

# Validation Opinion for Post Registration Changes

Report for:  
ReNew Wind Energy (Jath) Private Limited

CDM project for  
Wind Power Project at Jath, Maharashtra

LRQA Reference : CDM-MUM-0062099 Version 03.3  
Date : 31/10/2014

Verification Team  
Ankush Jain Team Leader

Archak Pattanaik Technical Reviewer  
Prabodha C Acharya Decision Maker Reviewer

## Validation opinion

Lloyd's Register Quality Assurance Limited (LRQA) has been contracted by ReNew Wind Energy (Jath) Private Limited, the project participant (PP), to undertake the first periodic verification of the registered project activity "Wind Power Project at Jath, Maharashtra", project reference number 9154 registered as a CDM project activity on 26/12/2012.

LRQA conducted an independent third party assessment of the Post Registration Changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD following the VVS Version 07.0, section 9.5 and the PS Version 07.0 section 13.8 for Post Registration Changes.

In summary, the changes to the project design consist of increase in capacity from 74.65MW to 84.65MW. LRQA, by means of an on-site visit and review of the submitted revised PDD can confirm that these changes do not adversely affect the conclusion of the validation report with regard to:

1. Additionality of the project activity
2. Scale of the project activity
3. Applicability and application of approved baseline methodology

LRQA confirms that the information in the PDD, Version 05.1 dated: 05/09/2014, using latest form at the time of submission of this report, was materially the same as described in the registered PDD, Version 03 dated: 18/12/2012. LRQA further confirms that the changes in PDD, Version 06 dated: 05/09/2014 reflects the changes to the registered project design of a type listed in appendix 1 of the Project standard.

LRQA therefore requests the approval, by the CDM EB, of the post registration changes of the project activity as described above, in accordance to the guidance of the EB in the PCP.

### Decision Maker



Prabodha C Acharya

General Manager, Climate Change Services, South Asia

31/10/2014

Lloyd's Register Quality Assurance Ltd  
Hiramford  
Middlemarch Office Village  
Siskin Drive  
Coventry CV3 4FJ, United Kingdom

Registered office:  
Lloyd's Register  
71 Fenchurch Street  
London EC3M 4BS  
United Kingdom

## Findings

### 1. Description of the changes to the project design as described in the registered PDD

The registered PDD describes the project as 74.65MW comprising of Gamesa make G58 and G97 turbines (25 × 2 MW G97 turbines and 29 × 0.85MW G58 turbines). The capacity of the project was revised to 84.65MW based on the decision taken by the PP dated: 20/11/2012. The project now comprises of 30 × 2 MW G97 turbines and 29 × 0.85MW G58 turbines, totaling to 84.65MW. Team confirmed the revised capacity from the review of investment decision, amendment agreements, commissioning certificates, and the site visit.

The PDD has been revised to state the second decision to increase the project capacity. PP has further demonstrated additionality of the project for the revised decision as well as original decision. Increase in capacity does not impact the scale of the project or applicability of the methodology. Therefore, increase in the project does not impact the ability of the project to deliver emission reductions.

### 2. Validation findings and resolution for changes to the project design of a registered project activity

#### 2.1 Description of the changes

The PP has decided to increase the capacity of the project from 74.65MW to 84.65MW owing to availability of additional sites in the wind farm. The decision to increase the project capacity was taken on 20/11/2012. Team confirmed it from the review of documents, such as revised investment decision, amendment agreements, and commissioning certificates. Please refer Appendix 1 for full details of documents reviewed. These changes were known prior to submission for registration (24/12/2012). Increase in capacity does not impact the applicability of the methodology, baseline and additionality of the project activity. Further, additional five G-97 wind turbines are installed at the same wind farm along with the other wind turbines of the project activity. Therefore, this change in design will not have any impact on the overall operation/ability of the project activity to deliver emission reductions as stated in the PDD.

Increase in the project capacity does not impact the ability of the project to deliver emission reductions. Increase in capacity does not impact the applicability or application of the applied methodology. The PP has demonstrated the additionality of the project. The additional wind turbines are installed at the same wind park therefore monitoring plan of the project is not impacted.

For details please refer to protocol section below.

#### 2.1 Additionality of the project activity

The additionality of the project has been demonstrated based on original decision and revised decision. The PP has submitted the revised investment analysis by changing only key parameters that were revised due to change in project capacity. Due to this change in project capacity the PP has revised the investment analysis by changing only key parameters. The IRR was changed from 12.48% to 12.39%. Team confirms that based on the investment analysis submitted by the PP, the project is additional.

For details please refer to protocol section below.



**2.2 Scale of CDM project activity in the new PDD, if changes affect the scale of a small scale Project activity**

Not applicable as project is large scale.

**2.3 Applicability and application of approved baseline methodology**

Change in capacity does not impact the applicability and application of baseline methodology. Each items of applicability of the methodology has been discussed in the protocol section below.

The baseline was prescribed by the methodology. Therefore, change in capacity does not impact the baseline.

For details please refer to protocol section below.

### 3. Appendix

#### Appendix 1: List of documents reviewed

1.	Monitoring report Version 1 dated: 25/02/2014, Version 2 dated: 22/04/2014, Version 3 dated: 05/05/2014, Version 4.1 dated: 26/06/2014, Version 4.2 dated: 10/07/2014, Version 4.3 dated: 05/09/2014
2.	Emission reduction spreadsheet Version 1 dated: 25/02/2014, Version 2 dated: 05/05/2014, Version 3 dated 26/05/2014, Version 4 dated: 10/07/2014
3.	Invoices applicable for the monitoring period
4.	Joint Meter reading for the monitoring period
5.	Certified copy of Project Appraisal Committee meeting report dated: 20/11/2012 on increase in capacity
6.	Revised PDD, Version 04 dated: 22/04/2014, Version 05 dated: 10/07/2014, Version 05.1 dated: 05/09/2014 and Version 06 dated: 05/09/2014
7.	Revised IRR and ER spreadsheet, dated: 22/04/2014
8.	PLF report prepared by GL Garrad Hassan, a third party, dated: 09/07/2013
9.	Intimation letter from MSEDCL for grid interconnection dated: 09/12/2011
10.	Bank loan sanction letter dated: 28/12/2012
11.	Investment decision to increase the capacity of the project from 74.65MW to 84.65MW dated 20/11/2012
12.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/7553 dated: 27/08/2013 (5*2MW)
13.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/1649 dated: 20/02/2013 (5*2MW)
14.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/6166 dated: 11/07/2013 (4*2MW)
15.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/8864 dated: 09/10/2012 (4*2MW)
16.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/6161 dated: 11/07/2013 (3*2MW)
17.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/8865 dated: 09/10/2012 (3*2MW)
18.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/3954 dated: 12/04/2013 (2*2MW)
19.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/6165 dated: 11/07/2013 (1*2MW)
20.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/7558 dated: 27/08/2013 (1*2MW)
21.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/7557 dated: 27/08/2013 (1*2MW)
22.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/1985 dated: 14/03/2013 (1*2MW)
23.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/9118 dated: 15/10/2012 (7*850kW)
24.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/5154 dated: 05/06/2013 (7*850kW)
25.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/7554 dated: 27/08/2013 (6*850kW)
26.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/6156 dated: 11/07/2013 (4*850kW)

27.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/9119 dated: 15/10/2012 (3*850kW)
28.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/6157 dated: 11/07/2013 (1*850kW)
29.	Commissioning certificate, Ref SE/SC/DyEE/Wind Mill/6168 dated: 11/07/2013 (1*850kW)
30.	Power Purchase Agreement for 2MW (1*2MW), dated: 03/07/2013
31.	Power Purchase Agreement for 6MW (3*2MW), dated: 10/12/2012
32.	Power Purchase Agreement for 8MW (4*2MW), dated: 10/12/2012
33.	Power Purchase Agreement for 8.5MW (10*850kW), dated: 10/12/2012
34.	Erection and commissioning contracts, dated: 20/09/2012
35.	Development contracts dated: 18/09/2012
36.	Supply contracts dated: 20/09/2012
37.	Amendment to Erection and commissioning contract dated: 11/01/2013
38.	Amendment to Development contract dated: 11/01/2013
39.	Amendment to Supply contract dated: 11/01/2013

## Appendix 2: List of persons interviewed and on site assessment

Date	Location	Team Members on site	Subjects covered	Persons interviewed
02/04/2014	Project site; and Jangi substation	Ankush Jain	Opening meeting	Rohit Joshi, ReNew Power Mahesh Arali, ReNew Power Satish Nikam, ReNew Power Veer bhardra, ReNew Power Swamy, Shivkumar S, Maruti Wind Park Developers
			Project implementation and management	
			Site tour	
			Data management and reporting systems	
			Data verification	
			QA/QC, management systems	
			Environmental and social issues	
			Issues with local stakeholders	
TBD	ReNew Wind Energy (Jath) Private Limited, Gurgaon	Ankush Jain	Closing meeting at site	Rohit Joshi, ReNew Power
			Project implementation and management	
			Project operation, Plant Load Factor	
			Requirements of Power Purchase Agreement (PPA)	
			Data archiving	
			Closing meeting	

#### 4. Certificate of Appointment

##### 1<sup>st</sup> Periodic verification of "Wind Power Project at Jath, Maharashtra"

We hereby certify that the following personnel have engaged in the verification process that has fully satisfied the competence requirements of the verification of the CDM project activity.

Name of Person	Assigned Roles
Ankush Jain	Team Leader, Sector Expert
Archak Pattanaik	Technical Reviewer, Sector Expert
Prabodha C Acharya	Decision Maker

Signed by

##### Decision Maker



Prabodha C Acharya  
General Manager, Climate Change Services, South Asia  
31/10/2014

## Protocol

This document has been produced by the LRQA Verification Team or the Post Registration changes validation team after the desk review and the site visit, as applicable, have been completed.

It outlines the verified situation in relation to a number of criteria, including those defined in the Validation and Verification Standard (VVS) and the Project Standard (PS) produced by the CDM Executive Board.

Where LRQA has identified issues requiring corrective action or clarification, **a reference is made in the 'Conclusion' column, and details** are stated in the section marked 'Findings'.

- Part 1 Validation of temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan and/or monitoring methodology
- Part 2 Validation of corrections
- Part 3 Validation of changes to the start date of the crediting period of the Project Activity or CPA
- Part 4 Validation of permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or monitoring methodology
- Part 5 Validation of changes to the project design of a registered project activity
- Part 6 Validation of changes to the project design of a registered PoA



## 1- Validation of temporary deviations

Team conclusions	
<b>1-1. Documentation from the PP</b>	
1-1.1. Is the alternative monitoring proposal completed?	Not applicable
1-1.2. Has the supplemental documentation been submitted as appropriate, especially when further explanation is necessary on the alternative monitoring?	Not applicable
<b>1-2. Level of accuracy</b> (Para 298 of the VVS)	
1-2.1. Determine whether the deviation is likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions:  Have the project participants applied conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the deviation?	Not applicable

## 2- Validation of corrections

Team conclusions	
<b>2-1. Documentation from the PP</b>	
2-1.1. Is the revised PDD with the corrections completed in clean and track change versions?	Not applicable
2-1.2. Has the supplemental documentation been submitted as appropriate?	Not applicable
<b>2-2. Means of verification</b> (Para 303 of the VVS)	
2-2.1. Determine whether the corrected information is an accurate reflection of actual project information.	Not applicable
2-2.2. Determine whether the corrected parameters are in accordance with the applied methodology and/or selected monitoring plan.	Not applicable

### 3- Validation of changes to the starting date of the crediting period of the Project Activity or CPA

	Team conclusions
<b>3-1. Documentation from the PP or the CME</b>	
3-1.1. Is a demonstration of no changes to the project activity or CPA that would result in a less conservative baseline provided?	Not applicable
3-1.2. Has supplemental documentation been submitted to demonstrate that substantive progress has been made by the project participants or the CME to start the project activity?	Not applicable
<b>3-2. Assessment of the demonstration</b> (Para 273 of the PS)	
3-2.1. Determine whether the baseline is affected by the delay in the starting day of the crediting period. If it is affected, verify if the new baseline is less conservative or not.	Not applicable
3-2.2. Assess if the PPs have implemented actions to start the project activity or CPA. List these actions and determine if the new start date of the crediting period can be met.	Not applicable

#### 4- Validation of permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan and/or monitoring methodology

	Team conclusions
<b>4-1. Documentation from the PP</b>	
4-1.1. Does the revised PDD contain a revised monitoring plan completed in clean and track change versions?	Not applicable
4-1.2. Has the supplemental documentation been submitted as appropriate, especially when further explanation is necessary on the revised monitoring plan?	Not applicable
<b>4-2. Level of accuracy</b> (Para 308 VVS)	
4-2.1. Did the revision of the monitoring plan ensure that the level of accuracy in the monitoring and verification process was not reduced as a result of revision? 1) frequency of measurements 2) quality of monitoring equipment 3) calibration requirements 4) QA/QC procedures.	Not applicable
<b>4-3. Completeness</b> (Para 311 VVS)	
4-3.1. Ensure that the permanent changes are not likely to lead to a reduction in the	Not applicable

Team conclusions	
<p>accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions</p> <p>4-3.2. In case the permanent changes will lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions, request the PPs to apply conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the permanent change.</p>	
<b>4-4. Compliance with approved monitoring methodology</b> (Para 309 VVS)	
<p>4-4.1. If the proposed revision refers to a later version of the applied methodology, does the revised monitoring plan ensure that the application does not compromise the conservativeness in the monitoring and verification process and of the ER calculations?</p>	Not applicable
<b>4-5. Findings of previous verification reports</b>	
<p>4-5.1. If there are findings in the previous verifications related to the proposed revision of the monitoring plan, have the</p>	Not applicable

	Team conclusions
findings been taken into account?	

## 5- Validation of changes to the project design of a registered project activity

Team conclusions	
<b>5-1. Background</b> (Section 13.8 of the PS)	
5-1.1. Identify concerns related to the conformity of the actual project activity and its operation with the registered PDD.	It was noted that the capacity of the project has increased from 74.65MW to 84.65MW. It was confirmed that additional 5 WTGs of capacity 2MW each was installed at the same wind site where the remaining project is located.
5-1.2. Provide the opinion on the changes as below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) when the changes occurred</li> <li>b) reasons for these changes taking place</li> <li>c) whether the changes would have been known prior to registration of the project activity</li> <li>d) how the changes would impact the overall operation/ability of the project activity to deliver emission reductions as stated in the PDD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The PP had decided to change the project capacity on 20/11/2012. Team confirmed it based on the review of minutes of project appraisal committee meeting.</li> <li>b) It was confirmed that the changes were made due to availability of additional sites at the wind farm. During the site visit team confirmed that additional wind turbines are located at the same wind farm. Further, Team confirmed the justification from the interview of the PP.</li> <li>c) The decision to increase the capacity was made on 20/11/2012 whereas the project was submitted for registration on 24/12/2012. Therefore, it was known to the PP that changes in capacity will be made prior to submission for registration. PP has justified that though it was known that the changes would be made in the capacity, there were some uncertainties in the additional wind turbines:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Consent from the bank for availability of additional funds was not available at the decision making of the PP. The loan was sanctioned on 28/12/2012, which is after the submission of project</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	Team conclusions
	<p>activity.</p> <p>b. Agreement with supplier was not available at the time of decision making of the PP. The agreement was signed on 11/01/2013, which is after the submission of the project activity.</p> <p>Though the decision was made, the PP justified that the PDD was not updated to unavailability of funds from bank as well as agreement with the supplier. PP has further stated that due to above uncertainty and risk of missing the December 2012 deadline, their management has decided to consider this change through PRC.</p> <p>Team validated the response from the PP based on the review of bank loan sanction letter dated: 28/12/2012 and amendment agreement dated: 11/01/2013 with the supplier for change in capacity.</p> <p>d) Due to installation of additional wind turbines, the overall capacity of the project activity was increased to 84.65MW. This additional capacity would increase the electricity generation and corresponding emission reductions. Further, there is no impact on scale of the project activity, applicability of the methodology and baseline scenario which remains valid after the increase in capacity. The IRR of the project marginally decreased to 12.39% from 12.48% earlier. For assessment on impact on scale, applicability, baseline scenario, and additionality of the project, please refer to sections below. Therefore, validation team confirms that the change would not impact the overall operation/ability of the project activity to deliver emission reductions as stated in the PDD.</p>
5-1.3. If the identified changes fall in the following, check the elements in 5-2	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The effective output capacity has been increased due to increased number of</p>



	Team conclusions
<p>below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Changes in the effective output capacity due to increased installed capacity or increased number of units, or installation of units with lower capacity or units with a technology which is less advanced than that described in the PDD</li> <li>(b) Addition of component or extension of technology</li> <li>(c) Removal or addition of one (or more) sites of a project activity registered with multiple sites</li> <li>(d) Different values of those actual operational parameters relevant to determination of emission reduction which are within the control of project participant and which result in the IRR passing the benchmark as described in the registered PDD.</li> </ul> <p>(Para 280 of the PS)</p>	<p>units. This is in accordance with point (a).</p>
<p>5-1.4. If the identified changes cause a project activity to no longer meet the criteria for small-scale CDM project activities, check the elements in 5-3 below.</p>	<p>Not applicable as it is a large scale project.</p>

		Team conclusions			
(Para 281 of the PS)					
5-1.5. If the identified changes in the implementation of project activity result in the following, check the elements in 5-4 below.  (a) the original methodology would no longer be applicable, or  (b) another methodology would have been applicable, or  (c) another baseline scenario would be more appropriate.  (Para 280 of the PS)		Change in capacity does not impact the applicability of the methodology. Further, the baseline scenario has been prescribed by the methodology. Therefore, addition of capacity to the existing project does not impact the baseline scenario.			
5-2. Changes which may impact the additionality of the project activity					
5-2.1. Check the impact of the change on the additionality of the project activity established at the time of registration and the specific conditions (investment / costs variables, barriers, relevant regulations).		The following input values to the investment analysis were changed due to increase in capacity.			
		Parameter	Value in registered PDD	Value in revised PDD	Remarks
		Total capacity	74.65 MW	84.65 MW	The capacity was changed due to addition of 5 units of 2MW G97 WTGs. Team confirmed the addition of five units from the review of Amendment contracts dated: 11/01/2013

Team conclusions				
	Project cost	4886 INR Million	5558 INR Million	The cost per WTG remains unchanged at 52 Million for G58 and 135 Million for G97. The increase in project cost is due to increase in number of G97 WTGs. Team confirmed the unit cost of the WTG from the review of Supply contract, Erection and commissioning contract, and Development contract. Team further confirmed from the review of Amendment contract dated: 11/01/2013 that the cost per WTG remains unchanged.
	Debt contribution	3420.20 INR Million	3890.60 INR Million	The debt equity ratio remains unchanged at 70:30. Debt contribution changed due to change in project cost.
	Equity contribution	1465.80 INR Million	1667.40 INR Million	The debt equity ratio remains unchanged at 70:30. Equity contribution changed due to change in project cost.
	O&M cost	57.33 INR Million	65.01 INR Million	The specific O&M cost remains unchanged at 0.768 INR Million/MW. The O&M cost was changed due to increase in capacity.
	Net generation	150.405 Million units	170.55 Million units	The PLF remains unchanged at 23%. Net generation figure was changed due to increase in capacity.
No other parameters were changed in the investment analysis.				

	Team conclusions
	<p>The IRR calculated as per the revised decision of 84.65MW was 12.39%; whereas the IRR as per the original decision of 74.65MW was 12.48%.</p> <p>Due to change in capacity, the benchmark has also been revisited to assess. The benchmark determined by the PP at the time of registration is based on the default return on equity in real basis and by including expected inflation rate. The default value of return on equity has been estimated based on the value provided in the Appendix of Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis. The forecasted inflation rate has been considered based on the inflation forecast value from the "Survey of professional forecasters".</p> <p>The revised investment decision was taken on 20/11/2012. The value of return on equity on real basis was not changed during the revised decision making. The most recent inflation forecast data is available from the "Survey of professional forecasters" dated: 29/10/2012. This report provides the inflation (Wholesale price index) estimate of 6.0% of long term period of 10 years. The revised benchmark available at the decision making would be:</p> <p><math>11.75\% + 6.00\% = 17.75\%</math></p> <p>This would be higher than that considered during original investment decision. Therefore, for conservativeness the benchmark was not revised.</p> <p>Due to change in capacity the common practice analysis was also revised. The similar capacity plants are now ranging from 42.325MW to 126.975MW. The total number of similar capacity power plants from the above selected capacity</p>

Team conclusions	
	range with the same evidence source as selected in the registered PDD is 89. Out of 89 similar capacity power plants 14 are registered CDM projects, leading to $N_{all}$ as 75. All the 75 power plants are either thermal (19), hydro (55), or biomass (1); therefore, $N_{diff}$ is also 75. The F factor is 0 and $N_{all} - N_{diff}$ is also 0. Therefore, it can be concluded that the project activity is not a common practice in India.
5-2.2. Review the investment analysis, if applicable, based on all original input data and check if the PPs have only modified the key parameters in the original spreadsheet calculations.	Yes. As discussed above, the investment analysis for the revised decision is based on the original input data with modification to key parameters changed due to increase in capacity. As discussed above, the unit cost of WTG, specific O&M cost and PLF remains unchanged. The change in values is due to change in number of WTGs, and overall capacity.
5-2.3. Check, if applicable, that the barriers are still valid under new circumstances, if only barriers were claimed to demonstrate additionality at the registration stage.	Not applicable. Additionality was demonstrated using investment analysis.
<b>5-3. Changes in the scale of CDM project activity</b>	
5-3.1. Check the changes against the applicable SSC criteria for Type I, Type II or Type III.	Not applicable as project is large scale. The change in capacity therefore does not impact the scale of the project.
<b>5-4. Changes which impact the applicability/application of baseline methodology</b>	
5-4.1. Check the applicability and application of baseline methodology with which the	Yes. Change in capacity does not impact the applicability and application of baseline

	Team conclusions
project has been registered.	<p>methodology.</p> <p>Each items of applicability of the methodology has been discussed below.</p> <p>The baseline was prescribed by the methodology. Therefore, change in capacity does not impact the baseline.</p>

No.	Applicability conditions in the ACM0002 Version 13.0.0	Information in the PDD	Validation opinion on the changes to the project activity	Conclusion
1	This methodology is applicable to grid-connected renewable power generation project activities that (a) install a new power plant at a site where no renewable power plant was operated prior to the implementation of the project activity (greenfield plant); (b) involve a capacity addition; (c) involve a retrofit of (an) existing plant(s); or (d) involve a replacement of (an) existing plant(s).	The Project activity involves installation of a new power plant at a site where no renewable power plant was operated prior to the implementation of the project activity (Greenfield plant). Hence, it meets the requirement.	The project activity is a new wind power project. Team confirmed that additional WTGs were also new based on the project agreements.	OK
2	The project activity is the installation, capacity addition, retrofit or replacement of a power plant/unit of one of the following types: hydro power plant/unit (either with a run-of-river reservoir or an accumulation reservoir), wind power plant/unit, geothermal power plant/unit, solar power plant/unit, wave power plant/unit or tidal power plant/unit;	The project activity involves the installation of a wind power plant. Hence, it meets the requirement.	The project activity is a new wind power project. Team confirmed that additional WTGs were also new based on the project agreements.	OK
3	In the case of capacity additions, retrofits or replacements (except for capacity addition projects for which the electricity generation of the existing power plant(s) or unit(s) is not affected: the existing plant started commercial	Not applicable to the Project activity as the project is a Greenfield setup and does not involve capacity additions, retrofits or replacements.	The project activity is a new wind power project. Team confirmed that additional WTGs were also new based on the project agreements.	OK

No.	Applicability conditions in the ACM0002 Version 13.0.0	Information in the PDD	Validation opinion on the changes to the project activity	Conclusion
	operation prior to the start of a minimum historical reference period of five years, used for the calculation of baseline emissions and defined in the baseline emission section, and no capacity addition or retrofit of the plant has been undertaken between the start of this minimum historical reference period and the implementation of the project activity;			
4	<p>In case of hydro power plants, At least one of the following conditions must apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project activity is implemented in an existing single or multiple reservoirs, with no change in the volume of any of the reservoirs; or</li> <li>• The project activity is implemented in an existing single or multiple reservoirs, where the volume of any of reservoirs is increased and the power density of each reservoir, as per the definitions given in the Project Emissions section, is greater than 4 W/m after the implementation of the project activity; or</li> <li>• The project activity results in new single or multiple reservoirs and the power density of each reservoir, as per the definitions given in the Project Emissions section, is greater than 4 W/m<sup>2</sup> after the implementation of the project activity.</li> </ul>	Not applicable to the Project activity. The Project activity involves installation of a wind power plant.	The project activity is not a hydro power project	OK
5	In case of hydro power plants using multiple reservoirs where the power density of any of	Not applicable to the Project activity. The Project activity involves installation of a wind	The project activity is not a hydropower plant.	OK

No.	Applicability conditions in the ACM0002 Version 13.0.0	Information in the PDD	Validation opinion on the changes to the project activity	Conclusion
	<p>the reservoirs is lower than 4 W/m<sup>2</sup> after the implementation of the project activity all of the following conditions must apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The power density calculated for the entire project activity using equation 5 is greater than 4 W/m<sup>2</sup>;</li> <li>• All reservoirs and hydro power plants are located at the same river and were designed together to function as an integrated project that collectively constitutes the generation capacity of the combined power plant;</li> <li>• The water flow between the multiple reservoirs is not used by any other hydropower unit which is not a part of the project activity;</li> <li>• The total installed capacity of the power units, which are driven using water from the reservoirs with a power density lower than 4 W/m<sup>2</sup>, is lower than 15 MW;</li> <li>• The total installed capacity of the power units, which are driven using water from reservoirs with a power density lower than 4 W/m<sup>2</sup>, is less than 10% of the total installed capacity of the project activity from multiple reservoirs.</li> </ul>	power plant.		
6	The methodology is not applicable to the following:	The Project activity is installation of a wind power plant and hence does not involve the following-	The project activity does not involve switching from fossil fuel at the sites, or biomass fired power plant or hydro power	OK



No.	Applicability conditions in the ACM0002 Version 13.0.0	Information in the PDD	Validation opinion on the changes to the project activity	Conclusion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project activities that involve switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources at the site of the project activity, since in this case the baseline may be the continued use of fossil fuels at the site;</li> <li>Biomass fired power plants;</li> <li>A hydro power plant that results in the creation of a new single reservoir or in the increase in an existing single reservoir where the power density of the reservoir is less than 4 W/m<sup>2</sup>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources at the sites</li> <li>Biomass fired power plants</li> <li>Hydro power plants</li> </ul>	plant.	
7	In the case of retrofits, replacements, or capacity additions, this methodology is only applicable if the most plausible baseline scenario, as a result of the identification of baseline scenario, is "the continuation of the current situation, i.e. to use the power generation equipment that was already in use prior to the implementation of the project activity and undertaking business as usual maintenance".	The project is not a retrofit, replacement or capacity addition. Hence this condition is not applicable.	The validation team confirmed that the project is not an addition of renewable energy generation units at an existing facility but it is an installation of new power plant at new site (Greenfield project) where there is no existing renewable power generation facility. LRQA has confirmed this through the site visit, review of project agreements and commissioning certificate.	OK

## 6- Validation of changes to the project design of a registered PoA

Team conclusions	
<b>6-1. Changes allowed</b> (Para 131 of the PCP)	
6-1.1. PoA boundary: Check that the change is only: i. to expand geographical coverage and/or ii. to includes additional host parties	Not applicable
6-1.2. Eligibility criteria: Check that these changes are under the circumstances indicated in the "Standard for Demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for PoA"	Not applicable
6-1.3. .Addition of specific case CPA: i. Check that the PoA include more than one generic CPA-DD ii. Check that the new Specific CPA correspond to a generic CPA for which no specific CPA was submitted at the time of registration.	Not applicable

Team conclusions	
6-1.4. Application of provisions of the most recent version of the "Standard for sampling and surveys of for CDM PAs and PoAs"	Not applicable
<b>6-2. Eligibility criteria</b>	
6-2.1. Check that the CME has updated the Eligibility criteria for inclusion of CPAs in the PoA to reflect the changes above and has included them in new versions of PoA-DD and generic CPA-DD.	Not applicable
6-2.2. Assess the new eligibility criteria in the table below and determine whether the eligibility criteria are sufficiently objective and comprehensive to permit the assessment of the inclusion of CPAs in the PoA. Not Applicable (Delete or add rows in the table below as applicable)	