

ANNEX 3

ASSESSMENT

REGARDING POST REGISTRATION CHANGES

JAIN IRRIGATION SYSTEMS LIMITED

**13.2 MW WIND MILL POWER PROJECT IN
THENI DISTRICT OF TAMIL NADU, BY JISL-
INDIA**

Report No: 8110417395- 13/148

Date: 2013-11-06

TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
JI/CDM Certification Program
Langemarckstraße, 20
45141 Essen, Germany
Phone: +49-201-825-3335
Fax: +49-201-825-3290
www.tuev-nord.de
www.global-warming.de

Assessment Report on post registration changes	Report No.	Rev. No.	Date of 1st issue:	Date of this rev.
	8110417395- 13/148	0	2013-11-06	2013-11-06
Project:	Title:	Registr. date:	UNFCCC-No.:	
	13.2 MW Wind Mill Power Project in Theni district of Tamil Nadu, by JISL-India	2012-11-15	8079	
Project Participant(s):	Name:	Party:		
	Jain Irrigation Systems Limited	India		
Applied methodology/ies:	Title:	No.:	Scope:	
	Grid connected renewable electricity generation	AMS-I.D, 17	1/1.2	
Post Registration Changes:	Type of requested changes	Number of changes	Prior Approval required	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Temporary deviations from the MP	-	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Temporary deviations from the MM	-	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Corrections that do not affect the project	-	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Change to the start date of the crediting p.	-	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Permanent changes from the MP	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Permanent changes from the MM	-	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Design changes to the project activity/PoA	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Changes specific to A/R	-	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Revised PDD:	Title:	Attached in TC:	Attached clean:	
	13.2 MW Wind Mill Power Project in Theni district of Tamil Nadu, by JISL-India	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Assessment team / Technical Review and Final Approval	Assessment Team:	Technical review:	Final approval:	
	Manojkumar Borekar (TL, TE), Swapnil Thanekar (TM, TE) G, Ezhilarasu (TM, TE)	Kunal Rami	Kunal Rami	
Assessment Opinion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	The post registration changes require prior Approval by the Board		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The post registration changes do not require prior Approval by the Board		
Document information:	Filename:	No. of pages:		
	2013-11-06 PRC report Jains Irrigation_Clean.doc	24		

Abbreviations

CA	Corrective Action / Clarification Action
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CL	Clarification Request
CO₂	Carbon dioxide
CO_{2e}	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CP	Certification Program
DNA	Designated National Authority
EB	CDM Executive Board
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
JISL	Jain Irrigation Systems Limited
PA	Project activity
PDD	Project Design Document
PRC	Post Registration Changes
QC/QA	Quality control/Quality assurance
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard

Table of Contents	Page
1 OBJECTIVE / SCOPE	5
2 GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS	6
2.1 Project Characteristics	6
2.2 Overview of Post Registration Changes	6
2.3 Assessment team members and technical reviewers	7
2.4 Assessment Steps	7
2.5 Review of Documents	7
2.6 Follow-up Interviews	8
2.7 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests	8
2.7.1 Definition	8
2.7.2 Assessment	9
2.8 Technical review	9
2.9 Final approval	9
3 CHANGES THAT DO NOT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN.....	10
4 CHANGE TO THE START DATE OF THE CREDITING PERIOD.....	13
5 CHANGES TO THE PROJECT / PROGRAMME DESIGN.....	14
5.1 Assessment of Changes	14
5.2 Related Findings	18
6 SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT OPINIONS.....	19
7 REFERENCES	20
APPENDIX 1: ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL PARAMETERS.....	22
APPENDIX 2: ASSESSMENT OF BARRIER ANALYSIS.....	23
APPENDIX 3: STATEMENTS OF COMPETENCE OF INVOLVED PERSONNEL.....	24



1 OBJECTIVE / SCOPE

This report serves as an annex to the Post-registration changes request form (F-CDM-PRC).

2 GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

2.1 Project Characteristics

As this assessment was carried out as part of the 1st verification of the project activity please refer to chapter 2 of the verification report.

For a detailed project description please refer to the registered PDD^{/PDD/} and/or the latest verification report (to which this report is attached).

2.2 Overview of Post Registration Changes

Within this report post registration changes as listed in Table 2-2.1 are assessed.

Table 2-2.1: Overview Post Registration Changes

#	Applicable as of / from - to	Type of post registration change ¹⁾	Description
1	201x-xx-xx	TDfrMP	Not applicable
2	201x-xx-xx	TDfMM	Not applicable
3	201x-xx-xx	CrPDD	Not applicable
4	201x-xx-xx	ChSD	Not applicable
5	For dates applicable to each WTG please refer section 3.1 of this report.	PCfrMP	There was change in the metering system. The TVM meters were replaced by the ABT meters.
6	201x-xx-xx	PCfMM	Not applicable
7	2012-11-15 ¹ i.e. date of registration of project activity	CoPD	As per registered PDD the project activity involves 7 windmill which sell electricity to state electricity board and one WTG wheels power, whereas the verification team identified that six windmills sell electricity to grid and two windmills wheel the electricity to its own installation.
8	201x-xx-xx	CstAR	Not applicable

- ¹⁾ TDfrMP : Temporary deviation from registered monitoring plan
TDfMM : Temporary deviation from the monitoring methodology
CrPDD : Corrections to the registered PDD

¹ This change occurred prior to the date of registration of project activity but not transparently stated during the registration of project activity

ChSD	: Change to the start date of the crediting period
PCfMP	: Permanent changes from registered Monitoring Plan
PCfMM	: Permanent changes from Monitoring Methodology
CoPD	: Changes to the project design of a registered project activity / PoA
CstAR	: Changes specific to afforestation or reforestation

2.3 Assessment team members and technical reviewers

As this assessment was carried out as part of the First Periodic verification of the project activity please refer to the main part of the verification report.

2.4 Assessment Steps

The *assessment of post registration changes* consisted of the following steps:

- Appointment of team members and technical reviewers
- A desk review of the registered and revised PDD^{/PDD/} submitted by the client and additional supporting documents
- On-Site assessment (if required)
- Background investigation and follow-up interviews with personnel of the project developer and its contractors,
- Resolution of corrective actions (CARs / CLs) (if any)
- Final reporting
- Technical review
- Final approval.

In this case all activities were carried out as part of the First Periodic verification of this project activity.

2.5 Review of Documents

The registered as well as the revised PDD^{/PDD/} and supporting background documents related to the project design and the post registration changes were reviewed.

As far as required the assessment team used additional documentation by third parties like host party legislation, technical reports referring to the project design or to the basic conditions and technical data.

2.6 Follow-up Interviews

The validation team has conducted site visit and conducted site visit and carried out interviews in order to assess the information included in the project documentation and to gain additional information regarding the compliance of the project with the relevant criteria applicable for CDM.

During validation the validation team has performed interviews to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. The main topics of the interviews are summarized in table 2-4.

Table 2-4: Interviewed persons and interview topics

Interviewed Persons / Entities	Interview topics
Project proponent representatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Details of the project validation- Project history- Technical details of plant- Intended / implemented changes from the previous project design- Impact of changes on the additionality justification- Impact on the monitoring of the project- Editorial issues of the revised PDD^{/PDD/}

A comprehensive list of all interviewed persons is part of section 7 'References' of the First Periodic CDM Verification Report.

2.7 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

2.7.1 Definition

A **Corrective Action Request (CAR)** will be established where:

- mistakes have been made in assumptions, application of the methodology or the project documentation which will have a direct influence the project results,
- the requirements deemed relevant for validation of the intended / implemented changes,
- there is a risk that the changes cannot be approved by the UNFCCC or that emission reductions would not be able to be verified and certified after the implementation of the changes.

A **Clarification Request (CL)** will be issued where information is insufficient, unclear or not transparent enough to establish whether a requirement is met.

2.7.2 Assessment

After reviewing all relevant documents and taken all other relevant information into account, the assessment team issues all findings (in the course of a draft report, if applicable) and hands over the findings to the project proponent in order to respond on the issues raised and to revise the documentation accordingly.

The final reporting step starts after resolution of the raised CARs and CLs. In case the findings from CARs and CLs cannot be resolved by the project proponent or the proposed action related to the FARs raised cannot be assessed as adequate, no positive assessment opinion can be issued by the validation team.

The CAR(s) / CL(s) / FAR(s) are documented in the context of the respective chapters.

2.8 Technical review

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

As a result of the technical review process the assessment opinion as prepared by the validation team leader may be confirmed or revised. Furthermore reporting improvements might be achieved.

2.9 Final approval

After successful technical review of the final report an overall (esp. procedural) assessment of the requested post registration changes will be carried out by a senior assessor located in the accredited premises of TÜV NORD.

Only after this step the notification or the report can be forwarded to the UNFCCC (in case of a positive validation opinion).

3 CHANGES THAT DO NOT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN

3.1 Assessment of Changes

Requested Deviations / Changes #1

- Type of change(s):
- ☐ Temporary Deviation from Monitoring Plan
 - ☐ Temporary Deviation from Monitoring Methodology
 - ☐ Corrections that do not affect the project design
 - ☒ Permanent Change from Monitoring Plan
 - ☐ Permanent Change from Monitoring Methodology
 - ☐ Changes specific to afforestation or reforestation

A. Description of post registration change

Start Date:

Please provide the start date of the change

As per the date of replacement of meters provided below.

End Date:

Please provide the end date of the change, if applicable

Requested Deviations / Changes #1

Description:

Please give a detailed description of the changes

The existing TVM meters are replaced by the ABT meters for the WTGs as per below table:

WEG HTSC No.	OLD METER NO	NEW ABT METER NO	METER REPLACED ON
T-21	05031948	13192367	16.07.2013
T-22	04961984	13192442	16.07.2013
T-23	04961987	13192437	16.07.2013
T-24	04961989	13191918	21.05.2013
T-25	05031949	13192455	16.07.2013
T-26	04961988	13192480	16.07.2013
T-27	TN902473	HT02120276	26.05.2012
T-28	04961982	13192538	16.07.2013

During the applied monitoring period there was replacement of the installed metering system i.e. TVM meters were replaced by the ABT meters. This action was initiated by the state electricity board and beyond the control of PP. The certificate of replacement of meter is submitted to the DOE. The Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation Limited has also undertaken the testing and calibration of existing (TVM meters) and new ABT meters and it was certified that the old (TVM meters) and new meters (ABT meters) were working within specified accuracy limits. For details please refer to Annex-1 of MR.

B. Assessment of post registration change – Temporary deviations from MP or MM

Accuracy:

Please give a detailed assessment whether the deviation is likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the ER calculation.

The ABT meters are more accurate and robust compared to TVM meters. The accuracy of the ABT meters is 0.2 class whereas the accuracy of the TVM meters was 0.5 class. Thus the existing metering system is replaced by more accurate metering system.

Conservative-ness:

Please give a detailed assessment whether conservative assumptions or discount factors have been applied to ensure that ER will not be overestimated.

Not applicable as the existing metering system is replaced by more accurate metering system.

Appendix 1 PS:

Check if the changes fall under one of the scenarios of appendix 1 of the PS.

Yes it falls under the provision of para 4 and 5 (b).

C. Revised PDD

Requested Deviations / Changes #1

Rev. of PDD: Check whether the changes have been fully addressed in a revised PDD.	<input type="checkbox"/> The changes have correctly been reflected in the revised PDD. <input type="checkbox"/> A revision of the PDD is not required (in case of temp. changes). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The revised PDD has been forwarded in (i) track-change and (ii) clean version.
D. Prior Approval	
Prior approval: Assess whether the change requires prior approval of the board	<input type="checkbox"/> The post registration change requires prior approval <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The post registration change does not require prior approval

3.2 Related Findings

The following table includes raised CAR and the assessments of the same by the assessment team.

Finding	B1 _{PDD}
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR <input type="checkbox"/> CL
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	The revised PDD is deficient regarding the change in the accuracy class of metering system from 0.5 to 0.2 and its associated impacts on the monitoring parameters.
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	The PDD is updated under section B.7.3 regarding the change in the metering system. It is also confirmed that there is increase in the accuracy of the installed metering system, thus it has positive impact on the monitoring of monitoring parameters.
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	The change is following the requirements stipulated under the para 4 and 5 (b) of Appendix 1 PS. The PDD under section B.7.3 includes detailed description of metering change. The verification team acknowledges the fact that there is increase in the accuracy of the installed metering system, thus it has positive impact on the monitoring of monitoring parameters. The CAR has been CLOSED.
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed

4 CHANGE TO THE START DATE OF THE CREDITING PERIOD

The post registration changes do not fall under this category.

5 CHANGES TO THE PROJECT / PROGRAMME DESIGN

5.1 Assessment of Changes

Requested Changes to the project design #1

Type : ☒ *Changes to the project design*

☐ *Changes to the PoA design*

A. Description of post registration change

Start Date: Please provide the start date of the change	2012-11-15	End Date: Please provide the end date of the change, if applicable	-
Description: Please give a detailed description of the changes esp. with regards to the effect on the project design.	As per registered PDD the project activity involves 7 windmill which sell electricity to state electricity board and one WTG wheels power, whereas the verification team identified that six windmills sell electricity to grid and two windmills wheel the electricity to its own installation.		

B. Applicability and application of the Approved Baseline Methodology

Description: Please give a detailed description on how the changes affect the applicability and application of the approved Baseline Methodology. Check if the actual changes would adversely affect the conclusions during validation.	<p>The applicability of the project activity is not affected as the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • capacity of the project activity remains unchanged • The project still continue to export electricity to Southern grid (6 WTGs) and also wheels the electricity (2 WTG's)
---	--

C. Additionality assessment

Description: Please give a detailed description re-assessment of additionality. Check whether the actual changes would adversely affect the conclusions during validation. If required please make use of the assessment tables in the annex.	<p><u>Methodology:</u></p> <p>In the original project documentation (registered PDD and validation report) the additionality was justified in line with the requirements of AMS I.D ver. 17 and as per Attachment A to Appendix B of the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities capturing the project conceptualization scenario. Based on the same validation team has conducted the re-assessment of the additionality of the project after design changes in the project activity.</p> <p><u>Decisive Route of Additionality Justification</u></p> <p>During the original validation of the project the additionality was justified on the basis of investment barrier and same is assessed by validation team in the re-assessment of additionality which is still valid.</p>
---	--

Requested Changes to the project design #1

The additionality as per registered PDD is based on;

- **Investment Barrier:** The project was conceptualized as installation of eight wind mills where 7 windmill (T21 to T27) will be selling electricity to state electricity board and one WTG wheels power (T28). After the commissioning of all the WEG's this scenario continued and later PP decided to wheel the electricity from its WEG number T27. The NoC to the same was issued by TANGEDCO on date 2011-08-02 and then the wheeling started. Thus, the project implementation changed from the reporting made in the PDD and corresponding validation report. Since this scenario is not captured during the validation of project activity the same is assessed at time of verification as it is identified during the document review. Due to the change in the project implementation, the only parameter which is affected is the tariff for the windmill T27. The earlier validated tariff was based on sale to grid which was INR 3.38/ kWh for sale to grid whereas the validated tariff for wheeling is INR 3.68 per kWh. The PP has substituted this value (INR 3.68 per kWh) in the IRR worksheet and it is found that the project IRR (9.29 %) is within the benchmark (12.25%). The verification team also checked and found that the project IRR remains within the validated benchmark of 12.25 % for all possible scenarios (except for the scenario of 10 % reduction in project cost which is hypothetical scenario and hence ruled out from assessment from validation stage itself).

Re-Assessment of Additionality

A revised PDD^{/PDD/} and financial spread sheet^{/R-IRR/} has been submitted by project proponent to validation team for re-assessment of the additionality.

- The revised PDD, financial spread sheet^{/R-IRR/} reflect the design changes which is basically change in the tariff associated with the wheeling. The PP has replaced the sale to grid tariff of one of windmill by tariff charge.

Validation team adopted the approach to assess the additionality of the project in the same manner in which it was proven in the registered PDD.

So, as per the requirement of the para 274 (a) of VVS; revised PDD^{/PDD/} as well as revised financial sheet^{/R-IRR/} is submitted by PP. In the revised financial sheet^{/R-IRR/} project proponent has modified the key input parameter (replaced the sale to grid tariff of one of windmill by tariff charge) in the original financial spread sheet^{/XLS/} calculations which is affected by the actual changes to the project activity

For assessment on the financial parameters refer "Appendix 1: Assessment of Financial Parameters" of this report.

Requested Changes to the project design #1

	<p><u>Result of Additionality Re-Assessment</u></p> <p>The revised PDD^{/PDD/} and financial sheet^{/R-IRR/} show that the IRR of project activity is not significantly influenced by the changes to the project design of the project activity. The project IRR increases to 9.29%.</p> <p>Thus the validation team has arrived at the conclusion that the additionality of the project is not adversely affected by the technical changes carried out as a deviation from the project design originally validated and registered.</p>
D. Scale of the Project activity	
<p>Description:</p> <p>Please give a detailed regarding the effect of the changes on the scale of the PA (i.e. LSC or SSC).</p>	<p>As guided by para 279 (b) of the VVS validation team has confirmed during the site visit and interview with the project proponent that there are no capacity changes in the project design. The project activity started wheeling prior to the registration of project activity however the entire validation and the PDD description was inline with the project inception at time of decision making. Furthermore, the changes in design of the project activity would not impact the overall operation/ability of the project activity as there is no change in the physical configuration of project activity.</p> <p>Since, the project applies the approved small scale methodology AMS-I.D, version 17. The baseline methodology is applicable since the project involves installation of windmills with the total installed capacity of the plant is 13.2 MW which is less than the 15 MW as stipulated in AMS I.D, version17.</p> <p>Thus, it is concluded by validation team during the revalidation activity that the project activity remains in small scale category after the design change.</p>
E. Revised PDD	
<p>Rev. of PDD:</p> <p>Check whether the changes have been fully addressed in a revised PDD. In this context pl. refer to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changes in the effective output capacity. - Addition of components or extension of technology - In case of multiple site projects: Removal or addition of sites - Operational parameters under the control of PPs differing from expected parameters - Changes to the baseline Meth (e.g. addition of a new Meth or change of 	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The post registration change has correctly been reflected in the revised PDD^{/PDD/}. This assessment is based on the following considerations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As there is no change in the physical configuration of project activity, the output capacity remains unaffected. 2. There are no additional components or extension of technology. 3. There is no removal or addition of site as the physical configuration of project activity remains similar to registered project activity. 4. The only parameter i.e. wheeling of electricity to grid compared to the same of electricity to grid has undergone change, otherwise all other operational parameters are in control of PP. 5. The baseline of project activity remains the same. The baseline scenario is export of electricity to the southern

Requested Changes to the project design #1

<p>the BL scenario.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effects with regards to B, C and D above incl. compliance with the MP and level of accuracy and completeness of monitoring. 	<p>regional grid.</p> <p>6. There is no revision in the monitoring plan as the existing monitoring plan is sufficiently catering the requirements to monitor the performance as well as emission reduction associated with the project activity.</p> <p>Thus based on its above assessment the validation team concludes that the said type of changes would not adversely affect the conclusions of the validation report or of the registered PDD with regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Additionality of the project activity; (ii) Scale of the project activity; (iii) Applicability and application of approved baseline methodology under which the project activity has been registered or the later version of the applied methodology; (iv) The compliance of the monitoring plan with applied monitoring methodology; or (v) The level of accuracy of the monitoring compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan. <p>The project activity is registered under the previous regulatory framework (VVM track), the old information is appropriately transferred to the new form. The verification team confirms that material included in the new form is materially the same as the information in the registered PDD except for the changes that are applied as part of this PRC report.</p> <p>Thus in conjunction with the para 271 and 273 of VVS and para pertaining to "Changes to the project design of a registered project activity" of Appendix-1 of project standard concludes that the "Changes that do not require prior approval by the board".</p>
<p>Traceability:</p> <p>Check if the PPs have provided a revised PDD in both clean and track-change version.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The revised PDD^{/PDD/} has been forwarded in (i) track-change and (ii) clean version.</p>

F. Prior Approval

Requested Changes to the project design #1

Prior approval: Assess whether the change requires prior approval of the board.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The changes do not raise concerns with respect to aspects outlined in the PS: a) applicability and application of the Approved Baseline Methodology under which the project activity has been registered b) additionality of the project c) scale of the CDM project activity and Prior Approval by the Board is not required.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The post registration change requires prior approval.

5.2 Related Findings

Refer the finding CAR B1 in the verification report raised by verification team. Also refer to additional finding pertaining to the revised submitted PDD.

Finding	B2 _{PDD}	
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	The revised PDD (under section B.3, B.6.1) is incorrectly representing that seven WTG sell electricity to grid and one is wheeling electricity. This is inconsistent with present situation.	
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	The PDD is corrected in this regards.	
DOE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	The section B.3 and B.6.1 of the PDD are appropriately addressed. The PDD now states that six WTG sell electricity to southern regional grid of india and two WTG wheel electricity. The CAR has been CLOSED.	
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed	

6 SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT OPINIONS

The below listed changes have occurred after the registration of the project / PoA.

Type of Change occurred		Total No. of changes	No. of changes which require prior approval
<input type="checkbox"/>	Temporary deviations from the MP	--	--
<input type="checkbox"/>	Temporary deviations from the MM	--	--
<input type="checkbox"/>	Corrections that do not affect the project	--	--
<input type="checkbox"/>	Change to the start date of the crediting p.	--	--
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Permanent changes from the MP	1	--
<input type="checkbox"/>	Permanent changes from the MM	--	--
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Design changes to the project activity / PoA	1	--
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes specific to AR projects	--	--

None of the changes requires prior approval of the Board.

Pune, 2013-11-06



Mr. Manojkumar Borekar
TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification
Program
Assessment Team Leader

Essen, 2013-11-06



Kunal Rami
TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP
Final Approval

7 REFERENCES

All references are listed in the Verification Report (chapter 7) to which this assessment is attached

APPENDIX

- A1:** Assessment of Financial Parameters
- A2:** Assessment of Barrier analysis
- A3:** Competence statements of involved personnel

Assessment Report regarding Post Registration Changes:

13.2 MW Wind Mill Power Project in Theni district of Tamil Nadu, by JISL-India

TÜV NORD CERT GmbH JI/CDM Certification Program

P-No.: 8110417395- 13/148



APPENDIX 1: ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL PARAMETERS

Table A-1: Assessment of Financial Parameters (VVS, v. 4.0, §§ 120, 121 / in case financial parameters stem from FSR §122)

<input type="checkbox"/>	No financial parameters are used for additionality justification					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Assessment of all financial parameters see below					
Parameter	Value applied	Unit	Source of Information (please indicate document and page)	Reference	DOE ASSESSMENT	
					Correctness of value applied	Comment
Tariff (for captive consumption)	3.68	INR/kWh	Electricity Bill for the month of March 2009	Page 136-137 of Final Validation Report /VAL/		<p>Project developer is wheeling the power generated by the WTG to the factory for captive consumption. Accordingly, the project developer had considered a tariff of INR 3.68/kWh, based on the power tariff paid by the company before the decision making date in respect of captive consumption. The detailed assessment of this tariff is already part of ANNEX 3: ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL PARAMETERS page 136-137 of Final Validation Report.</p> <p>The PP has appropriately replaced the tariff from INR 3.38/ kWh for sale to grid to the validated tariff for wheeling is INR 3.68 per kWh. Both the values are already validated at time of validation therefore additional assessment is not necessary at this stage.</p>

Assessment Report regarding Post Registration Changes:

13.2 MW Wind Mill Power Project in Theni district of Tamil Nadu, by JISL-India

TÜV NORD CERT GmbH JI/CDM Certification Program

P-No.: 8110417395- 13/148



APPENDIX 2: ASSESSMENT OF BARRIER ANALYSIS

Table A-2: Assessment of Barrier Analysis (VVS, v. 4.0, §§ 124-127)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		No barrier parameters are used for additionality justification		
<input type="checkbox"/>		Assessment of barriers see below		
Kind of Barrier (invest, tech, other)	Description of Barrier	Evidence used	Assessment of validation team	
			Appropriateness of information source	Explanation of final result
1	Investment barrier:	/PDD/ /VAL/ /XLS/ /PDD/ /R-IRR/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project IRR is within the benchmark. The only parameter which has undergone variation is tariff of the WEG T27. The PP has appropriately replaced the tariff from INR 3.38/ kWh for sale to grid to the validated tariff for wheeling is INR 3.68 per kWh. Both the values are already validated at time of validation therefore additional assessment is not necessary at this stage.
2	Technical barrier	/PDD/ /VAL/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable
3	Other barriers	/PDD/ /VAL/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable.
4	Prevalent practice	/PDD/ /VAL/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable.

Assessment Report regarding Post Registration Changes:

13.2 MW Wind Mill Power Project in Theni district of Tamil Nadu, by JISL-India

TÜV NORD CERT GmbH JI/CDM Certification Program

P-No.: 8110417395- 13/148



APPENDIX 3: STATEMENTS OF COMPETENCE OF INVOLVED PERSONNEL

Part of the Verification Report