td>Extreme wind speed</td><td>59.5 m/s</td></tr> <tr> <td>Rated rotational speed</td><td>32 rpm</td></tr> <tr> <td>Operating range rotational speed</td><td>12-29 rpm</td></tr> <tr> <td>Orientation</td><td>Upwind</td></tr> <tr> <td>No. of blades</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td>Blade material</td><td>Fibre Glass Epoxy reinforced with integral lightning protection</td></tr> <tr> <td>Gear box type</td><td>Gear less</td></tr> <tr> <td>Generator type</td><td>Synchronous</td></tr> <tr> <td>Braking</td><td>Aerodynamic</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Technical detail of the equipment	Remark	Turbine model	E-53	Rated power	800 kW	Rotor diameter	53m	Hub Height	75m	Turbine Type	Gearless horizontal axis wind turbine with variable rotor speed	Power regulation	Independent electromechanical pitch system for each blade	Cut in wind speed	2.5 m/s	Rated wind speed	12 m/s	Cut out wind speed	28-34 m/s	Extreme wind speed	59.5 m/s	Rated rotational speed	32 rpm	Operating range rotational speed	12-29 rpm	Orientation	Upwind	No. of blades	3	Blade material	Fibre Glass Epoxy reinforced with integral lightning protection	Gear box type	Gear less	Generator type	Synchronous	Braking	Aerodynamic
Technical detail of the equipment	Remark																																						
Turbine model	E-53																																						
Rated power	800 kW																																						
Rotor diameter	53m																																						
Hub Height	75m																																						
Turbine Type	Gearless horizontal axis wind turbine with variable rotor speed																																						
Power regulation	Independent electromechanical pitch system for each blade																																						
Cut in wind speed	2.5 m/s																																						
Rated wind speed	12 m/s																																						
Cut out wind speed	28-34 m/s																																						
Extreme wind speed	59.5 m/s																																						
Rated rotational speed	32 rpm																																						
Operating range rotational speed	12-29 rpm																																						
Orientation	Upwind																																						
No. of blades	3																																						
Blade material	Fibre Glass Epoxy reinforced with integral lightning protection																																						
Gear box type	Gear less																																						
Generator type	Synchronous																																						
Braking	Aerodynamic																																						

	Output voltage	400 V
	Yawing system	Active yawing with 4 electric yaw drives with brake motor and friction bearing
	Tower	74 m concrete
	<p>The above-mentioned details are also consistent with the details mentioned in the registered PDD/14/. Through remote auditing (Microsoft teams application interview) and document review, the verification team confirms that all physical features of the project activity including technology, data collection systems and storage systems have been implemented in accordance with the registered project design document/14/.</p> <p>The monitoring plan required for the ex-post monitoring EG_{facility,y}, Gp_e, Gp_i and L_i is as per the registered PDD /14/. The location of energy meters were found to be installed at the respective places as observed through schematic metering arrangement /19/, captured videos and photographs /11/ by the verification team.</p> <p>The verification team has reviewed the power purchase agreement/7/ to confirm the power from the project activity is being supplied to the grid in compliance to the applied methodology ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, Version-11/12/ and registered PDD/14/.</p> <p>The power from the project activity is being sold to HESCOM, assessment team has reviewed the copy of invoices /9/ raised by project proponent to the buyer to confirm the same.</p> <p>The rated capacity of WTGs, location/identification number, meter serial number and make were verified from the commissioning certificates /5/, name plates /10/ and the photographic evidence/11/ and found to be consistent with the information provided in the MR/2/.</p> <p>The project boundaries and all key equipment are in line with the registered PDD/14/. The verification team confirmed during the remote auditing (video conferencing) that the CDM project is completely operational and the name plate details of all key equipment's are in line with the registered PDD/14/.</p> <p>The details of operation of WTGs installed were cross checked through interviews and found consistent. As confirmed through interviews, no events have occurred during the monitoring period which may affect the applicability of the applied methodology as reported in the MR/2/.</p> <p>The allocation of the responsibilities is followed as described in the registered PDD /14/. Routines for the archiving of data are defined and documented. Calculations, laid down in the monitoring report are in line with registered PDD /14/.</p> <p>Interviews (refer section D.3 of this report) were carried out with the plant personnel during the Microsoft teams application interview to verify the actual monitoring system practiced by PP. It was found that the plant personals are aware of their roles & responsibilities. The actual monitoring system presently practiced complies with the monitoring plan provided in the registered PDD/14/ and the monitoring methodology/12/.</p> <p>All the data have been measured as specified in the registered PDD /14/. The monitored data are archived partly in physical (hard copy) and partly in electronic form. The archived data will be kept for the whole crediting period and 2 years after the crediting period.</p>	
	Findings	No finding raised.
	Conclusion	<p>The verification team confirms that:</p> <p>a) The project activity is implemented as per the registered PDD/14/, the project activity was fully operational during the monitoring period.</p>

	<p>b) The actual operation of the proposed CDM project activity is in line to the registered PDD/14/, the power generated from the project activity is supplied to Southern grid.</p> <p>c) No approvals of the deviation, request for revision in monitoring plan, request of notification or request for approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD/14/ were requested in the current monitoring period.</p> <p>d) The actual emission reductions are lower than the expected emission reductions for the current monitoring period.</p> <p>It has reviewed the registered PDD/14/, validation report/14/, previous MR and verification report/14/, the applied monitoring methodology/12/, relevant decisions from the CMP and the CDM EB and found that the final MR /2/ for this monitoring period is in line with all the above-mentioned documents.</p>
--	--

E.4. Post-registration changes

E.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents¹

>> No Post Registration Changes have occurred during this monitoring period. Therefore, this section is not applicable.

E.4.2. Corrections

>> No Corrections have occurred during this monitoring period. Therefore, this section is not applicable.

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

>> No changes to the start date have occurred during this monitoring period. Therefore, this section is not applicable.

E.4.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan

>> No Post Registration Changes have occurred during this monitoring period. Therefore, this section is not applicable.

E.4.5. Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents

>> No Post Registration Changes have occurred during this monitoring period. Therefore, this section is not applicable.

E.4.6. Changes to the project design

>> No Post Registration Changes have occurred during this monitoring period. Therefore, this section is not applicable.

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

>> This section is not applicable.

¹ Other standards, methodologies, methodological tools and guidelines (to be) applied in accordance with the applied(selected) methodologies are collectively referred to as the other (applied) methodological regulatory documents).

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

Means of verification	<p>The verification team was able to confirm that the monitoring plan contained in registered PDD/14/ and MR/2/ is in accordance with the approved methodology applied for the project activity i.e. ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, Version-11/12/.</p> <p>All parameters stated in the registered PDD /14/ and the applied methodology /12/ has been fulfilled in the current monitoring period. The discussion regarding each parameter has been elaborated in the further sections (E.6.1 and E.6.2) of this Verification report.</p>
Findings	No findings have been raised.
Conclusion	As per para 357 and 358 of CDM VVS for project activity version 03.0 /15/, in the opinion of the verification team the monitoring plan of the registered PDD/14/ complies with the monitoring requirement of the applied approved methodology ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, Version-11/12/ in the context of the project activity.

E.6. Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan

E.6.1. Data and parameters fixed ex ante or at renewal of crediting period

Means of verification	As per the registered PDD/14/, the following parameter is listed as fixed ex-ante parameter for estimating emission reductions.		
	Parameter	Value	Verification Assessment
	EF _{grid,OM,y} Operating Margin Emission Factor of Southern Regional Electricity Grid	0.998157 tCO ₂ e/MWh	<p>The Operating Margin emission factor has been calculated as per Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, version 02” as 3-year generation weighted average using data for the years 2005-06 to 2007-08.</p> <p>The data is obtained from “CO2 Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector” version 04 /21/, published by the Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of Power, Government of India.</p> <p>The values are consistent with the registered PDD /14/ and hence accepted by the verification team.</p>
EF _{grid,BM,y} Build Margin Emission Factor of Southern Regional Electricity Grid	0.71332 tCO ₂ e/MWh	<p>The Build Margin emission factor has been calculated as per Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, version 02” using the most recent data available at the time of registration i.e. for the year 2007-08.</p> <p>The data is obtained from “CO2 Baseline Database for Indian</p>	

			Power Sector" version 04 /21/, published by the Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of Power, Government of India. The values are consistent with the registered PDD /14/ and hence accepted by the verification team.
	EF_{grid,CM,y} Combined Margin Emission Factor of Southern Regional Electricity Grid	0.92694 tCO ₂ e/MWh	The combined grid emission factor has been calculated based on the data obtained from "CO ₂ Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector" version 11 /21/, published by the Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of Power, Government of India. The values are consistent with the registered PDD /14/ and hence accepted by the verification team.
Findings	CAR-03 was raised and closed successfully.		
Conclusion	As per para 360 to 361 of CDM VVS for project activity version 03.0 /15/, the assessment team concludes that the ex-ante parameter of the project activity is in accordance with the registered PDD /14/ and meets the requirements of the applied monitoring methodology/12/. The verification team confirms that the value used for grid emission factor (Fixed ex-ante) for calculation of emission reduction is consistent with registered PDD/14/ and correctly applied in MR /2/ and emission reduction spread sheet /4/ and justified.		

E.6.2. Data and parameters monitored

Means of verification	Verification team confirms through remote audit (Microsoft teams application interview) verification and from the document review, the actual monitoring system complies with the monitoring plan mentioned in the registered PDD/14/.		
	During the verification, the monitoring parameter of the registered PDD /14/ have been verified with regard to the appropriateness of the verification method; the correctness of the values applied for ER calculation, the accuracy and applied QA/QC measures. The monitoring parameters have been measured / determined without material misstatements and is in line with all applicable standards and relevant requirements.		
	The assessment for the monitoring parameter is given below:		
	<u>Data/Parameter, Unit:</u> <u>Net Electricity supplied to grid by the project (EG_y) (MWh)</u>		

	<i>Monitoring equipment (type, accuracy class, serial number, calibration frequency, date of last calibration, validity)</i>	<p>The technical details specified in the MR/2/ were found consistent with the actual records and on ground as checked during the remote auditing (video conferencing).</p> <p>The accuracy of the main and the check energy meters are 0.2s as verified during the remote audit, and through the pictures submitted by PP /12/, which is as per the registered PDD/14/ and hence acceptable.</p> <p>Under the current monitoring period, delay in calibration has been observed for which adjustments in the emission reduction calculation have been done as per para 366 of VVS version 03. During the current monitoring period, meter replacement was carried out as follows:</p> <p>Details of meters at 33 kV metering point:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Meter Type</th> <th>Calibration dates</th> <th>Remarks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2"> Type: Main Meter Meter No.: 5389382 Make: L & T Accuracy class: 0.2s </td> <td>16-05-2019</td> <td rowspan="2"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay in calibration observed. The meter was working within permissible limits on 24/07/2020. Hence error observed during calibration of the meter (0.85%) has been applied for period May – July 2020. </td> </tr> <tr> <td>24-07-2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2"> Type: Check Meter Meter No.: 7022924 Make: L & T Accuracy class: 0.2s </td> <td>16-05-2019</td> <td rowspan="2"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The check meter was found to be working outside the permissible range of error 0.389%. The meter was replaced with a new check meter 19008132 on 24/07/2020. </td> </tr> <tr> <td>24-07-2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2"> Type: Check Meter Meter No.: 19008132 Make: L & T Accuracy class: 0.2s </td> <td>-</td> <td rowspan="2"> The meter was replaced with 20006010 on 23/11/2020. Calibration delayed by approx. two months. </td> </tr> <tr> <td>24-07-2020</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Details of bulk meter at 220 kV Substation:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Meter Type</th> <th>Calibration dates</th> <th>Remarks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> </tbody> </table>			Meter Type	Calibration dates	Remarks	Type: Main Meter Meter No.: 5389382 Make: L & T Accuracy class: 0.2s	16-05-2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay in calibration observed. The meter was working within permissible limits on 24/07/2020. Hence error observed during calibration of the meter (0.85%) has been applied for period May – July 2020. 	24-07-2020	Type: Check Meter Meter No.: 7022924 Make: L & T Accuracy class: 0.2s	16-05-2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The check meter was found to be working outside the permissible range of error 0.389%. The meter was replaced with a new check meter 19008132 on 24/07/2020. 	24-07-2020	Type: Check Meter Meter No.: 19008132 Make: L & T Accuracy class: 0.2s	-	The meter was replaced with 20006010 on 23/11/2020. Calibration delayed by approx. two months.	24-07-2020	Meter Type	Calibration dates	Remarks
		Meter Type	Calibration dates	Remarks																		
		Type: Main Meter Meter No.: 5389382 Make: L & T Accuracy class: 0.2s	16-05-2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay in calibration observed. The meter was working within permissible limits on 24/07/2020. Hence error observed during calibration of the meter (0.85%) has been applied for period May – July 2020. 																		
			24-07-2020																			
Type: Check Meter Meter No.: 7022924 Make: L & T Accuracy class: 0.2s	16-05-2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The check meter was found to be working outside the permissible range of error 0.389%. The meter was replaced with a new check meter 19008132 on 24/07/2020. 																				
	24-07-2020																					
Type: Check Meter Meter No.: 19008132 Make: L & T Accuracy class: 0.2s	-	The meter was replaced with 20006010 on 23/11/2020. Calibration delayed by approx. two months.																				
	24-07-2020																					
Meter Type	Calibration dates	Remarks																				

		Type: Main Meter Meter No.: 7022908 Make: L & T Accuracy class: 0.2s	09-09-2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The meter was replaced with 20005931 on 23/11/2020.• Delay in calibration observed.• Calibration report for year 2019-20 not traceable.	
			23-11-2020	Hence maximum permissible error of the meter (0.2s) has been applied for period January – November 2020.	
		Type: Main Meter Meter No.: 20005931 Make: L & T Accuracy class: 0.2s	-	This meter was installed on 23/11/2020.	
			23-11-2020		
		Type: Check Meter Meter No.: 7022915 Make: L & T Accuracy class: 0.2s	09-09-2019	The meter was replaced with 20006010 on 23/11/2020. Calibration delayed by approx. two months. Error applied for the gap as per the CDM PS for project activities.	
			23-11-2020		
		Type: Check Meter Meter No.: 20006010 Make: L & T Accuracy class: 0.2s	-	This meter was installed on 23/11/2020.	
			23-11-2020		
		The Calibration of all the meters have been done by HESCOM /6/ which is acceptable to the verification team. The calibration certificates /6/ are verified and found that the error in calibration test apart from the ones mentioned in the above table is within the accuracy class of the respective meter.			
		Measuring/Reading / Recording frequency	Net electricity exported by the project activity to the grid is monitored continuously and recorded on monthly basis in the form of Monthly Form B /8/. The measuring and recording frequency is in compliance with the registered PDD /14/ and the applied methodology /12/.		
		Data collection (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and	Net electricity exported by the project activity to the grid is calculated as = Electricity export (G _{pe}) – 115% Electricity import (G _{pi}) – Transmission loss (L _i). The details of these parameters are provided in tables below. The verification team has verified the calculation method with the PPA /7/ and confirms it to be accurate and in line with the		

	<i>reporting)</i>	<p>registered PDD /14/.</p> <p>The net electricity exported by the project activity is monitored continuously and reported on monthly basis in form of Monthly Form B /8/.</p> <p>The details of roles and responsibilities for the monitoring is provided in the MR/2/. The plant personnel were interviewed during remote auditing and the assessment team confirms that the details as provided are followed at site and are effective reliable for the accounting of emission reductions.</p> <p>The verification team has verified all the Form B /08/ for this monitoring period and confirms that the same values are applied in the ER calculation sheet /4/.</p>								
	<i>Verified value</i>	40,555.783 MWh								
	<i>Cross checks</i>	The verification team has verified all the Form B /8/ for this monitoring period and confirms that the same values are applied in the ER calculation sheet /4/. The monthly reported data (under ER sheet /4/) was also cross-checked (as prescribed in the registered PDD/14/) with the invoices /9/ and conservative data was taken for the emission reduction calculation.								
	<i>QA/QC procedures applied</i>	The energy meters were calibrated by state utility i.e. HESCOM /6/.								
	<p><u>Data/Parameter, Unit:</u></p> <p><u>Electricity Export recorded at the meter(s) connected 39 machines of the project activity (Gp_e) (MWh)</u></p>									
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Discussion and verification assessment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Purpose of data</i></td> <td>Baseline Emissions</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Monitoring equipment (type, accuracy class, serial number, calibration frequency, date of last calibration, validity)</i></td> <td> <p>The technical details specified in the MR/2/ were found consistent with the actual records and on ground as checked during the remote auditing (video conferencing).</p> <p>The accuracy of the main and the check energy meters are 0.2s as verified during the remote audit, and through the pictures submitted by PP /12/, which is as per the registered PDD/14/ and hence acceptable.</p> <p>Under the current monitoring period, delay in calibration has been observed for which adjustments in the emission reduction calculation have been done as per para 366 of VVS version 03. During the current monitoring period, meter replacement was carried out. The details of calibration and meter change are given in the EG_y parameter table above.</p> <p>The Calibration of all the meters have been done by HESCOM /6/ which is acceptable to the verification team. The calibration certificates /6/ are verified and found that the error in calibration test apart from the ones mentioned in the above table is within the accuracy class of the respective meter.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Measuring/Reading / Recording frequency</i></td> <td> <p>Electricity exported by the project activity to the grid is monitored continuously and recorded on monthly basis in the form of Monthly Form B /8/.</p> <p>The measuring and recording frequency is in compliance with the registered PDD /14/ and the applied methodology /12/.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Discussion and verification assessment	<i>Purpose of data</i>	Baseline Emissions	<i>Monitoring equipment (type, accuracy class, serial number, calibration frequency, date of last calibration, validity)</i>	<p>The technical details specified in the MR/2/ were found consistent with the actual records and on ground as checked during the remote auditing (video conferencing).</p> <p>The accuracy of the main and the check energy meters are 0.2s as verified during the remote audit, and through the pictures submitted by PP /12/, which is as per the registered PDD/14/ and hence acceptable.</p> <p>Under the current monitoring period, delay in calibration has been observed for which adjustments in the emission reduction calculation have been done as per para 366 of VVS version 03. During the current monitoring period, meter replacement was carried out. The details of calibration and meter change are given in the EG_y parameter table above.</p> <p>The Calibration of all the meters have been done by HESCOM /6/ which is acceptable to the verification team. The calibration certificates /6/ are verified and found that the error in calibration test apart from the ones mentioned in the above table is within the accuracy class of the respective meter.</p>	<i>Measuring/Reading / Recording frequency</i>	<p>Electricity exported by the project activity to the grid is monitored continuously and recorded on monthly basis in the form of Monthly Form B /8/.</p> <p>The measuring and recording frequency is in compliance with the registered PDD /14/ and the applied methodology /12/.</p>
	Discussion and verification assessment									
<i>Purpose of data</i>	Baseline Emissions									
<i>Monitoring equipment (type, accuracy class, serial number, calibration frequency, date of last calibration, validity)</i>	<p>The technical details specified in the MR/2/ were found consistent with the actual records and on ground as checked during the remote auditing (video conferencing).</p> <p>The accuracy of the main and the check energy meters are 0.2s as verified during the remote audit, and through the pictures submitted by PP /12/, which is as per the registered PDD/14/ and hence acceptable.</p> <p>Under the current monitoring period, delay in calibration has been observed for which adjustments in the emission reduction calculation have been done as per para 366 of VVS version 03. During the current monitoring period, meter replacement was carried out. The details of calibration and meter change are given in the EG_y parameter table above.</p> <p>The Calibration of all the meters have been done by HESCOM /6/ which is acceptable to the verification team. The calibration certificates /6/ are verified and found that the error in calibration test apart from the ones mentioned in the above table is within the accuracy class of the respective meter.</p>									
<i>Measuring/Reading / Recording frequency</i>	<p>Electricity exported by the project activity to the grid is monitored continuously and recorded on monthly basis in the form of Monthly Form B /8/.</p> <p>The measuring and recording frequency is in compliance with the registered PDD /14/ and the applied methodology /12/.</p>									

	<i>Data collection (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting)</i>	<p>Electricity exported by the project activity to the grid is a Measured parameter. It is monitored continuously and reported on monthly basis in form of Monthly Form B/8/.</p> <p>The details of roles and responsibilities for the monitoring is provided in the MR/2/. The plant personnel were interviewed during remote auditing and the assessment team confirms that the details as provided are followed at site and are effective reliable for the accounting of emission reductions.</p> <p>The verification team has verified all the Form B /08/ for this monitoring period and confirms that the same values are applied in the ER calculation sheet /4/.</p>										
	<i>Verified value</i>	41,001.795 MWh										
	<i>Cross checks</i>	The verification team has verified all the Form B /8/ for this monitoring period and confirms that the same values are applied in the ER calculation sheet /4/. The monthly reported data (under ER sheet /4/) was also cross-checked (as prescribed in the registered PDD/14/) with the invoices /9/ and conservative data was taken for the emission reduction calculation.										
	<i>QA/QC procedures applied</i>	The energy meters were calibrated by state utility i.e. HESCOM /11/.										
	<p><u>Data/Parameter, Unit:</u> <u>Electricity Import recorded at the meter(s) connected 39 machines of the project activity (Gp_i) (MWh)</u></p>											
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Discussion and verification assessment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Purpose of data</i></td> <td>Baseline Emissions</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Monitoring equipment (type, accuracy class, serial number, calibration frequency, date of last calibration, validity)</i></td> <td> <p>The technical details specified in the MR/2/ were found consistent with the actual records and on ground as checked during the remote auditing (video conferencing).</p> <p>The accuracy of the main and the check energy meters are 0.2s as verified during the remote audit, and through the pictures submitted by PP /12/, which is as per the registered PDD/14/ and hence acceptable.</p> <p>Under the current monitoring period, delay in calibration has been observed for which adjustments in the emission reduction calculation have been done as per para 366 of VVS version 03. During the current monitoring period, meter replacement was carried out. The details of calibration and meter change are given in the EG_y parameter table above.</p> <p>The Calibration of all the meters have been done by HESCOM /11/ which is acceptable to the verification team. The calibration certificates /11/ are verified and found that the error in calibration test apart from the ones mentioned in the above table is within the accuracy class of the respective meter.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Measuring/Reading / Recording frequency</i></td> <td> <p>Electricity imported by the project activity to the grid is monitored continuously and recorded on monthly basis in the form of Monthly Form B /8/.</p> <p>The measuring and recording frequency is in compliance with the registered PDD /14/ and the applied methodology /12/.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Data collection</i></td> <td>Electricity imported by the project activity to the grid is a</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Discussion and verification assessment	<i>Purpose of data</i>	Baseline Emissions	<i>Monitoring equipment (type, accuracy class, serial number, calibration frequency, date of last calibration, validity)</i>	<p>The technical details specified in the MR/2/ were found consistent with the actual records and on ground as checked during the remote auditing (video conferencing).</p> <p>The accuracy of the main and the check energy meters are 0.2s as verified during the remote audit, and through the pictures submitted by PP /12/, which is as per the registered PDD/14/ and hence acceptable.</p> <p>Under the current monitoring period, delay in calibration has been observed for which adjustments in the emission reduction calculation have been done as per para 366 of VVS version 03. During the current monitoring period, meter replacement was carried out. The details of calibration and meter change are given in the EG_y parameter table above.</p> <p>The Calibration of all the meters have been done by HESCOM /11/ which is acceptable to the verification team. The calibration certificates /11/ are verified and found that the error in calibration test apart from the ones mentioned in the above table is within the accuracy class of the respective meter.</p>	<i>Measuring/Reading / Recording frequency</i>	<p>Electricity imported by the project activity to the grid is monitored continuously and recorded on monthly basis in the form of Monthly Form B /8/.</p> <p>The measuring and recording frequency is in compliance with the registered PDD /14/ and the applied methodology /12/.</p>	<i>Data collection</i>	Electricity imported by the project activity to the grid is a
	Discussion and verification assessment											
<i>Purpose of data</i>	Baseline Emissions											
<i>Monitoring equipment (type, accuracy class, serial number, calibration frequency, date of last calibration, validity)</i>	<p>The technical details specified in the MR/2/ were found consistent with the actual records and on ground as checked during the remote auditing (video conferencing).</p> <p>The accuracy of the main and the check energy meters are 0.2s as verified during the remote audit, and through the pictures submitted by PP /12/, which is as per the registered PDD/14/ and hence acceptable.</p> <p>Under the current monitoring period, delay in calibration has been observed for which adjustments in the emission reduction calculation have been done as per para 366 of VVS version 03. During the current monitoring period, meter replacement was carried out. The details of calibration and meter change are given in the EG_y parameter table above.</p> <p>The Calibration of all the meters have been done by HESCOM /11/ which is acceptable to the verification team. The calibration certificates /11/ are verified and found that the error in calibration test apart from the ones mentioned in the above table is within the accuracy class of the respective meter.</p>											
<i>Measuring/Reading / Recording frequency</i>	<p>Electricity imported by the project activity to the grid is monitored continuously and recorded on monthly basis in the form of Monthly Form B /8/.</p> <p>The measuring and recording frequency is in compliance with the registered PDD /14/ and the applied methodology /12/.</p>											
<i>Data collection</i>	Electricity imported by the project activity to the grid is a											

	<i>(from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting)</i>	<p>Measured parameter. It is monitored continuously and reported on monthly basis in form of Monthly Form B /8/.</p> <p>The details of roles and responsibilities for the monitoring is provided in the MR/2/. The plant personnel were interviewed during remote auditing and the assessment team confirms that the details as provided are followed at site and are effective reliable for the accounting of emission reductions.</p> <p>The verification team has verified all the Form B/08/ for this monitoring period and confirms that the same values are applied in the ER calculation sheet /4/.</p>
	<i>Verified value</i>	47.188 MWh
	<i>Cross checks</i>	The verification team has verified all the Form B /8/ for this monitoring period. The monthly reported data (under ER sheet /4/) was also cross-checked (as prescribed in the registered PDD/14/) with the invoices /9/ and conservative data was taken for the emission reduction calculation. The import values for the ER calculation were taken from invoices since invoice consists of 115% import values as per the formula used for calculation of EG_y ; whereas Form B consist of only import values.
	<i>QA/QC procedures applied</i>	The energy meters were calibrated by state utility i.e. HESCOM /11/.
<p><u>Data/Parameter, Unit:</u> <u>Transmission loss between the metering point for the project activity feeding the pooling substation of Enercon and the metering point at EB Substation (L_i) (MWh)</u></p>		
		Discussion and verification assessment
<i>Purpose of data</i>		Baseline Emissions
<i>Monitoring equipment (type, accuracy class, serial number, calibration frequency, date of last calibration, validity)</i>		<p>The technical details specified in the MR/2/ were found consistent with the actual records and on ground as checked during the remote auditing (video conferencing).</p> <p>The accuracy of the main and the check energy meters are 0.2s as verified during the remote audit, and through the pictures submitted by PP /12/, which is as per the registered PDD/14/ and hence acceptable.</p> <p>Under the current monitoring period, delay in calibration has been observed for which adjustments in the emission reduction calculation have been done as per para 366 of VVS version 03. During the current monitoring period, meter replacement was carried out. The details of calibration and meter change are given in the EG_y parameter table above.</p> <p>The Calibration of all the meters have been done by HESCOM /11/ which is acceptable to the verification team. The calibration certificates /11/ are verified and found that the error in calibration test apart from the ones mentioned in the above table is within the accuracy class of the respective meter.</p>
<i>Measuring/Reading / Recording frequency</i>		<p>Transmission loss for the project activity to the grid is recorded on monthly basis in the form of Monthly Form B /8/.</p> <p>The recording frequency is in compliance with the registered PDD /14/ and the applied methodology /12/.</p>

	<i>Data collection (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting)</i>	<p>Transmission loss for the project activity to the grid is a Calculated parameter. It is recorded on monthly basis in form of Monthly Form B /8/.</p> <p>The details of roles and responsibilities for the monitoring is provided in the MR/2/. The plant personnel were interviewed during remote auditing and the assessment team confirms that the details as provided are followed at site and are effective reliable for the accounting of emission reductions.</p> <p>The verification team has verified all the Form B/08/ for this monitoring period and confirms that the same values are applied in the ER calculation sheet /4/.</p>
	<i>Verified value</i>	398.824 MWh
	<i>Cross checks</i>	The verification team has verified all the Form B /8/ for this monitoring period with the ER sheet /4/. The monthly reported data (under ER sheet /4/) was also cross-checked (as prescribed in the registered PDD/14/) with the invoices /9/ and conservative data was taken for the emission reduction calculation.
	<i>QA/QC procedures applied</i>	The energy meters were calibrated by state utility i.e. HESCOM /11/.
Findings	CAR-02 and CAR-03 were raised and closed successfully.	
Conclusion	As per para 360 to 361 of CDM VVS for project activity version 03.0 /16/, the assessment team concludes that the monitoring of the project activity is being carried out in accordance with the registered monitoring plan and meets the requirements of the applied monitoring methodology. The adequacy and compliance of the registered monitoring plan in the MR can be concluded to be conforming. The flow of the information from the point of generation up to reporting has been reviewed and found to be correct and appropriate meeting the requirements of the applied methodology/12/.	

E.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan

Means of verification	No sampling plan applied for the project activity. Therefore, this section is not applicable.
Findings	-
Conclusion	Not applicable.

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

Means of verification	Verification team has checked whether the calibration of the measuring equipment that has an impact on the claimed GHG emission reductions is conducted by the PP at a frequency specified in the monitoring plan/14/. There are three monitoring parameters 1. EG _y 2. Gp _e 3. Gp _i 4. L _i Out of these monitoring parameters, two are monitored i.e. (Gp _e and Gp _i) and two are calculated i.e. (EG _y and L _i) is calculated. During review of calibration records, the verification team observed delay in calibration, error outside maximum permissible limit in the calibration report and untraceability of some calibration reports for the current monitoring period. The details of these non-compliances along with details of the energy meters are given in the below table:				
	Monitoring Equipment	Main Meter (at 33kV)	Check Meter (at 33kV)	Main Meter (at 220kV)	Check Meter (at 220kV)
	Function:	Measuring energy export to grid and import from grid	Measuring energy export to grid and import from grid	Measuring transmission loss between pooling and EB substation	Measuring transmission loss between pooling and EB substation
	Ownership:	DISCOM meter	DISCOM meter	DISCOM meter	DISCOM meter
	Location:	CEB substation	CEB Substation	Substation	
	Parameter:	EG _y , Gp _e and Gp _i	EG _y , Gp _e and Gp _i (only when main meter fails)	L _i	L _i (only when main meter fails)
	Type:	L&T	L&T	L&T	L&T
	Serial number:	5389382	7022924, 19008132	7022908, 20005931	7022915, 20006010
	Accuracy:	0.2s	0.2s	0.2s	0.2s
	calibration dates:	16/05/2019, 24/07/2020	16/05/2019, 24/07/2020	09/09/2019, 23/11/2020	09/09/2019, 23/11/2020
	Name of the certifier	HESCOM (State government authority)	HESCOM (State government authority)	HESCOM (State government authority)	HESCOM (State government authority)
	Validity of calibration	15/05/2019, 23/07/2021	15/05/2019, 23/07/2021	08/09/2019, 22/11/2021	08/09/2019, 22/11/2021
	Frequency of calibration	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual
	Details of non-compliances	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Delay in calibration observed.• The meter had error of 0.85% on 05/06/2020• The meter was working within permissible limits on 24/07/2020• Hence error	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The check meter was found to be working outside the permissible range of error 0.389%.• The meter was replaced with a	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The meter was replaced with 20005931 on 23/11/2020.• Delay in calibration observed.• Calibration report for year 2019-20 not traceable. <p>Hence maximum permissible error of the meter (0.2s) has been applied</p>	<p>The meter was replaced with 20006010 on 23/11/2020. Calibration delayed by approx. two months.</p>

		observed during calibration of the meter (0.85%) has been applied for period May – July 2020.	new check meter 19008132 on 24/07/2020.	for period January – November 2020.	
	<p>The verification team confirms that the error has been applied in a conservative manner as per para 367 of the VVS for PA, version 03/15/. The Calibration performance was checked from the calibration reports /06/ and found that the meters were within the respective accuracy level as verified from the calibration results apart from those mentioned in the table above.</p> <p>Calibration frequency: Once in a year as per registered PDD /14/. The calibration validity of the energy meters/06/ during this monitoring period were verified from the corresponding calibration certificates/06/. Error was applied by the PP for the calibration gap in line with the requirements of CDM PS, version 03 for project activities.</p> <p>The monitoring equipment's have been installed in the project activity according to registered monitoring plan /14/.</p>				
Findings	CL 03 was raised and closed satisfactorily. Refer to appendix 4 for further details.				
Conclusion	The Verification team confirms that the error has been applied in a conservative manner as per para 367 of the VVS for PA, version 03/15/.				

E.8. Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals

E.8.1. Calculation of baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	<p>The calculation, applied formulae and the method for calculation of baseline emissions are in accordance with the registered PDD /14/ and are in line with the requirements of the applied methodology (ACM0002 Version 11 /12/). The formulae and the methods referred in the MR /02/ and the emission reduction calculation spread sheet/04/ for estimation of emission reduction complies with the corresponding formulae and methods in the registered PDD /14/.</p> <p>The ex-ante and validated fixed value of grid emission factor i.e. The combined margin of the emission factor, (0.92694 tCO₂e/MWh, registered PDD /14/) is taken into account for the calculation of baseline emissions.</p> <p>The assessment of data and the calculation of GHG emission reduction in the MR /02/ and the emission reduction excel sheet /04/ have been verified based on the monthly electricity export, import and transmission loss data /08/.</p> <p>As per registered PDD /14/, the baseline emissions of the project is calculated from net electricity supplied to grid (EG_y) and combined margin emission factor of grid (EF_{grid,CM,y}) as follows:</p> $BE_y = EG_y * EF_{grid,CM,y}$ <p>Where:</p> <p>BE_y = Baseline emissions in year y (tCO₂e/y)</p> <p>EG_y = Net Electricity supplied to grid by the project (MWh)</p> <p>EF_{grid,CM,y} = Combined Margin Emission Factor of Southern Regional Electricity Grid calculated using the latest version of the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" (tCO₂/MWh)</p> <p>Where</p> $EG_y (EG_{PJ,y}) = G_{pe} - 115\%G_{pi} - L_i$
------------------------------	---

	Gp _e	=	Electricity Export recorded at the meter(s) connected 39 machines of the project activity.
	Gp _i	=	Electricity Import recorded at the meter(s) connected 39 machines of the project activity.
	L _i	=	Transmission loss between the metering point for the project activity feeding the pooling substation of Enercon and the metering point at EB Substation.
	<p>The electricity export, import and transmission loss values are verified from Form B /08/ which is signed by HESCOM representative and found that the value considered for the ER calculation is correct. The values of Electricity export, import and transmission loss are cross verified from the monthly invoices /09/.</p> <p>The calculation is provided in the emission reduction calculation sheet. The ER sheet is verified and found that the calculation of EG_y is correct.</p>		
	Parameter	Description	Value for this Monitoring period
	Gp _e	Electricity Export recorded at the meter(s) connected 39 machines of the project activity.	41,001.795 MWh
	Gp _i	Electricity Import recorded at the meter(s) connected 39 machines of the project activity.	47.188 MWh
	L _i	Transmission loss between the metering point for the project activity feeding the pooling substation of Enercon and the metering point at EB Substation.	398.824 MWh
	EG _y	Net Electricity supplied to grid by the project	40,555.783 MWh
	EF _{grid,CM,y}	Combined Margin Emission Factor of Southern Regional Electricity Grid calculated using the latest version of the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" (tCO ₂ /MWh)	0.92694 tCO ₂ /MWh
	BE _y	Baseline emissions in year y (tCO _{2e} /y)	37,592 tCO ₂
Hence, baseline emission for this monitoring period is 37,592 tCO _{2e} (Rounded down).			
Findings	CL-02, CL-04 and CAR-04 were raised and closed successfully. Refer Appendix 4 for further details.		
Conclusion	<p>As per para 372 and 373 of CDM VVS for project activity version 03.0 /15/, Verification team concludes that the calculation provided in the monitoring report /02/ and emission reduction spread sheet /04/ are complete and reflect all the requirements of the registered PDD/14/ and:</p> <p>a) All the monitored data pertaining to baseline calculation as required by the registered PDD /14/ was available to PP, the same has been verified by the verification team.</p> <p>b) All the formula used for the baseline, was in line to the registered PDD /14/.</p> <p>c) The ex-ante emission factors correctly sourced from the registered PDD /14/ and was found to be appropriate and justified.</p>		

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

Means of verification	As per registered PDD /14/ and applied methodology /12/, project emission has been considered as zero. Hence the project emission is zero (PE _y = 0).
Findings	No findings raised.
Conclusion	Hence the project emission is zero (PE _y = 0).

E.8.3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions

Means of verification	Not applicable in accordance with applied methodology/16/ and registered PDD /14/.
Findings	No findings raised.
Conclusion	NA

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

Means of verification	<p>As per registered PDD/14/, the emission reductions (ER_y) by the project activity during the monitoring period are equal to the baseline emission less project emission and leakage emission.</p> <p>Emission Reduction (ER) = Baseline emission – Project emission – Leakage emission</p> <p>(No project and leakage emissions have been considered for the project activity.)</p> <p>$ER_y = BE_y = 37,592 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$</p> <p>The calculation provided in the ER sheet and MR was assessed to be appropriate by the verification team.</p> <p>The verification team confirms that a complete set of data for this monitoring period is available to verify the emission reduction calculation, and the same was found in accordance with the registered PDD/14/.</p> <p>The net electricity supplied to the grid has been sourced from the Form B/8/, the same forms the basis of emission reduction calculation. The verification team has verified the net electricity generation for respective months by the project activity and found the values used are consistent between the Form B /8/ and ER sheet /4/. The same has been checked from the invoices /9/ raised by the project proponent to HESCOM /10/.</p> <p>No lack of evidence and missing data were detected during this monitoring period. The verification team confirms that the emission reductions are real and measurable.</p> <p>No reporting risks have been identified for the data reported.</p> <p>All the monitored data are archived in electronic form. The data will be kept for the whole crediting period and 2 years after the last crediting period thereby meeting the requirement of the PDD. The verification team has checked and confirms that all the meters are calibrated. Thus, concludes no material risks in the claimed emission reduction for the applied period.</p>
Findings	CL-02, CL-04 and CAR-04 were raised and closed successfully. Refer Appendix 4 for further details.
Conclusion	<p>As per para 372 and 373 of CDM VVS for project activity version 03.0/16/, Verification team concludes that the calculation provided in the monitoring report/2/, and emission reduction spread sheet/4/ are complete and reflect all the requirements of the registered PDD /14/ and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) All the monitored data as required by the registered monitoring plan was available to PP, the same has been verified by the verification team. b) All the formula used for the baseline, leakage and project emissions were in line to the registered PDD /14/. <p>The ex-ante emission factors correctly sourced from the registered PDD/14/ and was found to be appropriate and justified.</p>

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

Means of verification	The MR includes a comparison of the calculated actual emission reductions with the ex-ante calculated values in the registered PDD /14/.
------------------------------	--

	Estimated Reduction as per Registered PDD:	64,095 tCO ₂ e /14/
	Emission per Registered PDD:	
	Actual Reduction for the Monitoring Period	37,592 tCO ₂ e/02/
	In summary, verification team confirms that the actual emission reduction is lower than the estimate of the registered PDD /14/ for the current monitoring period.	
Findings	No findings raised.	
Conclusion	In summary, verification team confirms that the actual emission reduction is lower than the estimate of the registered PDD /14/ for the current monitoring period. Verification team confirms that the comparison for the estimated and actual emission reduction for this monitoring period is correctly calculated and reported.	

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

Means of verification	The actual emission reductions are lower than the estimated emission reductions based on the registered PDD /14/.
Findings	No findings raised.
Conclusion	The ERs achieved during the monitoring period are lower than the ERs estimated in the registered PDD /14/.

E.8.7. Actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks during the first commitment period and the period from 1 January 2013 onwards

Means of verification	The complete monitoring period falls after 01 January 2013 and therefore the total ERs during the monitoring period i.e. 01/01/2020 - 31/12/2020 (including both the days) pertains to the 2 nd commitment period. Total 37,592 tCO ₂ e CERs are verified during this monitoring period.
Findings	No findings raised.
Conclusion	Total 37,592 tCO ₂ e CERs verified pertains to the period from 1 January 2013 onwards.

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

Means of verification	Not applicable to the proposed project activity.
Findings	Not applicable to the proposed project activity.
Conclusion	Not applicable to the proposed project activity.

E.10. Global stakeholder consultation

Means of verification	Not applicable since it is the 4 th monitoring period.
Findings	Refer above.
Conclusion	Refer above.

SECTION F. Internal quality control

>>

The draft verification report prepared by team leader is reviewed by an independent technical reviewer (having competence of relevant technical area himself/herself or through an independent technical area expert) to confirm the internal procedures established by KBS are duly followed and the verification report/opinion is reached in an objective manner and complies with the applicable CDM requirements.

The independent technical reviewer may approve or reject the draft verification report. The findings may be identified even at this stage, which needs to be satisfactorily resolved, before the request for issuance is submitted to UNFCCC. The final decision is taken by the Manager Technical and Certification. The technical reviewer and Manager T&C can be same person.

The final decision is authorized by Managing Director, KBS once the report is approved by the Manager T&C.

SECTION G. Verification opinion

>>

The verification team confirms that the the evidence is of sufficient quantity, appropriate quality and reliable. The reported values, notation, units and sources in the monitoring report for all the monitoring parameters have been cross checked with the emission reduction sheet and monitoring report. During the course of verification, the data submitted by PP was cross verified with the values mentioned in the emission reduction sheet and monitoring report. The procedure for data monitoring, recording, transfer and compilation was also verified and found in compliance with the monitoring plan as mentioned in the registered PDD /14/.

Evidences (Documents/interview/remote audit) referred for verification of individual monitoring parameter and fixed parameters are defined in section E.6 above. It is confirmed by the assessment team that the reported emission reductions have been conservatively calculated. A list of referred documents for verification is also included in Appendix 3 of this report.

Based on the information seen and evaluated we confirm that the implementation of the project has resulted in 37,592 tCO_{2e} emission reductions during period from 01/01/2020-31/12/2020 (Including both the days).

SECTION H. Certification statement

>>

KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd. has been contracted by Generacion Eolica India Limited to undertake independent verification and certification for the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions reported from the project GEI Wind Power Project in Karnataka, India, UNFCCC Ref. No. 4144 for the monitoring period 01/01/2020-31/12/2020 in the Monitoring Report Version 1 (first submission) dated 01/09/2021.

The verification is based on the validated PDD and the monitoring report for this project. Our verification approach was based on the requirements as defined under the Kyoto Protocol, Marrakech accord, as well as those defined by the CDM Executive Board.

The management of the Generacion Eolica India Limited is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions on the basis set out within the project Final Monitoring Report, version 1.2 dated 05/11/2021. The calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project is the responsibility of the management of the Generacion Eolica India Limited. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures are in accordance with the Monitoring Report Version 1.2 dated 05/11/2021.

It is our responsibility to express an independent GHG verification opinion on the GHG emissions and on the calculation of GHG emission reductions from the project for the period 01/01/2020-31/12/2020 based on the reported emission reductions in the Final Monitoring Report Version 1.2 dated 05/11/2021 for the same period.

Based on an understanding of the risks associated with reporting GHG emissions data and the controls in place to mitigate these, KBS planned and performed our work to obtain the information and explanations that we considered necessary to provide sufficient evidence for us to give reasonable assurance that this reported amount of GHG emission reductions for the period is fairly stated.

KBS confirms the following;

Reporting period: From 01/01/2020-31/12/2020

Verified and certified emission in the above reporting period:

	Amount	Unit
Baseline emissions (BE)	37, 592	tCO _{2e}
Project emissions (PE)	0	tCO _{2e}
Leakage emissions (LE)	0	tCO _{2e}
Total CERs (01/01/2020-31/12/2020)	37, 592	tCO _{2e}

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
BE	Baseline Emissions
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CDM EB	CDM Executive Board
CERs	Certified Emission Reductions
CL	Clarification Request
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
COP	Conference of Parties
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EF	Emission Factor
ERs	Emission Reductions
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHGs	Greenhouse Gas(es)
HESCOM	Hubli Electricity Supply Company Limited
kV	Kilo Volt
KP	Kyoto Protocol
KPTCL	Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Limited
kWh	Kilo Watt Hour
LE	Leakage Emissions
MR	Monitoring Report
MP	Monitoring Plan
MWh	Mega Watt Hour
PE	Project Emissions
PDD	Project Design Document
PS	Project Standard
PCP	Project Cycle Procedure
PP	Project Participant
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation & Verification Standard

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

Personnel Name:		Sanjay Kandari	
Qualified to work as:			
Team Leader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Technical Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Validator/Verifier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Technical Reviewer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Expert (India)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Area(s) of Technical Expertise			
Sectoral Scope		Technical Area	
Energy Industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)		TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation from fossil fuels and biomass including thermal electricity from solar	

Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	TA 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energy sources
Energy demand	TA 3.1. Energy Demand
Waste Handling and Disposal	TA 13.1 Waste Handling and Disposal TA 13.2 Manure
Approved by (Manager C & T)	Akhilesh Joshi
Approval date:	11/12/2015

Personnel Name:	Sayali A. kumar		
Qualified to work as:			
Team Leader	<input type="checkbox"/>	Technical Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Validator/Verifier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial Expert	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Reviewer	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local Expert (India)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Area(s) of Technical Expertise			
Sectoral Scope	Technical Area		
Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	TA 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energy sources		
Approved by (Manager C & T)	Shikha Sharma		
Approval date:	17/03/2021		

Personnel Name:	Anjana Sharma		
Qualified to work as:			
Team Leader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Technical Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Validator/Verifier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Technical Reviewer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Expert (India)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Area(s) of Technical Expertise			
Sectoral Scope	Technical Area		
SS: 01: Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation from fossil fuels and biomass including thermal electricity from solar		
	TA 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energy sources		
SS 3: Energy demand	TA 3.1. Energy Demand		
SS 5: Chemical industry	TA 5.1 Chemical industry		
SS 12: Solvents use	TA 12.1 Chemical industry		
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1 Waste Handling and Disposal		
	TA 13.2 Manure		
Approved by (Manager C & T)	Shikha Sharma		
Approval date:	05/08/2021		

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1.	Project participant	Webhosted monitoring report	Version 1.0, dated 01/09/2021 (published)	Project participant
2.	Project participant	Final Monitoring report	Version 1.2 dated 05/11/2021 (final)	Project participant
3.	Project participant	Draft ER calculation sheet	Corresponding to hosted	Project participant
4.	Project participant	Final ER calculation sheet	Corresponding to final MR version	Project participant
5.	KPTCL	Commissioning certificates of the project activity	Dated 30/09/2008 (3.2MW), 18/12/2007 (3.2MW), 12/09/2008 (3.2 MW), 17/03/2008 (4.8MW), 26/06/2008 (6.4 MW), 08/07/2008 (8MW), 13/10/2008 (2.4 MW)	Project participant
6.	HESCOM	Calibration Reports of Energy meters corresponding to this monitoring period (01/01/2020-31/12/2020)		Project participant
7.	Project participant	Operation and management agreement	-	Project participant
		Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) with CEB	Dated 22/12/2007	
8.	KPTCL	Electricity export, import and transmission loss data by the project activity certified by KPTCL for the monitoring period (01/01/2020-31/12/2020) – FORM B	-	Project participant
9.	Project participant	Monthly invoices corresponding to FORM B for the monitoring period (01/01/2020-31/12/2020)	-	Project participant
10.	Enercon	Technical specification of the WTG/meters installed under the project activity, Name plates and photographs	-	Project participant
11.	Project participant	Photographic evidences of meters, turbines etc.	-	Project participant
12.	UNFCCC	Approved monitoring methodology: ACM0002 ver. 11 - Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources	Version 11	UNFCCC
		Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system	Version 02	
		Tool for the demonstration and		

		assessment of additionality	Version 5.2	
13.	Project participant	Training records	-	Project participant
14.	UNFCCC/PP	Registered Documents 1. Registered PDD for the version 07, dated 25/02/2011 2. Validation Opinion by TUV NORD dated 09/03/2011 3. Previous Verification and Certification Report by LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) dated 09/10/2020	-	UNFCCC
15.	UNFCCC	CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities, Version 03.0 CDM Project Standard for project activities, Version 03.0 CDM project cycle procedure for project activities, Version 03.0	-	UNFCCC
16.	UNFCCC	CDM-MR-FORM - Monitoring report form for CDM project activity, Version 09.0: https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/PDDs_Forms/index.html	-	UNFCCC
17.	UNFCCC	Glossary "CDM terms"	Version 10	Publicly available
18.	Project participant	Organizational structure	-	Project participant
19.	Project participant	Single line diagram	-	Project participant
20.	UNFCCC Secretariat	CDM Executive Board announcement to relax mandatory site visits by designated operational entities (DOEs) for an extended period of 24 June to 31 December 2020 due to the continuing COVID-19 pandemic	-	UNFCCC Secretariat
21.	CEA	CEA CO ₂ Baseline Database, Version 4	-	Publicly available

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

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

No FARs raised from validation and previous verification

FAR ID	xx	Section no.	E.2	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR				
Project participant response				Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by project participant				
DOE assessment				Date: DD/MM/YYYY

Table 2. CL from this verification

CL ID	01	Section no.	E.1	Date: 06/10/2021
Description of CL				
Since L_i is calculated as per the formula given in section C of MR, PP has mentioned it as measured, the parameter is not measured rather calculated. Therefore the description shall be clarified.				
Project participant response				Date: 10/10/2021
Corrected as 'calculated'.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
MR Version 1.1				
DOE assessment				Date: 19/10/2021
The MR is revised appropriately. Hence CL-01 is closed.				

CL ID	02	Section no.	E.8.1, E.8.4	Date: 06/10/2021
Description of CL				
It was observed by the verification team during the desk review that net export (export-import) values higher than electricity export values for the month January and February 2020. The Net export values in form B are different than ER sheet for the same months. PP shall clarify the discrepancies among documents.				
Project participant response				Date: 10/10/2021
In form B, transmission loss is given as negative value for the months of Jan & Feb 2020. This happened due to meter failure at other projects where actual generation was higher than that metered. Hence Net export value is more than the gross electricity export which is clearly an overestimation.				
To correct this and taking the a conservative approach to emission reduction for the current monitoring period, the highest transmission loss percentage recorded for the whole monitoring period is considered for transmission loss calculation for the months of January and February 2020.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Revised ER sheet				
DOE assessment				Date: 20/10/2021
The revised transmission loss applied for the months January and February 2020 considers the highest transmission loss percentage in the entire monitoring period. This value is higher than the actual transmission loss for Jan and Feb 2020. In absence of the actual accurate values, the verification team confirms the conservativeness of the approach. Hence closed.				
CL-02 is closed.				

CL ID	03	Section no.	E.7	Date: 06/10/2021
Description of CL				
PP to clarify why error of 0.389% has been applied for export and import of June 2020 for delay in calibration whereas 0.2% error has been applied for May and July 2020. The two approaches shall be further clarified.				
Project participant response				Date: 10/10/2021
<p>It is observed that -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calibration due date was 15/05/2020. However it was delayed by approx. two and half months. • On 05/06/2020, main meter is found to have a percentage error of 0.85%. • However, on 24/07/2020, main meter was found to be operating within the permissible limit of error of 0.2%. • On 24/07/2020 the check meter was found to be working with error of 0.389% which is outside the permissible range. Hence it was replaced. <p>Taking a conservative approach, the error margin of 0.85% is now applied on export and import data from the main meter for the months of May, Jun, Jul 2020.</p>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Form B for month of June 2020 (jun -2020 GEI) - Form B for month of July 2020 (B-form month of July Harthi-pages-1-5) - Revised ER sheet 				
DOE assessment				Date: 20/10/2021
<p>The verification team has checked the submitted documents. The error applied for the months of May, June and July 2020 ensures conservative calculation of emission reductions. The detailed assessment is included in the calibration section of verification report.</p> <p>CL-03 is closed.</p>				

CL ID	04	Section no.	E.8.1, E.8.4	Date: 06/10/2021
Description of CL				
For June 2020, values of export and transmission loss are consistent with the invoice but are inconsistent with Form B. The discrepancy shall be further clarified by PP.				
Project participant response				Date: 10/10/2021
<p>This is now corrected and made consistent with the main meter value of Form B. Refer response on CL-03 above.</p> <p>On 05/06/2020, as main meter was found to have percentage error of 0.85%, invoice was raised based on the check meter readings. Hence Invoice values are inconsistent with main meter values in Form B. It may be noted that main meter value is lower than that of check meter for the month and hence is conservative.</p>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Form B for month of June 2020 (jun -2020 GEI) - Form B for month of July 2020 (B-form month of July Harthi-pages-1-5) - Revised ER sheet 				
DOE assessment				Date: 20/10/2021
<p>The clarification provided was cross-checked with Form B and invoice of June 2020. The revised value for June 2020 ensures conservative approach for calculation of emission reduction.</p> <p>CL-04 is closed.</p>				

Table 3. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	01	Section no.	E.1	Date: 06/10/2021
Description of CAR				

In section A of MR:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The field for 'Monitoring report number for this monitoring period' on pg 1 of MR is incorrectly filled as per the MR filling guidelines. 2. The location map of the project activity has not been given in the section A.2 of MR in line with MR filling guidelines. 3. The village name for WTG location no 163 in section A.2 of MR is inconsistent with registered PDD. 4. The geocoordinates in section A.2 of MR are inconsistent with registered PDD. 	
Project participant response	Date: 10/10/2021
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring report number is corrected as per guidelines. 2. Location map is added. 3. Village name for WTG location no 163 is updated in line with registered PDD. 4. Geo coordinates are updated in line with registered PDD 	
Documentation provided by project participant	
<i>MR Version 1.1</i>	
DOE assessment	Date: 20/10/2021
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 'monitoring period number for this monitoring period' is revised to include 'Not applicable' in line with the MR filling guidelines. Hence closed. 2. The location map of the project activity is now provided in the revised MR. Hence closed. 3. The village name for WTG no 163 in the revised MR is found to be consistent with the registered PDD. Hence closed. 4. The geocoordinates in the revised MR are consistent with the registered PDD. Hence closed. 	
CAR-01 is closed.	

CAR ID	02	Section no.	E.6.2	Date: 06/10/2021
Description of CAR				
The formula stated in the procedure for calculation of transmission loss by the State utility in section C of MR does not describe the parameter Gh_j .				
Project participant response				Date: 10/10/2021
Formula and Parameter updated in line with registered PDD				
Documentation provided by project participant				
MR Version 1.1				
DOE assessment				Date: 20/10/2021
The formula in the revised MR is consistent with the registered PDD and all the parameters have been described as per the registered monitoring plan. Hence closed.				
CAR-02 is closed.				

CAR ID	03	Section no.	E.6.1, E.6.2	Date: 06/10/2021
Description of CAR				
In section D of MR:				
1. The Description of parameter $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ in section D.1 of MR is not in line with the parameter.				
2. The 'Source of data' description for parameter L_i is not in line with the parameter.				
Project participant response				Date: 10/10/2021
1. The Description of parameter $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ is updated in line with PDD.				
2. The 'Source of data' description is updated in line with PDD				
Documentation provided by project participant				
MR Version 1.1				
DOE assessment				Date: 20/10/2021
1. The description of parameter $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ in section D.1 of revised MR is in line with the registered PDD. Hence closed.				
2. The 'Source of data' description for parameter L_i in the revised MR is in line with the registered PDD. Hence closed.				
CAR-03 is closed				

CAR ID	04	Section no.	E.8.1, E.8.4	Date: 06/10/2021
Description of CAR				
The serial number of replaced bulk main meter in Annex 1 of MR and ER sheet is inconsistent with the calibration report.				
Project participant response				Date: 10/10/2021
Serial number of bulk main meter is corrected				
Documentation provided by project participant				
MR Version 1.1				
Revised ER sheet				
DOE assessment				Date: 20/10/2021
The serial number of replaced bulk meter in the revised MR is consistent with the calibration report. Hence closed.				
CAR-04 is closed.				

Table 4. FAR from this verification

No FAR raised from this verification.

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

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
04.0	6 April 2021	Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect the “Clarification: Regulatory requirements under temporary measures for post-2020 cases” (CDM-EB109-A01-CLAR).
03.0	31 May 2019	Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure consistency with version 02.0 of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (CDM-EB93-A05-STAN); • Make structural and editorial improvements.
02.1	11 January 2018	Editorial revision to correct the numbering of appendices in the instructions.
02.0	31 October 2017	Revision to align with the requirements of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (version 01.0).
01.0	23 March 2015	Initial publication.
Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Form Business Function: Issuance Keywords: project activities, verifying and certifying		