



**Verification and certification report form for
CDM project activities
(Version 03.0)**

Complete this form in accordance with the instructions attached at the end of this form.

BASIC INFORMATION

Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity	1.5 MW Wind Power Project in Maharashtra by M/s. Allgrow ventures (4992 ¹ – UN reference number)
Scale of the project activity	<input type="checkbox"/> Large-scale <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small-scale
Version number of the verification and certification report	01
Completion date of the verification and certification report	11/02/2021
Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period	Monitoring period number: 2 nd Monitoring period: 01/01/2013 to 31/10/2019 (Inclusive of both the dates)
Version number of the monitoring report to which this report applies	02
Crediting period of the project activity corresponding to this monitoring period	01/09/2011 to 31/08/2021(Fixed, 10 Years) https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1310469722.91/view
Project participants	M/s. Allgrow Ventures
Host Party	India
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	AMS-I.D. ver. 16 - Grid connected renewable electricity generation ² Standardized baseline: Not Applicable
Mandatory sectoral scopes	01
Conditional sectoral scopes, if applicable	NA
Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring duration in the registered PDD	16,993 tCO _{2e} (Calculated on pro-rata basis based on number of days of the monitoring period)
Certified amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring period	16,589 tCO _{2e}
Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) UNFCCC Ref. No.: E-0032

¹ <https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1310469722.91/view>

² <https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/W3TINZ7KKWCK7L8WTFQOQFQQH4SBK>

Name, position and signature of the approver of the verification and certification report	Mr. Agustín Calle de Miguel <i>Applus+ Certification CDM Technical Manager</i> Signature: 
--	--

SECTION A. Executive summary

The project activity is a wind based power project with a main objective of mitigating the greenhouse gas effect. The project activity generates electrical power using wind energy, through operation of wind Turbine Generator (WTG) in village Adwadi, Nashik District, Maharashtra state in India. The total installed capacity of the proposed project activity is 1.5 MW, which comprises of 1 nos. of Wind Turbine Generator (WTG) of 1500 kW. The electricity produced by the project activity reduces the associated emissions with thermal power generation in the NEWNE Grid (Now Indian Grid) of the country which is dominated by fossil fuel based electricity. The electricity generated through the power project is evacuated to Maharashtra State Electricity Board (MSEB). The power generated at 690 Volts and it is stepped up to 132 KV to the nearest substation

Assessment team also observed that there is no change in design/technical parameter as mentioned in the registered PDD and thus the same is found correct. No design change observed for the current monitoring period and the rated capacity as mentioned in the registered PDD is implemented onsite and thus the same is acceptable and correct for the current monitoring period. No PRC change is thus envisaged for the current monitoring period.

1. Verification Scope: The verification scope encompasses an independent and objective review and ex-post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions by the DOE. The verification is based on the submitted monitoring report, the validated and registered PDD as well as its validation report, the applied monitoring methodology, relevant decisions, clarifications and guidance from the CMP and the EB and any other information and references relevant to the project activity's resulting emission reductions. These documents are reviewed against the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM Modalities and Procedures and related rules and guidance. Based on the requirements in the "CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, Version 02", Applus+ Certification has applied a rule-based approach for the verification of the project. The principles of accuracy, completeness, relevance, reliability and credibility were combined with a conservative approach to establish a traceable and transparent verification opinion. The verification considers both quantitative and qualitative information on emission reductions. The verification is not meant to provide any consultancy towards the client. However, stated requests for clarifications, corrective and/or forward actions may provide input for improvement of the monitoring activities.

2. Methodology:

LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) – Hereinafter referred as Applus+ Certification - approach to the verification is a two-stage process.

In the 1st stage, Applus+ Certification completed a strategic review and risk assessment of the project activities and processes in order to gain a full understanding of:

- Activities associated with all the sources contributing to the project emissions and emission reductions, including leakage if relevant;
- Protocols used to estimate or measure GHG emissions from these sources;
- Collection and handling of data;
- Controls on the collection and handling of data;
- Means of verifying reported data; and
- Compilation of the monitoring report.

Applus+ Certification used a Periodical Verification Checklist which, based on the risk-based assessment of the parameters and data collection and handling processes for each of those parameters, describes the verification approach and the sampling plan.

3. Desk Review

In the 2nd stage, using the Verification Checklist, Applus+ Certification verified the implementation of the monitoring plan and the data presented in the Monitoring Report for the period in question. This involved a site visit and a desk review of the Monitoring Report. This Verification Report describes the findings of this assessment.

The Monitoring Report version 01 submitted by the PP was made publicly available on the UNFCCC website before the verification activities started. The published MR was assessed based on all the relevant documents. The aim of the assessment in the desk review was to:

- verify the completeness of the data and the information presented in the MR;
- Check the compliance of the MR with respect to the monitoring plan depicted in the registered PDD and verify that the applied methodology was carried out. Particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of the metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures was paid;
- Evaluate the data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions.

4. Assessment team

According to the sectoral scope / technical area and experience in the sectoral or national business environment, LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) has composed a project assessment team in accordance with the appointment rules in the internal Quality Management System of LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification).

The composition of audit team shall be approved by the LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) ensuring that the required skills are covered by the team.

The four qualification levels for team members that are assigned by formal appointment rules are as presented below:

- Lead Auditor (LA).
- Auditor (A) / Auditor in Training (AiT).
- Technical Expert (TE).
- Technical Reviewer (TR).

The sectoral scope / technical area knowledge linked to the applied methodology/ies shall be covered by the assessment team.

Name	Role	SS Coverage	TA Coverage	Financial aspect
Mr. Sukanta Das	LA/TE	YES	YES	NA
Mr. Simon Shen	TR	YES	YES	NA

The curriculum vitae of the DOE's Verification team members are provided in Appendix 2 of this report.

4. Review of Documentation:

The Monitoring Report version 01 submitted by the PP was made publicly available on the UNFCCC website before the verification activities started. The published MR was assessed based on all the relevant documents. A cross-check between information provided and information from other sources has been done. A complete list of documents reviewed is available in Appendix 3 of this report.

5. On-site Assessment and follow-up Interviews:

As a part of the verification, the on-site inspection has been performed by the assessment team. The objective of the on-site assessment is to:

- confirm the implementation and operation of the project;
- review the data flow for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters;
- confirm the correct implementation of procedures for operations and data collection;

- Cross-check the information provided in the MR documentation with other sources;
- Check the monitoring equipment against the requirements of the PDD and the approved methodology, including calibrations, maintenance, etc.
- Review the calculations and assumptions used to obtain the GHG data and ER;
- Identify if the quality control and quality assurance procedures are in place to prevent or correct errors or omissions in the reported parameters.

The details are mentioned in section D.2 of this report.

6. Quality of Evidences

Sufficient evidence covering the full verification period in the required frequency is available to verify the figures stated in the final MR. The source of the evidences will be discussed in Appendix 3 of this report. Specific cross-checks have been done in cases that further sources were available. The monitoring report's figures were checked by the assessment team against the raw data. The data collection system meets the requirements of the monitoring plan as per the methodology.

7. Reporting of Findings

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

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

- a) Modifications to the implementation, operation and monitoring of the registered project activity has not been sufficiently documented by the project participants;
- b) Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions that will impact the quantity of emission reductions;
- c) Issues identified in a FAR during validation to be verified during verification or previous verification(s) have not been resolved by the project participants.

The assessment team shall raise a Clarification Request (CL) if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM requirements have been met.

All CARs and CLs raised during verification shall be resolved prior to submitting a request for issuance.

Forward Action Requests (FARs) may be raised during verification for actions where the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period. All the CARs/CLs/FARs are being discussed in Appendix 4 of this report

8. Internal Quality Control

As a final step of verification, the final documentation including the verification report has to undergo an internal quality control by the Technical Reviewer. Each report has to be finally approved either by the DOE's Technical Manager or the Deputy. In case one of these two persons is part of the assessment team, the approval can only be given by the person who is not a part of the assessment team. If the documents have been satisfactorily approved, the request of issuance is submitted to CDM EB along with the requisite documents.

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.	Lead Auditor / Technical expert	OR	DAS	SUKANTA	True Quality Certifications private Limited- Outsourced entity	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

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	EI	Shen	Simon	Applus+ Certification
2.	Approver	IR	Calle	Agustín	Applus+ Certification

SECTION C. Application of materiality

C.1. Consideration of materiality in planning the verification

No.	Risk that could lead to material errors, omissions or misstatements	Assessment of the risk		Response to the risk in the verification plan and/or sampling plan
		Risk level	Justification	
1	Human errors: Readings from Meters (if not automatic)	LOW	Human error is likely to occur if the monitoring personnel are not trained well or inexperienced in data recording procedures and monitoring processes.	All the personal are well trained to monitor and collect data and thus risk associated with Human error is minimized. Assessment team checked the training records to confirm that all the personal are well trained to handle the activities related to monitoring. Assessment team checked the training records for the complete monitoring period and confirm that the personal are well trained to monitor and collect data for the project activity.
2	Human error: Quantification of emission reduction	LOW	Use of spread-sheets without adequate data control, changes/updates, version tracking, traceability and security	All the energy statement i.e. the Certificate of Energy Delivered at MSEDCL Grid, issued by MSEDCL and the invoices for the complete monitoring period are checked and thus the assessment team confirms that the ER value is conservative and correct.

C.2. Consideration of materiality in conducting the verification

In line with Guidelines for Application of materiality in verifications, the verification team has conducted a complete verification of all the information presented in the monitoring report and data monitored as presented in the emission reduction calculation spread sheet. It invoices follows the paper trail back to the raw data such as meter reading records and invoices. There are no material errors, overestimation of ER, omission or misstatement.

SECTION D. Means of verification

D.1. Desk/document review

The verification was performed primarily based on the review of the monitoring report and the supporting documentation. This process included review of data and information presented to verify their completeness and review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment used including calibration requirements, and the QA/QC procedures, and an evaluation of data management and the QA/QC system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reduction. DOE used CDM validation and verification standard for project activities version 02.0 for assessment.

The initial MR Version 01 submitted by the project participant and additional background documents related to the emission reductions are reviewed as an initial step of the verification process. The subsequent step involved the identification of corrective action requests, clarification requests and Forward action request (CAR, CL and FAR) which are presented in Appendix 4 of this report. As a result of these findings, the MR is revised to MR Version 02. A complete list of all documents and records reviewed is as attached in Appendix 3 of this report.

D.2. On-site inspection

Duration of on-site inspection: 14/10/2020				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	<p>The verification team conducted visit to the project site on 14/10/2020 to confirm the information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. An on-site assessment was conducted as a part of verification activity and involved:</p> <p>1) an assessment of the implementation and operation of the CDM project activity as per the registered PDD</p> <p>2) a review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting of the monitoring parameters</p> <p>3) interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the Monitoring Plan</p> <p>4) a cross-check between information provided in the MR and data from other sources</p> <p>5) a check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance, and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the applied methodology</p> <p>6) a review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and ERs, and</p> <p>7) an identification of QA/QC procedures in place to prevent, or identify and correct, any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters</p>	<p>The project is located below:</p> <p>Village: Adwadi Taluka: Sinner District: Nashik State: Maharashtra Country: India</p>	14/10/2020	Mr. Sukanta Das

D.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Mehta	Mrs. Giselle D.	PP representative	14/10/2020	As mentioned above in section D.2 of this report	Mr. Sukanta Das

D.4. Sampling approach

No sampling is used as the verification team has visited wind site along with the substations. The verification team has reviewed all the documents like commissioning certificates, energy statements i.e. Certificate of Energy Delivered at MSEDCL Grid, issued by MSEDCL, invoices etc.

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	00	01	00
Compliance of the project implementation and operation with the registered PDD	00	02	00
Post-registration changes	00	00	00
Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with the methodologies including applicable tools and standardized baselines	00	00	00
Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan	00	01	00
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	00	01	00
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals	00	01	00
Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits	00	00	00
Global stakeholder consultation	00	00	00
Others (please specify)	00	00	00
Total	00	06	00

SECTION E. Verification findings

E.1. Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form

Means of verification	The verification team has determined whether the monitoring report was completed using the valid version of the applicable monitoring report form. The verification team has checked whether all the sections of the monitoring report follows the guidelines provided in the template.
Findings	CAR 01 was raised during the verification process and closed successfully. Please refer Appendix 4 for the detail closure of the CAR.
Conclusion	The MR was web hosted in version 07.0 of the MR form, which was the current and active version in the UN platform. PP used the latest version of the MR template available on UN web site i.e. version 07 for correction of the CAR/CL raised and submitted the same to DOE for further assessment. The monitoring report has been prepared as per the instructions provided in the template. DOE has made the version 01 of the monitoring report covering the monitoring period from 01/01/2013 to 31/10/2019 (inclusive of both days) publicly available through its dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website before undertaking the site visit for the verification on 14/10/2020. The verification team has concluded that the monitoring report was completed using the valid version of the applicable monitoring report form and is followed the guidelines contained in the template.

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

This is 2nd periodic verification. No FAR was raised during the Validation of the project.
<https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1310469722.91/view>

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

Means of verification	The verification team determined the conformity of the actual implemented project activity and its operation with the registered project design document. DOE has, by means of a desk review and an on-site visit/technical manual, assessed whether all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place, and that the project participants have operated the CDM project activity as per the registered PDD
Findings	CAR 02 and CAR 03 were raised during the verification process and closed successfully. Please refer Appendix 4 for the detail closure of the CAR.
Conclusion	<p>The verification team has reviewed the commissioning certificates (=to conclude commissioning date and installed capacity) to conclude that the implemented capacity of the project is same as mentioned in the registered PDD. The capacity does not change after the registration of the project activity as confirmed by the assessment team during verification site visit. The WTG AD-09 located at Adwadi village, Sinner taluka, Nashik district in Maharashtra was commissioned on 31/03/2009.</p> <p>Assessment team during the onsite visit concluded that all the WTGs of the project activity are in operation from the commissioning and operating satisfactorily during the reported monitoring period. The plant however undergone scheduled maintenance as per the manufacturer's specifications and no unforeseen incident observed by the assessment team during the monitoring period which may alter the applicability of the methodology or change the additionality of the project. The details are checked by the assessment team from the plant log records and found correct. Therefore, assessment team conclude that plant was running satisfactorily for the current monitoring period.</p> <p>The technical parameters (=name plate capacity) of the project activity are checked by the assessment team during the verification site visit and also cross checked from the Manufacturers technical manual. The details as mentioned in the registered PDD are same as operational onsite and hence assessment team conclude that there is no change in technical specifications from the registered PDD. The detail specification's is as below:</p>

Technical details for the project activity has been given below:

Rotor	
Diameter	82.0 m
Cut in Speed	4 m /s
Cut out speed	20 m /s
Rated wind speed	14 m/s
Swept area	5278 m ²
Rotation speed	16.30 rpm
Regulation	Pitch
Generator	
Type	Asynchronous , 4 poles
Output	1500 kw
Rotation speed	1511 rpm
Operating voltage	690 V
Frequency	50 HZ
Cooling systems	Air cooling
Gear Box	
Type	3 stage gear box
Rotation	95.09
Cooling systems	Oil cooling
Nominal load	1650 kw
Yaw Machine	
Drive system	4 active electrical yaw motors
Bearing	Polyamide slide bearings
Safety system	
Aerodynamic breaks	3 times independent pitch regulation
Mechanical breaks	Spring powered disc brake, hydraulically released fail safe
Control unit	Microprocessor Controlled indicating operating conditions with UPS backup system
Tower	
Type	Free standing, lattice type, hot dip galvanized

Assessment team also checked the Latitude and longitude of the project using the GPS mete and cross checked the coordinates using Google earth. The details as mentioned in the registered PDD are correct. The coordinates details are as follows:

Owner	Installed Capacity (MW)	Village/Taluka	Location Number	Latitude	Longitude
M/s Allgrow Ventures	1.5	Adwadi/S inner	AD09	N19°43'8.33"	E73°54'5.42"

The project is a small-scale project activity (rated capacity is less than or equal to 15 MW type-I project activity) and the same is confirmed by the DOE during the onsite visit.

During the onsite visit assessment team checked the feeder locations of the power plant and confirm that the feeder detail as mentioned in the MR is correct. The electricity generated through the power project is evacuated to Maharashtra State Electricity Board (MSEB).The power generated at 690 Volts and it is stepped up to 132 KV to the nearest substation.

No change in project design envisaged for the project activity which can alter or

	change Methodology requirement for the current monitoring period. Based on the documentary evidence of commissioning certificates and physical verification DOE concludes that the project was implemented as per the registered PDD version 04 dated 29/06/2011
--	--

E.4. Post-registration changes**E.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents³**

Not applicable for present Monitoring period

E.4.2. Corrections

Not applicable for present Monitoring period

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

Not applicable for present Monitoring period

E.4.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan

Not applicable for present Monitoring period

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

Not applicable for present Monitoring period

E.4.6. Changes to the project design

Not applicable for present Monitoring period

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

Not applicable for the project activity.

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

Means of verification	The verification team determined whether the registered monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology AMS.I.D version 16 including applicable tools
Findings	No finding was raised regarding Compliance of monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool and standardized baseline
Conclusion	The verification team is able to confirm that the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD version 04 is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the project activity, i.e. AMS.I.D version 16 and its applicable tools. The same is followed onsite and thus assessment team confirms that project activity comply with the requirement of Approved methodology and registered PDD.

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	The assessment team checked the registered PDD to confirm the ex-ante fixed parameter mentioned in the current monitoring report. Assessment team also interviewed the personal onsite to check further regarding the ex-ante values used for emission reduction calculation.
Findings	No findings were raised regarding the same.
Conclusion	OM and BM were mentioned as ex-ante fixed parameter. Assessment team checked the values, source of data, choice of data, purpose of the data mentioned

³ 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).

	<p>in the MR from the registered PDD and confirms that the similar approach was considered for the current monitoring period also.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. OM: (=1.0086 tCO₂/MWh): Operating Margin emissions factor for grid connected power generation in year y calculated using the version 02 of "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system." EF_{OM} is computed using the Simple Operating margin CO₂ emission factor. Simple Operating margin CO₂ emission factor is calculated from the weighted average CO₂ emissions per unit net electricity generation of all power plants serving the system, not including low-cost / must-run. This is in agreement with the guidance provided in the Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system. The value is considered from CEA version 04 and registered PDD. Assessment team checked the registered PDD and found that value considered for emission reduction calculation in this present monitoring period is sourced from the registered PDD. Thus assessment team conclude that the emission reduction calculation for the present monitoring period is conservative and correct. 2. BM: (=0.5977tCO₂/MWh): Build Margin emissions factor for grid connected power generation in year y calculated using the latest version 02 of "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system. Build margin emission factor is the generation-weighted average emission factor of all power plants <i>m</i> during the most recent year <i>y</i> for which generation data is available. Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system is used to calculate EF_{BM}. The value is considered from CEA version 04 and registered PDD. Assessment team checked the registered PDD and found that value considered for emission reduction calculation in this present monitoring period is sourced from the registered PDD. Thus assessment team conclude that the emission reduction calculation for the present monitoring period is conservative and correct. <p>The value for OM and BM were considered from the CO₂ baseline database (Version 04) published by Central Electricity Authority (CEA). The default value as mentioned in the registered PDD and MR are same. The value of combined margin in India is being given by CEA and thus assessment team conclude that the value is correct and appropriate. The default value in turn is used for baseline calculation as per the formula given in the registered PDD for the current monitoring period.</p>
--	--

E.6.2. Data and parameters monitored

Means of verification	The assessment team checked the registered PDD to confirm the ex-post parameter mentioned in the current monitoring report. Assessment team also interviewed the personal onsite to check further regarding the ex-post parameter monitoring and confirms that the same is in line with the registered PDD. AMS.I.D version 16 which was the applied methodology during the registration of the project is also checked to ensure that monitoring parameter as mentioned in the registered PDD and current MR are in compliance with the methodology.
Findings	CAR 04 was raised during the verification period. Please refer Appendix 4 of this report for the detail closure of the CAR
Conclusion	<p>As per the registered PDD and requirement of the registered methodology following parameters needs to be monitored:</p> <p>EG_{BL,y}: Net Electricity generated by WTG and exported to grid (=18,312,438KWh)</p> <p>The primary source of data for emission reduction calculation is Certificate of Energy Delivered at MSEDCL Grid, issued by MSEDCL. The same source is used for the present verification. The net electricity supplied to the grid is calculated, by joint meter reading done by MSEDCL and the PP representative every month. The formula used to calculate net electricity supplied to the grid is:</p> $EG_{BL,Y} = EG_{Export,1} - EG_{Import,1} - EG_{Transmission\ Loss,1}$ <p>Where EG Export and EG Import are the measured value from the WTG meter as</p>

explained in present MR and $EG_{\text{transmission}}$ loss is calculated from the apportioning method. The calculation is done by state official and PP has no role to play in it. The JMR provided by state electricity board has also mentioned the Export value by considering the Transmission loss itself, hence separate value transmission loss is not mentioned in ER calculations.

Joint Meter Reading is done at the end of each month with the buyer of the electricity i.e. Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Licensee (MSEDCL), to ascertain the exact amount of electricity exported. MSEDCL monitors through state-of-the-art sealed and tested meters. The metering system comprises of two sets of meters – meters on the generator cables recording gross electricity generation and meters in the sub-station recording net electricity generation from all the WTGs connected to the grid. Apportioning method is applied to calculate the net electricity supplied to the grid by each WTG and then a "Certificate of Energy Delivered at MSEDCL Grid" is issued by MSEDCL. The electricity sale invoices are generated on the basis of this certificated only which is used for cross check purpose. The practice followed is acceptable to the assessment team as the same is as per the requirement of the registered PDD and applied methodology.

EG_{Export} : Electricity Exported to grid by WTG (=18,348,491 KWh)

The primary source of data for emission reduction calculation is Certificate of Energy Delivered at MSEDCL Grid, issued by MSEDCL. The same source is used for the present verification. The Gross Electricity supplied to the grid is measured, through joint meter reading, which is done at the end of each month by the buyer of the electricity i.e. Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Licensee (MSEDCL), and the PP representative, to ascertain the exact amount of electricity exported.

The metering system comprises of two sets of meters – meters on the generator cables recording gross electricity generation (M-2) and meters in the sub-station recording net electricity generation from all the WTGs connected to the grid (M-1) To ensure the continued and reliable measurement, each Main Meter has its backup meter also.

The project employs Class 0.2s high accuracy monitoring and control equipment that measures, record, report, monitor and control of various key parameters of the plant. These monitoring and controls are the part of the Control System of the Wind Power Project. All meters are calibrated annually and sealed as per the industry practices. The approach and monitoring is acceptable to the assessment team as the same is as per the requirement of registered PDD and applied methodology.

EG_{Import} : Electricity Imported from grid by WTG. (=36,052 KWh)

The primary source of data for emission reduction calculation is Certificate of Energy Delivered at MSEDCL Grid, issued by MSEDCL. The same source is used for the present verification. The Gross Electricity import from the grid is measured, through joint meter reading, which is done at the end of each month by the buyer of the electricity i.e. Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Licensee (MSEDCL) and the PP representative, to ascertain the exact amount of electricity exported.

The metering system comprise of two sets of meters – meters on the generator cables recording gross electricity generation (M-2) and meters in the sub-station recording net electricity generation from all the WTGs connected to the grid (M-1)

The project employs Class 0.2s high accuracy monitoring and control equipment that measures, record, report, monitor and control of various key parameters of the plant. These monitoring and controls are the part of the Control System of the Wind Power Project. All meters are calibrated annually and sealed as per the industry practices. The approach and monitoring is acceptable to the assessment team as the same is as per the requirement of registered PDD and applied methodology.

E.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan

Means of verification	The verification assessed whether the compliance of the sampling efforts and surveys with the registered sampling plan in accordance with the "Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities" if PP had applied a sampling approach to determine data and parameters monitored.
Findings	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
Conclusion	PP did not apply sampling plan to determine data and parameters monitored during this monitoring period. The verification team has checked all the documents such as Monthly meter energy statement, gross generation statement for individual WTG and Total site WTGs, invoice etc. and hence sampling plan was not required. The verification team hereby confirms that it checked all the documents

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

Means of verification	The verification team determined whether the calibration of the measuring equipment that has an impact on the claimed emission reductions is conducted by the PP at a frequency specified in the registered monitoring plan																			
Findings	CAR 05 was raised during the verification of the project activity. Please refer Appendix 4 of this report for the detail closure of the CAR																			
Conclusion	<p>The energy meters used are tri-vector meters which are of accuracy class 0.2s. The meters are monitored continuously & cumulative readings are taken at the end of the month by joint meter reading procedure. These are sealed by MSEDCL to avoid malfunctioning with meter readings. The officials frequently check the meters for tampering and malfunctioning with the meters. As per the registered PDD, Meters are calibrated once in a years by the authority in the presence of O&M Contractor / investors representatives and MSEDCL officials to ensure the working of meter within permissible limits. The calculation of net electricity supplied to grid is under purview of state electricity board and PP does not have any control on it. The value of net electricity supplied to grid after deducting the transmission losses i.e electricity at delivery point (main substation) is considered for emission reduction calculation. Also accuracy class of meters, calibration interval is under control of state electricity board and PP does not have any control on it.</p> <p>The metering arrangement is (Electronic trivector meter) energy meters (main and check) at the project site. These meters record several parameters including electricity exported & imported. These electricity meters are being used by state utility officials to obtain the value of export and import and hence Net electricity supplied is calculated based on these values.</p> <p>No delay in Calibration is observed during the present monitoring period and frequency as mentioned in the registered PDD is followed onsite.</p> <p>The calibration of the energy meters installed at HT side of the transformer were carried out by Meter and testing division of the electricity board which is 3rd party organization and the same is acceptable to the assessment team. The Meter and testing division of the electricity board is accredited by Indian national laboratory i.e. NABL (National Accreditation Board for Testing and Calibration Laboratories, Govt of India) to carry out the testing of the meters which is as per the national regulation and thus traceability of the Calibration is also confirmed by the assessment team.</p> <p>The calibration dates of the meters are within the range of monitoring period which is acceptable to the assessment team.</p> <p>The detail of the calibration is as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Meter Serial No.</th><th>Date of Calibration</th><th>Due date of Calibration</th><th>Date of Calibration</th><th>Due date of Calibration</th><th>Date of Calibration</th><th>Due date of Calibration</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>						Meter Serial No.	Date of Calibration	Due date of Calibration	Date of Calibration	Due date of Calibration	Date of Calibration	Due date of Calibration							
Meter Serial No.	Date of Calibration	Due date of Calibration	Date of Calibration	Due date of Calibration	Date of Calibration	Due date of Calibration														

14796435 (Main)	12/12/2012	11/12/2013	08/12/2013	07/12/2014	02/12/2014	01/12/2015
14796431 (Check)						

Meter Serial No.	Date of Calibration	Due date of Calibration	Date of Calibration	Due date of Calibration	Date of Calibration	Due date of Calibration
14796435 (Main)	27/11/2015	26/11/2016	20/11/2016	19/11/2017	18/11/2017	17/11/2018
14796431 (Check)						

Meter Serial No.	Date of Calibration	Due date of Calibration
14796435(Main)	02/11/2018	01/11/2019
14796431 (Check)		

Only main meter (14796435) data was considered for net electricity supplied to grid for current monitoring period. The check meter (14796431) data is not used for current monitoring period. There is no delay in calibration in both the meters and calibration results are within permissible limit.

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	The verification team assessed whether the data and calculations of GHG emission reductions achieved resulting from the registered CDM project activity. The verification team has checked whether calculations of baseline GHG emissions, project GHG emissions and leakage GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan
Findings	CAR 06 was raised during the verification process. The description of the CAR and its closure is described below in Appendix 4 of this report
Conclusion	<p>Baseline emissions include only CO_{2e} emissions from electricity generation in fossil fuel fired power plants that are displaced due to the project activity. The Calculation of baseline emissions for the monitoring period is presented properly in the MR and the same is checked by the assessment team and found correct.</p> <p>The baseline emission is calculated as follows (= considered from the registered PDD):</p> $BE_y = EG_{BL,y} * EF_{CO_2, grid,y}$ $BE_y = 18,312 * 0.9059$ $BE_y = 16,589 \text{ tCO}_{2e}(\text{Round down Value})$ <p>Assessment team checked the Baseline emission calculation from the emission reduction calculation sheet and found the same to be correct.</p>

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

Means of verification	The verification team assessed whether the data and calculations of GHG emission reductions achieved resulting from the registered CDM project activity. The verification team has checked whether calculations of baseline GHG emissions, project GHG emissions and leakage GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan.
------------------------------	---

Findings	No findings were raised
Conclusion	Project emission is zero as per the requirement of the methodology and registered PDD

E.8.3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions

Means of verification	The verification team assessed whether the data and calculations of GHG emission reductions achieved resulting from the registered CDM project activity. The verification team has checked whether calculations of baseline GHG emissions, project GHG emissions and leakage GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	The leakage emissions according to the applied methodology and registered PDD are zero.

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

Means of verification	The verification team assessed whether the data and calculations of GHG emission reductions achieved resulting from the registered CDM project activity. The verification team has checked whether calculations of baseline GHG emissions, project GHG emissions and leakage GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan.
Findings	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
Conclusion	<p>Emission reductions in this monitoring period are: Total Baseline Emissions: 16,589 tCO₂e Total Project Emission: 0 Total Leakage emission: 0 Total Emission Reduction: Emission reduction calculation is done based on following formula,</p> $\text{Emission reduction (ER}_y\text{)} = \text{Baseline Emission (BE}_y\text{)} - \text{Project Emission (PE}_y\text{)} - \text{Leakage emission (LE}_y\text{)}$ $= 16,589 - 0 - 0 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e} = 16,589 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$

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 verification team has determined the CER achieved during this monitoring period with the estimated value and reason for increase if any.
Findings	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section
Conclusion	<p>The actual CER is 2 % less than the estimated value. The actual CER value for the power plant for the current monitoring period is 16,589 tCO₂e. As per CDM registered PDD, 2,486 tCO₂e is the amount of CERs generated annually. Therefore, following unitary method, the amount of estimated ex ante for this monitoring period is identified. The total number of days in this monitoring period is 2495 = 16,993 tCO₂e (Estimated for the current monitoring period).</p> <p>The current monitoring period involves variation in wind flow and this is nature dependent and not in control of PP. The less in CER value is due to lower PLF obtained for the monitoring period.</p>

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

Means of verification	The verification team has determined the CER achieved during this monitoring period with the estimated value and reason for increase if any.
Findings	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section
Conclusion	The actual CER is 2 % less than the estimated value. The actual CER value for the power plant for the current monitoring period is 16,589 tCO ₂ e. As per CDM registered PDD, 2,486 tCO ₂ e is the amount of CERs generated annually. Therefore, following unitary method, the amount of estimated ex ante for this

	<p>monitoring period is identified. The total number of days in this monitoring period is 2495= 16,993 tCO₂e (Estimated for the current monitoring period).</p> <p>The current monitoring period involves variation in wind flow and this is nature dependent and not in control of PP. The less in CER value is due to lower PLF obtained for the monitoring period.</p>
--	--

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 verification team has determined the CER achieved during first commitment period and second commitment period
Findings	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
Conclusion	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks reported up to 31 December 2012: 0 tCO₂e 2. GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks reported from 1 January 2013 onwards: 16,589 tCO₂e

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

Means of verification	Not applicable for the present monitoring period
Findings	Not applicable for the present monitoring period
Conclusion	Not applicable for the present monitoring period

E.10. Global stakeholder consultation

Means of verification	Not applicable for the present monitoring period
Findings	Not applicable for the present monitoring period
Conclusion	Not applicable for the present monitoring period

SECTION F. Internal quality control

As a final step of verification, the final documentation including the verification report has to undergo an internal quality control by the Technical Reviewer. Each report has to be finally approved either by the DOE's Technical Manager or the Deputy. In case one of these two persons is part of the assessment team, the approval can only be given by the person who is not a part of the assessment team. If the documents have been satisfactorily approved, the request of issuance is submitted to CDM EB along with the requisite documents

SECTION G. Verification opinion

Applus+ Certification has been engaged by M/s. Allgrow Ventures to perform the 2nd periodical verification of the "1.5 MW Wind Power Project in Maharashtra by M/s. Allgrow ventures" (UN reference number: 4992)

The management of M/s. Allgrow Ventures is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions on the basis set out within the project's Monitoring Plan in the revised registered approved PDD version 04 dated 29/06/2011 and the applied methodology AMS.I.D version 16.

Our verification approach was based on the requirements as defined under the Kyoto Protocol, Marrakesh accord, as well as those defined by the CDM Executive Board. Our approach is risk-based, drawing on an understanding of the risks associated with reporting GHG emissions data and the controls in place to mitigate these. The verification can confirm that:

- the project is operated as planned and described in the project design document approved by the EB;
- the monitoring plan is as per the applied methodology;
- the monitoring in Monitoring Report is as per the PDD and the monitoring plan approved by the EB;
- the development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures are in accordance with the registered monitoring plan;
- the installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately;
- the monitoring system is in place and generates GHG emission reductions data;
- the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements.

In our opinion, the GHG emission reductions for "1.5 MW Wind Power Project in Maharashtra by M/s. Allgrow ventures" for the monitoring period 01-01-2013 to 31-10-2019 (Inclusive of both days) as reported in Monitoring Report, prepared on the basis of the project's Monitoring Plan are fairly stated.

Based on the information we have seen and evaluated, we confirm the following statement:

Reporting period: From 01/01/2013 to 31/10/2019
(Inclusive of both days)

Verified emissions in the above reporting period:

Leakage emissions	0 tCO ₂ equivalents
Project emissions	0 tCO ₂ equivalents
Baseline emissions	16,589 tCO ₂ equivalents
Emission reductions	16,589 tCO ₂ equivalents

SECTION H. Certification statement

Same as above

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
BM	Build Margin
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CMS	Central Monitoring system
CER	Certified Emission Reduction(s)
CERC	Central Electricity regulatory commission.
CL	Clarification request
CM	Combined Margin
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
DR	Document Review
EF	Emission Factor
ER	Emission Reductions sheet
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
GWP	Global Warming potential
MSEDCL	Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd
PP	Project Participant
PPA	Power purchase agreement

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

1. Mr. Sukanta Das has done M. SC in Electronics and Photonics and M. Tech in Energy technology from Tezpur Central University and Indian Institute of Technology in Bombay respectively. He is a Certified Lead Auditor for ISO 14001 EMS and ISO 9001 QMS (2008 and 2015) from International Registry for Certified Auditors (IRCA) and Certified Lean Management practitioner from Quality Council of India (QCI). He has more than 12 years of working experience at TUV Nord/Reconsult/CRA and Applus+ Certification under various categories of projects and programmes starting from Renewable to waste and supercritical GHG mitigation projects. He also worked in various Carbon foot-printing projects as well. He is empanelled with Applus+ Certification since 2015 and has been involved in more than 300 Validations and Verifications of PAs and PoAs as Lead Auditor, Technical Expert and Technical Reviewer for Renewable and non-Renewable as well as Energy Demand and Waste Management projects and programmes, and has participated in several waste management projects as Team Leader. Moreover, he also have audit experience of Warehouse Physical and Safety audits, Vendor audits among others.
2. Mr. Simon Shen (Master's Degree in Thermal Energy Engineering, Bachelor's Degree in Environmental Engineering) is an Auditor appointed by Applus+ LGAI for the GHG project assessment, auditing and technical review. He has more than 6 years of work experience in CDM/GS4GG/VCS project assessment and review with Applus+, apart from the years of experience working as GHG Auditor and ISO 9001/14001 in TUV SUD for 3.5 years before he joined Applus+. Mr. Simon Shen has extensive experience also as former Applus+ Shanghai CDM Technical Manager.

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1	NA	Commissioning certificates of the Wind power plant	Commissioning Certificates of the wind power plant	Project participant
2	NA	Contract of the project participant with the DOE	Contract document signed between PP and DOE	Project participant
3	NA	VVS standard-version 02	UNFCCC web site	UNFCCC
4	NA	Monthly energy statement i.e. the Certificate of Energy Delivered at MSEDCL Grid issued by MSEDCL and Invoices for the complete monitoring period	Monthly energy statement i.e. Certificate of Energy Delivered at MSEDCL Grid issued by MSEDCL and Invoices for the complete monitoring period	Project participant
5	NA	MR version 01 MR version 02	MR version 01 dated 30/07/2020 MR version 02 dated 10/02/2021	Project participant
6	NA	ER sheet version 01 ER sheet version 02	ER sheet version 01 dated 30/07/2020 ER sheet version 02 dated 10/02/2021	Project participant
7	NA	Actual geo-coordinates by GE	Actual coordinates for the project activity via GPS meters	Project participant
8	NA	Break Down details of both the Units	Log book records onsite	Project participant

CDM-VCR-FORM

9	NA	Guidelines for Application of materiality in verifications version 2.0	UNFCCC web site	UNFCCC
10	NA	Calibration details for the complete monitoring period	Calibration certificates for the installed meters	Project participant
11	NA	Registered documents of the project activity	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1310469722.91/view Registered PDD version 06 dated 29/06/2011 Registered Validation report dated 12/08/2011	NA

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

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

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

Table 3 **CAR from this verification**

CAR ID	01	Section no.	E.1	Date: 14/10/2020
Description of CAR				
The Editorial comments are compiled in one CAR. The same is described below:				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> As per MR, the project activities commissioned details are not provided. Moreover, the certificates are missing. Corrective action is sought for the same. Information on the implementation and actual operation in section B.1 of the PDD of the project activity, including relevant dates (e.g. construction, commissioning, start of operation). Supporting related to the same is also not submitted to the assessment team. In accordance with the Project Standard Ver.02, Para 256(A), Project participant mentioned the details regarding the technologies used in the project activity but to verify the same, no such document (i.e. technical equipment's details, technical lifetime etc.) is provided to DOE team. 				
Project participant response				Date: 10/02/2021
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The commissioning details have now been incorporated in section A.1 of the Monitoring report Version 02. The commission certificate has now been submitted to assessment team. The actual implementation status along with the relevant dates of construction, commissioning and start of operation has now been incorporated in monitoring report version 02. The supportive for the same have also been submitted to assessment team. Official WTG technical specification brochure from Suzlon in support of technical equipment's details, technical lifetime has now been submitted to assessment team. 				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring Report Version 02 Commissioning Certificate WTG technical specification brochure 				
DOE assessment				Date: 11/02/2021

The supporting documents like Technical details and Commissioning certificate for the power plant is checked from the manufacturer specification and 3 rd party Govt documents respectively. The details are found correct as mentioned in registered PDD and previous Monitoring report.	
The Monitoring report is now filled with the latest template guideline i.e. version 07 and assessment team checked the same and found correct. CAR is thus closed	

CAR ID	02	Section no.	E.3.	Date: 14/10/2020
Description of CAR				
During the document review it was observed that the details of feeder wise Wind power plant location is missing in the MR. Corrective action is sought in the respective section of the MR				
Project participant response				Date: 10/02/2021
The details of feeder wise Wind Power Plant location has now been incorporated in Section A.2 of Monitoring Report Version 02.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Monitoring Report Version 02.				
DOE assessment				Date: 11/02/2021
The feeder WTGs location is now incorporated in the revised MR version 02. CAR is closed				

CAR ID	03	Section no.	E.3.	Date: 14/10/2020
Description of CAR				
In accordance with the Project Standard Ver.02, Para 260, Project Participant should provide Operation Log book records to DOE Team in orders to verify that does any plant shutdown happen or affects the calculation of GHG emission reduction or net anthropogenic GHG removal. Moreover, the supporting document regarding the breakdown details are also not provided to the assessment team. Corrective action is sought in the respective section of the MR and supporting documents for further analysis.				
Project participant response				Date: 10/02/2021
The log book regarding the breakdown details has now been provided to the assessment team. The breakdown information has now been incorporated in Annexure 1 of the Monitoring Report Version 02.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Breakdown details 2. Monitoring Report Version 02. 				
DOE assessment				Date: 11/02/2021
The breakdown details are checked and found correct. No unforeseen incident took place during the monitoring period. The log sheets were checked and thus CAR is closed				

CAR ID	04	Section no.	E.6.2	Date: 14/10/2020
Description of CAR				
Following observation are made regarding the monitoring part of the project:				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EG_{Export} Value is reserved till supporting documents like JMR sheets/Invoice is submitted 2. EG_{Import} Value is reserved till supporting documents like JMR sheets/Invoice is submitted 3. EG_{BL,y} Value is reserved till supporting documents is submitted 				
Corrective action is therefore sought regarding monitoring.				
Project participant response				Date: 10/02/2021
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. JMRs and Invoices have now been submitted in support of EG_{Export} Value. 2. JMRs and Invoices have now been submitted in support of EG_{Import} Value. 3. JMRs and Invoices have now been submitted in support of EG_{BL,y} Value. 				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Joint Meter Reading (JMRs) 2. Invoices 				
DOE assessment				Date: 11/02/2021
The JMR sheets and invoices are checked. The value of all the monitoring parameters in version 02 of the MR is correct and as per the JMR records. CAR is thus closed.				

CAR ID	05	Section no.	E.7	Date: 14/10/2020
Description of CAR				
The calibration details are not provided in the MR. Moreover, Calibration certificates for the complete monitoring period are also missing. Corrective action is sought for the same.				
Project participant response				Date: 10/02/2021
The Calibration details have now been incorporated in annexure 2 of the Monitoring Report Version 02. Also Calibration certificates have now been submitted to assessment team.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Calibration Certificates.				
DOE assessment				Date: 11/02/2021
The Calibration details are checked by the assessment team from the calibration records and found correct. The calibration frequency as per the registered PDD is followed onsite and there is no delay observed. CAR is thus closed.				

CAR ID	06	Section no.	E.8.1	Date: 14/10/2020
Description of CAR				
Following are the observation on the ER sheet:				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ER sheet is not submitted to the assessment team and hence the ER value is thus reserved. 2. The cross check mechanism is not included in the ER sheet as per the requirement of Methodology. Moreover, JMR/Invoices are not provided to DOE for the complete monitoring period. 3. The estimated calculation is not correct. The pro-rata calculation for estimated emission reduction is missing in the ER sheet. Appropriate correction is sought in the respective section of the MR. 4. PP is requested to check whether billing period matches with the monitoring period. 				
The ER value is not rounded down which is not conservative. Corrective action is sought.				
The emission reduction calculation is thus reserved till the submission of proper documents.				
Project participant response				Date: 10/02/2021
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ER Sheet has now been submitted to the assessment team. 2. The crosscheck mechanism has now been included in the ER Sheet. The JMRs and invoices for the complete monitoring period has now been submitted to the assessment team. 3. The pro-rata calculation for estimated emission reduction has now been incorporated in ER Sheet and the calculation of estimated emission reduction has now been rectified and updated in Monitoring report version 02. 4. The billing cycle and the monitoring period of the project has been crosschecked and the billing cycle matches with the monitoring period. 5. The ER Value has now been rounded down. 6. ER Sheet along with supportive documents like JMRs and Invoices have now been submitted to assessment team. 				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring Period Version 02. 2. Emission Reduction Sheet 3. JMRs 4. Invoices 				
DOE assessment				Date: 11/02/2021
The actual ER sheet is now submitted to the assessment team. The value are now checked against the supporting and found correct. ER value is this found to be accurate. CAR is closed.				
The cross check mechanism is now incorporated in the ER sheet. CAR is closed.				
The estimated ER value is now calculated correctly. CAR is closed				
The billing period matches with the monitoring period. CAR is closed.				
The emission reduction value is now rounded down. CAR is closed.				

Table 4 — FAR 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>
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		