
VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION REPORT

M/s The Tata Power Company Limited

**Tata Power - Wind power project at
Samana in Jamnagar district,
Gujarat**

UNFCCC Reference 8442

Monitoring Period 1: 06/12/2012 to 31/12/2013
(Both days inclusive)

SGS Climate Change Programme

SGS United Kingdom Ltd
SGS House
217-221 London Road
Camberley Surrey
GU15 3EY
United Kingdom

Date of Issue:		Project Number:	
19/05/2014		CDM.VER1406 MP1	
Project Title:			
Tata Power - Wind power project at Samana in Jamnagar district, Gujarat			
Organisation:		Client:	
SGS United Kingdom Limited		M/s The Tata Power Company Limited	
Publication of Monitoring Report:			
Monitoring Period:		06/12/2012 – 31/12/2013	
First Monitoring Version and Date:		Version 01 dated 16/01/2014	
Final Monitoring Version and Date:		Version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014	
Summary:			
<p>SGS United Kingdom Ltd has performed the first periodic verification of the CDM project “Tata Power - Wind power project at Samana in Jamnagar district, Gujarat”, with UNFCCC reference number of 8442, registration date of 06/12/2012 and crediting period from 06/12/2012 up to 05/12/2022. The verification includes confirming the implementation of the monitoring plan of the registered PDD version 08 dated 22/10/2012 (as well as revised PDD^{/1.3/}) and the application of the monitoring methodology as per ACM0002 version 13.0 dated 11/05/2012. A site visit was conducted to verify the data submitted in the monitoring report. SGS confirms the following has been reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The registered PDD^{/1/}, revised PDD^{/1.3/}, including the monitoring plan and the corresponding validation report^{/4/}; (b) Monitoring report^{/2-2.3/}; (c) The applied monitoring methodology^{/14/}; (d) Relevant decisions, clarifications and guidance from the CMP and the CDM Executive Board; (e) All information and references relevant to the project activity's resulting in emission reductions. <p>This project activity is a wind power generation project with a total installed capacity of 50.4 MW. This project activity consists of the installation of 63 Wind Turbine Generators, each with a capacity of 800 kW (E-53 make). The electricity generated from these Wind Turbine Generators is being supplied to Gujarat state electricity grid which is now a part of NEWNE (Northern, Eastern, Western and North-Eastern) grid of India</p> <p>SGS confirms that the project is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered (as well as the revised) Project Design Document. The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements. Our opinion relates to the projects GHG emissions and the resulting GHG emission reductions reported and related to the valid and registered project baseline and monitoring and its associated documents. Based on the information seen and evaluated we confirm that the implementation of the project has resulted in 78,938 tCO₂e emission reductions during period 06/12/2012 up to 31/12/2013 (both days inclusive).</p>			
Subject:			
CDM Verification			
Verification Team:			
Vikas Bankar – Lead Assessor, Local Assessor and Technical Area Expert (TA 1.2)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Distribution (without permission from the Client or responsible organisational unit)	
Technical Review:		<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Distribution	
Date: 20/05/2014			
Name: Ramkrishna Patil			
Authorised Signatory:			
Name: Siddharth Yadav			
Date: 20/05/2014			
Revision Number:	Date:	Number of Pages:	<input type="checkbox"/> Unrestricted Distribution
0	07/04/2014	45	
1	30/04/2014	46	
2	13/05/2014	46	
3	19/05/2014	48	

Abbreviations

BEF	Baseline Emission Factor
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CEA	Central Electricity Authority
CER	Carbon emission Reductions
CL	Clarification Request
CMP	Conference of Parties Serving as Meeting of Parties
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
COP	Conference of Parties
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EB	Executive Board
EIL	Enercon India Limited
EPC	Engineering, Procurement and Construction
ER	Emission Reductions
FAR	Forward Action Request
GEDA	Gujarat Energy Development Agency
GETCO/	Gujarat Electricity Transmission Company Limited
GETCL	
GHG	Green House Gas
GUVNL	Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited
JMR	Joint Meter Reading
ISO	International Organisation for Standardisation
LSHC	Local Stake Holder Consultation
MOP	Meeting of Parties
MP	Monitoring Plan
MR	Monitoring Report
MW	Megawatt
MWh	Megawatt-hour
NEWNE	Northern Eastern Western and Northern-Eastern
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
PDD	Project Design Document
PGVCL	Paschim Gujarat Vij Corporation Limited
PLF	Plant Load Factor
PS	Project Standard
PP	Project Participant
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
PRC	Post Registration Changes
QA/QC	Quality Assurance and Quality Control
TPCL	Tata Power Company Limited
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard
WEC / WTG	Wind Energy Converter / Wind Turbine Generator

Table of Content

1. Introduction.....	5
1.1 Objective.....	5
1.2 Scope	5
1.3 Project Activity and Period Covered.....	5
2. Methodology	7
2.1 General Approach	7
2.2 Verification Team for this Assessment	7
2.3 Means of Verification.....	7
2.3.1 Review of Documentation	7
2.3.2 Site Visits.....	8
2.4 Reporting of Findings	8
2.5 Internal Quality Control	9
3. Verification Findings.....	10
3.1 Project Implementation.....	10
3.2 Post registration changes	12
3.2.1 Temporary deviations from registered monitoring plan or applied methodology.....	12
3.2.2 Corrections	12
3.2.3 Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan or applied methodology	13
3.2.4 Changes to project design of registered project activity	14
3.2.5 Changes to start date of crediting period	14
3.3 Remaining Issues, CAR's, FAR's from Previous Validation or Verification.....	14
3.4 Completeness and accuracy of Monitoring	14
3.4.1 Verification of monitoring of parameters	14
3.4.2 Verification of implementation of sampling plan	18
3.5 Accuracy of Equipment.....	18
3.6 Summary of compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments.....	19
3.7 Accuracy of Emission Reduction Calculations.....	19
3.8 Quality of Evidence to Determine Emission Reductions	21
3.9 Management and operational System and Quality Assurance.....	21
3.10 Data from External Sources.....	21
4. Calculation of Emission Reductions.....	23
5. Recommendations for Changes in the Monitoring Plan.....	25
6. Overview of Results	26
7. Verification and Certification Statement.....	28
8. Document References	29
9. Findings Overview	34
10. Statement of Competence.....	45
11. Photographic Evidence	47

1. Introduction

1.1 Objective

SGS United Kingdom Ltd has been contracted by M/s The Tata Power Company Limited (one of the project participants of the project) to perform an independent verification of its CDM project "Tata Power - Wind power project at Samana in Jamnagar district, Gujarat". CDM projects must undergo periodic audits and verification of emission reductions as the basis for issuance of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs).

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

- The emissions report conforms with the requirements of the monitoring plan in the registered and revised PDD and the approved methodology; and
- The data reported are complete and transparent.

1.2 Scope

The scope of the verification is the independent and objective review and ex post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emission by the project activity. The verification is based on the validated and registered (as well as revised) project design document and the monitoring report. The project is assessed against the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM Modalities and Procedures and related rules and guidance.

SGS has, based on the recommendations in the Validation and Verification Standard, employed a risk-based approach in the verification, focusing on the identification of significant reporting risks and the reliability of project monitoring.

Due professional care has been exercised and ethical conduct has been followed by the assessment team during the verification process. The verification report is a fair presentation of the verification activity.

The verification is not meant to provide any consulting towards the Client. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the project design.

1.3 Project Activity and Period Covered

This engagement covers emissions and emission reductions from anthropogenic sources of greenhouse gases included within the project boundary of the following project and period.

Title of Project Activity: Tata Power - Wind power project at Samana in Jamnagar district, Gujarat

UNFCCC Registration Number: 8442

Monitoring Period Covered in this Report: 06/12/2012 – 31/12/2013

Project Participants: Host Country: India
M/s The Tata Power Company Limited

Annex 1 Country: Sweden

Swedish Energy Agency

Asian Development Bank as trustee of the Future Carbon Fund

Location of the Project Activity: Dhun Dhoraji, Mota Paanchdevada, Nana Paanchdevada, Sadodar, Narmana, Dal Devaliya villages in Jamnagar District of Gujarat state in India.

Geo-coordinates range:

Latitude: Ranges from 22° 3' 54.660" N -
22° 7' 10.260" N, Longitude: Ranges from
70° 10' 46.740" E - 70° 14' 29.700" E

The project activity is located at Jamnagar district in the state of Gujarat, India. The project activity consists of the installation of 63 WTGs, each with a capacity of 800 kW. The electricity generated from these Wind Turbine Generators is being sold to GUVNL who is one of the distribution licensees in the state of Gujarat and integral part of NEWNE Grid. In the absence of the project activity, the equivalent amount of electricity would have been otherwise generated through fossil fuel dominated power plants connected to NEWNE grid; thereby resulting in higher GHG emissions. Hence the generation of power through the project activity contributes to GHG emission reductions. The project activity is already commissioned^{9/} and it is found to be running satisfactorily.

2. Methodology

2.1 General Approach

SGS performs the verification work using a Periodic Verification Checklist prepared following the VVS. The Periodic Verification Checklist describes the verification approach and the sampling plan.

The checklist gives the assessment team 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.

Using the Periodic Verification Checklist, SGS 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.

Only verification activities undertaken after the publication of the monitoring report on the UNFCCC CDM website were used as a basis for SGS to conclude our verification and submit a request for issuance of CERs to the Board.

2.2 Verification Team for this Assessment

A team of competency has been selected to perform the verification of the project.

Name	Role
Vikas Bankar	Lead Assessor, Local Assessor and Technical Area Expert (TA 1.2)

2.3 Means of Verification

2.3.1 Review of Documentation

The validated PDD, revised PDD, the monitoring report submitted by the client and additional background documents related to the project performance were reviewed. A complete list of all documents reviewed is attached in section 8 of this report.

2.3.2 Site Visits

As part of the verification, the following on-site inspections have been performed by the Lead Assessor/Team Leader, Local Assessor and Technical Area Expert (TA 1.2).

Location: Dhun Dhoraji, Mota Paanchdevada, Nana Paanchdevada, Sadodar, Narmana, Dal Devaliya villages in Jamnagar District of Gujarat state in India.	
Date: 07/02/2014	
Coverage:	Source of Information / Persons Interviewed
Review of performance records i.e. invoices raised by project participant, Certificates of share of electricity generated issued by GETCO, calibration records, and monitoring practice adopted at site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical equipment and operation Data uncertainty and residual risks; 	Mr. Sajid P, Area Lead (Wind World (India) Limited) Mr. Nikhil Kumar Singh, Site Engineer (Wind World (India) Limited)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality control and quality assurance procedures Monitoring equipment including calibration performance Implementation of procedures for operations and data collection 	Mr. Sajid P, Area Lead (Wind World (India) Limited) Mr. Nikhil Kumar Singh, Site Engineer (Wind World (India) Limited) Mr. Subhakanta Nayak, Lead Engineer (TATA Power Company Limited)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring report and emission reduction calculations, Methods and formulae for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage 	Mr. Sandeep Pipaliya, Lead Associate (TATA Power Company Limited) Mr. Srinidhi S Rao, Project Consultant (Emergent Ventures India)

2.4 Reporting of Findings

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

In general, where insufficient or inaccurate information is available and clarification or new information is required the team shall raise a Clarification Request (CL) specifying what additional information is required.

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

- I. Non-compliance with the monitoring plan or methodology are found in monitoring and reporting and has not been sufficiently documented by the project participants, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;
- II. Modifications to the implementation, operation and monitoring of the registered project activity has not been sufficiently documented by the project participants;
- III. Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions that will impact the quantity of emission reductions;
- IV. 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 verification process may be halted until this information has been made available to comply with the requirements of the CDM Executive Board. Failure to address a CL may result in a CAR. Information or clarifications provided as a result of a CL may also lead to a CAR.

A clarification request (CL) will be raised 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.

Corrective Action Requests and Clarification Requests are raised in the Periodic Verification Checklist. The Project Developer is given the opportunity to “close” outstanding CARs and respond to CLs.

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, which are for the benefit of future projects and future verification activities. These have no impact upon the completion of the verification activity.

All CARs, CLs and FARs for this verification period are included in this report.

2.5 Internal Quality Control

Following the completion of the assessment process and a recommendation by the Assessment Team, all documentation will be forwarded to a Technical Review Team. The task of the Technical Review Team is to check that all procedures have been followed and all conclusions are justified. The Technical Reviewer will either accept or reject the recommendation made by the assessment team.

Technical Review Team

Name	Role
Ramkrishna Patil	Technical Reviewer and Technical Area Expert (TA 1.2)

3. Verification Findings

3.1 Project Implementation

The project activity is implemented and equipments are installed^{/9/} as described in the registered PDD^{/1/} and revised PDD^{/1.3/}.

This is the first verification for the project activity. The project activity has been commissioned^{/9/} and implemented satisfactorily. The same has been checked and verified during the site visit to the project activity. The start date of this monitoring period is 06/12/2012 which is in line with the start date of crediting period mentioned on the UNFCCC project webpage. This is checked and confirmed from <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1354168605.84/view>.

The below table summarises progress of the project activity;

Status	Relevant Date
Project Registration with UNFCCC	06/12/2012
First Monitoring Period (Current Verification)	06/12/2012 – 31/12/2013 (Both days included)

A verification site visit to the project activity has been carried out by members of the verification team on 07/02/2014. The operation and implementation of the project activity have been checked and have been confirmed during the site visit to the project activity. It is also found to be consistent with the registered PDD^{/1/} and revised PDD^{/1.3/}.

The monitoring report version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014^{/2.3/} has been checked for consistency with the registered PDD^{/1/} and revised PDD^{/1.3/}; it is found to be consistent. The PP has considered the monitoring parameters in the monitoring report as per the registered monitoring plan^{/1/}. The recording frequency and completeness of the data for the monitoring period have been checked and it is found to be appropriate as per the registered monitoring plan^{/1/}.

The locations of the monitoring instruments i.e. energy meters have been checked and confirmed during the site visit to the project activity conducted on the 07/02/2014. The same is found to be appropriate and consistent with the registered PDD^{/1/} and revised PDD^{/1.3/}. Photographic evidences for the site installations and the meters are also attached in section 11 of this verification report.

The PP has used the latest MR template i.e. version 3.2^{/12/} as per the 'Guideline: Completing the monitoring report form, version 4.0^{/15/}'. It was noted that, although the word version of the MR submitted was in line with the template available on UNFCCC website (i.e. F-CDM-MR form version 3.2^{/12/}), during the conversion to PDF format, some of the table borders disappeared. It was verified by the assessment team that the format of the MR template was not altered/modified in line with the para 11 of the 'Guideline: Completing the monitoring report form' version 4.0. These lines are visible if zoom is increased. The Monitoring Report for the first monitoring period is in compliance with the monitoring plan of the registered PDD^{/1/} and revised PDD^{/1.3/}.

The project had been registered with the large scale approved baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002 version 13.0, "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources"^{/14/} and the verification is carried out in accordance with the applied methodology. It was confirmed during the site visit that the project activity during the current periodic verification is still in accordance with the applicability criteria of the methodology^{/14/}. This is in line with paragraphs 261 - 263 of VVS version 6.0^{/11/}.

Comparison of actual emission reductions with the same projected in the registered PDD:

Actual verified emission reductions for the current monitoring period (06/12/2012 to 31/12/2013) for the project activity is 78,938 tCO₂ which is found to be around 23.89% lower when compared to the estimated emission reductions of 103,718 tCO₂ for the same period as per the registered PDD^{/1/} and revised PDD^{/1.3/}.

The assessment team had checked during the site visit that there is no change in the project design described in the registered PDD^{/1/} and revised PDD^{/1.3/}. The decrease in the emission reductions is due to lesser wind availability in the current monitoring period due to the variable nature of wind available in the region; this is not within the control of the project participant. The appropriateness of the justification provided for lower PLF achieved has been confirmed by the technical area expert involved in the project activity. Since, the actual PLF achieved is lower than the estimated PLF, it has no impact on additionality; hence it is accepted.

Corresponding to paragraphs 264-267 of VVS version 6.0^{/11/}, the verification team confirms that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the approved methodology ACM0002 version 13.0^{/14/}, which was applied to the project activity. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

Discussion on CAR/CL:

CAR #1 was raised to ask the PP to clarify the below points;

1. Name of the project participant and title of the applied methodology mentioned on the title page of the MR Version 01 was not found in line with the same mentioned on UNFCCC project webpage <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1354168605.84/view>.
2. Content of information included in section A.1 of the MR was not found in line with Guidelines: Completing the monitoring report form, version 4.0.
3. Section B.1 of the MR Version 01 doesn't include a technology diagram in line with Guidelines: Completing the monitoring report form, version 4.0.

In response, the PP submitted the revised MR Version 1.1^{/2.1/} with the name of the project participant and title of the applied methodology mentioned on the title page of the MR, in line with the information on the UNFCCC project webpage <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1354168605.84/view>. Also sections A.1 and B.1 of the MR were found to be completed in line with Guidelines: Completing the monitoring report form, version 4.0. **CAR #1** was further extended to ask PP to clarify the below points;

- All project participants listed on UNFCCC project webpage were not mentioned on the title page and section A.3 of the MR.
- Thousand separators were not used appropriately in sections E.5 and E.6 of MR in line with paragraph 14 of Guidelines: Completing the monitoring report form, version 4.0.
- All the changes were not listed in Appendix 6 of the PDD^{/1.1/}.

In response, the PP submitted the revised MR^{/2.3/} with all project participants listed on the title page and section A.3 of the MR^{/2.3/} and thousand separators were appropriately used in sections E.5 and E.6 of the MR^{/2.3/}. Also the PP submitted a revised PDD^{/1.3/} with all changes summarised in Appendix 6 of the PDD^{/1.3/}. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; thus **CAR #1** was closed out.

CL #2 was raised to ask the PP to clarify the following;

1. Section 1.2 of MR^{/2/}: it is found that geo-coordinates mentioned for two WTGs i.e. TATASP-07 (2110) and TATASP-08 (2111) are exactly the same.
2. Section 1.3 of MR^{/2/}: Name of the project participant mentioned is found to be inconsistent with the UN project webpage <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1354168605.84/view>.
3. Section B.1 of the MR^{/2/} mentions commissioning dates of the WTGs which are inconsistent with the registered PDD.

In response, the PP submitted the revised MR^{/2.2/} with the appropriate geo-coordinates mentioned in section 1.2 of the MR (which is checked and confirmed from details of geo-coordinates submitted by technology supplier for the project activity). Also the revised MR^{/2.2/} includes the names of project participants in section 1.3 of the MR in line with those listed in UN project webpage. Also the PP corrected commissioning dates of first and last WTGs commissioned in line with commissioning certificates submitted for the project activity. The commissioning dates of the first and last WTGs commissioned, mentioned in section B.5 of the registered PDD^{/1/}, are found to be appropriate; however the PP submitted the revised PDD^{/1.1/} with corrected geo-ordinates for two WTGs i.e. TATASP-07 (2110) and TATASP-08 (2111) and calibration frequency as once in three years. **CL #2** was further extended to ask the PP to clarify the basis for the three years of

calibration frequency. In response, the PP submitted a letter from GETCL^{/18/} indicating three years of calibration frequency which is out of the control of the PP. Also it is observed that changes 4, 5, 6 listed in section B.2.2 of the MR^{/2.2/} were more relevant in section B.2.3 of the MR^{/2.2/}, thus PP is requested to clarify the same. In response, the PP submitted the revised MR^{/2.3/} in which the post registration changes are appropriately mentioned in section B.2.2 and B.2.3 of the MR^{/2.3/}. Also all the changes from the registered PDD were not indicated in track change mode in the track change version of the revised PDD^{/1.2/}; hence CL #2 was further extended. In response, PP submitted revised PDD^{/1.3/} with all the changes reflected in track change mode. Thus it is found to be appropriate and hence **CL #2** was closed out.

Detailed discussion on the above CAR/CL can be referred to in section 9 of this verification report.

3.2 Post registration changes

There are post registrations changes observed from the registered PDD^{/1/} as listed below;

1. Geo-coordinates mentioned for two WTGs i.e. TATASP-07 (2110) and TATASP-08 (2111) are corrected in line with details of geo-coordinates provided by the technology supplier^{/19/}.
2. In section A.2.4 of the registered PDD, reference of Appendix 2 is corrected as Annex II for details of WTGs involved in the project activity mentioned in Annex II of the PDD.
3. In section B.4, the reference to total installed capacity of power stations in host country is changed from Annex 3 to Annex I.
4. In section E.1, the reference to stakeholders meeting recording and meeting minutes is changed from Appendix 3 to Annex III.
5. Measurement method for parameter "Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, EGy" is mentioned as 'Measured and Calculated' instead of calculated.
6. Calibration frequency is mentioned as once in three years instead of annual calibration frequency.
7. The metering single line diagram in section B.7.3 is corrected to give clear representation of actual metering arrangement at site.

The detailed assessment of above changes are discussed below in sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 of this verification report in line with the requirements specified in paragraph 282 - 285 of VVS version 6.0^{/11/}.

It is to be noted that this project is registered under the previous regulatory framework (VVM track), and the old information is transferred to the new VVS track form. The verification team confirms that the material (information) included in the new form is materially the same as the information in the registered PDD.

3.2.1 Temporary deviations from registered monitoring plan or applied methodology

There are no temporary deviations observed from the registered monitoring plan as well as applied methodology during the current monitoring period. It was verified and confirmed from the Monitoring Report^{/2.3/}, Registered PDD^{/1/}, revised PDD^{/1.3/}, UNFCCC project webpage (<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1354168605.84/view>), applied methodology^{/14/} and on-site verification. This was checked and confirmed in line with the requirements specified in paragraph 286-291 of VVS version 6.0^{/11/}.

3.2.2 Corrections

The following corrections are observed in the registered PDD^{/1/} during verification assessment carried out for first monitoring period for the project activity.

1. Correction in Geo-coordinates: During the verification assessment of the project activity, it is observed that Geo-coordinates mentioned in section A.2.4 of the registered PDD^{/1/} for two WTGs i.e. TATASP-07 (2110) and TATASP-08 (2111) were exactly the same. The PP was asked to provide details of geo-coordinates of all the 63 WTGs involved in the project activity through CL #2. The PP submitted detailed geo-coordinates of all the 63 WTGs involved in the project activity provided by the technology supplier^{/19/} along with revised PDD^{/1.3/} with corrected Geo-coordinates mentioned in section A.2.4 of the revised PDD^{/1.3/} for two WTGs i.e. TATASP-07 (2110) and TATASP-08 (2111).

This correction does not affect the design of the project activity and therefore does not require prior approval by the Board as per Appendix 1 of Project Standard version 06^{/13/}. Further discussion can be referred above in section 3.1 of this report and in section 9 under CL #2.

2. The registered PDD^{/1/} includes details of WTGs involved in the project activity such as unique identification numbers of the WTGs and their location in Annex II of the registered PDD^{/1/}. However, in section A.2.4 of the registered PDD, it was referred as Appendix 2 and it is now corrected as Annex II in the revised PDD^{/1.3/}. This correction does not affect the design of the project activity; hence does not require prior approval by the Board.
3. The registered PDD^{/1/} includes the details on total installed capacity of power stations in host country (India) in Annex 1 of the registered PDD^{/1/}; however, section B.4 of the registered PDD^{/1/} mentioned the reference as Annex 3, which is now corrected as Annex 1 in the revised PDD^{/1.3/}. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.
4. Annex III of the registered PDD^{/1/} includes details on the summary of comments received in LSHC meeting, Attendance sheet and LSHC photographs. However, section E.1 of the registered PDD^{/1/} mentioned the reference as Appendix 3. This is now corrected as Annex III in the revised PDD^{/1.3/}. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

This was found to be in line with the requirements specified in paragraph 292 - 294 of VVS version 6.0^{/11/}. All above corrections are of a typographical nature and do not affect the design of the project activity, hence does not require prior approval as per Appendix 1 of Project Standard version 6.0^{/13/}.

3.2.3 Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan or applied methodology

During the site visit assessment of the project activity, the changes below are observed when compared with the actual monitoring practice being followed at the project site and it is discussed as below;

1. **Measurement Method:** Section B.7.1 of the registered PDD^{/1/} mentioned the measured method for monitoring parameter "*Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, EGy*" as "*Calculated*". However, during the site visit, it is found that this parameter is apportioned based on measurement carried out at Sadodar (33/220 kV) substation and individual cluster meters located near WTGs involved in the project. Hence it is corrected as "*Measured and Calculated*" for transparency and it is found to be in line with the applied methodology ACM0002 version 13.0^{/14/}. Also it is understood that the apportioning procedure is being carried out by the power purchasing utility i.e. GUVNL in this case and it is not in the control of the project participant. The monitoring practise of apportioning was based on measured parameters and was followed since commissioning of project activity. Thus transparency about measurement method is found to be appropriate.
2. **Change in Calibration Frequency:** Section B.7.1 of the registered PDD^{/1/} mentioned calibration frequency as annual. However, the PP submitted a letter from GETCL (Ref. ACE(R&C)/SE/Telecom/ABT Meter/37/10) dated 04/01/2012^{/18/} during the site visit to the project activity, which clearly indicates that "*all the meters at power evacuation sites are calibrated and tested once in a period of three years.*" It is accepted in line with paragraph 5a) of Appendix 1 of Project Standard version 6.0^{/13/} as this change in calibration frequency is not within the control of the project participants as confirmed during site visit to the project activity. Also the appropriateness has been checked and confirmed from CEA Notification No. 502/70/CEA/DP&D dated 17/03/2006^{/8/} which is considered as national standard, mentions that "*All interface meters shall be tested at least once in five years.*" Amendment regulations were published in gazette of India vide No. 505/6/2009/DP&D/D-1 dated 4th June, 2010 (http://cea.nic.in/reports/regulation/amend_meter_reg.pdf); however there was no amendment found related to calibration frequency. Hence calibration frequency of once in three years considered in the revised PDD^{/1.3/} for the project activity is found to be conservative; hence it is accepted. Further discussion can be referred above in section 3.1 of this report and in section 9 under CL #2.
3. **Correction of line diagram indicating metering locations:** Line diagram included in section B.7.2 of the registered PDD^{/1/} indicated dedicated metering arrangement; however during the site visit shared metering arrangement was observed by the assessment team. Hence, the PP has now corrected the line diagram, indicating monitoring locations with other WTGs which are not a part of

the project activity connected to the Sadodar substation in section B.7.3 of the revised PDD^{/1.3/}. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. Further discussion can be referred above in section 3.4.1 of this report and in section 9 under CAR #3.

This is found to be in line with the requirements specified in paragraph 297 - 301 of VVS version 6.0^{/11/}. The changes in calibration frequency for monitoring plan equipment is not in the control of the Project Participant and therefore does not require prior approval as per para 5(a) of Appendix 1 of Project Standard Version 6.0. The remaining changes are corrections in measurement methods and correction in line diagram of metering location and are for transparency in monitoring plan.

3.2.4 Changes to project design of registered project activity

The project activity is implemented and operating in compliance with the project description mentioned in the registered PDD^{/1/} and revised PDD^{/1.3/}; hence no changes to the project design of the registered project activity are observed in the current monitoring period. It was verified and confirmed from the registered PDD^{/1/} revised PDD^{/1.3/}, UNFCCC project webpage and the on-site verification. This was checked and confirmed in line with the requirements specified in paragraph 304 - 317 of VVS version 6.0^{/11/}.

3.2.5 Changes to start date of crediting period

The project activity has not changed the start date of the crediting period. It was verified and confirmed through the UNFCCC project webpage. This was checked and confirmed in line with the requirements specified in paragraph 295 and 296 of VVS version 6.0^{/11/}.

3.3 Remaining Issues, CAR's, FAR's from Previous Validation or Verification

Since this is first verification of the project activity, the verification team has reviewed the validation report^{/4/} in line with the requirement of paragraph 319 (h) of VVS version 6.0^{/11/}. No open issue is found from the validation stage of the project activity.

3.4 Completeness and accuracy of Monitoring

3.4.1 Verification of monitoring of parameters

Monitoring of reductions in GHG emissions resulting from the registered project have been implemented in accordance with the registered^{/1/} and revised PDD^{/1.3/}. The project activity was registered on 06/12/2012 with UNFCCC Reference No. 8442. The monitoring report version 01^{/2/} as well as final monitoring report version 1.3^{/2.3/} for the current verification mentions the monitoring period from 06/12/2012 to 31/12/2013 (both days inclusive). During the site visit, personnel involved at various levels of operation of the project activity have been interviewed. It has been confirmed that the onsite personnel are conscious of the importance of monitoring related activities. The onsite verification of measurement records also substantiate consistency in recording and reporting of the monitored data. The monitoring mechanism is effective and reliable.

As per VVS version 6.0 para 252 and 253^{/11/}, monitored parameters under the project monitoring plan is in compliance with the registered PDD^{/1/} and revised PDD^{/1.3/}, the monitoring results of the parameter as reviewed during the verification process are discussed below:

“Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, EG_y ”

Monitoring Report, onsite checks	Requirement in the applicable methodology and relevant EB Documents	Requirement in the registered and revised PDD	Implementation of the project	Conclusion on the compliance of the implementation with the monitoring plan & Methodological requirements.
Registered and Revised PDD & Approved Methodology				
Data/Parameter	$EG_{\text{facility},y}$	EG_y	EG_y	
Description	Quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project plant/unit to the grid in year y	Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project	Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project	
Measured/Calculated /Default	Measured	Measured and Calculated	Measured and Calculated	
Source of data	Not specified	Monthly share certificate issued by GETCO/GEDA	Monthly share certificate issued by GETCO/GEDA	
Monitoring equipment	Energy Meter	Energy Meter	Energy Meter	
Measuring/Reading/ Recording frequency	Continuous measurement and at least monthly recording	Measuring frequency: Continuous Recording frequency: Monthly	Measuring frequency: Continuous Recording frequency: Monthly	
Calculation method (if applicable)	Not specified	Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project is measured and calculated as a difference between electricity export and import by the project activity.	Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project is measured and calculated as a difference between electricity export and import by the project activity which is under purview of state electricity board. However, Certificates for Share of Electricity Generated by Wind Farm by GETCO doesn't include data of electricity exported and imported separately. It only includes the values of net electricity supplied to grid by the project activity.	During the site visit to the project activity, it is found that the electricity exported and imported by the project activity are being measured through dedicated cluster meters installed for the project activity. However, these do not account for transmission losses into it. Hence the values of electricity exported and imported measured at cluster meters are being used to apportion the values of electricity exported and imported measured at Sadodar (33/220 kV) substation to arrive at Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project. This apportioning procedure is being carried out by the state utility and it is not in the control of the project participant. Thus it is concluded that the Monitoring Plan included in the Monitoring Report and observed at the project site is found to be in line with the registered PDD ^{1/} , revised PDD ^{1.3/} and applied methodology ACM0002 version 13.0 ^{14/} .
QA/QC procedures	Not specified	Meter calibration shall be conducted once in a year as per registered PDD which is now proposed to be changed to once in 3 years by GETCO through revised PDD ^{1.3/} in accordance with the	Meter calibration shall be conducted once in a year as per registered PDD which is now proposed to be changed to once in 3 years by GETCO through revised PDD ^{1.3/} in accordance with the local calibration	

<div>Monitoring Report, onsite checks</div> <div>Registered and Revised PDD & Approved Methodology</div>	Requirement in the applicable methodology and relevant EB Documents	Requirement in the registered and revised PDD	Implementation of the project	Conclusion on the compliance of the implementation with the monitoring plan & Methodological requirements.
		<p>local calibration standards (letter received from GETCL^{/18/}).</p> <p>Meter accuracy: 0.2s of the meter at respective substations that would be used for the metering of electricity exported.</p> <p>TPCL prepare invoices on monthly basis for the net electricity supplied to the grid and submit the same to GUVNL along with copy of joint meter reading as certified by SEA (State energy Account) issued by of Gujarat SLDC (State Load Dispatch Centre). These invoices can be used for cross checking of data mentioned in share of electricity certificate by GEDA, used for Emission reduction calculation</p>	<p>standards (letter received from GETCL^{/18/}).</p> <p>All the meters installed in for the project activity have meter accuracy class of 0.2s.</p> <p>TPCL prepare invoices on monthly basis for the net electricity supplied to the grid and submit the same to GUVNL along with copy of joint meter reading as certified by SEA (State energy Account) issued by of Gujarat SLDC (State Load Dispatch Centre). These invoices can be used for cross checking of data mentioned in share of electricity certificate by GEDA, used for Emission reduction calculation</p>	

This is a measured and calculated parameter. The electricity exported and imported by the project activity is being measured at 33 kV cluster meters located at metering yard owned by Wind World (India) Limited (earlier known as Enercon India Limited) who is acting as EPC contractor for the project activity. The feeder goes to 33/220 kV GETCL Sadodar substation where all the feeders at the project site (feeders of other WTGs including feeder of project activity WTGs) are interconnected with the grid and net electricity supplied to the grid by all WTGs, including the project activity, is being measured by energy meters located at 33/220 kV GETCL Sadodar substation. Net electricity supplied to the grid by the project is calculated as the difference of apportioned values of electricity exported and electricity imported measured at 33/220 kV GETCL Sadodar substation. This apportioning is being done based on electricity exported by the project activity being measured at cluster meters. This is as per the registered and revised PDD for the project activity and same has been checked and confirmed on site during the site visit. The value of this parameter is directly mentioned in Certificates for Share of Electricity Generated by Wind Farm by GETCO^{/5/} and it is found to be consistent with the MR^{/2.3/} and Excel spreadsheet^{/3.4/}. The Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project is further cross-checked against invoices^{/6/} which were raised by the project participant in the current monitoring period and found to be consistent.

The verified value of this parameter is **85,579 MWh** for current monitoring period.

Discussion on CAR/CL:

CAR #3 was raised to ask the PP to clarify the following points

- Section C of the MR^{/2/} incorrectly mentioned the title of the applied methodology.
- Line diagram included in section C of the MR was not appropriate as it was indicating bulk meter as project specific.
- Notations and descriptions of the parameters included in sections D.1 and D.2 of the MR were not found in line with the registered PDD. Also purpose of data was not mentioned.
- The value of operating margin mentioned in section D.1 of the MR was not found to be consistent with registered PDD
- The monitoring parameter “Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, EGy” was mentioned as calculated.
- Check meter serial number mentioned in section D.2 of the MR was not found to be in line with the site visit observations made

In response, the PP submitted the revised MR^{/2.2/} with the appropriate title of the applied methodology mentioned and corrected line diagram included in section C of the MR. Notations and descriptions of the parameters included in sections D.1 and D.2 of the MR were made consistent with the same mentioned in the registered PDD along with purpose of data mentioned appropriately. The PP corrected the operating margin value reported in section D.1 of the MR in line with the registered PDD^{/1/} and revised PDD^{/1.1/}. The revised MR^{/2.2/} now mentions monitoring parameter “Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, EGy” as measured and calculated. Also the PP corrected the check meter serial numbers in section D.2 of the MR. CAR #3 was further extended to ask PP to clarify the following;

- Description of monitoring parameter “EGy” in section D.2 of the MR^{/2.2/} was not found in line with the registered PDD.
- Location of energy meters was not mentioned in section D.2 of the MR^{/2.2/}. Also the PP didn't mention the delayed calibration period in section D.2 of the MR^{/2.2/}.

In response, the PP submitted the revised MR^{/2.3/} with the description of the monitoring parameter “EGy” in section D.2 of the MR^{/2.3/} mentioned in line with the registered PDD. Also section D.2 of the revised MR^{/2.3/} now includes information on location of energy meters and the delayed calibration period. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. Thus **CAR #3** is closed out.

Detailed discussion on the above CAR/CL can be referred to in section 9 of this verification report.

3.4.2 Verification of implementation of sampling plan

Not applicable as no sampling plan is followed for this project activity. 100% of the data has been checked and verified. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

3.5 Accuracy of Equipment

During the verification assessment of the project activity, accuracy and calibration⁷⁷ of all the metering and plant installations have been checked and found appropriate. The details of monitoring equipments involved in the project activity and their calibration details are mentioned in the below table;

Metering Location	Meter Serial Number	Accuracy Class	Date of Calibration	Validity Dates	Are there delays in calibration?	Calibration Entity
Substation Meters at Sadodar	GJB01470	0.2s	17/07/2012, 06/09/2013	05/09/2014	Yes, Delay in calibration is observed for the months of July 2013, August 2013 and September 2013	PGVCL
	GJU04175					
	GJU04176					
	GJU67589					
	KAB11082					
Feeder 18 (Cluster meters)	GJB01605 (Main) 07025563 (Check)	0.2s	17/07/2012, 15/07/2013	14/07/2014	NO delay in calibration is observed.	GEDA
Feeder 19 (Cluster meters)	GJB01604 (Main) 07025367 (Check)					

The registered PDD^{1/} and revised PDD^{1.3/} mention that the monitoring equipments involved in the project activity will be of accuracy class 0.2s. The registered PDD^{1/} mentions the calibration frequency as Annual; however the revised PDD^{1.3/} mentions that calibration will be carried out once in three years for the project activity. This is due to a letter received from GETCL (Ref. ACE(R&C)/SE/Telecom/ABT Meter/37/10) dated 04/01/2012^{18/} which clearly indicates that *“all the meters at power evacuation sites are calibrated and tested once in a period of three years.”* CEA Notification No. 502/70/CEA/DP&D dated 17/03/2006^{8/} which is considered as national standard mentions that *“All interface meters shall be tested at least once in five years.”* Amendment regulations were published in the gazette of India vide No. 505/6/2009/DP&D/D-1 dated 4th June, 2010 (http://cea.nic.in/reports/regulation/amend_meter_reg.pdf); however no amendment was found related to calibration frequency. Hence calibration frequency of once in three years considered in the revised PDD^{1.3/} for the project activity is found to be conservative. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

The CEA Notification No. 502/70/CEA/DP&D dated 17/03/2006^{8/} also indicates that Interface meters should have an accuracy class of 0.2s. Hence, the accuracy classes of 0.2s for the energy meters installed at the project activity site are found to be appropriate. The test results are found to be within the permissible limit and they are found to be accepted. During the site visit to the project activity, it is observed that meters installed at common metering point i.e. 33 kV were calibrated on 17/07/2012 and their calibration were due on 17/07/2013 considering annual calibration frequency as per registered PDD^{1/}. However, calibrations were carried for those meters on 06/09/2013. Hence delay in calibration is observed for the period of 17/07/2013 – 05/09/2013 (in current monitoring period). The PP has applied maximum permissible error of 0.2% for complete months of July 2013, August 2013 and September 2013 as a conservative approach. Also the project participant applied the maximum permissible error of 0.4% (apply error of double of maximum permissible error conservatively considering the fact that in wind projects import is less than 1% of export) to the values of Net electricity supplied to the grid by the project as electricity exported and imported are not available separately in Certificates for Share of Electricity Generated by Wind Farm by GETCO^{5/}. Calibration frequency of once in three years will be followed from second verification onwards. Thus it is found to be appropriate and conservative in line with paragraph 272 to 274 of VVS, version 6.0^{12/}. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

The verification team is able to confirm that the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is in accordance with the relevant guidance provided by the CDM Executive Board and it is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan (as per registered and revised PDD). As per Para 269 c) to e), VVS, version 6.0^{11/}, the verification team is able to confirm as follows:

- (i) The equipment used for monitoring is in accordance with the relevant guidance provided by the CDM Executive Board and it is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the registered and revised PDD;
- (ii) Monitoring results are consistently recorded as per approved frequency in the registered and revised PDD;
- (iii) Quality assurance and quality control procedures have been applied in accordance with the registered and revised PDD.

3.6 Summary of compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments.

As referring to section 3.5 of this report, a delay in calibration is observed and accordingly the PP had applied maximum permissible error of 0.4% (which is the twice of rated accuracy i.e. 0.2s of the installed meters) to the values of Net electricity supplied to the grid by the project as electricity exported and imported are not available separately in Certificates for Share of Electricity Generated by Wind Farm by GETCO^{5/}. This is also found to be in line with paragraphs 272 – 274 of VVS version 6.0^{11/}.

3.7 Accuracy of Emission Reduction Calculations

The calculation of the emission reductions is found to be correct. The details of the reported and the verified values for all parameters are listed in section 4 of this report, ‘Calculation of Emission Reductions’.

The net electricity supplied to the grid by the project activity is used for the emission reduction calculations. The project participant has provided a complete set of data for the specified monitoring period of 06/12/2012 up to 31/12/2013. The values of parameters are reported in the ER spreadsheet^{/3.4/} by the PP and were checked and confirmed with the information mentioned in the Certificates for Share of Electricity Generated by Wind Farm by GETCO^{/5/} and invoices^{/6/} raised by the project participant. The values are found to be consistent and accurate.

The formula and method used to calculate the baseline emissions are appropriate. Since the project is a wind power generation project, project emissions and leakage emissions are not involved in the project activity. This is found to be in line with the approved methodology ACM0002, version 13.0 and as defined in the registered PDD^{/1/} and revised PDD^{/1.3/}.

Discussion on CAR/CL:

CAR #4 was raised to ask the PP to clarify the below points

- The PP included monitored data up to November 2013 in ER calculation sheet^{/3/}; however webhosted MR includes data up to December 2013.
- Import values mentioned in ER calculation sheet were not clear, as the monthly share certificate doesn't include the same values.
- The export value for the month December 2012 is considered for the complete month whereas the monitoring period starts from 06/12/2012.
- Paragraphs 237-239 of VVS version 5.0 (latest applicable version of VVS at the time the finding was raised) was not referred to for delayed calibration period.

In response, the PP submitted the revised ER calculation sheet^{/3.1/} with data included for the month of December 2013. The values of share of reactive energy mentioned in the share certificates were mistakenly considered as import values by the PP; hence the PP removed import values from the ER calculation sheet as monthly share certificates do not include the same. Also the PP considered data for the month of December 2012 appropriately in line with start date of monitoring period for the project activity. CAR #4 was raised to ask PP to clarify on error applied to delayed calibration period. In response, PP submitted revised ER calculation sheet^{/3.2/} with maximum permissible error of 0.4% (which is double the rated accuracy i.e. 0.2s of the installed meters) to the values of Net electricity supplied to the grid by the project as electricity exported and imported are not available separately in Certificates for Share of Electricity Generated by Wind Farm by GETCO^{/5/} in line with paragraphs 237 – 239 of VVS version 5.0^{/11/} (latest version of VVS at the time the finding was raised). CAR #4 was further extended to ask the PP to clarify on below points;

- Five days electricity generation data subtraction for the month of December 2012 was not clear.
- ER Calculation^{/3.2/} sheet does not clarify why 0.4 % error is used being energy meters of 0.2% accuracy class.
- Guideline EB52 Annex 60 was applied to VVS track project.

In response, the PP submitted the revised ER calculation sheet^{/3.3/} with notes included for transparency on five days electricity generation data subtraction for the month of December 2012 and consideration of 0.4% to net electricity supplied to grid by the project activity. Also the PP referred section 9.4.4 of VVS version 6.0 of guidelines on delayed calibration period. CAR #4 was further extended to ask the PP to clarify the following points;

- Row 38: there was no indication as to whether this row is for the whole of December or only from 06/12/2012.
- Cell B42, states the calibration delay is between 16/07/2013-05/09/2013. But in the MR (page 12), it states the calibration delay is between 17/07/2013-05/09/2013.

In response, the PP submitted the revised ER calculation sheet^{/3.4/} with appropriate period mentioned in row 38 and appropriate calibration delay period mentioned in Cell B42. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CAR #4** was closed out.

CL #5 was raised to ask the PP to clarify the following;

- The values of baseline emissions and emission reductions included in the title page, section E.4, E.5 and E.7 of the MR^{2/} were inconsistent with ER calculation sheet^{3/} submitted for the project activity.
- The value of estimated emission reductions for the current monitoring period mentioned on the title page and in section E.5 of the MR considering 391 days involved in the current monitoring period was not correct.

In response, the PP submitted the revised MR^{2.1/} with the revised values of baseline emissions and emission reductions mentioned on the title page, section E.4, E.5 and E.7, to ensure consistency with ER calculation sheet^{3.1/} submitted for the project activity. Also the PP appropriately calculated estimated emission reductions for the current monitoring period considering 391 days in current monitoring period and it was mentioned on the title page and section E.5 of the MR^{2.1/}. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; hence **CL #5** was closed out.

The detailed discussion on above CL can be referred in section 9 of this verification report.

3.8 Quality of Evidence to Determine Emission Reductions

Critical parameters used for the determination of the Emission Reductions are discussed in section 3.4 of this report. All the data recorded is in compliance with the monitoring report.

The data pertaining to the parameters mentioned in section 3.4 of this report are maintained in the identified records^{6/, 15/}. The external sources data have been discussed in section 3.10 of this report. All the data is in compliance with the figures stated in the monitoring report version 1.3^{2.3/} and the ER calculation excel spreadsheet^{3.4/}.

According to the registered PDD^{1/} and revised PDD^{1.3/}, the verification team has checked the Certificates for Share of Electricity Generated by Wind Farm by GETCO^{5/}. The same have been cross checked against the invoices^{6/} raised by project participant.

The comparison of the actual Emission Reductions claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the registered PDD^{1/} and revised PDD^{1.3/} has been provided in section E.5 of the monitoring report. The verification team reviewed the comparison of the actual CERs claimed in the monitoring period against the estimated CERs in the PDD (both registered as well as revised)^{1/, 1.3/}; the same has been discussed in section 3.1 of this report.

3.9 Management and operational System and Quality Assurance

The company involved in the project have quality assurance system ISO 9001:2008^{17/} implemented. The company involved have assigned personnel with proper roles and responsibilities in the project and this is as per the registered PDD^{1/} and revised PDD^{1.3/}. During the site visit, the roles and responsibility for data monitoring and management have been checked. It was also found during the interview with plant personnel that the project has a well defined responsibility matrix and execution system to ensure the quality of CDM monitoring system. The same was found acceptable; therefore the assessment team can affirm that the management system of the CDM project is in place; with the responsibilities properly identified and in place.

In order to verify data quality, the company involved in the project works in accordance with a quality assurance procedure of Standard Operating Procedure which establishes the operational and management structure implemented.

3.10 Data from External Sources

Since, the combined margin grid emission factor was calculated based on ex-ante approach indicated by Tool to calculate emission factor of an electricity system, the value of “**Emission factor for the operating margin of the NEWNE Grid, EF_{OM, y}**” will remain ex-ante as **1.0049 tCO₂/MWh** throughout the crediting period and same has been considered from the registered PDD^{1/}. The basis for this was “CO₂ Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector”, version 5 published by the Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of

Power, Government of India. The “CO₂ Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector” is available at www.cea.nic.in/reports/planning/cdm_co2/cdm_co2.htm. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

The value of “**Emission factor for the build margin of the NEWNE Grid, EF BM, y**” is **0.6752 tCO_{2e}/MWh** considered from the registered PDD^{1/} and will remain ex-ante throughout the crediting period. The basis for this was “CO₂ Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector”, version 5 published by the Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of Power, Government of India. The “CO₂ Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector” is available at www.cea.nic.in/ressports/planning/cdm_co2/cdm_co2.htm. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

The “**Combined Margin CO₂ emission factor for NEWNE regional grid, EF y**” has been fixed ex-ante during the validation stage^{1/} as **0.9224 tCO_{2e}/MWh** (combined margin approach of ACM0002 version 13.0 (as estimated by the Host Party-Central Electricity Authority, Version 5.0)) and it is applicable for the crediting period considered for the project activity.

4. Calculation of Emission Reductions

Parameter	Reported Value (Webhosted MR ^{2/})	Verified Value (Final MR ^{2.3/})
Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, EG _y (MWh)	84,748.70	85,579
Combined Margin CO ₂ emission factor for NEWNE regional grid, EF _y (tCO ₂ /MWh)	0.9224	0.9224

The increase in value of net electricity supplied to the grid by the project is due to CAR#4; please refer section 9 for detailed discussion of CAR #4

Grid emission factor is determined ex-ante and fixed throughout the crediting period.

The emission reduction is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Baseline emission} &= \text{Net quantity supplied to the grid by the Project, EG}_y \text{ (MWh)} \times \text{Combined Margin CO}_2 \text{ emission factor for NEWNE regional grid, EF}_y \text{ (tCO}_2\text{/MWh)} \\
 &= 85,579 \times 0.9224 \\
 &= 78,938 \text{ t CO}_2\text{e}
 \end{aligned}$$

As per the applied methodology, leakage emissions and project emissions are zero.

Thus emission reductions are calculated as follow:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Emission reductions} &= \text{Baseline emissions} - \text{Project emissions} - \text{Leakage emissions} \\
 &= 78,938 - 0 - 0 \\
 &= 78,938 \text{ t CO}_2\text{e}
 \end{aligned}$$

Emission Reduction:

Period	Reported Value (as per the web hosted MR) tCO ₂ e	Verified Value tCO ₂ e	If Different, Summary of Issues That Caused the Difference
06/12/2012 – 31/12/2013	78,172	78,938	<i>Difference is observed.</i>
CERs (Up to 31 December 2012 (1st commitment period);)	4,971	4,895	<i>CAR #4 was raised to ask the PP to clarify the basis of input values considered in ER Calculation sheet for the project activity. Also the PP didn't consider data for the month of December 2013. Paragraphs 272-274 of VVS version 6.0 were not followed for delayed calibration period. In response, the PP removed import values considered in the ER calculation sheet as those were not relevant to the project activity. Also the PP applied maximum permissible error in line with paragraphs</i>

Period	Reported Value (as per the web hosted MR) tCO ₂ e	Verified Value tCO ₂ e	If Different, Summary of Issues That Caused the Difference
CERs (From 1 January 2013 onwards.	73,201	74,043	272-274 of VVS version 6.0; hence CAR #4 was closed out. The detailed discussion on above CAR can be referred to in section 9 of this verification report.

5. Recommendations for Changes in the Monitoring Plan

Changes (permanent in nature) related to the measurement method for monitoring parameter “Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, EGy”, Calibration frequency and Line Diagram indicating metering locations are proposed to be changed through the revised PDD. Detailed assessment on the proposed changes is included in section 3.2.3 of this verification report.

6. Overview of Results

Assessment Against the Provisions of Decision 17/CP.7:

Is the project documentation in accordance with the requirements of the registered PDD and relevant provision of decision 17/CP.7, EB decisions and guidance and the COP/MOP?

Yes. The results of the compliance assessment are recorded in the verification checklist which is used as an internal report only.

Have on-site inspections been performed that may comprise, inter alia, a review of performance records, interviews with project participants and local stakeholders, collection of measurements, observations of established practices and testing of the accuracy of monitoring equipment?

Yes. Assessment team member (Lead Assessor/Team Leader, Local Assessor and Technical Area Expert (TA1.2)) visited the site and undertook interviews, collected data, audited the implementation of procedures, checked calibration certificates and checked data, inter alia.

The results of the site visits are recorded in the verification checklist which is used as an internal report only.

The evidences have been checked and collected. The final monitoring report is attached with this verification report.

Has data from additional sources been used? If yes, please detail the source and significance.

Data used from external sources is Grid Emission Factor (EF_y) as per the registered and revised PDD and it is fixed ex-ante during the validation as 0.9224 tCO₂/MWh as per CEA database version 05 (http://www.cea.nic.in/reports/planning/cdm_co2/cdm_co2.htm).

Please review the monitoring results and verify that the monitoring methodologies for the estimation of reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources have been applied correctly and their documentation is complete and transparent.

Yes. The monitoring methodology has been correctly applied and the monitoring report and supporting references are complete and transparent.

Have any recommendations for changes to the monitoring methodology for any future crediting period been issued to the project participant?

No recommendations have been issued.

Determine the reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that would not have occurred in the absence of the CDM project activity, based on the data and information using calculation procedures consistent with those contained in the registered project design document and the monitoring plan.

The data used in anthropogenic emission reduction calculation is consistent with those contained in the registered and revised PDD and monitoring plan. The emission reduction was 103,718 tCO₂ for the period 06/12/2012 to 31/12/2013 as per the estimation made in the registered and revised PDD. The actual emission reduction has been verified as 78,938 tCO₂ for the same period and this difference is discussed in section 3.1 of this verification report.

Identify and inform the project participants of any concerns related to the conformity of the actual project activity and its operation with the registered project design document. Project participants shall address the concerns and supply relevant additional information.

Corrections are made through revised PDD related to geo-coordinates of the project activity and references made in the PDD towards information included in Annexures of the registered PDD. It is confirmed that these corrections do not affect the design

of the project activity as per Appendix 1 of the PS version 6.0. Also changes (permanent in nature) related to the measurement method for monitoring parameter "Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, EGy", Calibration frequency and Line Diagram indicating metering locations are proposed to be changed through the revised PDD. It is confirmed that prior approval is not required for these permanent changes as per Appendix 1 of the PS version 6.0. Detailed assessment on these changes is included in sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 of this report.

Post monitoring report on UNFCCC website

Yes, the Monitoring Report is available at ref. UNFCCC Project Reference Number 8442 on the UNFCCC website

<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1354168605.84/view>

7. Verification and Certification Statement

SGS United Kingdom Ltd has been contracted by M/s The Tata Power Company Limited to perform the verification of the emission reductions reported for the CDM project "Tata Power - Wind power project at Samana in Jamnagar district, Gujarat" and UN Registration number 8442 in the period from 06/12/2012 to 31/12/2013.

The verification is based on the validated and registered and revised project design document and the monitoring report for this project. Verification is performed in accordance with section I of Decision 3/CMP.1, and relevant decisions of the CDM EB and CoP/MoP. The scope of this engagement covers the verification and certification of greenhouse gas emission reductions generated by the above project during the above mentioned period, as reported in "Tata Power - Wind power project at Samana in Jamnagar district, Gujarat", Monitoring Report version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014^{2,3/}.

The management of M/s The Tata Power Company Limited is responsible for the preparation, calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures are in accordance with the monitoring report.

It is our responsibility to express an independent GHG verification opinion on the GHG emissions and on the calculation of GHG emission reductions from the project for the period 06/12/2012 to 31/12/2013 based on the reported emission reductions in the Monitoring Report version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014^{2,3/} for the same period.

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

SGS confirms that the project is implemented as described in the validated and registered project design documents. Based on the information we have seen and evaluated, we confirm the following:

Project Title:	Tata Power - Wind power project at Samana in Jamnagar district, Gujarat
UNFCCC Reference Number:	8442
Registered PDD and Approved Used for Verification:	Registered PDD Version 08 dated 22/10/2012 Revised PDD version 11 dated 19/05/2014 - submitted with Request for Issuance
Methodology Used for Verification:	ACM0002 version 13.0, "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" dated 11/05/2012
Applicable Period:	06/12/2012 – 31/12/2013
Total GHG Emission Reductions Verified:	78,938 tCO ₂ e

Signed on behalf of the Verification Body by Authorized Signatory



Signature:

Name: Siddharth Yadav

Date: 20/05/2014

8. Document References

/1/	Registered PDD Version 08 dated 22/10/2012, http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1354168605.84/view				
/1.1/	Revised PDD version 09 dated 20/03/2014				
/1.1.1/	Revised PDD version 09 dated 31/03/2014 (Client did not revise version of the PDD)				
/1.2/	Revised PDD version 10 dated 29/04/2014				
/1.3/	Revised PDD version 11 dated 19/05/2014				
/2/	Monitoring report, Version 1.0, dated 16/01/2014				
/2.1/	Monitoring report, Version 1.1, dated 20/03/2014				
/2.2/	Monitoring report, Version 1.2, dated 31/03/2014				
2.3/	Monitoring report, Version 1.3, dated 29/04/2014				
/3/	Emission Reduction Sheet, Version 1.0, dated 16/01/2014				
/3.1/	Emission Reduction Sheet, Version 1.1, dated 20/03/2014				
/3.2/	Emission Reduction Sheet, Version 1.2 dated 31/03/2014				
/3.3/	Emission Reduction Sheet, Version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014				
/3.4/	Emission Reduction Sheet, Version 1.4 dated 13/05/2014				
/4/	Project Webpage: Validation Report (Report No. 8106533796 – 10/231) dated 07/11/2012 http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1354168605.84/view				
/5/	Certificates for Share of Electricity Generated by Wind Farm by GETCO for the period from December 2012 up to December 2013				
/6/	Invoices raised by M/s The Tata Power Company Limited to GUVNL for the period from December 2012 up to December 2013				
/7/	Calibration Certificates for the project activity;				
	Meter Serial Number	Accuracy Class	Date of Calibration	Validity Dates	Reference of Calibration Certificate
	GJB01470	0.2s	17/07/2012, 06/09/2013	05/09/2014	Calibration Certificates for all meters dated 17/07/2012 from PGVCL Calibration Certificates for all meters dated 06/09/2013 from PGVCL
	GJU04175				
	GJU04176				
	GJU67589				
	KAB11082				

	GJB01605 (Main) 07025563 (Check)	0.2s	17/07/2012, 15/07/2013	14/07/2014	Meter Test Report dated 17/07/2012 from GEDA Meter Test Report dated 15/07/2013 from GEDA
	GJB01604 (Main) 07025367 (Check)	0.2s	17/07/2012, 15/07/2013	14/07/2014	Meter Test Report dated 17/07/2012 from GEDA Meter Test Report dated 15/07/2013 from GEDA
/8/	CEA Notification No. 502/70/CEA/DP&D dated 17/03/2006 http://www.cea.nic.in/reports/regulation/meter_reg.pdf Amendment regulations published in gazette of India vide No. 505/6/2009/DP&D/D-1 dated 4th June, 2010 http://cea.nic.in/reports/regulation/amend_meter_reg.pdf				
/9/	Commissioning certificates from GEDA: 1. Commissioning Certificate (Ref. No. GEDA/PWF/TPCL/Mota-Panch/2008-09/3130) dated 10/10/2008 indicates that 4 WTGs were commissioned on 30/09/2008 and 09 WTGs were commissioned on 29/09/2008 2. Commissioning Certificate (Ref. No. GEDA/PWF/EIL-TPCL/Dhundhoraji/2008-09/3078) dated 10/10/2008 indicates that 2 WTGs were commissioned on 29/09/2008 3. Commissioning Certificate (Ref. No. GEDA/PWF/TPCL/Mota-Panch/2008-09/4988) dated 29/11/2008 indicates that 5 WTGs were commissioned on 14/11/2008 4. Commissioning Certificate (Ref. No. GEDA/PWF/TPCL/Dal-Devaliya/2008-09/4989) dated 29/11/2008 indicates that 3 WTGs were commissioned on 14/11/2008 5. Commissioning Certificate (Ref. No. GEDA/PWF/TPCL/Dal-Devaliya/2008-09/5346) dated 20/12/2008 indicates that 3 WTGs were commissioned on 29/11/2008, 03 WTGs were commissioned on 08/12/2008 and 01 WTG was commissioned on 11/12/2008 6. Commissioning Certificate (Ref. No. GEDA/PWF/TPCL/Dal-Devaliya/2008-09/5824) dated 23/01/2009 indicates that 3 WTGs were commissioned on 05/01/2009 and 01 WTG was commissioned on 16/01/2009 7. Commissioning Certificate (Ref. No. GEDA/PWF/TPCL/Mota-Panch/2008-09/5938) dated 23/01/2009 indicates that 1 WTG was commissioned on 08/12/2008 and 02 WTGs were commissioned on 05/01/2009 8. Commissioning Certificate (Ref. No. GEDA/TPCL/PWF/Dhundhoraji/2009-10/1416) dated 13/07/2009 indicates that 4 WTGs were commissioned on 07/05/2009 9. Commissioning Certificate (Ref. No. GEDA/PWF/TPCL/Dal-Devaliya/2009-10/1417) dated 13/07/2009 indicates that 8 WTGs were commissioned on 06/05/2009 10. Commissioning Certificate (Ref. No. GEDA/PWF/TPCL/Mota-Panch/2000-10/1393) dated 10/07/2009 indicates that 7 WTG was commissioned on 06/05/2009 11. Commissioning Certificate (Ref. No. GEDA/PWF/TPCL/Mota-Panch/2009-10/1395) dated 10/07/2009 indicates that 7 WTG was commissioned on 07/05/2009				
/10/	The "CO ₂ Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector" version 05 published by the Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of Power, Government of India www.cea.nic.in/reports/planning/cdm_co2/cdm_co2.htm				
/11/	Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard version 6.0 dated 11/04/2014				

/12/	MONITORING REPORT FORM (F-CDM-MR) version 03.2 dated 05/11/2013
/13/	Clean Development Mechanism Project Standard version 6.0 dated 11/04/2014
/14/	Applied methodology ACM0002 version 13.0, "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" dated 11/05/2012
/15/	Guideline: Completing the monitoring report form, version 4.0 dated 04/10/2013
/16/	PPA between GUVNL and The Tata Power Company Limited (Ref. GUVNL/COM/315/450) dated 08/03/2010 for 20 MW capacity PPA between GUVNL and The Tata Power Company Limited (Ref. GUVNL/COM/WF/336/1457) dated 21/07/2010 for 0.8 MW capacity PPA between GUVNL and The Tata Power Company Limited (Ref. GUVNL/COM/528) dated 19/03/2009 for 29.6 MW capacity
/17/	ISO 9001: 2008 Certificate (Ref. QS-898HH) dated 18/02/2013
/18/	Letter from GETCL (Ref. ACE(R&C)/SE/Telecom/ABT Meter/37/10) dated 04/01/2012
/19/	Details of Geo-coordinates for all the 63 WTGs involved in the project activity provided by the technology supplier

Sr. No.	MR Revision	Date of Revision	Main Changes reason of Revision
1	MR version 1.0	16/01/2014	MR webhosted to UNFCCC Website
2	MR version 1.1	20/03/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PP appropriately mentioned name of project participants and title of the applied methodology consistent with the same mentioned UN project web-page http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1354168605.84/view on title page of the MR through CAR #1. • Section A.1 of the MR includes commissioning dates first and last WTG of the project activity and actual emission reductions achieved in current monitoring period through CAR #1. • Section B.1 of the MR includes technology diagram through CAR #1. • Correct geo-coordinates mentioned for two WTGs i.e. TATASP-07 (2110) and TATASP-08 (2111) in section 1.2 of the MR through CL #2. • Section A.3 of the MR mentions name of project participant consistent with the UN project webpage http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1354168605.84/view through CL #2. • Section C of the MR correctly mentions title of the applied methodology through CAR #3 • Line diagram included in section C of the MR which indicates that other WTGs are also connected to bulk meters in sub-station through CAR #3. • Sections D.1 and D.2 of MR appropriately mentions notations and descriptions of the parameters included in sections D.1 and D.2 of the MR in line with the registered PDD through CAR #3. • PP corrected operating margin value mentioned in section D.1 of the MR consistent with the registered PDD through CAR #3. • PP appropriately mentioned purpose of data for all the parameters included in section D.1 and D.2 of the MR in line with Guidelines: Completing the monitoring report form, version 4.0 through CAR #3. • PP mentioned the monitoring parameter "Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project activity during year 'y', EGy" as Measured and Calculated through CAR #3. • PP corrected check meter serial numbers in section D.2 of the MR through CAR #3. • The values of baseline emissions and emission reductions included in title page, section E.4, E.5 and E.7 of the MR corrected in line with ER calculation sheet submitted for the project activity through CL #5. • The value of estimated emission reductions for the current monitoring period correctly mentioned on title page and in section E.5 of the MR considering 391 days involved in the current monitoring period through CL #5. • The values of baseline emissions and emission reductions updated through CAR #4.
3	MR version 1.2	31/03/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The values of baseline emissions and emission reductions updated through CAR #4.

4	MR version 1.3	29/04/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of project participants in section A.3 of the MR are made consistent with the UN project web-page through CAR #1. • PP has used thousand separators appropriately in section E.5 and E.6 of the MR through CAR #1. • Post Registration Changes appropriately included in sections B.2.2 and B.2.3 of the MR through CL #2. • Description of monitoring parameter “EGy” mentioned in section D.2 of the MR is corrected in line with the registered PDD through CAR #3. • Locations of meters are transparently mentioned in section D.2 of the MR through CAR #3. • PP incorporated cluster meter details in section D.2 along with their calibration details through CAR #3.
---	----------------	------------	---

9. Findings Overview

	CARs	CLs	FARs
Total Number raised	03	02	-

Date:	07/02/2014	Raised by:	Assessment Team		
Type:	CAR	Number:	01	Reference:	Title Page, MR Completion Guidelines
Lead Assessor Comment:			Date: 07/02/2014		
<p>PP is requested to clarify the appropriateness name of project participant and title of the applied methodology mentioned on title page of the MR version 01 in line with the same mentioned on UN project webpage http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1354168605.84/view.</p> <p>Please clarify the appropriateness of content of information included in section A.1 of the MR in line with Guidelines: Completing the monitoring report form, version 4.0.</p> <p>Section B.1 of the MR version 01 doesn't include technology diagram in line with Guidelines: Completing the monitoring report form, version 4.0. Please clarify</p>					
Project Participant Response:			Date: 28/02/2014		
<p>The name of project participant and the title of the applied methodology are now corrected in the MR as per the information given under the UN webpage.</p> <p>The information now under section A.1 of the revised MR now includes project commissioning details and net GHG emission reduction achieved. This is in-line with "Guidelines: Completing the monitoring report form, version 4.0".</p> <p>The technology diagram is now included under section B.1 of the revised MR. This confirms to "Guidelines: Completing the monitoring report form, version 4.0".</p>					
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:					
Revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014					
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:					
Revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 is checked for appropriateness of corrections made in line with MR completion guidelines.					
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:			Date: 25/03/2014 Reopen: 15/04/2014		
<p>PP appropriately mentioned name of project participants and title of the applied methodology consistent with the same mentioned UN project web-page http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1354168605.84/view. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. However, PP is requested to clarify why all project participants listed on UN project webpage are not mentioned on title page and section A.3 of the MR.</p> <p>Section A.1 of the revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 now includes commissioning dates first and last WTG of the project activity. It also includes actual emission reductions achieved in current monitoring period for the project activity. This is found to be in line with Guidelines: Completing the monitoring report form, version 4.0.</p> <p>Section B.1 of the revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 now includes technology diagram in line with Guidelines: Completing the monitoring report form, version 4.0. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.</p> <p>PP is requested to clarify if all the changes are listed in Appendix 6 of the PDD. Also PP is requested to clarify appropriateness of thousand separator used sections E.5 and E.6 of MR in line with paragraph 14 of Guidelines: Completing the monitoring report form, version 4.0.</p> <p>Thus CAR #1 is open.</p>					

Project Participant Response:	Date: 29/04/2014
<p>All the project participants listed in the UN webpage is now mentioned in title page and section A.3 of the revised MR.</p> <p>All the changes are now mentioned in Appendix 6 of the revised PDD. Further the thousands separator in section E.5 and E.6 is rectified in-line with the MR completion guidelines.</p>	
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:	
Revised MR version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014	
Revised PDD version 10 dated 29/04/2014	
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
<p>Revised MR version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014 is checked for appropriateness of project participants listed in section A.3 and thousand separators used in section E.5 and E.6 of the MR.</p> <p>Revised PDD version 10 dated 29/04/2014 is checked for appropriateness of post registration changes summarized in Appendix 6 of the PDD.</p>	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	Date: 29/04/2014
<p>PP appropriately mentioned name of project participants in section A.3 of the MR consistent with the same mentioned UN project web-page http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1354168605.84/view. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.</p> <p>Appendix 6 of the revised PDD version 10 dated 29/04/2014 now includes list of all the changes made in the PDD. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.</p> <p>Thus CAR #1 was closed out.</p>	
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:	Date: 29/04/2014

Date:	07/02/2014	Raised by:	Assessment Team		
Type:	CL	Number:	02	Reference:	Section 1.2, Section 1.3, B.1
Lead Assessor Comment:			Date: 07/02/2014		
<p>Section 1.2: it is found that geo-coordinates mentioned for two WTGs i.e. TATASP-07 (2110) and TATASP-08 (2111) are found exactly same. Please clarify.</p> <p>Section 1.3: Name of project participant mentioned is found to be consistent with the UN project webpage http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1354168605.84/view.</p> <p>Section B.1 of the MR version 01 mentions last WTG was commissioned on 06/05/2009; however registered PDD is mentioned it as 07/05/2009. Please clarify the inconsistency observed. Also PP is requested to submit commissioning certificates for the project activity.</p>					
Project Participant Response:			Date: 28/02/2014		
<p>There was a typo-error in giving the geo co-ordinates of WTG's TATASP-07 (2110) and TATASP-08 (2111). Now in the revised MR the correct co-ordinate details are provided. The same is also corrected in the PDD and is submitted for EB approval.</p> <p>The project participant name is now maintained consistent with the information available under project UN webpage.</p> <p>The last WTG under the project activity was commissioned on 07/05/2009. The correction is done from 06/05/2009 to 07/05/2009 in the revised MR. Further the commissioning certificates of all the WTG's is provided to cross verify the same.</p>					
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:					
Revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014					
Revised PDD version 09 dated 20/03/2014					
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:					
<p>Revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 is checked for appropriateness for appropriateness of name of project participant mentioned in section A.3 of the MR. Also revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 is checked for appropriateness of commissioning dates included in section B.1 of the MR.</p> <p>Also PP submitted geo-coordinates of the WTGs involved in the project activity and those are checked in line with correction made in section 1.2 of the revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 and section A.2.4 of the revised PDD version 09 dated 20/03/2014.</p>					
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:			Date: 25/03/2014		
<p>PP submitted revised MR with correct geo-coordinates mentioned for two WTGs i.e. TATASP-07 (2110) and TATASP-08 (2111) in section 1.2 and it is found to be in line with the geo-coordinates of WTGs involved in the project activity provided by the project participant. Also PP submitted revised PDD version 09 dated 20/03/2014 wit corrected geo-coordinates mentioned for two WTGs i.e. TATASP-07 (2110) and TATASP-08 (2111) in section A.2.4 of the PDD. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.</p> <p>It is found that PP changed calibration frequency to once in three year in revised PDD version 09 dated 20/03/2014 from annual calibration frequency mentioned in the registered PDD. PP is requested to clarify the basis for the same.</p> <p>Section A.3 of the revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 now mentions name of project participant consistent with the UN project webpage http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1354168605.84/view. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.</p> <p>Commissioning certificates are not provided by the project participant. PP is requested to provide it to verify commissioning dates for the project activity.</p> <p>Thus CL #2 is open.</p>					

Project Participant Response:	Date: 31/03/2014
<p>The calibration frequency of the energy meters is changed from annually to once in 3 years based on the letter from GETCO to all wind farm owners dated 04/01/2012. The letter states that the ABT meters at the power evacuation sites shall be calibrated and tested once in 3 years. The footnote reference to the same is provided in section B.7.1 of the revised PDD. This is now incorporated as a correction and is submitted to the EB for approval. Further the letter from GETCO is also submitted to the verification team for reference.</p> <p>Commissioning certificates of all the WTG's are now submitted to the verification team.</p>	
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:	
<p>Letter from GETCL (Ref. ACE(R&C)/SE/Telecom/ABT Meter/37/10) dated 04/01/2012</p> <p>Commissioning Certificates</p> <p>Revised PDD version 09 dated 31/03/2014</p>	
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
<p>Letter from GETCL (Ref. ACE(R&C)/SE/Telecom/ABT Meter/37/10) dated 04/01/2012 is checked for appropriateness calibration frequency applicable for the project activity.</p> <p>Commissioning certificates for the project activity are checked for appropriateness of commissioning dates mentioned in section B.1 of the MR.</p> <p>Revised PDD version 09 dated 31/03/2014 (PP didn't changed the version number of the revised PDD) is checked for appropriateness of calibration frequency applicable for the project activity.</p>	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	Date: 01/04/2013
<p>PP submitted letter from GETCL (Ref. ACE(R&C)/SE/Telecom/ABT Meter/37/10) dated 04/01/2012 which clearly indicates that all the meters at the power evacuation sites are tested and calibrated in once in a 3 years period. Thus calibration frequency of 3 years is accepted.</p> <p>PP submitted commissioning certificates for the project activity against the start and end date of the commissioning period for the project activity. It is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. However, PP is requested to clarify the appropriateness of numbers of WTGs commissioned on 29/09/2008 and 30/09/2008 mentioned in section B.1 of the MR in line with the commissioning certificates provided for the project activity.</p> <p>Thus CL #2 is open.</p>	
Project Participant Response:	Date: 07/04/2014
<p>The number of WTG's commissioned on 29/09/2008 and 30/09/2008 is correct and in-line with the commissioning certificate. The commissioning certificates of the same are submitted for reference.</p>	
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:	
<p>No documents are submitted</p>	
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
<p>Explanation provided by PP is checked for appropriateness of number of WTGs commissioned on 29/09/2008 and 30/09/2008.</p>	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	Date: 07/04/2014 Reopen: 15/04/2014
<p>Assessment team had rechecked number of WTGs commissioned on 29/09/2008 and 30/09/2008 in line with commissioning certificates submitted for the project activity. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.</p> <p>PP is requested to clarify the appropriateness of changes 4, 5, 6 listed in section B.2.2 of the MR. Please clarify if these changes should have been included in section B.2.2 of the MR.</p> <p>Thus CL #2 is open.</p>	
Project Participant Response:	Date: 29/04/2014
<p>The changes 4, 5, and 6 are now included under section B.2.3 of the revised MR version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014 as permanent changes.</p>	

Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:	
Revised MR version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014	
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
Revised MR version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014 is checked for appropriateness of changes included in section B.2.2 of the MR.	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	Date: 29/04/2014 Reopen: 17/05/2014
<p>PP now submitted revised MR version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014 with post registration changes appropriately included in sections B.2.2 and B.2.3 of the MR. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.</p> <p>PP is requested to clarify why Changes summarized in Appendix 6 of the PDD are not visible in track change mode. PP is requested to check whether all the changes made are listed in track change mode in track changed copy of PDD. Also Appendix 6 should have been blank in PDD directly converted from VVM track to VVS track. Please clarify.</p> <p>Thus CL #2 is open.</p>	
Project Participant Response:	Date: 19/05/2014
<p>The Appendix 6 is now incorporated as track change mode in revised PDD. Further all changes are listed in the appendix 6.</p> <p>The necessary corrections where the section to be blank from VVM to VVS is also done.</p>	
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:	
Revised PDD version 11 dated 19/05/2014	
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
Revised PDD version 11 dated 19/05/2014 is checked for appropriateness of all the changes made in track change mode.	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	Date: 19/05/2014
PP submitted revised PDD version 11 dated 19/05/2014 with all the changes from the registered PDD are made in track change mode only. Also PP submitted original PDD transformed into VVS format. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.	
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:	Date: 19/05/2014

Date:	07/02/2014	Raised by:	Assessment Team		
Type:	CAR	Number:	03	Reference:	Section C and D
Lead Assessor Comment:			Date: 07/02/2014		
PP is requested to clarify the appropriateness of the title of the applied methodology mentioned in section C of the MR version 01.					
Line diagram included in section C of the MR version 01 is not clear. Please make it clear.					
PP is requested to clarify the appropriateness of notations and descriptions of the parameters included in sections D.1 and D.2 of the MR in line with the registered PDD.					
PP is requested to clarify the appropriateness of operating margin value mentioned in line with the same mentioned in the registered PDD.					
It is found that PP has mentioned the monitoring parameter “Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, EGy” as calculated. PP is requested to clarify how this is fulfilling the methodological requirements.					
PP is requested to check meter serial numbers mentioned in line with the site visit observations made.					
Project Participant Response:			Date: 28/02/2014		
The title of the applied methodology in section C is now made consistent in-line with the project information under the UN webpage.					
The line diagram under section C is revised and the representation is corrected.					
The notations and parameter descriptions in section D.1 and D.2 is corrected and now matching with the registered PDD.					
The value of the operating margin is now corrected in-line with the registered PDD.					
The monitoring parameter EG _y is measured and calculated value. The changes are now done in the revised MR. Also details on how it is measured and calculated in included in the MR.					
As per the site visit observations, the energy meter serial numbers are corrected in the revised MR.					
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:					
Revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014					
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:					
Revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 is checked for appropriateness of corrections made against above queries raised.					
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:			Date: 25/03/2014 Reopen: 15/04/2014		
Section C of the revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 now correctly mentions title of the applied methodology. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.					
PP submitted revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 with line diagram included in section C of the MR and it is found to be in line with observations made during site visit to the project activity; hence it is accepted.					
Sections D.1 and D.2 of the revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 appropriately mentions notations and descriptions of the parameters included in sections D.1 and D.2 of the MR in line with the registered PDD. Also PP appropriately mentioned purpose of data for all the parameters included in section D.1 and D.2 of the MR in line with Guidelines: Completing the monitoring report form, version 4.0. This is found to be appropriate and hence it is accepted.					
PP now corrected operating margin value mentioned in section D.1 of the revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 in line with the same mentioned in the registered PDD; hence it is accepted.					
PP now mentioned the monitoring parameter “Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, EGy” as Measured and Calculated. Also PP clarified that how measurement is involved in the project activity. This is found to be in line with the methodological requirements. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.					
PP now mentioned check meter serial numbers in section D.2 of the MR. This is found to be appropriate and hence it is accepted.					

<p>PP is requested to clarify the appropriateness of description of monitoring parameter “EGy” in section D.2 of the MR in line with the registered PDD.</p> <p>PP is requested to clarify the location of energy meters mentioned in section D.2 of the MR. Also PP didn't mentioned about delayed calibration period in section D.2 of the MR.</p> <p>Thus CAR #3 is open.</p>	
Project Participant Response:	Date: 29/04/2014
<p>The monitoring parameter EG_y is now corrected and made consistent with the registered PDD.</p> <p>The details of the location of the energy meters are now incorporated clearly in the revised MR section D.2. Further the delay in calibration period is also included in the revised MR.</p>	
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:	
Revised MR version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014	
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
Revised MR version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014 is checked for appropriateness of description of monitoring parameter “EGy” and location of meters included in section D.2 of the MR.	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	Date: 29/04/2014
<p>PP submitted revised MR version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014 with appropriate description of monitoring parameter “EGy” mentioned in section D.2 of the MR in line with the registered PDD. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.</p> <p>Also location of meters are now transparently mentioned in section D.2 of the MR. Also PP now incorporated cluster meter details as well in section D.2 along with their calibration details. Details of meters and their calibration are checked in line with calibration certificates provided for the project activity. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.</p> <p>Thus CAR #3 is closed out.</p>	
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:	Date: 29/04/2014

Date:	07/02/2014	Raised by:	Assessment Team		
Type:	CAR	Number:	04	Reference:	ER Calculation Sheet
Lead Assessor Comment:				Date: 07/02/2014	
<p>PP included monitored data up to November 2013 in ER calculation sheet; however webhosted MR includes data up to December 2013. Please clarify the inconsistency observed.</p> <p>PP is requested to clarify the appropriateness and basis of import values mentioned in ER calculation sheet whereas a monthly share certificate doesn't include the same.</p> <p>The export value for the month December 2012 is considered for the complete month. Please clarify the same in line with start date of the monitoring period i.e. 06/12/2012.</p> <p>PP is requested to clarify why Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements i.e. EB 52 Annex 60 is not referred for delayed calibration period.</p>					
Project Participant Response:				Date: 28/02/2014	
<p>In the ER sheet, the monitoring period is now changed up to December 2013.</p> <p>As per the Validator observation, the monthly share certificate does not include the import value and it gives the net electricity supplied after deducting import from export. The import value column is now removed from the ER sheet.</p> <p>The current monitoring period starts from 06/12/12. Accordingly the net export value from 01/12/12 to 05/12/12 is deducted completely as a conservative approach. The revised ER sheet and MR is submitted.</p> <p>During the current monitoring period, there was calibration gap of the energy meters for a period from 16/07/2013 to 05/09/2013. The energy generation has therefore been adjusted now following the "GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSING COMPLIANCE WITH THE CALIBRATION FREQUENCY REQUIREMENTS" Annex 60, EB 52. Adopting the conservative approach the adjustment has been made for maximum possible error i.e., 0.2 % accuracy class for the months July 2013, August 2013 and September 2013 for energy generation.</p>					
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:					
Revised ER Calculation Sheet					
Revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014					
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:					
Revised ER calculation sheet version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 and revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 are checked for appropriateness of corrections made against above queries.					
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:				Date: 25/03/2014	
<p>PP now included monitored data up to December 2013 in ER calculation sheet which is found to be in line with webhosted MR; hence it is accepted.</p> <p>PP now corrected ER calculation sheet to indicate the values of parameter "Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, EGy" which are not found to be consistent with the monthly share certificates; hence it is accepted.</p> <p>PP now deducted the daily generation values for the period of 01/12/2012 to 05/12/2014 from the value of "Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, EGy" as per monthly share certificate for the month of December 2012. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.</p> <p>PP had applied maximum permissible error of 0.2% to reported values of "Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, EGy" as monthly share certificates doesn't indicate electricity exported and imported by the project activity separately. However, PP is requested to clarify the conservativeness of the same.</p>					
Project Participant Response:				Date:	
The monthly share certificate does not give the export and the import value separately. Hence in order to apply the maximum permissible error of 0.2% on both the export and the import, the PP has used 0.4% error on the net export value. The calculation of the same is given in the revised excel sheet.					

Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:	
Revised ER calculation sheet	
Revised MR version 1.2 dated 31/03/2014	
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
Revised ER calculation sheet version 1.2 dated 31/03/2014 and revised MR version 1.2 dated 31/03/2014 are checked for appropriateness of maximum permissible error applied to delayed calibration period.	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	Date: 01/04/2014 Reopen: 15/04/2014
<p>PP submitted revised ER calculation sheet with maximum permissible error applied twice (i.e. 0.4%) conservatively as electricity exported and imported are not separately available in monthly share certificate of electricity generation. This is found to appropriate and conservative; hence it is accepted. Also PP submitted revised MR version 1.2 dated 31/03/2014 with corrected values of net electricity supplied to grid by the project, baseline emissions and emission reductions.</p> <p>Five days electricity generation data subtraction for the month of December 2012 is not clear. Also excel sheet does not clarify why 0.4 % error is used being 0.2% accuracy class and how use of this error for net export is conservative.</p> <p>PP is requested to clarify the appropriateness of EB52 Annex 60 applied to VVS track projects. Please clarify why relevant VVS paragraphs are not referred.</p> <p>Thus CAR #4 is open.</p>	
Project Participant Response:	Date: 29/04/2014
<p>Under the project activity, the export and import data is not available to the PP and only net export is available. The net export calculated for the month Dec-2012 is from 6/12/12 to 31/12/12. The data for the days from 01/12/2012 to 05/12/2012 is subtracted as it does not fall under the current monitoring period. The clarity on the same is now included in the revised excel sheet. Further to clarity on why 0.4% error is applied instead of 0.2% accuracy class and how it is conservative is also included in the excel sheet.</p> <p>The reference to latest guidelines relevant to VVS standards is included in the revised excel sheet.</p>	
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:	
Revised ER calculation sheet version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014	
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
Revised ER calculation sheet version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014 is checked for appropriateness of corrections made against above queries raised.	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	Date: 29/04/2014 Reopen: 13/05/2014
<p>PP submitted revised ER calculation sheet version 1.3 dated 29/04/2014 with transparent note included in ER calculation sheet about deduction of 5 days (01/12/2012 – 05/12/2012) electricity generation data from December 2012 month's net electricity supplied to grid by the project. Also PP clarified that since both export and import values are not available to PP; PP applied maximum permissible error of 0.4% to net electricity supplied to grid by the project activity conservatively. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.</p> <p>PP now referred section 9.4.4 of the VVS version 6.0 instead of EB 52 Annex 60 as project being VVS track. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.</p> <p>Tab "ER calculation sheet"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Row 38: there is no indication as to whether this row is for the whole of December or only from 06/12/2012. Please clarify. Cell B42, states the calibration delay is between 16/07/2013-05/09/2013. But in the MR (page 12), it states the calibration delay is between 17/07/2013-05/09/2013. Please clarify the inconsistency observed. <p>Thus CAR #4 is open.</p>	

Project Participant Response:	Date: 13/05/2014
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The net electricity and the emission reduction value in row 38 are accounted from 06/12/2012 – 31/12/2012. The same is now given as reference in the revised spread sheet. The calibration delay under the current monitoring period is from 17/07/2013 – 05/09/2013. The correction is done in the revised spread sheet. 	
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:	
Revised ER calculation sheet version 1.4 dated 13/05/2014	
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
Revised ER calculation sheet version 1.4 dated 13/05/2014 is checked for appropriateness of corrections made against above queries.	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	Date: 13/05/2014
<p>PP submitted revised ER calculation sheet version 1.4 dated 13/05/2014 with appropriate period mentioned as 06/12/2012 – 31/12/2012 in row 38. Also Cell B42 now correctly mentions calibration delay period as 17/07/2013 – 05/09/2013. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.</p> <p>Thus CAR #4 was closed out.</p>	
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:	Date: 13/05/2014

Date:	07/02/2014	Raised by:	Assessment Team		
Type:	CL	Number:	05	Reference:	Section E
Lead Assessor Comment:			Date: 07/02/2014		
PP is requested to clarify the appropriateness of the values of baseline emissions and emission reductions included in title page, section E.4, E.5 and E.7 of the MR in line with ER calculation sheet submitted for the project activity.					
PP is requested to clarify the appropriateness of the value of estimated emission reductions for the current monitoring period mentioned on title page and in section E.5 of the MR considering 391 days involved in the current monitoring period.					
Project Participant Response:			Date: 28/02/2014		
The baseline emission and the emission reductions values are now maintained consistent through the revised MR and are matching with the ER excel sheet.					
The necessary correction in the title page and in section E.5 is done considering 391 days involved in the current monitoring period.					
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:					
Revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014					
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:					
Revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 is checked for appropriateness of corrections made in section E of the MR in line with above queries raised.					
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:			Date: 25/03/2014		
PP now corrected the values of baseline emissions and emission reductions included in title page, section E.4, E.5 and E.7 of the revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 in line with ER calculation sheet submitted for the project activity. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.					
PP now correctly mentions the value of estimated emission reductions for the current monitoring period mentioned on title page and in section E.5 of the revised MR version 1.1 dated 20/03/2014 considering 391 days involved in the current monitoring period; hence it is accepted.					
Thus CL #5 is closed out.					
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:			Date: 25/03/2014		

10. Statement of Competence

Name: **Vikas Bankar**

Status

- Lead Assessor	x	- Expert	X
- Assessor	x	- Financial Expert	
- Local Assessor	India	- Technical Reviewer	X

Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)

x

Technical Area(s): TA 1.2 Energy generation from renewable energy
Sources

2. Energy Distribution

x

Technical Area(s): TA 2.1 Electricity distribution
TA 2.2 Heat distribution

3. Energy Demand

x

Technical Area(s): TA 3.1 Energy Demand

4. Manufacturing

Technical Area(s):

5. Chemical Industry

Technical Area(s):

6. Construction

Technical Area(s):

7. Transport

Technical Area(s):

8. Mining/Mineral Production

Technical Area(s):

9. Metal Production

Technical Area(s):

10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas)

Technical Area(s):

11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and

Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride

Technical Area(s):

12. Solvent Use

Technical Area(s):

13. Waste Handling and Disposal

Technical Area(s):

14. Afforestation and Reforestation

Technical Area(s):

15. Agriculture

Technical Area(s):

Approved Member of Staff
by:

Siddharth Yadav

Date: **17/07/2012**

Name: Ramkrishna Patil

Status

- Lead Assessor	x	- Expert	x
- Assessor	x	- Financial Expert	
- Local Assessor	India	- Technical Reviewer	x

Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)	x
Technical Area(s): TA 1.2 Energy generation from renewable energy sources	
2. Energy Distribution	x
Technical Area(s): TA 2.1 Electricity distribution TA 2.2 Heat distribution	
3. Energy Demand	x
Technical Area(s): TA 3.1 Energy Demand	
4. Manufacturing	
Technical Area(s):	
5. Chemical Industry	
Technical Area(s):	
6. Construction	
Technical Area(s):	
7. Transport	
Technical Area(s):	
8. Mining/Mineral Production	
Technical Area(s):	
9. Metal Production	
Technical Area(s):	
10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas)	
Technical Area(s):	
11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride	
Technical Area(s):	
12. Solvent Use	
Technical Area(s):	
13. Waste Handling and Disposal	
Technical Area(s):	
14. Afforestation and Reforestation	
Technical Area(s):	
15. Agriculture	
Technical Area(s):	

Approved Member of Staff by: Siddharth Yadav Date: 02/07/2012

11. Photographic Evidence

Unique reference number: Cluster Meter Photographs¹

Parameter: Net quantity supplied to the grid by the Project

Name of equipment: Energy Meters

Date: 07/02/2014



Unique reference number: Cluster Meter Photographs

Parameter: Net quantity supplied to the grid by the Project

Name of equipment: Energy Meters

Date: 07/02/2014



Unique reference number: WTG and Sadodar Substation

Parameter: Net quantity supplied to the grid by the Project

Name of equipment: WTG and Sadodar Substation

Date: 07/02/2014

¹ Cluster Meter photographs included above. However substation meter photographs could not be captured due to reflection from meter enclosure glass. Those were visually noted.



- o0o -