VALIDATION REPORT

G.R.ENGINEERING PVT.LTD.

VALIDATION OF THE

1.65 MW WIND POWER PROJECT BY G.R. ENGINEERING PVT. LTD

REPORT NO. INDIA-VAL/431.49/2012
REVISION NO. 02

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

62/71 BOULEVARD DU CHATEAU
92571 NEUILLY SUR SEINE CDX - FRANCE

Report No: INDIA-val/431.49/2012 rev. 02

VALIDATION REPORT

Date of first issue:	Organizational unit:
05/10/2012	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client:	**Client ref.:**
G.R.Engineering Pvt Ltd	Mr. S Shirolkar

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has conducted the validation of the "1.65 MW Wind Power Project by G.R.Engineering Pvt. Ltd" located at Vandhiya village, Kutch District in the state of Gujarat, India on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the CDM Executive Board, as well as the host country criteria.

The validation scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project's baseline study, monitoring plan and other relevant documents, and consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final validation report and opinion. The overall validation, from Contract Review to Validation Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

The first output of the validation process is a list of Clarification and Corrective Actions Requests (CL and CAR), presented in Appendix A. Taking into account this output, the project proponent revised its project design document.

In summary, it is Bureau Veritas Certification's opinion that the project correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology AMS I.D, version 17 and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM and the relevant host country criteria.

Report No.:	Subject Group:
INDIA-val/431.49/2012	CDM

Project title:

1.65 MW Wind Power Project by G.R. Engineering Pvt. Ltd

Work carried out by:

R S Premkumar – Team Leader
Pramod Kamble – Team Member
Sushil Budhia Associates – Financial Expert

Internal Technical Review carried out by:

Sanjay S Patankar – Internal Technical Reviewer

Date of this revision:	Rev. No.:	Number of pages:
22/12/2012	02	112

Indexing terms

Work Approved by

Mr Flavio Gomes

☒ No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit

☐ Limited distribution

☐ Unrestricted distribution

Abbreviations

BM	Build Margin
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CEA	Central Electricity Authority
CERs	Certified Emission Reductions
CL	Clarification Request
CM	Combined Margin
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
DR	Desk Review
DVR	Detailed Validation Report
EB	Executive Board
EF	Emission Factor
EIA	Environment Impact Assessment
FAR	Forward Action Request
GEDA	Gujarat Electricity Development Agency
GERC	Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission
GETCO	Gujarat Electricity Transmission Corporation Organization
GUVNL	Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited
GHGs	Green House Gas(es)
HCA	Host Country Approval

ITR	Internal Technical Review
MP	Monitoring Plan
MW	Mega watt
NCDMA	National CDM Authority
NEWNE	Northern, Eastern, Western, and North-Eastern regional grids
OM	Operating margin
O & M	Operation and Maintenance
PDD	Project Design Document
PLF	Plant Load Factor
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
REF	Reference
RI	Report Issuance
SV	Site Visit
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change
VVM	Validation and Verification Manual
WEC	Wind Energy Convertors

Table of Contents *Page*

1. INTRODUCTION 6
1.1. Objective 6
1.2. Scope 6
1.3. Validation Team 6

2. METHODOLOGY 7
2.1. Review of Documents 8
2.2. Follow-up Interviews 8
2.3. Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests 9
2.4. Internal Technical Review 9

3. VALIDATION CONCLUSIONS 10
3.1. Approval (43-44) 10
3.2. Authorization (49) 12
3.3. Sustainable Development (52) 12
3.4. Modalities of Communications (58,61) 13
3.5. Project Design Document (63) 13
3.6. Changes in the Project Activity (17) 13
3.7. Project Description (69) 14
3.8. Baseline and Monitoring Methodology 15
3.8.1. Applicability of the selected Methodology (77) 15
3.8.2. Project Boundary (86-87) 17
3.8.3. Baseline Identification (94-95) 17
3.8.4. Algorithms and/or Formulae used to determine Emission Reductions (99-100) 19
3.9. Additionality (104) 22
3.9.1. Prior consideration of the Clean Development Mechanism (112)..... 22
3.9.2. Identification of Alternatives (116) 25
3.9.3. Investment Analysis (123) 25
3.9.4. Barrier Analysis (127) 35
3.9.5. Common Practice Analysis (130) 35
3.10. Monitoring Plan (133) 35
3.11. Environmental Impacts (137) 38
3.12. Local Stakeholder Consultation (140) 38

4. COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS 40

5. VALIDATION OPINION 40

6. REFERENCES 42

7. CURRICULA VITAE OF THE DOE'S VALIDATION TEAM MEMBERS 45

APPENDIX A: CDM PROJECT VALIDATION PROTOCOL 46

APPENDIX B: GLOBAL STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS 97

1. INTRODUCTION

G.R. Engineering Pvt Ltd. has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to validate its CDM project "1.65 MW Wind Power Project by G.R. Engineering Pvt. Ltd." (hereafter called "the project") located at Jamnagar district in the state of Gujarat, India.

This report summarizes the findings of the validation of the project, performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

1.1. Objective

The validation serves as project design verification and is a requirement of all projects. The validation is an independent third party assessment of the project design. In particular, the project's baseline, the monitoring plan (MP), and the project's compliance with relevant UNFCCC and host country criteria are validated in order to confirm that the project design, as documented, is sound and reasonable, and meet the stated requirements and identified criteria. Validation is a requirement for all CDM projects and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of certified emission reductions (CERs).

UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the CDM Executive Board, as well as the host country criteria.

1.2. Scope

The validation scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project's baseline study and monitoring plan and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against Kyoto Protocol requirements, UNFCCC rules and associated interpretations.

The validation 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. Validation Team

The validation team consists of the following personnel:

FUNCTION	NAME	CODE HOLDER*	TASK PERFORMED
Lead Verifier	R S Premkumar	☒ Yes ☐ No	☒ DR ☒ SV ☐ RI
Verifier	Pramod Kamble	☒ Yes ☐ No	☒ DR ☒ SV ☐ RI
Financial Specialist	Sushil Budhia Associates	☐ Yes ☒ No	☒ DR ☐ SV ☐ RI
Internal	Sanjay S Patankar	☒ Yes ☐ No	☒ DR ☐ SV ☐ RI

Technical Reviewer (ITR)			
Report Approval	Flavio Gomes	☐**Yes** ☒ **No**	☒**DR** ☐**SV** ☒**RI**

* DR – Document Review, SV – Site Visit, RI – Report Issuance

2. METHODOLOGY

The overall validation, from Contract Review to Validation Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

In order to ensure transparency, a validation protocol was customized for the project, according to the version 03.0 of the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard, issued by CDM Executive Board at its 70th meeting on 23/11/2012. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), means of validation and the results from validating the identified criteria. The validation protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organizes, details and clarifies the requirements a CDM project is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent validation process where the validator will document how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the validation.

The completed validation protocol is enclosed in Appendix A to this report.

2.1 REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS

The Project Design Document (PDD) submitted by G.R. Engineering Pvt Ltd and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Guidelines for Completing the Project Design Document (CDM-PDD), Approved methodology, Kyoto Protocol, Clarifications on Validation Requirements to be Checked by a Designated Operational Entity were reviewed.

To address Bureau Veritas Certification corrective action and clarification requests, G.R. Engineering Pvt Ltd revised the PDD and resubmitted it in December 2012. The validation findings presented in this report relate to the project as described in the PDD version 2.3.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 12/12/2011, Bureau Veritas Certification made a site visit and performed interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to discuss issues identified in the document review. Representatives of G.R. Engineering Pvt Ltd, Ecolutions Carbon India Pvt Ltd (Project Consultants), Local stakeholders and Suzlon Infrastructure Services Limited (O&M contractors for the project activity) were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
G.R. Engineering Pvt Ltd	CDM Consideration Methodology applicability Baseline determination Additionality Local stakeholder consultation and resolution of their concerns Supporting data and documentation Resolution of CAR's and CL's
Local Stakeholders	Views and concerns about the Project Activity Confirmation of the local stakeholder meeting conducted by the Project Participant.

Ecolutions Carbon India Ltd (Project Consultant)	Methodology application Baseline determination & emission factor Additionality Monitoring Plan GHG Calculations Supporting data, evidences and documentation Resolution of CAR's and CL's
Vestas India (O&M of the WEG's at site)	Monitoring System at site Metering system at site

2.3 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the validation is to raise the requests for corrective actions and clarification and any other outstanding issues that needed to be clarified for Bureau Veritas Certification positive conclusion on the project design.

Corrective Action Requests (CAR) is issued, where:

(a) The project participants have made mistakes that will influence the ability of the project activity to achieve real, measurable additional emission reductions;
(b) The CDM requirements have not been met;
(c) There is a risk that emission reductions cannot be monitored or calculated.

The validation team may also use the term Clarification Request (CL), if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM requirements have been met.

To guarantee the transparency of the verification process, the concerns raised are documented in more detail in the validation protocol in Appendix A.

2.4 Internal Technical Review

The validation report underwent an Internal Technical Review (ITR) before requesting registration of the project activity.

The ITR is an independent process performed to examine thoroughly that the process of validation has been carried out in conformance with the requirements of the validation scheme as well as internal Bureau Veritas Certification procedures.

The Lead Verifier provides a copy of the validation report to the reviewer, including any necessary validation documentation. The reviewer reviews the submitted documentation for conformance with the validation scheme. This will be a comprehensive review of all documentation generated during the validation process.

When performing an Internal Technical Review, the reviewer ensures that:

The validation activity has been performed by the team by exercising utmost diligence and complete adherence to the CDM rules and requirements.

The review encompasses all aspects related to the project which includes project design, baseline, additionality, monitoring plans and emission reduction calculations, internal quality assurance systems of the project participant as well as the project activity, review of the stakeholder comments and responses, closure of CARs, CLs and FARs during the validation exercise, review of sample documents.

The reviewer compiles clarification questions for the Lead Verifier and Validation Team and discusses these matters with Lead Verifier.

After the agreement of the responses on the 'Clarification Request' from the Lead Verifier as well as the PP(s) the finalized validation report is accepted for further processing such as uploading on the UNFCCC webpage.

3. VALIDATION CONCLUSIONS

In the following sections, the conclusions of the validation are stated.

The findings from the desk review of the original project design documents and the findings from interviews during the follow up visit are described in the Validation Protocol in Appendix A.

The Clarification and Corrective Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Validation Protocol in Appendix A. The validation of the Project resulted in 15 Corrective Action Requests and 09 Clarification Requests.

The number between brackets at the end of each section correspond to the VVM paragraph

3.1 Approval (43-44)

India is the only party involved in the project activity at this stage and is the host party. The Project participant, M/s G.R. Engineering Pvt Ltd has

obtained approval (Ref /4/) from DNA of India and has provided a copy of the DNA approval letter to the validation team. The letter of approval clearly states that India has ratified the Kyoto Protocol and the approval is for voluntary participation in CDM project activity. Also, the letter of approval mentions that project contributes to sustainable development. The letter is unconditional with respect to party to the Kyoto Protocol, voluntary participation, contribution to sustainable development and title of project activity. The HCA however does not refer to the same project activity title as stated in the webhosted PDD. Hence the validation team raised CL 9 for the Project Participant to clarify the same. The Project Participant responded to state that the title of the proposed project activity in the application to the DNA of India for Host Country Approval as well as in the application made in Form F, to the Indian DNA as well as to the UNFCCC for prior consideration of CDM were all the same. However, while finalizing the PDD, the title of the proposed project activity erroneously included the name of the village in which the proposed project activity is located in. Further it is stated that the capacity and location of the proposed project activity has not changed and also the capability of the project activity to deliver emission reductions has also not changed. The validation team reviewed the same and noted that the title of the proposed project activity as indicated in the HCA issued by the Indian DNA as well as the on the UNFCCC website, under Prior Consideration, are the same. Hence the validation team accepted the justification of the Project Participant since the change in the project activity title does not impact the basic ability of the project activity to lead to sustainable development in the region and its capability to deliver emission reductions, which are the primary requirements of any CDM project. Hence the CL was closed.

In accordance with Para 39 – 42/VVS, Bureau Veritas Certification considers that:

a. Each letter confirms the Party is a Party to the Kyoto Protocol;

b. Each letter confirms the participation is voluntary;

c. In the case of the host Party, the letter confirms that the proposed project activity contributes to the sustainable development of the country;

d. Each letter refers to the precise proposed project activity title in the PDD being submitted for registration.

e. The letter(s) of approval is unconditional with respect to the items above.

f. The letter(s) of approval has been issued by the respective Party's DNA and is valid for the proposed project activity under validation.

The validation team raised CAR 1 since the HCA for the project activity was not available or provided to the validation till the time of issuance of the DVR. In response to CAR 1, the Project Participant provided a copy of the Host Country Approval Letter issued by Ministry of Environment and Forest [Government of India] which was cross-checked with its original and hence the CAR was closed by the validation team.

3.2 Authorization (49)

The participation for the project participant has been approved by India, which is a Party of the Kyoto Protocol. This was checked from UNFCCC website http://maindb.unfccc.int/public/country.pl?country=IN.

The project design document has mentioned M/s G.R. Engineering Pvt Ltd as the project participant and their participation are approved by the DNA vide their approval letter (Ref /4/). Hence, the validation team confirms that the participation for project participant has been approved by a Party of the Kyoto Protocol. The validation team does not doubt the authenticity of the letter of approval as it has been issued on the official letterhead of Ministry of Environment and Forest (Government of India) and signed by Deputy Secretary, Climate Change. The validation team confirmed the authenticity of the approval by cross-checking it with the original copy of the letter of Approval. The letter of approval clearly states that India has ratified the Kyoto Protocol and the approval is for voluntary participation in CDM project activity. Also, the letter of approval mentions that project contributes to sustainable development.

The project was initially webhosted on the UNFCCC for global stakeholder's comments as per CDM requirements. The project was webhosted from 01/11/2011 to 30/11/2011. Comments were received from 01 global stakeholder, which have been discussed in Appendix B of this report.

However the validation team noted during the validation process, that the PDD that was initially webhosted was for another investor who is not a part of this proposed project activity. Therefore the DOE has re-webhosted the project PDD with the correct information from 01/08/2012 to 30/08/2012. Comments were received from 02 global stakeholders, which have also been discussed in Appendix B of this report.

3.3 Sustainable Development (52)

The host Party's DNA has confirmed the contribution of the Project to the sustainable development of the host Party. Please refer to section 3.1 of this report.

3.4 Modalities of Communication (58, 61)

The validation team has performed due diligence on the MoC statement and validated the corporate identity of all project participants and focal points included in the Modalities of Communication (MoC) statement, as well as the personal identities, including specimen signatures and employment status, of their authorized signatories.

Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the MoC statement complies with all relevant forms and requirements.

3.5 Project Design Document (63)

Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that the PDD complies with the latest forms and guidance documents for completion of PDD.

3.6 Changes in the Project activity (17)

During the site visit, no physical changes pertaining to the project design was observed as compared to details mentioned in the webhosted PDD.

The final PDD, Ver. 02.3 (Ref /3/) has the following changes with respect to version 02 (Ref /2/) which was re-webhosted

- The Project boundary diagram has been revised in the PDD as the actual metering system at site was not transparently described.
- The latest versions of the applied methodology and the emission factor tool have been included in the revised PDD.
- Ex-ante calculations of the baseline emissions were incorrect, which has now been corrected.
- Monitoring plan has been revised in the PDD in accordance with the actual monitoring practice to transparently describe the process of metering and monitoring at site.
- The description of the local stakeholder consultation process has been corrected in the revised PDD.

CAR 3 was raised since the project boundary shown in the web hosted PDD was not as per the actual metering scenario observed at site. The same has been revised in the PDD and hence the corrective action was closed.

CAR 10 & 15 were raised since the section B. 7 of the webhosted PDD was not as per the actual monitoring practice at site. The same has revised in the PDD and hence the corrective action was closed.

The validation team hereby confirms that the PDD complies with the latest PDD format and PDD Completeness Guidelines for completion of the PDD.

3.7 Project Description (69)

The process undertaken to validate the accuracy and completeness of the project description is as follows;

The proposed project activity involves the installation of 01 no Wind Energy Generator's (WEG), of capacity 1.65 MW, thereby totaling 1.65 MW capacity, located at Vandhiya village of Bhachau Taluka, Kutch District, Gujarat, India. The entire electricity generated from the proposed project activity will be exported to the NEWNE grid with a firm power purchase agreement with the State Electricity Utility viz; GUVNL (Ref /5/).

This project generates electricity using wind energy, which does not result in any greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Thus, this project activity will lead to a reduction in GHG emissions that would otherwise have occurred when using electricity generated from conventional fossil fuel based sources in the NEWNE regional grid.

The Project will result in annual estimated emission reductions of 2,756 tCO2e during the ten years of its fixed crediting period.

The validation did not reveal any information indicating that the Project can be seen as a diversion of official development assistance (ODA) funding towards the host country.

Validation team validated the accuracy of the project description through a combination of steps consisting of review of purchase orders (Ref /6/ & /7/) related to the project activity, commissioning certificate for the Wind Energy Generator's (Ref /8/), site visit and interview of the project participant and their representatives. The confirmation that the electricity will only be exported to the grid is available through the PPA (Ref /5/).

The validation team observed that the company has claimed tax depreciation benefits for the proposed CDM project activity. Hence it is confirmed that the project activity is not claiming benefits under Generation Based Incentive Scheme (GBI). Since the Project Participant has signed a long term PPA with the GUVNL, the validation team confirms that the project activity is also not eligible to claim Renewable Energy Certificate (REC) benefits.

Based on site visits, document review and interviews conducted, the validation team hereby confirms that the project description in the final PDD (Ref /3/) is accurate and complete in all respects.

3.8 Baseline and monitoring methodology

3.8.1 Applicability of the selected methodology (77)

The proposed project activity applies the approved methodology AMS I.D, version 17 (Ref /19/).

Applicability of the applied methodology is justified and assessed as follows;

3. Applicability Condition 1: The Purchase orders (Ref /6/ & /7/) for the project activity and the physical verification at site indicate that the project activity involves installation of windmills alone and therefore is a renewable energy project. The Grid connectivity was verified through PPA (Ref /5/), samples of records of Monthly GEDA Share Certificates issued by GUVNL (Ref /30/) and physical connection to the grid at site. As per CEA database Version 7 (Ref /22/), Gujarat falls under the NEWNE grid, the geographic and system boundaries of which are clearly identified and information on the characteristics of the grid is available. Thus applicability condition 1 of the methodology is assessed and found to be meeting the requirements of the applied methodology.

4. Applicability Condition 2: Illustration of the situation under which methodology the project activity can be classified was found to be AMS ID, since the project activity is a wind power project and supplies electricity to the State grid viz; grid connected.

5. Applicability Condition 3: The proposed project activity is the installation of a new power plant at the site and therefore can be classified as a Greenfield project. The purchase orders for the Wind Turbine Generator's (Ref /6/ & /7/) and the commissioning certificate (Ref /8/) indicate that the wind turbines are new and are not transferred.

6. Applicability Condition 4: This condition is not applicable as the proposed project activity is a wind power project and not a hydro project.

7. Applicability Condition 5: Physical verification at the site indicate that the project activity is not an add up of a renewable and non-renewable component but is a wind power plant with an installed capacity of 1.65 MW, which is below the threshold limit of 15 MW for small scale project activities. The project falls under Type I Renewable energy projects, category D: Electricity generation for a system.

8. Applicability Condition 6: The project activity does not involve any combined heat and power (cogeneration) systems and is only a

biomass based power plant generating and supplying the entire electricity to the grid.

9. Applicability Condition 7: The project activity does not involve addition of renewable energy generation units to an existing renewable power generation units at the same site, as was verified during the physical site visit.

10. Applicability Condition 8: The proposed project activity is a green field wind power project and does not involve retrofit and/or modifications to existing equipment. The project capacity is 1.65 MW, which is below the threshold limit of 15 MW for small scale project activities.

The validation team therefore agrees that the project activity meets all the applicability conditions of the selected approved methodology AMS I.D, version 17 (Ref /19/).

Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that the selected baseline and monitoring methodology, AMS I.D, Version 17 is previously approved by the CDM Executive Board, and is applicable to the project activity, which complies with all the applicability conditions therein. The small scale methodology AMS I.D version 17 (Ref /19/) is applied in conjunction with the latest version of General Guidance to SSC CDM methodologies

3.8.2 Project boundary (86-87)

The validation team validated the project boundary by:

The spatial extent of the project boundary is assessed through the description in the PDD and the grid structure in India as known from the official data available from the Central Electricity Authority (CEA) (Ref /22/). The project activity boundary therefore includes the project power plant (wind energy generators) and all power plants connected physically to the NEWNE electricity grid of India that the CDM project power plant is connected to. The consideration of only CO_2 gas for the baseline emissions is conservative and is in line with the methodology and hence appropriate.

The electricity imported by the project activity is accounted in the net electricity exported by the project activity, $EG_{BL,y}$. There are no other sources of project emissions. Hence, in line with the methodology, project participant has considered project emissions as zero for renewable energy projects. Further, it is also confirmed through the verification of purchase orders for the WEG (Ref /6/ & /7/) and the commissioning certificate of the WEG (Ref /8/) that the equipments of the Project Activity are new and does not involve any transfer of equipment from or to the project activity and thus there is no leakage accountable to the project activity.

The project design is sound and the geographical (Kutch district in Indian State of Gujarat) boundaries of the project and temporal (20 years) boundaries of the project are clearly defined. Life of the project activity equipment is 20 years.

CAR 3 was raised by the validation team since the metering system was not appropriately described in the project boundary diagram. The same has been elaborated by the Project participant in the revised version of the PDD and therefore the correction action request was closed.

Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that the identified project boundary and the selected sources and gases are justified for the project activity. The validation team did not identify any emission sources that will be affected by the implementation of the proposed project activity and which are expected to contribute more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emissions reductions, and are not addressed by the selected approved methodology.

3.8.3 Baseline identification (94-95)

The methodology AMS I.D. ver. 17 prescribes the baseline for the project activity. The project activity is the installation of a new grid-connected renewable power plant/unit and hence, the baseline scenario is *that the*

electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity would have otherwise been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources into the grid. The same is in line with paragraph 10 of AMS I.D. ver. 17.

The baseline emissions are the product of electrical energy baseline $EG_{BL,y}$ expressed in MWh of electricity produced by the renewable generating unit multiplied by the grid emission factor(Para 11 of methodology AMS I.D version 17).

$$BE_y = EG_{BL,y} * EF_{CO2,grid,y}$$

Where:

BE_y = Baseline Emissions in year y (t CO_2)
$EG_{BL,y}$ = Quantity of net electricity supplied to the grid as a result of the implementation of the CDM project activity in year y (MWh)
$EF_{CO2,grid,y}$ = CO_2 Emission Factor of the grid in year y (t CO_2/MWh)
As per AMS I.D version 17, the Emission Factor can be calculated in a transparent and conservative manner in either of the following two options:

(a) A combined margin (CM), consisting of the combination of operating margin (OM) and build margin (BM) according to the procedures prescribed in the 'Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system', Version 2.2.1.

OR

(b) The weighted average emissions (in Kg CO_2/kWh) of the current generation mix. The data of the year in which the project generation occurs must be used.

The project participant has opted for option (a) above and hence combined margin is calculated as per Tools to calculate emission factor for an electricity system (Ref /21/).

The project participant has used the official published data on operating and build margin emission factors and calculated the combined margin emission factor as per version 2.2.1 of the "Tool to calculate emission factor". The value of the data used is published by Central Electricity Authority, CEA [Version 7] who is the sole authority for the publication of such data in India. The calculation in CEA database version 7 is also in

accordance with version 2.2.1 of the Tool to calculate emission factor. It was noted by the validation team that version 7 of the CEA database has been used by the Project Participant which was available at the start of webhosting of the PDD for global stakeholder comments (viz. start of validation).

Project participant has applied weight factors for the OM and BM [75% & 25% respectively] as specified in the tool to calculate emission factor for combined margin option. The years considered for OM are 2008-09 to 2010-11 and for the BM it is 2010-11. Accordingly, the combined margin emission factor value for NEWNE grid is calculated as 0.9534 tCO_2/MWh.

Validation team agrees to this emission factor since it is based on the official background data published by CEA (Central Electricity Authority) which is an official central government agency. The validation team further notes that the emission factor is not provided by DNA but by the competent authority.

Based on the above assessment, Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that:

(a) All the assumptions and data used by the project participants are listed in the PDD, including their references and sources;
(b) All documentation used is relevant for establishing the baseline scenario and correctly quoted and interpreted in the PDD;
(c) Assumptions and data used in the identification of the baseline scenario are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable;
(d) Relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances are considered and listed in the PDD;
(e) The approved baseline methodology has been correctly applied to identify the most reasonable baseline scenario and the identified baseline scenario reasonably represents what would occur in the absence of the proposed CDM project activity.

3.8.4 Algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions (99-100)

The steps taken and the equations and parameters applied in the PDD to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions comply with the requirements of the selected methodology including applicable tool(s).

As per AMS I.D, version 17, paragraph 11, the baseline is defined as the product of quantity of net electricity supplied to the grid as a result of the project activity, $EG_{BL, y}$ expressed in MWh multiplied by a grid emission factor

$BE_y = EG_{BL, y} * EF_{CO2, grid, y}$

Where, BE_y is the baseline emissions in year y (tCO_2),

$EG_{BL, y}$ is the quantity of net electricity supplied to the grid as a result of implementation of the project activity, and,

$EF_{CO2, grid, y}$ is CO_2 emission factor of the grid in year y (tCO_2/MWh).

The project participant has calculated the baseline emissions by multiplication of the net electricity supplied by the project activity to the grid and the grid emission factor. The detailed algorithms are transparently described under sections B.6.3 of the final PDD (Ref /3/).

The algorithm to calculate the emission reductions from the project activity are described as;

$ER_y = BE_y – PE_y – LE_y$ where,

ER_y = emission reductions from the project activity

PE_y = project emissions from the project activity

LE_y = leakage emissions from the project activity

As described in AMS I.D, the project emissions are considered to be zero for most renewable energy projects.

With reference to this methodology, project does not lead to any leakage, as the equipments in the project activity are not transferred from another activity. Hence the emissions due to leakage are considered to be zero.

Validation team assessed the calculations of estimated Emission Reductions as provided by project participant in a spreadsheet (Ref /15/). The assumptions in this spreadsheet were validated as follows -

Parameter, Value	Source of information	Validation justification
Project Capacity, 1.65 MW	Purchase Order's & PPA	The project activity is as per the documents verified and seen at site.
Number of machines, 01	Purchase Order's, commissioning certificates	The numbers of machines are as per the documents provided and seen at site.
PLF, 20 %	Letter from the financing bank viz; Yes Bank dated 28/07/2011 (Ref /9/)	The PLF is based on the value considered by the financing bank while sanctioning the loan to the Project Participant.

		The letter from the financing bank viz; Yes Bank states that the electricity generation figures considered at the time of project financing was 2.89 million units for the 1.65MW wind power project which deduces to a PLF value of 20%. Since the PLF value considered in the working is in line with the requirements of EB 48, Annex 11, the same is accepted by the validation team. Please refer section on investment analysis [Section 3.9.3 of this report] for the further details on the validation of PLF.
$EG_{BL,y}$(MWh); 2,890.80	Calculated Value	The value is calculated as: $EG_{BL,y}$ = Project capacity (1.65 MW) * PLF (20%) * Number of hours of operation in a year (24 Hrs/day * 365 days /year) = 2890.80 MWh
Baseline EF, 0.9534 tCO_2e/MWh for NEWNE Grid	CEA database Version 7	CEA database is an official source of data and hence acceptable.

The estimated annual average emission reductions of approximately 2,756 CO_2e over the 10 year crediting period of emission reduction represents a reasonable estimation using the assumptions given by the project. All the assumptions for this estimate either come from the assumptions used for investment analysis or grid emission factor as taken from CEA website. These are already validated in section 3.6.3 of this report. The validation team confirms that the estimates of baseline emissions can be replicated using the information provided. It also can be verified using the spreadsheet (Ref /15/) for calculations of Emission Reductions.

CAR 6 was raised by the validation team since the version of the CEA database was not consistently used in the webhosted PDD. The same has now been made consistent across the revised PDD and hence CAR was closed.

CAR 7 was raised since clear and transparent references to data were not provided in Annex 3 of the PDD. Further the BM value was taken as an average of the last 3 vintage years which was not in line with the requirements of the tool. The Project Participant corrected the same in the revised version of the PDD and hence the CAR was closed.

CAR 8 was raised by the validation team as the ex-ante calculation of the baseline emissions was incorrect. Further the PLF values were inconsistently described across the PDD. The same has now been corrected by the Project Participant in the revised PDD and hence the CAR is closed.

Based on the above assessment, Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that:
(a) All assumptions and data used by the project participants are listed in the PDD, including their references and sources;

(b) All documentation used by project participants as the basis for assumptions and source of data is correctly quoted and interpreted in the PDD;

(c) All values used in the PDD are considered reasonable in the context of the proposed CDM project activity;

(d) The baseline methodology has been applied correctly to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage emissions and emission reductions;

(e) All estimates of the baseline emissions can be replicated using the data and parameter values provided in the PDD.

3.9 Additionality (104)

The additionality of the project activity has been demonstrated by using the Guidelines for Demonstration of Additionality for Small Scale Project Activities, Version 9, [EB 68, Annex 27]..The steps taken by the validation team to assess the additionality of the Project Activity include review of documents indicated in the assumptions in the IRR excel sheet (Ref /16/). The detailed steps are described in Sections 3.9.1 through 3.9.5 below.

3.9.1 Prior consideration of the clean development mechanism (112)

Start date

The validation team validated the project activity start date provided in the PDD as follows;

The Project participant provided copies of all the Purchase orders (Ref /6/ & /7/) placed for the project activity. The date of the P.O's placed by the Project Participant was observed to be 25/06/2010 (Ref /6/) & 26/06/2010 (Ref /7/). Since for wind energy generators, there cannot be any other real action before the Purchase order, the validation team accepted the date of Purchase Order as the starting date for the project activity. The

same is also in accordance with the "Glossary of CDM terms". Accordingly, 25/06/2010 which is the date of the first purchase order (Ref /6/) raised, is accepted as the start date of the project activity.

Since the start date of the project activity was after 02 August 2008, the serious consideration of CDM for the project activity was assessed in line with the guidelines as specified in EB 62, Annex 13 (Ref /24/) as under;

The validation team verified the communications made by the Project Participant to the Indian DNA as well as to the UNFCCC secretariat and noted that the intimation was done to both, the UNFCCC secretariat as well as to the Indian DNA by the Project Participant on 19/10/2010 (Ref /10/). Since the intimation to both the entities was done within 6 months of the project activity start date (viz; 25/06/2010), the validation team concluded that CDM was seriously considered in the decision to implement the project activity. The validation team further reviewed the confirmation mail received by the Project Participant from the UNFCCC vide email dated 26/10/2010 (Ref /11/), confirming the receipt of the intimation. Also the validation team verified the communication made by the Project Participant to the UNFCCC on the CDM website http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/PriorCDM/notifications/index_html and observed that the communication was made to the UNFCCC on 19/10/2010.

CL 9 was raised by the validation team since from the CDM website, it was observed that for M/s G.R. Engineering Pvt Ltd, notification for prior consideration of CDM was sent twice. i.e first on 26/04/2010 and later on 19/10/2010. Project Participant responded to state that the PP has two separate wind power projects which are under validation and hence a total of two prior CDM consideration (one for each project) were submitted to UNFCCC. For the first wind power project, CDM validation is under process and according to page no 16, of the PDD[1], Prior CDM consideration for the previous wind mill was submitted on 26/04/2010. GPS co-ordinates for the first wind mill are N23°12'29" E70°37'50" The GPS co-ordinates for the proposed project activity are N 23° 13' 28.3" E 70° 38' 07.1" and the Prior CDM consideration form relevant to this project activity is dated 19/10/2010.

The validation team reviewed the commissioning certificates and the geo-coordinates of the previous wind project of capacity of 1.65 MW and noted that the earlier wind power project is also under CDM validation in another bundle. The prior consideration of CDM for the earlier project was done on 26/04/2010 whereas the prior consideration notification for the proposed project activity was done on 19/10/2010. Thus the CL was closed.

Based on the above, the validation team confirms that CDM benefits were a decisive factor in the decision to proceed with the Project Activity.

[1] http://cdm.unfccc.int/filestorage/M/9/K/M9K1WLJI36FBPOES7AXN258CVQZHR0/PDD%20WAMS.pdf?t=bFR8bWF3a2FifDAZn9qBGM_v7VP7yjwfwVPA

The validation team verified all the evidences related to the project implementation and CDM implementation steps and observed that the project participant had initiated real action in parallel to the implementation of the project activity and that all the activities from the start date of the project activity viz; placement of the P.O for the Wind Turbine Generator (Ref /6/ & /7/) until the date of initial webhosting of the PDD for global stakeholder comments dated 01/11/2011 are completed well within the time span of 2 years and hence adequately meets the requirements as mandated by the Guidelines on the Demonstration and Assessment of Prior Consideration of the CDM, Version 04, EB 62, Annex 13 (Ref /24/).

From the above discussions, it is observed that the benefits of CDM were a decisive factor in the decision to proceed with the project activity. Further, continuing and real actions were taken by project participant to secure CDM status in parallel with the implementation of the project activity. This is in line with Para 8 of Annex 13 of EB 62 (Ref /24/).

Based on the above assessment, the validation team hereby confirms that the proposed CDM project activity complies with the requirements of EB 62 Annex 13.

3.9.2 Identification of alternatives (116)

The approved methodology AMS I.D version 17 prescribes the baseline as the grid; hence no further analysis on identification of alternatives is required.

As per Guidelines for Demonstration of Additionality for Small Scale Project Activities, Version 9, [EB 68, Annex 27], Project participant has used investment barrier to demonstrate additionality.

.

3.9.3 Investment analysis (123)

Since the capacity of the project activity is less than 5 MW, the Project Participant has used the latest EB guideline for demonstrating additionality for micro-scale projects. However it was observed that none of the applicability conditions of the guidelines are fulfilled viz;

1. The geographic location of the project activity is in LDCs/SIDs or in a special underdeveloped zone of the host country identified by the Government before 28 May 2010.
   Validation Opinion - The geographic location of the project activity is in the state of Gujarat in India which has not been identified as an LDC/SID by the host country, India.
2. The project activity is an off grid activity supplying energy to households/communities (less than 12 hrs grid availability per 24 Hrs/day is also considered as off grid for this assessment).

Validation Opinion - The proposed project activity is a grid connected activity supplying energy to the regional grid viz; NEWNE grid. Hence this condition is not fulfilled.

3. The project activity is for distributed energy generation with both conditions (i) and (ii) satisfied (see below);
   (i) Each of the independent subsystem/measure in the project activity is smaller than or equal to 750 kW electrical installed capacity;
   (ii) End users of the subsystem or measure are households/communities/SME.

   Validation Opinion – The independent sub-system /measure in the project activity is larger than 750 kW viz; 1650 kW. Hence this condition is not fulfilled.
4. The project activity employs specific renewable energy technologies/measures recommended by the host country DNA and approved by the Board to be additional in the host country

   Validation Opinion – There are no specific renewable energy technologies / measures that are recommended by the host country DNA and approved by the Board as additional in the host country, India. Hence this condition is also not fulfilled.

Since none of the conditions of the latest EB guideline were satisfied, the Project Participant has used the investment analysis as stated in Guidelines for Demonstration of Additionality for Small Scale Project Activities, Version 9, [EB 68, Annex 27].

The project participant has demonstrated the additionality of the project using the investment barrier, as stated in Guidelines for Demonstration of Additionality for Small Scale Project Activities, Version 9, [EB 68, Annex 27] Post-tax project IRR has been considered as the financial indicator. Accordingly the Prime Lending rate [PLR] has been considered as the benchmark, which has been used for comparison with the post-tax project IRR. The validation team hereby confirms that the selected benchmark is appropriate to the financial indicator type in accordance with the "Guidelines for the assessment of Investment Analysis".

The validation team has validated the assumptions made in the PDD and the spreadsheets as tabulated below:

Parameter, Value	Source of information	Validation justification
Project cost INR 102.50 million	Proposal from M/s Vestas India dated 14/06/2010 (Ref /17/)	The project cost is taken from the offer letter of M/s Vestas India dated 14/06/2010 for the 1.5 MW wind project at Gujarat, which reflects the project cost applicable at the time of decision making. The cost for supply of the Wind Turbine Generator is indicated to be INR 97.68 million and the cost for erection and commissioning of the Wind Turbine Generator is indicated to be INR 4.82 million. Therefore the total project cost deduces to be INR 102.50 million. This is as per para 6 of Guidelines on the Assessment of Investment Analysis (EB 62 Annex 5). The actual project cost was also verified from the purchase orders raised and has been subjected to a sensitivity analysis.
Project Capacity, 1.65 MW	Proposal from M/s Vestas India dated 14/06/2010 (Ref /17/)	The project capacity is as per the offer letter from M/s Vestas India which indicates the project capacity to be 1.65 MW.
Number of machines, 01	Purchase Order (Ref /6/ & /7/)	The number of machines is calculated based on the actual purchase orders placed.
PLF(CUF), 20.0 %	Letter from the financing bank viz; Yes Bank dated 28/07/2011 (Ref /9/)	The PLF is based on the value considered by the financing bank while sanctioning the loan to the Project Participant. The letter from the financing bank viz; Yes Bank states that the electricity generation figures considered at the time of project financing was 2.89 million units for the 1.65MW wind power

Parameter, Value	Source of information	Validation justification
		project which deduces to a PLF value of 20%. Since the PLF value considered in the working is in line with the requirements of EB 48, Annex 11, the same is accepted by the validation team. The validation team also verified the PLF indicated in the GERC Tariff Order dated 30/01/2010 (Ref /18/) which was applicable at the time of investment decision and noted that the PLF indicated under para 3.8 (page 21 of the tariff order) is 23.0 %, which is higher than the PLF assumed by the project participant on the investment analysis. Since the PLF considered by the Project Participant in the investment analysis is lower than the PLF as indicated in the applicable GERC Tariff Order of 2010, the Project Participant has subjected the parameter of PLF to a sensitivity analysis of +15% [PLF value of 23.0%] to cover the PLF value as indicated in the GERC tariff order [Refer to further discussion on sensitivity analysis of PLF below]
Total O&M Cost, per annum from 3rd year onwards, INR 2.0 million	Proposal from M/s Vestas India dated 14/06/2010 (Ref /17/)	The O&M cost is taken from the offer letter of M/s Vestas India dated 14/06/2010 which reflects the cost applicable at the time of decision making. The offer letter indicates an O&M cost of INR 2.0 million per WEG per annum from the 3rd

Parameter, Value	Source of information	Validation justification
		year onwards, with the O&M for the first 2 years indicated to be free of cost. The validation team reviewed the O&M agreement signed between the Project Participant and the O&M contractor (Ref /12/) and observed that the O&M cost is indicated to be INR 2.0 million for the 1.65 MW WEG per annum from the 3rd year onwards. Thus there is no difference observed in the O&M costs as indicated in the initial offer and the O&M agreement. However the Project Participant has still subjected the parameter of O&M cost to a sensitivity analysis of -10% and demonstrated that the project IRR is below the benchmark. [Please refer discussion on sensitivity analysis below.]
Escalation in O&M cost from the 3rd year onwards, 6.0%	Proposal from M/s Vestas India dated 14/06/2010 (Ref /17/)	The escalation in the O&M cost is taken from the offer letter of M/s Vestas India which reflects the cost applicable at the time of decision making. The validation team reviewed the actual O&M agreement (Ref /12/) between the Project Participant and the O&M contractor and observed the annual escalation on O&M cost from the 3rd year onwards to be 6%. Hence the validation team accepted the escalation in the O&M cost as 6% for the financial analysis.

Parameter, Value	Source of information	Validation justification
Power Tariff, INR 3.56/kWh	GERC Tariff Order of 2010 (Ref /18/)	This is the applicable tariff order for the state of Gujarat dated 30/01/2010 (which is valid for a period of 5 years) valid at the time of decision making, which indicates the power tariff to be INR 3.56/kWh, fixed for the entire life of the project activity. Further the validation team also reviewed the Power Purchase Agreements (PPA) signed by the Project Participant with the GUVNL and observed that power tariff is indicated to be INR 3.56/kWh for the wind turbine and is fixed for the entire life of the project activity. However the Project Participant has still subjected the parameter of tariff to a sensitivity analysis of + 10%.

Parameter, Value	Source of information	Validation justification
Insurance Cost, INR 0.15 million	Tariff Advisory Committee Order (Ref /13/)	The Tariff Advisory Committee Order provides information on the nature of insurance to be taken for the various components and also indicates the premiums payable for various machinery and other components. The TAC Order, Section IV (Sheet 31, Page 31 of the document) indicates the insurance premium to be INR 1.50/mille which deduces to be 0.15% of the project cost. Therefore the insurance value works out to be INR 0.15 million. The validation team also reviewed the actual Insurance premium paid by the project participant is INR 0.22 million (Ref /14/) which is more than the premium considered at the time of decision making. The validation team noted that even if the cost of insurance premium is not considered, the equity IRR of the project activity changes to 7.43%, which is also below the benchmark. Hence the validation team confirms that the insurance cost considered is reasonable.
Debt equity ratio 70:30	GERC Tariff order dated 30/01/2010, (Ref /18/)	This is the applicable tariff order for the state of Gujarat dated 30/01/2010 (which is valid for a period of 5 years) is valid at the time of decision making, which indicates the debt equity ratio to be 70:30. The validation team also reviewed the actual debt equity ratio and observed the ratio to be almost 70:30 [69:31].

Parameter, Value	Source of information	Validation justification
Loan Tenure, 10 years	GERC Tariff order dated 30/01/2010, (Ref /18/)	This is the applicable tariff order for the state of Gujarat dated 30/01/2010 (which is valid for a period of 5 years) is valid at the time of decision making, which indicates the loan tenure to be 40 quarters viz; 10 years. The same is therefore accepted by the validation team.
Interest Rate on Loan, 11.0%	http://www.rbi.org.in/scripts/WSSView.aspx?Id=14965	The interest rate is considered as the average value of the applicable interest rate on 02/06/2010, which is sourced from the monthly bulletin of RBI and is available and applicable at the time of investment decision. Since the interest rate is sourced from the RBI website, which is the Central Bank in India, the same is therefore accepted by the validation team.
Baseline EF, 0.9534 tCO2/MWh for NEWNE grid	CEA database, Version 7 (Ref /22/).	CEA database is an official source of data and hence acceptable as explained in section 3.8.4 of this report. The validation team verified the values of Operating Margin and Build Margin from the CEA database, Version 7 and the Combined Margin calculations from the emission reduction excel sheet and confirms that they are correct.

The validation team has verified the assumptions as above and observed that they are correct and based on conservative values that are applicable at the time of investment decision. All other values used for investment analysis apart from above have been taken from assumptions considered for calculation of emission reductions which are applicable at the time of decision making. The input values are validated as per Para 6 of EB 62 Annex 5 as explained above.

The financial expert has verified the project IRR calculations and observed them to be correct. Depreciation values have been correctly calculated in the IRR calculations. The financial expert and the validation team hereby confirm that project participant has applied all the statutory levies and taxes as per the then valid Income Tax rules.

The project IRR for the proposed project activity works out to be 7.21 %.

Benchmark –
The project participant has considered the Reserve Bank of India's Prime Lending Rate [PLR] as the benchmark for the proposed project activity. As per Para 12 of Guidelines on the Assessment of Investment Analysis (EB 62 Annex 5), "*In cases where a benchmark approach is used the applied benchmark shall be appropriate to the type of IRR calculated. Local commercial lending rates or weighted average costs of capital (WACC) are appropriate benchmarks for a project IRR. Required/expected returns on equity are appropriate benchmarks for equity IRR.*"

The Project Participant has selected project IRR as the financial indicator, therefore Prime Lending rate is accepted as an appropriate benchmark for a comparison with project IRR for the demonstration of additionality.

The Project Participant has considered the PLR from the RBI website dated 02/06/2010, which was applicable and available at the time of investment decision. The value of the PLR deduces to be 11.0%[2] and since the RBI is the Central Bank of India under whose control all the financing institutions of the country operate, the validation team accepted the same.
Based on the above approach and corresponding values, the benchmark PLR for the proposed project activity is worked out to be 11.0%.

Thus the validation team confirms that the project IRR for the project activity is 7.21% which is below the benchmark of 11%.

[2] http://www.rbi.org.in/scripts/WSSView.aspx?Id=14965

Sensitivity Analysis:

The only variables, which contribute to more than 20% of the project cost or the project revenue, are PLF, Capital Cost, O&M and tariff.

PLF: The validation team reviewed the GERC Tariff Order of 2010 (Ref /18/), which is the applicable tariff order for the State of Gujarat and observed the PLF to be 23% which is higher than the PLF value considered by the Project Participant in the financial working by 15%. Hence the Project Participant has subjected the parameter of PLF to a sensitivity of +15% and observed the project IRR to be 9.21% which is lower than the benchmark. Hence the validation team is of the opinion that the sensitivity analysis range considered for PLF is robust.

Project Cost: The project cost indicated in the initial offer by M/s Vestas India, which was available at the time of investment decision, was INR 102.50 million whereas the actual project cost [based on the purchase orders raised] worked out to be INR 101.49 million, which is just 0.98% lower than the offer cost. However the project participant has conducted the sensitivity analysis at the variation of -10% and the project IRR was observed to be 8.31% @ -10% variation. The validation team based on the same could conclude that the sensitivity analysis on the project cost considering variation within range of -10% is conservative and the project IRR was below the benchmark.

Tariff: The power tariff in Gujarat is fixed for the entire life of the project activity at INR 3.56/kWh based on GERC Tariff Order of 2010 (Ref /18/) which was available to the project participant at the time of investment decision. A review of the Power Purchase Agreement [PPA] signed between the Project Participant and the GUVNL for the proposed project activity also indicates the tariff to be INR 3.56/kWh for the entire life of the project activity. However the Project Participant has still subjected the parameter of tariff to a sensitivity analysis of +10% and the project IRR works out to be 8.54% without CDM revenue which is below the benchmark.

O&M Cost: The Project Participant has considered an O&M cost of INR 2.0 million based on the offer letter from M/s Vestas India. The validation team further reviewed the actual O&M agreement signed between the Project Participant and the O&M contractor and noted that the O&M cost is the same as that of the offer cost viz; INR 2.0 million. However the Project Participant has still subjected the parameter of O&M cost to a sensitivity analysis of -10% and the project IRR without CDM revenues deduces to be 7.47% which is lower than the benchmark.

CL 5 was raised by the validation team since the use of the salvage value was not clearly spelt out in the PDD. The same has now been clearly described in the revised PDD and hence the CL is closed.

The validation team raised CL 7 since the parameter of power tariff was not subjected to a sensitivity analysis in the webhosted PDD. Further the justification for subjecting the parameter of PLF, O&M and project cost to only ± 10% sensitivity was not provided by the Project Participant. The Project participant in response to the CL has subjected the parameter of power tariff to a sensitivity analysis of + 10% and also provided justification for subjecting the other parameters to a sensitivity of only ± 10 %. The validation team reviewed the revised IRR sheet and observed them to be correct. Hence the CL was closed.

The validation team, based on the assessment result by the financial expert engaged, hereby confirms that the underlying assumptions are appropriate and the financial calculations are correct. The validation team therefore confirms that the project IRR for the Project Participant, without CDM revenues, is 7.21% and even with sensitivity analysis, the values do not cross the benchmark and hence it can be considered that the project is not viable without CDM revenues. Thus the project is additional.

3.9.4 Barrier analysis (127)

Project participant has not conducted barrier analysis to demonstrate additionality.

3.9.5 Common practice analysis (130)

Common practice analysis has not been used to demonstrate additionality. As per Guidelines for Demonstration of Additionality for Small Scale Project Activities, Version 9, [EB 68, Annex 27], additionality can be demonstrated by any one of the four barriers listed. Project participant has demonstrated additionality using investment barrier only.

3.10 Monitoring plan (133)

The Project activity uses the approved monitoring methodology AMS ID, Version 17. Please refer discussions on the applicability of the methodology at section 3.8.1 above. The steps taken to assess whether the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the project design are described below. Validation team considers the monitoring plan to be complying with the requirements of the methodology for the following reasons –

1. According to the methodology, there is only one variable that a windmill project needs to monitor, i.e., $EG_{BL,y}$, the net electricity supplied to the grid by the proposed Project Activity.
2. EFgrid,CM,y, the emission factor is fixed ex-ante based on CEA database, Version 7. This is in line with the EF tool as required by the methodology.
3. Project participant has provided provision for monitoring these parameters and for electronic as well as hard copy archiving of the monitored data. This is stated in Section B.7.1 of the revised PDD.
4. Project participant has provided for archiving the data for 2 years beyond the crediting period or last issuance whichever is later.
5. The monitoring plan includes requirements for calibration of the energy meters, used for monitoring the project activity variable, $EG_{BL,y}$, once in 3 years. The calibration is conducted by the State Electricity Authority. In case during the calibration, the meter(s) is found to be outside the permissible limits of error, then the meter(s) would be replaced immediately by the Electricity Utility. The error identified in the energy meter during the calibration would be applied to all the monitored data since the date of the last calibration, in case the meter has been used in the preparation of the monthly Joint Meter reading.
6. The monitoring frequency for $EG_{BL,y}$ matches with that of the applied methodology, viz. continuous measurement and monthly recording. The cross checking will be carried out with the invoices raised by the Project Participant on the State Electricity Utility for payments, for the net electricity delivered by the Project Activity to the grid.
7. The Project Participant has included an additional parameter $EG_{WEG,y}$ which provides the values of the net electricity supplied to the grid by the project activity Wind Turbine Generator's, as recorded by the energy meter located at the project site itself. These monthly readings, which are recorded and maintained by the Project Participant representatives [viz; the O&M contractors], would be compared with the monthly net electricity supplied readings indicated in the GEDA Share Certificate and an conservative approach would be considered for emission reduction calculations.
8. Under section B.7.2 of the revised PDD, project participant has provided the detailed metering system, measurement procedure, procedures to deal with data uncertainty, procedure for apportioning of the measured data, organizational structure etc.

The validation team validated the metering system at site as follows viz;

1. There is a main and check meter of accuracy class 0.5% connected to Wind Turbine Generator of the project activity at the project site.
2. This main/check meter at the project site is capable of continuous monitoring and hourly measurement.
3. The electricity exported and imported by the project activity Wind Turbine Generator are recorded at this main /check meter on a monthly basis, by representatives of the Project Participant.

4. There is another set of meters at the GEDA sub-station [Shikarpur sub-station] to which the project as well as non project Wind Turbine Generator's are connected to. During the site visit, the validation team noted that the project activity Wind Turbine Generator is connected to feeder No 6 in the sub-station and there are another 14 nos of non-project Wind Turbine Generator's connected to the same. The validation team accepts the fact that this configuration is subject to change in the future and this change is not within the control of the Project Participant.
5. There is a main meter [ABT meter] and check meter [trivector energy meter] at the GEDA substation of accuracy class 0.5s. The net electricity supplied value is recorded at the sub-station by the representatives of the Project Participant and GEDA /GETCO. Since this recorded value at the sub-station consists generation of project as well as non project activity Wind Turbine Generator's, SLDC conducts an apportioning procedure to deduce the net electricity supplied value by the individual investors. The process of this apportioning is conducted and controlled by the State Electricity Utility and neither the Project Participant nor its representatives have a role to play in the same.
6. Based on this apportioning procedure, Project Participant receives the GEDA Share Certificate, which provides the net electricity supplied value to the grid.
7. Based on this GEDA Share certificate, Project Participant raises an invoice on the State Utility based on which payments are released.

The validation team physically verified the metering system installed at the site of the project activity. Monitoring plan was not correctly described in the webhosted PDD and hence CAR 10 & 15 were raised. Project participant revised the monitoring plan in the PDD and has now described the metering and monitoring system in details in section B.7.1 & B.7.2 of the revised PDD, as is observed at the site. Validation team confirms that the description in the revised PDD now correctly represents the metering system available at the project activity site. Hence the CAR 10 & 15 was satisfactorily closed.

The validation team also interacted with the team of the O&M service provider; M/s. Vestas Wind Technology India Pvt Limited, who is the windmill supplier itself. The agency is experienced in the monitoring system and is managing O&M of numerous other wind farm CDM projects.

The validation team therefore is of the opinion that the project participant through the O&M agency is capable of implementing the monitoring plan in the context of the project activity.

The validation team considers that the means of implementation of the monitoring plan, including the data management and quality assurance and quality control procedures, are sufficient to ensure that the emission

reductions achieved by/resulting from the proposed project activity can be reported ex post and verified.

Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that the monitoring plan complies with the requirements of the methodology including applicable tool(s), the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the project design and the project participants are able to implement the described monitoring plan.

3.11 Environmental Impacts (137)

As per the Schedule of the EIA notification (Ref /27/), given by the Ministry of Environment and Forests (Government of India) EIA is not a regulatory requirement in India for wind energy projects. Thus the project activity does not require EIA. The project activity does not involve any negative environmental impacts, as the WEGs are installed for generation of power using wind which is a clean source of energy.

Project participant has obtained HCA approval (Ref /4/) from DNA of India and it is confirmed by the Authority that the project contributes to sustainable development in India. The project activity is in compliance with all current applicable legislations.

3.12 Local stakeholder consultation (140)

The steps taken to assess the adequacy of the local stakeholder consultation are described below.

A local stakeholder consultation meeting to discuss stakeholder concerns on the Project Activity was conducted by the Project Participant at the project site on 02/07/2011 (Ref /28/). The method of invitation to the local stakeholders was by a notice in a local newspaper 'Gujarat Samachar' on 23/06/2011. (Ref /29/)

The validation team feels that the time provided [about 10 days] to the local stakeholders for providing comments on the Project Activity is adequate. The same was verified by the validation team during the personal interaction with some of the local stakeholders during the validation site visit.

The list of participants, copy of the newspaper advertisement inviting participation of interested local stakeholders, and minutes of the stakeholder meeting proceedings maintained by the project participants (Ref /28/ & /29/) were verified by the validation team. The stakeholders viewed this project as contributing to local environmental benefits and socio-economy. Overall, there was agreement that the project activity was a beneficial project from the local sustainable development.

During the validation site visit, the validation team also interviewed few of the local stakeholders for their views about the project activity. The villagers confirmed that the stakeholder consultation meeting was held at the wind farm site. The villagers expressed satisfaction over the windmill project activity in the region and confirmed that the project activity gives employment opportunity to the local public and thus contributes to the economical growth of the region.

CAR 13 was raised by the validation team since the identity of the local stakeholders that made comments was not described in the PDD. The same has now been included in the revised PDD and hence the CAR was closed.
CL 3 was raised since the description of the process of inviting local stakeholder consultation for the proposed project activity was not transparent in Section E.1 of the PDD. The same has now been described in Section E.1 of the revised PDD and therefore the CL was closed, based on the corrections made by the Project Proponent in the revised PDD.

The validation team hereby confirms that the process of local stakeholder consultation is observed to be adequate.

4. COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS

The PDD using methodology AMS I.D, Version 17 was webhosted on the UNFCCC for global stakeholder's comments as per CDM requirements. The project was initially webhosted from 01/11/2011 to 30/11/2011. Comments were received from 01 global stakeholder.

However the validation team noted during the validation process, that the PDD that was initially webhosted was for another investor who is not a part of this proposed project activity and therefore was an erroneous webhosting. Therefore the DOE has re-webhosted the project PDD with the correct information from 01/08/2012 to 30/08/2012. Comments were received from 02 global stakeholders, which have also been discussed in Appendix B of this report.

The project participant provided response to each of these comments. Validation team took due account of these comments and the respective responses while making the validation opinion. The details of the comments received, responses by the project participant/s and the explanation of how due account of these is taken by the validation team are attached as Appendix B with this validation report.

5. VALIDATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed a validation of the "1.65 MW Wind Power Project by G.R. Engineering Pvt. Ltd." Project in India. The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria and host country criteria and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The validation consisted of the following three phases: i) a desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) the resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final validation report and opinion.

The project correctly applies the approved consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology AMS ID, Version 17 and uses the latest version of Guidelines for Demonstration of Additionality for Small Scale Project Activities, Version 9, [EB 68, Annex 27] for demonstration of additionality. In line with this, the PDD provides analysis of investment barrier to determine that the project activity itself is not the baseline scenario. The PDD provides investment barrier to demonstrate additionality. The project internal rate of return of the project (with sensitivity even on project cost, O & M cost, PLF and tariff) is less than the benchmark and hence it is demonstrated that the project is additional.

By synthetic analysis of the description of the project, the project is likely to result in reductions of GHG emissions. An analysis of the investment barrier demonstrates that the proposed project activity is not a likely baseline scenario. Emission reductions attributable to the project are hence additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity.

Given that the project is implemented and maintained as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated annual emission reductions of 2,756 tCO2e during the 10 years of its fixed crediting period.

The review of the revised project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided Bureau Veritas Certification with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of stated criteria. In our opinion, the project correctly applies and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM and the relevant host country criteria.

Bureau Veritas Certification thus requests registration of "1.65 MW Wind Power Project by G.R. Engineering Pvt. Ltd" as a CDM project activity.

Mr Sanjay S Patankar
Internal Technical Reviewer
22/12/2012

Mr R S Premkumar
Team Leader
22/12/2012

6. REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:
Documents provided by Type the name of the company that relates directly to the GHG components of the project.

/1/ Webhosted PDD, Version 01, dated 05/06/2011

/2/ Re-webhosted PDD, Version 02, dated 24/07/2012

/3/ Final PDD, Version 02.3 dated 22/12/2012

/4/ Host Country Approval issued to the project activity vide reference no. 4/13/2012-CCC dated 11/10/2012 issued by Indian DNA

/5/ Power Purchase Agreement signed between M/s G.R. Engineering Pvt Ltd and GUVNL for the 1.65 MW project capacity dated 18/09/2010

/6/ Supply Agreement issued by M/s G.R. Engineering Pvt Ltd on M/s Vestas Wind Technology India Pvt Ltd dated 25/06/2010, for supply of 01 no WEG of 1.65 MW capacity.

/7/ Agreement for Erection and Commissioning issued by M/s G.R. Engineering Pvt Ltd to M/s Vestas Wind Technology India Pvt Ltd dated 26/06/2010, for erection and commissioning activities for the 01 no WEG of 1.65 MW capacity.

/8/ Commissioning certificate for 01 no WEG of 1.65 MW capacity of M/s G.R. Engineering Pvt Ltd issued by GEDA vide letter no. GEDA/PWF/VWT-VGREPL/Vandhiya/10-11/3080 dated 13/10/2010 indicating the commissioning of the WEG on 29/09/2010

/9/ Letter from the financing bank viz; Yes Bank dated 28/07/2011 – For PLF

/10/ Email communication from the Project Participant to UNFCCC as well as to the Indian DNA dated 19/10/2010 intimating them of the proposed project activity as a CDM project activity – Prior CDM Consideration

/11/ Email confirmation from the UNFCCC to the Project Participant dated 26/10/2010 intimating the Project Participant of receipt of prior CDM consideration form.

/12/ Operation and Maintenance Agreement between the Project Participant and M/s Vestas Wind technology India Pvt Ltd dated 28/06/2010

/13/ Tariff Advisory Committee Order 2001

/14/ Actual insurance copy for the proposed project activity issued by Iffco-Tokio General Insurance Company Ltd dated 29/09/2010

/15/ Emission Reduction sheet

/16/ IRR excel sheet

/17/ Proposal from M/s Vestas India dated 14/06/2010 vide reference VESTA/PC/MKT/Gujarat for the 1.65 MW capacity wind power project.

/18/ GERC Tariff Order 2010

Category 2 Documents:
Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference document

/19/ AMS I.D, Version 17 - Indicative simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for selected small-scale CDM project activity categories – Grid connected renewable energy generation

/20/ Guidelines On Assessment Of Debundling For SSC Project Activities, version 3, EB 54, Annex 13

/21/ Emission Factor tool - Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, version 2.2.1, EB 63, Annex 19

/22/ CEA baseline database, version 07 dated January 2012 [http://www.cea.nic.in/reports/planning/cdm_co2/cdm_co2.htm]

/23/ Guidance on the Assessment of Investment Analysis, Version 05, EB 62, Annex 5

/24/ Guidelines on the Demonstration and Assessment of Prior Consideration of the CDM, Version 04, EB 62, Annex 13

/25/ Guidelines for the reporting and validation of PLF's, EB 48 Annex 11

/26/ Income Tax Act, Government of India [http://law.incometaxindia.gov.in/DIT/Income-tax-acts.aspx]

/27/ EIA notification, S.O. 1533 dated 14th September, 2006

/28/ Minutes of meeting of local stakeholder consultation process dated 02/07/2011, attendance sheet of the local stakeholder meeting conducted by the project participant at the project site

/29/ Invitation notice published in the local newspaper 'Gujarat Samachar' dated 23/06/2011 by the project participant inviting local stakeholder comments for the 1.65 MW capacity of the Project Activity.

/30/ Sample copies of the GEDA authorized monthly 'Share Certificates' for the proposed project activity.

Persons interviewed:
List persons interviewed during the validation or persons that contributed with other information that are not included in the documents listed above.

/1/	Mr Parmeshwaran, Site In Charge, Vestas India
/2/	Mr Dipak Gohel, Engineer, Vestas India
/3/	Mr Parakram Singh B Zala, Farmer, Shikarpur village – Local Stakeholder
/4/	Mr Ramzan, Driver, Surajbari village – Local Stakeholder
/5/	Mr Pravir Kale, CDM Consultant, Ecolutions
/6/	Ms Jayshri Jamliya, CDM Consultant, Ecolutions

7. CURRICULA VITAE OF BVC'S VALIDATION TEAM MEMBERS

Mr R S Prem Kumar - Team Leader, Climate Change Verifier

Lead auditor in Bureau Veritas Certification for Environment Management System, Quality Management System and Occupational Health and Safety Management System. Graduate in the field of Environmental Engineering and has more than 15 years of Industrial work experience in the field of environmental and occupational safety management systems. He has undergone training on Clean Development Mechanism. He is involved in the Validation/verification for more than 35 CDM/VCS projects.

Mr. Pramod Kamble – Team Member, Verifier - Climate change

Graduate in Chemical Engineering from Mumbai University (MUICT). He has prior experience in CDM, VCS and CCX projects development. He has undergone intensive training on Clean Development Mechanism and completed CDM Verifier/Lead Verifier training course. He has hands on experience in carrying out energy audits for energy industries and buildings. At present he is involved in the Validation/verification of CDM and VCS projects.

Sushil Budhia Associates (Financial Expert – For IRR Analysis)

Services from Sushil Budhia Associates were delivered by Mr. Sushil Budhia and Ms. Usha Gopalan who are both Chartered Accountants, for validating the IRR of the project activity. Mr. Sushil Budhia has been practicing as Chartered Accountant for 25 years and he has very wide experience on project finance, taxation and financial auditing. Ms Usha Gopalan has over 15 years of experience in Project finance, taxation and auditing. Mr. Sushil Budhia and Ms. Usha Gopalan have undergone training on Clean Development Mechanism They have conducted verification of financial indicators like IRR for more than 70 CDM projects

Sanjay S Patankar - Internal Technical Reviewer

Educational qualifications: B.E. (Mech.) M.E. (Mech.)

He has over 20 years of experience in engineering manufacturing industry covering various functions like enterprise management, product design, engineering, tool & die design, improvements in the production shop, quality assurance & control and systems planning and implementation, including ISO 9001 based quality management systems. Working for the last 2 years in Bureau Veritas Certification (India) Pvt. Ltd. as Lead Auditor for ISO 9001, 14001 and OHSAS 18001 standards/specifications. Has undergone training related to Clean Development Mechanism and is currently involved in validation and verification of CDM project activities.

Appendix A: SMALL SCALE PROJECT ACTIVITIES VALIDATION PROTOCOL

Table 1 Validation requirements based on VVS version 03.0 (EB 70 Annex 3), PS version 02.1 (EB 70 Annex 2), PCP version 03.1 (EB 70 Annex 4)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Part I Cover Page					
(a) Is the title of the project activity provided?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
(b) Is the version number of the PDD indicated?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
(c) Is the completion date of the PDD provided in DD/MM/YYYY format?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
(d) Are project participants indicated?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
(e) Is the host party(ies) indicated?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
(f) Is the sectoral scope and selected methodology(ies) indicated?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
(g) Is the estimated amount of annual average GHG emission reductions indicated?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
Part II PDD					
A. Description of project activity					
A.1 Purpose and general description of project activity					
A.1.1 Is a brief description of the project activity provided, including a summary of the scope of	PDD PS	31(b)	It is stated that PP has applied to register another small scale CDM project activity in	CL 1	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
activities/ measures that are to be implemented within the project activity?			bundle project activity at Karnataka. However from the reference source it is not evident whether G.R. Engineering is involved in bundle wind power project applied for registration under CDM.		
A.1.2 Are the scenario existing prior to the start of project and baseline scenario indicated?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
A.1.3 Does it explain how the project activity will reduce GHG emissions or increase GHG removals?	PS	31(c)	Yes	OK	OK
A.1.4 Is the estimated of annual average and total GHG emission reductions for the chosen crediting period provided?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
A.1.5 Is a brief description of how the project activity contributes to sustainable development provided?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
A.1.6 In order to determine whether the description of the proposed project activity in the PDD is accurate, complete, and provides an understanding of the proposed CDM project activity, does the DOE conducted a physical site visit to assess the Project? If not, please justify.	VVS	65	The validation team conducted a site visit on 12/12/2011 to assess the proposed project activity.	OK	OK
A.1.7 For all other proposed CDM project activities not referred to in VVS paragraphs 65-66, does the DOE undertaken the validation of project description by reviewing available designs and feasibility studies and should conduct comparison analysis with equivalent projects, as appropriate.	VVS	67	Not applicable	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.1.8 If the proposed CDM project activity involves the alteration of an existing installation or process, does the project description state the differences resulting from the project activity compared to the pre-project situation?	VVS	68	Not applicable	OK	OK
A.2 Location of project activity					
A.2.1 Is the host party(ies) indicated?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
A.2.2 Is region/state/province etc. indicated?	PDD		Yes	Ok	OK
A.2.3 Is City/Town/Community etc. indicated?	PDD		Yes	Ok	Ok
A.2.4 Are the details of physical location of the project activity, including information allowing the unique identification of this project activity and a map, provided?	PDD		Stated latitude and longitude for the WTG are incorrect. Please substantiate the physical location with suitable reference source.	CAR 2	OK
A.3 Technologies and measures (section A.3 of DD)					
A.3.1 Are there a list and the arrangement of the main manufacturing/ production technologies, systems and equipment involved?	PDD		Not applicable for a wind power project	OK	OK
A.3.1.1 Is the information about the age and average lifetime of the equipment based on manufacturer's specifications and industry standards, and existing and forecast installed capacities, load factors and efficiencies included in the description?	PDD		No, Section A.3 in the re-webhosted PDD does not detail the technology / measure	CAR 16	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.3.1.2 Are the monitoring equipments and their location in the systems included in the description?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
A.3.2 Are energy and mass flows and balances of the systems and equipment included in the project activity provided?	PDD		Not applicable	OK	OK
A.3.3 Are the types and levels of services provided by the systems and equipment that are being modified and/or installed under the project activity and their relation, if any, to other manufacturing/ production equipment and systems outside the project boundary provided?	PDD		Not applicable	OK	OK
A.3.4 Does the description clearly explain how the same types and levels of services provided by the project activity would have been provided in the baseline scenario?	PDD		Not applicable	OK	OK
A.3.5 Is a list of facilities, systems and equipment in operation under the existing scenario prior to the implementation of the project activity provided?	PDD		Not applicable	OK	OK
A.3.6 Is a list of facilities, systems and equipment in the baseline scenario provided?	PDD		Not applicable	OK	OK
A.3.7 If the proposed small-scale CDM project activity involves more than one component, do the project participants provide ex-ante calculations of baseline, project and leakage GHG emissions as well as GHG emission reductions for each year of	PS	90	Not applicable	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION		Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	the crediting period and for each component separately?					
A.3.8	Is a full description of the technologies and measures of the baseline scenario provided?	PDD		Not applicable	OK	OK
A.3.9	To determine the performance of equipment used in the proposed small-scale CDM project activity, does the project participants shall use: a) The appropriate value specified in the selected methodology; b) The national standard for the performance of the equipment type (project participants shall identify the standard used) if the value specified in subparagraph (a) is not available; c) An international standard for the performance of the equipment type, such as International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and International Electro technical Commission (IEC) standards (project participants shall identify the standard used) if the value specified in subparagraph (b) is not available; d) The manufacturer's specifications, provided that they are tested and certified by national or international certifiers, if the value specified in subparagraph (c) is not available; e) Performance data from test results conducted by an independent entity for equipment installed under the project activity if the value	PS	91	The WTG has an average life period of 20 years which has been provided by the manufacturer specifications.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
specified in subparagraph (d) is not available.					
A.4 Are following information of party(ies) and project participant(s) involved in the project activity provided in the tabular format? (section A.4 of PDD)	PDD				
A.4.1.1 List of project participants and parties	DD		Yes, however it is provided under Section A.3 of the PDD. Refer CAR 16 above	--	OK
A.4.1.2 Identification of Host Party	DD		Refer CAR 16 above	--	OK
A.4.1.3 Indication whether the Party wishes to be considered as project participant	DD		Refer CAR 16 above	--	OK
A.5 Public funding of project activity					
A.5.1 Is it indicated whether the project activity receives public funding from Annex I Parties?	DD		Yes, it is stated that there are ODA funds for the proposed project activity.	OK	OK
A.5.2 In case where public funding from Annex I Parties is involved, are followings provided? (a) Information on Parties providing public funding (b) Attached in Appendix 2: the affirmation obtained from such Parties that such funding does not result in a diversion of official development assistance, is separate from, and is not counted towards the financial obligations of those Parties	PS	34	Not applicable	OK	OK
A.6 Debundling for project activity					

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.6.1 Does the project participants demonstrate that the project activity is not a debundled component of a large-scale project activity?	DD PS	87	Yes	OK	OK
A.6.2 Is the project activity a debundled component of a large-scale project, i.e., is there a registered small-scale CDM project activity or an application to register another CDM project activity: (a) with the same project participants; (b) in the same project category and technology/measure; and (c) registered within the previous 2 years; and (d) whose project boundary is within 1 km of the proposed boundary of the proposed small-scale activity at the closest point?	PS EB54	88 Ann13	No	OK	OK
B. Application of selected approved baseline and monitoring methodology					
B.1 Reference of methodology (section B.1 of PDD)					
B.1.1 Is the selected methodology (ies) indicated with exact reference (number, title and version)?	DD		Yes	OK	OK
B.1.2 Are the baseline and monitoring methodologies selected by the project participants the valid versions of those approved by the Board?	VVS	70	Yes	OK	OK
B.1.3 Are there any tools and other methodologies to which the selected methodology indicated?	DD		Yes	OK	OK
B.1.4 Has specific guidance and/or clarifications	VVS	71	Not applicable	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION		Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	provided by the Board with respect to the approved methodology and any applicable tools been applied?					
B.1.5	Is there any deviation or clarification requested for the approved methodology?	VVS	78-81	No	OK	OK
B.2	**Project activity eligibility**					
B.2.1	Is the selected baseline and monitoring methodology applicable to the project activity and that the selected version valid at the time of submission of the proposed project activity for registration?	VVS	73-75	Yes	OK	OK
B.2.2	Does the PDD justify the choice of the selected methodology(ies) by showing that the project activity meets each applicability conditions of the selected methodology(ies)?	DD VVS	76	Refer to table 2 below.	OK	OK
B.2.3	Does the PDD indicate, from among the following below, the project type of the proposed small-scale CDM project activity, and demonstrate that the project activity qualifies as Type I, II, and/or III during every year of the crediting period in accordance with applicable provisions for project activity eligibility in the Project standard: a) Type I: Renewable energy project activities with a maximum output capacity of 15 MW (or an appropriate equivalent); b) Type II: Energy efficiency improvement project	DD PS	81	The proposed project activity is Type I project with an maximum output capacity of 1.65MW.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
activities that reduce energy consumption, on the supply and/or demand side, with a maximum output of 60 GWh per year (or an appropriate equivalent) in any year of the crediting period; or c) Type III: Other project activities not included in Type I or Type II that result in GHG emission reductions not exceeding 60 ktCO2e per year in any year of the crediting period.					
B.2.4 Do the project participants ensure that the proposed small-scale CDM project activity remains, for every year during the crediting period, within the limits of the type of project activity defined in section B.2.3 above.	DD PS	83	Yes	OK	OK
B.2.5 Do the project participants explain the documentation that has been used as a basis for justification and provide the references, or include the documentation in Appendix 3 of the PDD?	DD		Yes	OK	OK
B.3 Project boundary					
B.3.1 Is the project boundary of the project activity defined based on the guidance of the selected methodology(ies)?	DD		1. The substation rating as defined in project boundary in section B.3 of webhosted PDD is not matching with the substation rating as observed at site. 2. The metering system indicated in the project boundary diagram in the re-webhosted PDD is not in line with the	CAR 3	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			metering system observed at site.		
B.3.2 Is a flow diagram of the project boundary presented, physically delineating the project activity?	DD		The substation rating as defined in project boundary in section B.3 of webhosted PDD is not matching with the substation rating as observed at site.	--	OK
B.3.3 Does the flow diagram include the equipment, systems and flows of mass and energy described? In particular, is the emission sources and GHGs included in the project boundary and the data parameters to be monitored indicated in the diagram?	DD VVS	82	Please refer to CAR 3 raised above	--	OK
B.4 Establishment and description of baseline scenario	DD				
B.4.1 Is an explanation how the baseline scenario is established in accordance with the selected baseline methodology provided?	DD		The baseline is pre-defined by the applied methodology viz AMS ID as the grid. The same has been described in the PDD.	OK	OK
B.4.2 When establishing the baseline scenario, and where "future anthropogenic emissions by sources are projected to rise above current levels due to the specific circumstances of the host Party", do the project participants follow the "Guidelines on the consideration of suppressed demand in CDM methodologies"?	PS	42	Not applicable	OK	OK
B.4.3 Does the PDD explain and justify the key	DD		Not applicable	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
assumptions and rationale. Provide and explain all data used to establish the baseline scenario (variables, parameters, data sources etc.) and provide all relevant documentation and/or references?					
B.4.4 Provide a transparent description of the baseline scenario as established?	DD		Yes	OK	OK
B.4.5 Are the documents and sources referred to in the PDD correctly quoted and interpreted and are they crosschecked with other verifiable and credible sources, such as local expert opinion, if available?	VVS	91	Yes, documents and sources are correctly quoted.	OK	OK
B.4.6 Does the PDD provide a description of the identified baseline scenario, including a description of the technology that would be employed and/or the activities that would take place in the absence of the proposed project activity?	VVS	92	Yes	OK	OK
B.4.7 Have all applicable CDM requirements been taken into account in the identification of the baseline scenario for the proposed project activity?	VVS	93	Yes	OK	OK
B.4.8 Has relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances (type E+ or E-), such as sectoral reform initiatives, local fuel availability, power sector expansion plans, and the economic	VVS	93	National Policies and Circumstances relevant to the baseline of the project activity have not been provided in section B.5 of PDD.	CAR 4	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
situation in the project sector been taken into account?					
B.5 Demonstration of additionality					
B.5.1 Is the project activity demonstrated additional in accordance with one of options provided in the applicable provision for demonstration of additionality for small-scale project activities in the Project standard	DD		Refer to table 2 below.	OK	OK
B.5.1.1 Attachment A of Appendix B. In such cases, project participants should also follow the Non-binding practice examples to demonstrate additionality for SSC project activities;	VVS	159	Yes	OK	OK
B.5.1.1.1 Project participants shall provide an explanation to show that the project activity would not have occurred anyway due to at least one of the following barriers: a) Investment barrier: a financially more viable alternative to the project activity would have led to higher emissions; b) Technological barrier: a less technologically advanced alternative to the project activity involves lower risks due to the performance uncertainty or low market share of the new technology adopted for the project activity and so would have led to higher emissions;	VVS	159	The proposed project activity has used the Investment Barrier in line with Attachment A to Appendix B, to demonstrate additionality.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
c) Barrier due to prevailing practice: prevailing practice or existing regulatory or policy requirements would have led to implementation of a technology with higher emissions; d) Other barriers: without the project activity, for another specific reason identified by the project participant, such as institutional barriers or limited information, managerial resources, organizational capacity, financial resources, or capacity to absorb new technologies, emissions would have been higher.					
B.5.1.2 Any applicable additionality tool; or	VVS	159	Not applicable	OK	OK
B.5.1.3 Guidelines for demonstrating additionality of microscale project activities", if the proposed project activity meets one of the following criteria: a) Type I: Project activities up to 5 MW that employ renewable energy as their primary technology; b) Type II: Energy efficiency project activities that aim to achieve energy savings at a scale of no more than 20 GWh per year; or c) Type III: Other project activities not included in Type I or Type II that aim to achieve GHG emissions reductions at a scale of no more	VVS	160	The proposed project activity does not meet any of the criteria for micro-scale projects. However the same is not justified in the PDD.	CAR 17	

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
than 20 $ktCO_2e$ per year.					
B.5.2 If the start date of the project activity is prior to the date of publication of the PDD for the global stakeholder consultation, is evidence of the prior consideration of the CDM in accordance with applicable provisions related to the demonstration of prior consideration of the CDM in the Project standard provided?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
B.5.2.1 Is the start date of the project activity, reported in the PDD, the earliest date at which either the implementation or construction or real action of a project activity begins?	VVS	106	Starting date of the project activity is provided as 25/04/2007 which is stated as PO date for the WTG placed on Vestas Wind Technology India Pvt Ltd. However actual WTG supply agreement is contracted in year 2010 therefore project start date stated in section C.1.1 is incorrect.	--	OK
B.5.2.2 If the project activity requires construction, retrofit or other modifications, is it ensured that the date of commissioning not considered as the project activity start date?	VVS	106	Not applicable	OK	OK
B.5.2.3 Is it a project activity with a start date on or after 02 August 2008, or before 02 August 2008?	VVS	106	The project activity is with the start date after 02/08/2008	OK	OK
B.5.2.4 For a project activity with a start date on or after 02 August 2008, are the following provisions to be satisfied:			*for which PDD has not been published for GSC or a new methodology proposed to the EB before the project activity start date*		
B.5.2.4.1 Has the PP informed the Host Party DNA	PS	27	Please provide the Board Resolution Note/ extracts along with the chronology	CL 2	

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
and the UNFCCC secretariat in writing of the commencement of the project activity and of their intention to seek CDM status within 180days of the project activity start date?	VVS	107	reference documents to validate the CDM consideration for the project activity.		
B.5.2.4.2 Do the project participants inform the secretariat of the progress of the project activity every subsequent two years after the initial notification, until the PDD regarding the project activity has been published for global stakeholder consultation or, a new baseline and monitoring methodology is proposed or a revision of an approved baseline and monitoring methodology is requested for the project activity before the start date?	PCP	9	PP has informed the host country and UNFCCC secretariat in writing of the commencement of the project activity and their intention to seek the CDM benefits. However Please clarify following issues. 1) From CDM website, it was observed that for M/s G.R. Engineering, notification for prior consideration of CDM was sent twice. i.e first on 26/04/2010 and later on 19/10/2010. Please clarify.	CL 4	
B.5.2.5 For a project activity with a start date before 02 August 2008, are the following elements to be satisfied:	VVS	108	*for which the start date is prior to the date of publication of the PDD for global stakeholder consultation*		
B.5.2.5.1 Are evidence of their awareness of the CDM prior to the project activity start date, and that the benefits of the CDM were a decisive factor in the decision to proceed with the project provided?	PS VVS	28 108	Not applicable	OK	OK
B.5.2.5.2 Are evidence that continuing and real actions were taken to secure CDM status	PS VVS	28 108-	Not applicable	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
for the project in parallel with its implementation provided?		110			
B.5.2.5.3 Is an implementation timeline of the proposed CDM project activity provided?	PS	28(c)	Not applicable	OK	OK
B.5.3 With respect to the section B.5.1 above, if investment analysis is used:					
B.5.3.1 Are all relevant assumptions and parameters used in the analysis listed?	DD		Yes	OK	OK
B.5.3.2 Is the latest version of the "Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis" applied?	VVS	118	Yes	OK	OK
B.5.3.3 Is project activity one of the following cases in regards to investment analysis:	VVS	119			
B.5.3.3.1 The proposed project activity would produce no financial or economic benefits other than CDM-related income;	VVS	119(a)	No	OK	OK
B.5.3.3.2 The proposed project activity is less economically or financially attractive than at least one other credible and realistic alternative;	VVS	119(b)	No	OK	OK
B.5.3.3.3 The financial returns of the proposed project activity would be insufficient to justify the required investment.	VVS	119(c)	Yes	OK	OK
B.5.3.4 Has the accuracy of financial calculations carried out for investment analysis been	VVS	120			

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
verified as follows:					
B.5.3.4.1 Determine the suitability of the financial indicator selected by the project participants and conduct a thorough assessment of all parameters and assumptions used in calculating such financial indicators, and determine the accuracy and suitability of these parameters using available evidence and applying its expertise in relevant accounting practices	VVS	120(a)	Project participant to substantiate the consideration of PLF of 21% inline with Annex 11 of EB 48.	CL 8	OK
B.5.3.4.2 Cross-check the parameters against third-party or publicly available sources, such as invoices or price indices	VVS	120(b)	Yes, the parameters used in the investment analysis have been cross-checked with the applicable State Tariff Orders.	OK	OK
B.5.3.4.3 Review, as appropriate, feasibility reports, public announcements and annual financial reports related to the proposed project activity and the project participants	VVS	120(c)	Not applicable	OK	OK
B.5.3.4.4 Assess the correctness of computations carried out and documented by the project participants; and	VVS	120(d)	In financial spreadsheet, the calculation of salvage value is not clear. please clarify	CL 5	OK
B.5.3.4.5 Assess, where applicable, the sensitivity analysis by the project participants to determine under what conditions variations in the result would occur, and the likelihood of these conditions.	VVS	120(e)	Sensitivity analysis is done on project cost, O&M and on PLF of the project activity. PP has applied +/- 10% sensitivity to above parameters. However, Project participant to explain with adequate justification as to why the tariff is	CL 7	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			not subjected to a sensitivity analysis. Further, the project participant to justify the rationale for subjecting the PLF, O&M and Project cost to a sensitivity of only ±10%.		
B.5.3.5 If benchmark analysis is used:					
B.5.3.5.1 Is the benchmark clearly indicated?	DD		Yes, the benchmark is based on PLR.	OK	OK
B.5.3.5.2 Is the type of benchmark applied suitable for the type of financial indicator presented?	VVS	121(a)	Please provide the copy of Benchmark sheet. i.e. WACC calculation.	CL 6	OK
B.5.3.5.3 Does the risk premiums applied in determining the benchmark reflect the risks associated with the project type or activity?	VVS	121(b)	Not applicable	OK	OK
B.5.3.5.4 Is it reasonable to assume that no investment would be made at a rate of return lower than the benchmark?	VVS	121(c)	Yes	OK	OK
B.5.3.6 If cost comparison is used:					
B.5.3.6.1 Are the scenarios compared described?	DD		Not applicable	OK	OK
B.5.3.7 If PPs rely on values from FSR:	VVS	122			
B.5.3.7.1 Has the FSR been the basis of the decision to proceed with the investment in the project?	VVS	122(a)	No, the offer letter received from the Wind Turbine Generator supplier was the basis for the investment decision.	OK	OK
B.5.3.7.2 Are the values used in the PDD and associated annexes fully consistent with the FSR? If inconsistencies occur, was the	VVS	122(b)	Not applicable	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
appropriateness of the values validated?					
B.5.3.7.3 On the basis of its specific local and sectoral expertise, is confirmation provided, by cross-checking or other appropriate manner, that the input values from the FSR are valid and applicable at the time of the investment decision?	VVS	122(c)	Not applicable	OK	OK
B.5.4 If barriers analysis is used:	DD				
B.5.4.1 Is the "Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers" followed?	PS	48	Not applicable	OK	OK
B.5.4.2 Is it ensured that only the most relevant barriers selected?	DD		Not applicable	OK	OK
B.5.4.3 Is the credibility of the barriers justified with key facts and/or assumptions and the rationale?	DD		Not applicable	OK	OK
B.5.4.4 Is it ensured that issues that have a direct impact on the financial returns of the project activity are not considered as barriers but assessed by investment analysis? This does not refer to either: (a) Risk related barriers (b) Barriers related to the unavailability of sources of finance for the project activity	VVS	125	Not applicable	OK	OK
B.5.4.5 Were the barriers determined as real?	VVS	126(a)	Not applicable	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.5.4.6 Were the barriers determined as preventing the implementation of the project activity but not the implementation of at least one of the possible alternatives?	VVS	126(b)	Not applicable	OK	OK
B.6 Emission reductions					
B.6.1 Explanation of methodological choices					
B.6.1.1 Does the PDD explain how the methods or methodological steps in the selected methodology, for calculating project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage emissions and emission reductions are applied?	PDD VVS	96	Procedures to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions have been provided under section B.6.1 of the PDD. However following issues required to be answered, 1) Latest version of applied methodology AMS I.D. ver. 17 is not used, thereby references to equations used for emission reduction calculations are not correct. 2) Latest version of emission factor tool is not used to calculate emission factor. Calculation of build margin and thereby combined margin emission factor is not in line with the emission factor tool. 3) PP has not provided paragraph numbers of AMS ID relevant to parameters of project and baseline emissions.	CAR 5	OK
B.6.1.2 In case the methodology(ies) include different	PDD		Refer to table 2 below.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
scenarios or cases, does the PDD indicate and justify which scenario or cases applies to the project activity?					
B.6.1.3 In case the methodology(ies) allow different default values, does the PDD indicate and justify which of the default values have been chosen for the project activity?	PDD		Refer to table 2 below.	OK	OK
B.6.2 Data and parameters fixed ex ante (section B.6.2 of PDD)					
B.6.2.1 If data and parameters will not be monitored throughout the crediting period of the proposed project activity but have already been determined and will remain fixed throughout the crediting period, are all data sources and assumptions: a) Appropriate and correct? b) Applicable to the proposed CDM project activity? c) Resulting in a conservative estimate of the emission reductions?	PDD VVS	98	1. The version of CEA database use to calculate combined margin emission factor is not consistently mentioned throughout the PDD. 2. Justification provided for choice and source of data is not sufficient.	CAR 6	OK
B.6.2.2 For each piece of data or parameter, are tables provided in accordance with the instructions?	PDD		1. Annex 3 of the PDD does not provide the clear and transparent references and data used for emission factor calculation. 2. The BM is taken as average of last three years, which is not in line with the Tool to calculate emission factor.	CAR 7	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.6.3 Ex ante calculations of emission reductions					
B.6.3.1 Is a transparent ex ante calculation of project emissions, baseline emissions (or, where applicable, direct calculation of emission reductions) and leakage emissions expected during the crediting period, applying all relevant equations provided in the approved methodology provided?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3.2 Is the information how each equation is applied, in a manner that enables the reader to reproduce the calculation, provided?	PDD		1. Ex-ante calculation of baseline emission as provided in section B.6.3 is incorrect. 2. The PLF considered for baseline emission calculation is 21%, whereas the same is indicated to be 23.18% in section B.5 of webhosted PDD and whereas the bank loan letter indicates the PLF to be 20%. Please clarify and correct.	CAR 8	OK
B.6.3.3 Is the information of additional background information and/or data provided in Appendix 4, including relevant electronic spreadsheets?	PDD		No	OK	OK
B.6.3.4 Is a sample calculation for each equation used provided, substituting the values used in the equations?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3.5 If the proposed small-scale CDM project activity involves more than one component,	PDD PS	90	Not applicable	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
does the project participants provide ex ante calculations of baseline, project and leakage GHG emissions as well as GHG emission reductions for each year of the crediting period and for each component separately?					
B.6.4 Summary of the ex ante estimates of emission reductions					
B.6.4.1 Are the results of the ex ante estimation of emission reductions for all years of the crediting period, provided in a tabular format?	PDD		Estimation of emission reductions for all the years of the crediting period are provided in required tabular format. However Table provided is not in line with the Guidance to complete the CDM SSC PDD.	CAR 9	
B.6.4.2 If the project activity involves more than one component, does the PDD provide a separate table for each of the component or each of the selected methodology(ies), and whether the PDD provide a table showing the aggregate emission reductions of the project activity?	PDD		Not applicable	OK	OK
B.7 Monitoring Plan					
B.7.1 Data and parameters to be monitored					
B.7.1.1 Is specific information on how the data and parameters that need to be monitored would actually be collected during monitoring included?	PDD		Parameters measured at the project site and connected substations are stated in section B.7.1 viz; $EG_{BL,y}$ and EGy,export , EGy,import, $EGy,_{WEG}$ and EG_{CM} along with the calibration frequency. However following issues are not addressed in	CAR 10	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			monitoring plan described in section B.7.1 of the PDD 1. Measurement methods and procedures described in section B.7.1 is not in line with the actual practice followed at the site. 2. Accuracy class of measuring energy meters is not specified. 3. Responsible person/entity responsible to undertake the measurements is not specified. 4. Monitoring interval and recording frequency is not clear for various monitoring parameters. 5. Only annual calibration frequency is mentioned in PDD however how the calibration will be carried out and by whom is not stated.		
B.7.1.2 For each data or parameter, is the information completed, in a tabular format:					
B.7.1.2.1 The source(s) of data that will be actually used for the proposed project activity (e.g. which exact national statistics). Where several sources may be used, explain and justify which data sources should be preferred.	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.2.2 Is an estimate of the data/ parameter that	PDD		Yes	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
will be monitored during the crediting period provided?					
B.7.1.2.3 Where data or parameters are to be measured, does it specify the measurement methods and procedures, standards to be applied, accuracy of the measurements, person/entity responsible for the measurements, and, in case of periodic measurements, the measurement intervals?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.2.4 Is a description of the QA/QC procedures including the calibration procedures, where applicable, provided?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.2.5 Is the purpose of data indicated?	PDD		Yes, for calculation of baseline emissions;	OK	OK
B.7.1.3 Is this monitoring plan based on the approved monitoring methodology applied to the proposed CDM project activity?	VVS	131	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.4 Does the monitoring plan contain all necessary parameters?	VVS	132(a)	Refer to table 2 below		
B.7.1.5 Do the means of monitoring described in the plan comply with the requirements of the methodology including applicable tool(s)?	VVS	132(a)	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.6 Are the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan feasible within the project design?	VVS	132(b)	In section B.7.2 of the webhosted PDD, 1) The diagrammatic representation of metering arrangement in not inline with the arrangement observed during site	CAR 15	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			visit. Please justify the discrepancy. 2) Project participant to demonstrate the apportioning procedure to be followed at site. 3) In event of the verification period dates not matching with the billing cycle, how is the project participant going to account for the Net generation achieved during that period. 4) Description of monitoring plan provided in section B.7.2 of the PDD is in non-compliance with the actual monitoring procedure observed at site.		
B.7.1.7 Are the means of implementation of the monitoring plan sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by/resulting from the proposed CDM project activity can be reported ex post and verified?	VVS	132(b)	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.2 Sampling plan					
B.7.2.1 Are there any data and parameters monitored in section B.7.1 above to be determined by a sampling approach?	PDD		No	Ok	OK
B.7.2.2 Is a description of the sampling plan provided in accordance with the recommended outline for a sampling plan in the "Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project	PDD		Not applicable	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
activities and programme of activities"?					
B.7.3 Other elements of monitoring plan					
B.7.3.1 Is the operational and management structure, that the project operator will implement in order to monitor emission reductions and any leakage generated by the project activity, described in the PDD?	PDD PS	56(a)	Yes	Ok	OK
B.7.3.2 Are the responsibilities for and institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving clearly indicated?	PDD PS	56(c)	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.3.3 Does the monitoring plan include provisions to ensure that data monitored and required for verification and issuance be kept and archived electronically for two years after the end of the crediting period or the last issuance of CERs, whichever occurs later?	PS	56(b)	Yes	Ok	OK
B.7.3.4 Does the monitoring plan include uncertainty levels, methods and the associated accuracy level of measuring instruments to be used for various parameters and variables?	PS	56(e)	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.3.5 Does the monitoring plan include specifications of the calibration frequency for the measuring equipments?	PS	56(f)	Yes	OK	OK
C. Duration and crediting period					
C.1 Duration of project activity					

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
C.1.1 Start date of project activity					
C.1.1.1 Is the start date of the project activity stated, in the format of DD/MM/YYYY?	PDD		Starting date of the project activity is provided as 25/04/2007 which is stated as PO date for the WTG placed on Vestas Wind Technology India Pvt Ltd. However actual WTG supply agreement is contracted in year 2010 therefore project start date stated in section C.1.1 is incorrect.	CAR 11	
C.1.1.2 Does it describe how the start date has been determined and provide evidence to support this date?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
C.1.2 Expected operational lifetime of project activity					
C.1.2.1 Is the expected operational lifetime of the project activity stated in years and months?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
C.2 Crediting period of project activity					
C.2.1 Type of crediting period					
C.2.1.1 Is the type of crediting period chosen for the project activity stated?	PDD		1. Choice of the crediting period is not stated in section C.2 of the PDD. 2. It is not indicated whether fixed crediting period of 10 years is selected in section C.2.2 of the PDD	CAR 12	OK
C.2.1.2 In case a renewable crediting period was chosen, does it indicate whether it is the first, second or third?	PDD		Not applicable	OK	OK
C.2.2 Start date of crediting period					

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
C.2.2.1 Is the start date of crediting period stated in the format of DD/MM/YYYY?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
C.2.3 Length of crediting period					
C.2.3.1 Is the length of crediting period stated in years and months?	PDD		Yes	OK	OK
D. Environmental impacts					
D.1 Analysis of the environmental impacts					
D.1.1 Does the host party require to carry out an analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed small-scale CDM project activity?	PDD PS	99	No	OK	OK
D.1.2 If yes, is a summary of the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity and references to all related documentation provided?	PDD PS	99	Not applicable	OK	OK
E. Local stakeholder consultation					
E.1 Solicitation of comments from local stakeholders					
E.1.1 Did the project participants complete a local stakeholder consultation process and that due steps were taken to engage stakeholders and solicit comments for the proposed project activity?	VVS	138	Yes	OK	OK
E.1.2 Is the process by which comments from local stakeholders have been invited provided?	PDD		The process by which comments by local stakeholders have been invited and compiled is provided in section E.1.	CL 3	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			However it is not clear whether the details of local stakeholders meeting provided in section E.1 of PDD is for proposed project activity under validation. Name of PP mentioned is M/s Rohit Surfactant Pvt Ltd. Project proponent to clarify the same with reference document source.		
E.2 Summary of comments received					
E.2.1 Are stakeholders that have made comments identified?	DD		PDD does not identify the local stakeholders who have made the comments.	CAR 13	OK
E.2.2 Have comments by local stakeholders that can reasonably be considered relevant for the proposed CDM project activity been invited?	VVS	139 (a)	Yes	OK	OK
E.2.3 Is the summary of comments provided complete?	DD VVS	139 (b)	Yes	OK	OK
E.3 Report on consideration of comments received					
E.3.1 Is information provided to demonstrate that all comments received have been considered?	DD VVS	139 (c)	Yes	OK	OK
F. Approval and authorization					
F.1 General					
F.1.1 Is it indicated whether the letter(s) of approval from Party(ies) available at the time of submitting	DD		No	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION		Ref.	§	COMMENTS		Draft Concl	Final Concl
	the PDD to the validating DOE?						
F.2	**Approval**			COUNTRY A	COUNTRY B		
F.2.1	Has the DNA of each Party indicated as being involved in the proposed CDM project activity in section A.3 of the PDD provided a written letter of approval?	VVS	38	Letter of Approval from the Host Party DNA has not been submitted by the PP.		CAR1	OK
F.2.2	Does the letter of approval from DNA of each Party confirm that : (a) The Party is a Party of the Kyoto Protocol (b) The participation is voluntary (c) In the case of the host Party, the proposed CDM project activity contributes to the sustainable development of the country (d) Refers to the precise proposed CDM project activity title in the PDD being submitted for registration	VVS	39	The title of the proposed project activity in the webhosted PDD and in the HCA does not match.		CL 9	OK
F.2.3	Is(are) the letter(s) of approval unconditional with respect to (F.2.2) above?	VVS	40	Letter of Approval from the Host Party DNA has not been submitted by the PP.		--	OK
F.2.4	Has(ve) the letter(s) of approval been issued by the respective Party's DNA? If there is doubt with respect to (F.2.2) above, was it verified with the DNA that the letter of approval is valid for the proposed CDM project activity under validation?	VVS	41,42	Letter of Approval from the Host Party DNA has not been submitted by the PP.		--	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
F.2.5 Does the letter of approval by the DNA of the host Party confirm the contribution of the proposed CDM project activity to the sustainable development of the host Party?	VVS	51	Letter of Approval from the Host Party DNA has not been submitted by the PP.	--	OK
F.3 Authorization					
F.3.1 Has each project participant been authorized by at least one Party involved in a letter of approval?	VVS	45	Letter of Approval from the Host Party DNA has not been submitted by the PP.	--	OK
F.3.2 Is the information in tabular form in the PDD consistent with the contact information for project participants provided?	VVS	46	Letter of Approval from the Host Party DNA has not been submitted by the PP.	--	OK
F.3.3 Are any entities other than those approved as project participants included in the PDD?	VVS	47	Letter of Approval from the Host Party DNA has not been submitted by the PP.	--	OK
F.3.4 Has the approval of participation issued from the relevant DNA? And if in doubt, was it verified with the DNA that the approval of participation is valid for the proposed CDM project participants?	VVS	48	Letter of Approval from the Host Party DNA has not been submitted by the PP.	--	OK
Part III Others					
A. Appendixes of PDD					
A.1 Appendix 1: Contact information of project participants	PDD PS	99			
A.1.1 For each organization listed in section A.4 of PDD, is the table in PDD completed, with the following mandatory fields: Organization, City, postcode, Country, Telephone and Fax, e-mail	PDD PS	99	All mandatory fields in Annex-1 for the entity listed in A.3 of the PDD are completed. However email ID and mobile number of the representative of project	CAR 14	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION		Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	and Name of contact person?			participants are incorrect.		
A.2	**Appendix 2: Affirmation regarding public funding**					
A.2.1	If applicable, is the affirmation obtained from Parties providing public funding to the project Activity attached?	PDD PS	99	Yes	OK	OK
A.3	**Appendix 3: Applicability of the selected methodology(ies)**					
A.3.1	Is the background information on the applicability of the selected methodology provided?	PDD PS	99	Yes	OK	OK
A.4	**Appendix 4: Further background information on ex ante calculation of emission reductions**					
A.4.1	Is the background information on the ex ante calculation of emission reductions provided?	PDD PS	99	No, the same is already explained in Section B.6.1 of the PDD	OK	OK
A.5	**Appendix 5: Further background information on monitoring plan**					
A.5.1	Is the background information used in the development of the monitoring plan provided?	PDD PS	99	No, information is provided in Section B.7 of the PDD	OK	OK
A.6	**Appendix 6: Summary of post registration changes**					
A.6.1	Is a summary of the post registration changes provided?	PDD PS	99	Not applicable	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B. Global Stakeholder Consultation					
B.1.1 Is there any comment on the PDD of the proposed project activity received during Global Stakeholder Consultation process?	VVS	34	Yes, ** comments received from ** stakeholders, as: ….		
B.1.2 If yes, have all comments been taken into account during the validation of the proposed project activity?	VVS	35	Yes, the same has been included as Appendix B in the Final Validation Report	OK	OK
B.1.3 If comments indicate that the proposed project activity does not comply with the CDM requirements and are not substantiated, is there any further clarification from the entity providing the comment?	VVS	36	N.A	OK	OK
B.1.4 If yes, how comments received have been taken due account?	VVS	36	Not applicable	Ok	OK
B.1.5 If no, are the comments as originally provided proceeded to assess?	VVS	36	Yes	Ok	OK
C. Modalities of Communications (MoC)					
C.1.1 Has the corporate identity of all project participants and focal points included in MoC statement, as well as the personal identities, including specimen signatures and employment status, of their authorized signatories been validated by:	VVS	53			
C.1.1.1 Directly checking evidence for corporate, personal identity and other relevant	VVS	54(a)	No	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
documentation; or					
C.1.1.2 Notarized documentation; or	VVS	54(b)	No	OK	OK
C.1.1.3 Written confirmation from the project participant or the coordinating/managing entity that all corporate and personal details, including specimen signatures, are valid and accurate.	VVS	54(c)	Yes	OK	OK
C.1.2 If (C.1.1.3) above was chosen, is it ensured that the MoC statement is received from a project participant with whom the DOE has a contractual relationship?	VVS	55	Yes	OK	OK
C.1.3 If (C.1.1.3) above was chosen, is it ensured that the official who submits the MoC statement to the DOE and the official who signed the written confirmation (if a different person) is/are duly authorized to do so on behalf of the respective project participant?	VVS	56	Yes	OK	OK
C.1.4 If it is unable to validate the requirements by applying C.1.1.1 to C.1.1.3 above, are any further validation activities performed?	VVS	57	Not applicable	OK	OK
C.1.5 Has the latest version of the form “Modalities of Communication statement” (F-CDM-MOC) been used?	VVS	60(a)	Yes	OK	OK
C.1.6 Is the information required as per F-CDM-MOC, including its annex 1, correctly completed?	VVS	60(b)	Yes	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
C.1.7 Do the project participant's authorized signatories signing the F-CDM-MOC correspond to the project participant's authorized signatories included in F-CDM-MOC, annex 1?	VVS	60(c)	Yes	OK	OK

RESOLUTION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION AND CLARIFICATION REQUESTS

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
CAR-1 Letter of Approval from the Host Party DNA has not been submitted by the PP.	1-a	PP has applied for the Letter of Approval from the National CDM Authority, India. The same will be provided to DOE.	The copy of the Host Country Approval issued by the Indian DNA has been submitted by the project participant to the validation team. Hence the CAR is closed.
CAR-2 Stated latitude and longitude for the WTG are incorrect. Please substantiate the physical location with suitable reference source.	3-f-ii	Latitude and longitude for the WTG are corrected in revised PDD version 02 dated 24/07/2012. Suitable reference source are provided to DOE.	The details of the lat-longitude have now been corrected by the project participant in the revised PDD. Hence the CAR is closed.
CAR-3 1. The substation rating as defined in project boundary in section B.3 of webhosted PDD is not matching with the substation rating as observed at site. 2. The metering system indicated in the project boundary diagram in the re-webhosted PDD is not in line with the metering system observed at site.	3-m	1. The substation rating as defined in project boundary in section B.3 of PDD is corrected in PDD version 02 dated 24/07/2012 (which was made publically available on 1st August 2012) according to the substation rating as observed at site and mentioned in commissioning certificate. 2. The metering system indicated in the project boundary diagram is corrected according to the metering system observed at site in PDD version 2.1	The sub-station rating values have been corrected by the project participant in the revised PDD. The metering system has been correctly indicated in the revised version of the PDD. Hence the CAR is closed.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
		3.	
CAR-4 National Policies and Circumstances relevant to the baseline of the project activity have not been provided in section B.5 of PDD.	3-o-ii	National Policies and Circumstances relevant to the baseline of the project activity have been now provided in section B.5 of PDD version 02 dated 24/07/2012 ((which was made publically available on 1st August 2012)	Description of the national policies and circumstances relevant to the baseline of the project activity has now been included in Section B.5 of the revised PDD. Hence the CAR is closed.
CAR-5 Procedures to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions have been provided under section B.6.1 of the PDD. However following issues required to be answered, 1) Latest version of applied methodology AMS I.D. ver. 17 is not used, thereby references to equations used for emission reduction calculations are not correct. 2) Latest version of emission factor tool is not used to calculate emission factor. Calculation of build margin and thereby combined margin emission factor is not in line with the	3-p-i	1) Latest version of applied methodology AMS I.D. ver. 17 is used, thereby references to equations used for emission reduction calculations are being corrected in revised PDD version 02 dated 24/07/2012 2) In revised PDD version 02 dated 24/07/2012 latest versions of emission factor tool is used to calculate the emission factor.	1. The latest version of the methodology viz; Version 17 has now been used in the project activity. 2. The latest version of the Tool to Calculate the emission factor, Version 2.2.1 is now used. 3. Relevant paragraph numbers of the applied methodology viz; AMS ID has now been provided in the revised PDD. Based on the above observations, the CAR is closed.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
emission factor tool. 3) PP has not provided paragraph numbers of AMS ID relevant to parameters of project and baseline emissions.		3) Paragraph numbers of AMS ID version 17 relevant to parameters of of project and baseline emissions are now provided in revised PDD version 02 dated 24/07/2012	
CAR-6 1) The version of CEA database use to calculate combined margin emission factor is not consistently mentioned throughout the PDD. 2) Justification provided for choice and source of data is not sufficient.	3-q-iii	1) The version 07 of CEA database is used to calculate combined margin emission factor which is now consistently mentioned throughout the PDD Version 02 dated 24/07/2011. (Due to some errors observed in PDD version 01, PDD version 02 was published for Global stakeholders' consultation on 1st August 2012.) 2) Justification provided for choice and source of data is corrected according to the requirement in Section B.6 of PDD version 02.	1. The latest version of the CEA database viz; version 7 which is based on the latest version of the emission factor tool [Version 2.2.1] has been used in the revised PDD. 2. Justification for the choice of data has now been provided in the revised PDD. Hence the CAR is closed.
CAR-7 1) Annex 3 of the PDD does not provide the clear and transparent references and data used for emission factor calculation. 2) The BM is taken as average of last three years, which is not in line with the Tool to calculate emission factor.	3-q-iv	1) PDD version 02 is corrected and now section B.6.1 provides the clear and transparent references and data used for emission factor calculation. 2) The BM is taken based on the most recent information available on units already built for sample group at the time of CDM-PDD Version	1. The revised version of the PDD now provides a clear and transparent reference to the data used for emission factor calculation. 2. The calculation of BM has now been corrected in the revised PDD. Hence the CAR is closed.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
		02 submission to the DOE for Global Stakeholders consultation , which is in line with the Tool to calculate emission factor Version 02.2.1.	
CAR-8 1) Ex-ante calculation of baseline emission as provided in section B.6.3 is incorrect. 2) The PLF considered for baseline emission calculation is 21%, whereas the same is indicated to be 23.18% in section B.5 of webhosted PDD and whereas the bank loan letter indicates the PLF to be 20%. Please clarify and correct.	3-r-i	1) Ex-ante calculation of baseline emission as provided in section B.6.3 is corrected in revised PDD version 02.(Due to some errors observed in PDD version 01, PDD version 02 was published for Global stakeholders' consultation on 1st August2012) 2) For the PLF consideration, bank letter has been considered by PP according to EB guidelines Annex 11, EB 48. PP has considered PLF as 20 % consistent throughout in revised PDD version 02. Section B.5 & Section B.6.1 of the revised PDD Version 02 mentions the same PLF to calculate the IRR and Emission reduction calculations respectively.	1. Ex-ante calculation of the baseline emissions has now been corrected in the revised PDD. 2. The validation team reviewed the bank loan application letter for the proposed project activity and noted that the generation indicated therein deduces to a PLF value of 20%. Since this PLF value is in line with the EB 48 guidelines, the same has been accepted by the validation team. Hence the CAR is closed.
CAR-9 Estimation of emission reductions for all the years of the crediting period are provided in required tabular format. However Table provided is	3-s	Section B.6.4 of the PDD Version 02 is now corrected in line with the guidance to complete the CDM SSC PDD.	The tabular format in Section B.6.4 is now corrected in the revised PDD. Hence the CAR is closed.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
not in line with the Guidance to complete the CDM SSC PDD.			
CAR-10 Parameters measured at the project site and connected substations are stated in section B.7.1 viz; $EG_{BL,y}$ and EGy,export , EGy,import, $EGy,_{WEG}$ and EG_{CM} along with the calibration frequency. However following issues are not addressed in monitoring plan described in section B.7.1 of the PDD 6. Measurement methods and procedures described in section B.7.1 is not in line with the actual practice followed at the site. 7. Accuracy class of measuring energy meters is not specified. 8. Responsible person/entity responsible to undertake the measurements is not specified. 9. Monitoring interval and recording frequency is not clear for various monitoring parameters. 10. Only annual calibration frequency is mentioned in PDD however	3-t-ii-b	Monitoring Plan mentioned in section B.7.1 & B.7.2 of the PDD version 02 dated 24/07/2012 has been revised according to actual observed practice at site. Following points of Monitoring Plan has been corrected. 1. Measurement methods and procedures described in section B.7.1 is corrected according to actual practice followed at the site. 2. Accuracy class of measuring energy meters is specified in section B.7.1 of the revised PDD version 02. 3. Responsible person/entity responsible to undertake the measurements is specified in section B.7.2 in revised PDD version 02.	The monitoring plan description in Sections B.7.1 & B.7.2 of the PDD has now been revised. 1. The methods and procedures for measurement have now been described in the revised PDD. 2. Accuracy class of the metering system has now been described as 0.2 class in the revised PDD. 3. Persons/ entities responsible for the measurement and recording are now included in the monitoring plan in the revised PDD. 4. The monitoring, measurement and recording frequency is now transparently explained in the revised PDD. 5. The details of the calibration process have now been described in the revised monitoring plan. Based on the above observations, the CAR is closed.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
how the calibration will be carried out and by whom is not stated.		4. Monitoring interval and recording frequency is not clearly mentioned for various monitoring parameters in section B.7.1. 5. Calibration frequency and how the calibration will be carried out and by whom is stated in section B.7.1 in PDD version 02.	
CAR-11 Starting date of the project activity is provided as 25/04/2007 which is stated as PO date for the WTG placed on Vestas Wind Technology India Pvt Ltd. However actual WTG supply agreement is contracted in year 2010 therefore project start date stated in section C.1.1 is incorrect.	3-v-i	Due to some errors observed in PDD version 01, PDD version 02 was published for Global stakeholders' consultation on 1st August 2012 Starting date of the project activity is 25/06/2010 which is date of Purchase order placed by G.R. Engineering Pvt. Ltd to Vestas Wind Technology India Pvt Ltd.. Same is corrected in section C.1.1 in PDD version 02.	The validation team based on the review of all the purchase orders placed for the proposed project activity confirms that the earliest date on which real action begun was the date of the placement of the purchase order. The date of the earliest P.O was noted as 25/06/2010 and hence the same has been accepted by the validation team as the start date. The validation team further noted that an incorrect PDD was webhosted during the first instance but later on the project activity PDD was re-webhosted on the UNFCCC website for global stakeholder comments. Hence the CAR is closed.
CAR-12a and 12b 1) Choice of the crediting period is	3-x and 3-bb	1) Choice of the crediting period is stated in section C.2 of the PDD version 02 dated	1. Choice of the crediting period is now stated as Fixed.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
not stated in section C.2 of the PDD 2) It is not indicated whether fixed crediting period of 10 years is selected in section C.2.2 of the PDD		24/07/2012 2) Fixed crediting period of 10 years is selected in section C.2.2 of the PDD version02 dated 24/07/2012.	2. Section C.2.2 of the revised PDD has now been revised to state the fixed crediting period years to be 10 years. Hence the CAR is closed.
CAR-13 PDD does not identify the local stakeholders who have made the comments.	3-gg-i	Section E.2 of the PDD revised and mentioned about the local stakeholders how have made the comments. Attendance list will be provided to DOE for further scrutiny.	Section E.2 of the revised PDD now provides details regarding the identity of the local stakeholders who made comments. Hence the CAR is closed.
CAR-14 All mandatory fields in Annex-1 for the entity listed in A.3 of the PDD are completed. However email ID and mobile number of the representative of project participants are incorrect.	3-ii-ii	Appendix -1 of the PDD version 02 dated 24/07/2012 is corrected. Correct email ID and mobile number of representative are mentioned.	The revised version of the PDD, Annex 1 now details the correct email and mobile number of the project participant representative. Hence the CAR is closed.
CAR-15 In section B.7.2 of the webhosted PDD, 5) The diagrammatic representation of metering arrangement in not inline with the arrangement observed during site visit. Please justify	7-v	Due to some errors observed in PDD version 01, PDD version 02 was published for Global stakeholders' consultation on 1st August 2012. PDD version 02 dated 24/07/2012 involves following corrections/changes. 1) The diagrammatic representation of metering arrangement in corrected in revised PDD which is in line with the arrangement	The validation team noted that an incorrect PDD was webhosted during the first instance but later on the project activity PDD was re-webhosted on the UNFCCC website during August 2012 for global stakeholder comments. However the following changes were

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
the discrepancy. *6)* Project participant to demonstrate the a*pportioning procedure to be followed at site.* 7) In event of the verification period dates not matching with the billing cycle, how is the project participant going to account for the Net generation achieved during that period. 4) Description of monitoring plan provided in section B.7.2 of the PDD is in non-compliance with the actual monitoring procedure observed at site.		observed during site visit. 2) Project participant has demonstrated the apportioning procedure to be followed at site in revised PDD version 02. 3) If the date of registration is after the date of JMR (Verification period dates are not matching the billing cycle) then no CERs will be claimed until the next JMR is undertaken. Similarly, no CERs will be claimed for the last month if end date of the crediting period and JMR reading day do not coincide. 4) Monitoring plan provided in section B.7.2 of the PDD is revised in PDD version 02 which is as per monitoring procedure observed at site.	observed in the revised version of the PDD viz; 1. The metering diagram in the Section B.7.2 of the revised PDD now describes the metering arrangement as happens at site. 2. The detailed procedure for apportioning used by the GEDA / GETCO representatives to deduce the net electricity supplied by the individual WTG's to the grid is now described in the revised PDD. 3. OK. 4. The description of the monitoring plan has been revised to make it compliant with the actual metering and monitoring system at site. Hence the CAR is closed.
CL-1 It is stated that PP has applied to register another small scale CDM project activity in bundle project	3-j-ii	Due to some errors observed in PDD version 01, PDD version 02 was published for Global stakeholders' consultation on 1st August 2012. PDD version 02 dated 24/07/2012 involves	The validation team further noted that an incorrect PDD was webhosted during the first instance but later on the project activity PDD was re-webhosted on the

[3] http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Validation/DB/LSKAFN40P852EFWKG0VZ5DJF48PHDF/view.html

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
activity at Karnataka. However from the reference source it is not evident whether G.R. Engineering is involved in bundle wind power project applied for registration under CDM.		following corrections/changes. Prior CDM consideration section mentioned in previously webhosted PDD has been revised in Section B.5 of the PDD version 02.. PP has not applied to register another small scale bundled project activity in Karnataka (this was typo error in webhosted PDD). However, PP has another small scale wind power project with capacity of 1.65 MW in Gujarat which is under validation as a part of Bundled project *"WAMS wind project"*[3]. From the GPS co-ordinates of this project (N23°12'29" E70°37'50"), it is confirmed that project boundary of this project is not within 1 km of the project boundary of the proposed small –scale activity at the closest point.	UNFCCC website for global stakeholder comments. The validation team, based on the review of the documents and interviews with the project participant noted that the project participant has another 1.65 MW WTG in the same location prior to this project activity but the existing WTG is more than 1 km from the proposed project activity and therefore is not a debundled component of a large scale project activity. Further the validation team noted that the sum of the capacities of both the wind power projects totals 3.30 MW which is lower than the capacity for large scale projects viz; 15 MW. Therefore the validation team confirms that the proposed project activity is not a debundled component of a large scale project. Hence the CL is closed.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
CL-2 Please provide the Board Resolution Note/ extracts along with the chronology reference documents to validate the CDM consideration for the project activity.	3-o-iii	Prior CDM consideration section mentioned in webhosted PDD has been revised in Section B.5 of the PDD version 02. PP had submitted the prior CDM consideration form to UNFCCC within 6 months of start date of project activity and period between the start date of project activity & date of GSC is less than 2 years ,hence chronology of events is not required to be mentioned in PDD. However, copy of board resolutions had been provided to DOE.	The validation team further noted that an incorrect PDD was webhosted during the first instance but later on the project activity PDD was re-webhosted on the UNFCCC website for global stakeholder comments. The validation team based on the review of all the purchase orders placed for the proposed project activity confirms that the earliest date on which real action begun was the date of the placement of the purchase order. The date of the earliest P.O was noted as 25/06/2010 and hence the same has been accepted by the validation team as the start date. Since the start date is after 02/08/2008, the proposed project activity is classified as a new project activity. In line with the EB guidelines, the project participant has communicated to the UNFCCC and the Indian DNA within 6 months of the project activity start date and hence adequately meets the requirements of prior consideration of CDM. Hence the CL is closed.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
CL-3 The process by which comments by local stakeholders have been invited and compiled is provided in section E.1. However it is not clear whether the details of local stakeholders meeting provided in section E.1 of PDD is for proposed project activity under validation. Name of PP mentioned is M/s Rohit Surfactant Pvt Ltd. Project proponent to clarify the same with reference document source.	3-ff-i	The process of stakeholders meeting is properly mentioned in section E.1 of the PDD. New paper advertisement, attendance list and questionnaires will be provided to DOE to cross check the data. Name of PP is typo error (in previously webhosted PDD) which has been rectified and corrected. (Due to some errors observed in PDD version 01, PDD version 02 was published for Global stakeholders' consultation on 1st August 2012. PDD version 02 dated 24/07/2012 involves above corrections/changes.)	The validation team further noted that an incorrect PDD was webhosted during the first instance but later on the project activity PDD was re-webhosted on the UNFCCC website for global stakeholder comments. The re-webhosted PDD now includes the details of the local stakeholder consultation process undertaken for the proposed project activity under validation. Hence the CL is closed.
CL-4 PP has informed the host country and UNFCCC secretariat in writing of the commencement of the project activity and their intention to seek the CDM benefits. However Please clarify following	6-a-g	PP has two separate wind energy projects which are under validation and hence total two prior CDM consideration (one for each project) were submitted to UNFCCC. For the first wind mill, CDM application is in process and according to page no 16, of the PDD[4], Prior CDM consideration for the previous	The validation team reviewed the commissioning certificates and the geo-coordinates of the previous wind project of capacity of 1.65 MW and noted that the earlier wind power project is also under CDM validation in another bundle. The prior consideration of CDM for the earlier project was done on 26/04/2010

[4] http://cdm.unfccc.int/filestorage/M/9/K/M9K1WLJI36FBPOES7AXN258CVQZHR0/PDD%20WAMS.pdf?t=bFR8bWF3a2FifDAZn9qBGM_v7VP7yjwfwVPA

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
issues. 1) From CDM website, it was observed that for M/s G.R. Engineering, notification for prior consideration of CDM was sent twice. i.e first on 26/04/2010 and later on 19/10/2010. Please clarify.		wind mill was submitted on 26/04/2010. GPS co-ordinates for the first wind mill are N23°12'29" E70°37'50" GPS co-ordinates of existing project activity are N 23° 13' 28.3" E 70° 38' 07.1" . Prior CDM consideration form relevant to this project activity is dated 19/10 /2010. Evidence for the same will be provided to DOE.	whereas the prior consideration notification for the proposed project activity was done on 19/10/2010. Thus the CL was closed.
CL-5 In financial spreadsheet, the calculation of salvage value is not clear. please clarify	5-c-h	In revised financial sheet , the calculation of salvage value is shown clearly.	The revised IRR sheet has now considered the salvage value in line with the accounting principles of India. Hence the CL is closed.
CL-6 Please provide the copy of Benchmark sheet. i.e. WACC calculation.	5-c-l	Benchmark details are provided in revised financial sheet. As benchmark is PLR, additional sheet in not required.	The project participant has chosen the PLR as the benchmark for the proposed project activity. Since the same is in line with the EB guidelines, the same has been accepted and hence the CL is closed.
CL-7 Sensitivity analysis is done on project cost, O&M and on PLF of the project activity. PP has applied +/- 10% sensitivity to above parameters. However, Project participant to	5-c-ll	Tariff: Tariff has been taken as per GERC (Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's) tariff order(http://www.gercin.org/renewablepdf/en_1303211765.pdf) dated 30th January 2010, the applicable Tariff order at the time of decision making. (Publicly Available Information).	The validation team reviewed the applicable GERC Tariff Order of 2010, applicable to the proposed project activity and noted that the tariff is fixed at INR 3.56/kWh for the entire life of the project activity. The validation team further cross-checked

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
explain with adequate justification as to why the tariff is not subjected to a sensitivity analysis. Further, the project participant to justify the rationale for subjecting the PLF, O&M and Project cost to a sensitivity of only ±10%.		According to the same, tariff has been mentioned as INR 3.56 per kWH. According to the tariff order –dated 30th January 210- "The Commission has control period of 3 (three) years w.e.f. 11th August, 2009.. The tariff decided in a particular control period shall apply to all projects which are commissioned after 11th August 2009. Further, it is proposed that the tariff determined for a project shall remain in effect for the whole project life." This project was commissioned during the year 2010 which falls within the control period of three years and hence the applicable tariff rate would be Rs 3.56 only for the project life of 20 years. Hence clearly the applicable Tariff for the project activity is Rs 3.56. This can be also cross checked with signed PPA. Revised PDD versions 02 also mentions about the sensitivity of tariff. Rationale for subjecting the PLF, O&M and Project cost to a sensitivity of only 10 % is +10%. Is described in section B.5 of the PDD version 02 . PP has also crosschecked the sensitivity with cross over point of benchmark with these	the tariff indicated in the PPA signed by the project participant with the State Electricity Utility and observed the tariff to be fixed for the entire period of 20 years at INR 3.56/kWh. However the project participant has still subjected the parameter of tariff to a standard sensitivity analysis of +10% to demonstrate the robustness of the IRR working. The rationale for subjecting the parameters of PLF, O&M cost and project cost to only 10% of variations has now been provided in Section B.5 of the revised PDD. Further the scenarios wherein the parameters would cross the benchmark has also been included in the revised PDD. Hence the CL is closed.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
		parameters and described the possibilities of occurrence of these situations in section B.5 of the PDD version 02 dated 24/07/2012.	
CL-8 Project participant to substantiate the consideration of PLF of 21% inline with Annex 11 of EB 48.	5-c-qq-i	Plant load Factor has been taken 20 % according to Bank Loan letter which is in line with EB 48, Annexure 11. A copy of the same will be provided to DOE to crosscheck.	The PLF for the proposed project activity has been considered from the bank loan application letter of the pp to the financing bank. The PLF indicated therein is 20%, which also meets the requirements of EB 48, Annex 11. Since the PLF considered by the pp meets the EB guideline requirements, the same has been accepted by the validation team. Hence the CL has been closed.
CL 9 The title of the proposed project activity in the webhosted PDD and in the HCA does not match.		Title of the project according to Host Country approval is " 1.65 MW Wind Power Project by G. R. Engineering Pvt. Ltd." which is same as Prior CDM consideration form submitted to UNFCCC. According to Host Country Approval location is Village Vandhiya , District Kutch of Gujarat state. Title of at the time of finalization of PDD was slighted changed due to typo error which is "1.65 MW Wind Energy Project at Village Vandhiya	The validation team noted that the title of the proposed project activity in the application to the DNA of India for Host Country Approval as well as in the application made in Form F, to the Indian DNA as well as to the UNFCCC for prior consideration of CDM were all the same. However, while finalizing the PDD, the title of the proposed project activity erroneously included the name of the village in which the proposed project

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
		Taluka: Bhachau, Dist: Kutch, Gujarat, India of G.R. Engineering Pvt. Ltd." However, both the title refers the same capacity , location and name of the project participants. This minor change in title does not any how reflect any changes in sustainable development criteria of the project . PDD version 2.3 dated 22/12/2012 is corrected with the same title as mentioned in the Host Country approval."	activity is located in. Further it is stated that the capacity and location of the proposed project activity has not changed and also the capability of the project activity to deliver emission reductions has also not changed. The validation team reviewed the same and noted that the title of the proposed project activity as indicated in the HCA issued by the Indian DNA as well as the on the UNFCCC website, under Prior Consideration, are the same. Hence the validation team accepted the justification of the Project Participant since the change in the project activity title does not impact the basic ability of the project activity to lead to sustainable development in the region and its capability to deliver emission reductions, which are the primary requirements of any CDM project. Hence the CL was closed.

Appendix B: Summary of Global Stakeholder Comment

Sr. No.	*Details of the commenter*	*Date of Comment*	*Comment [unedited]*	*Response by project participant*	*Explanation on how account is taken by DOE*
1.	*Submitted by:* *Gujarat Forum on CDM*	Between 1-Nov-2011 to 30-Nov-2011	Gujarat forum on CDM respectfully submit the following comments on the Project Design Document (PDD) for 1.65 MW Wind Energy Project at Village Vandhiya Taluka: Bhachau, Dist: Kutch, Gujarat, India of G.R. Engineering Pvt. Ltd We thank the CDM Executive Board and Designated Operation Entity (DOE) for recognizing the integral role of transparency in CDM Validation process, and for taking this comment into consideration. The project is not appropriate for the following points The investment analysis is incomplete and fails to provide the data and assumptions necessary for reader to reproduce the result No justification has been given regarding the selection of sites for installation of Wind farm turbines and how much land has been acquired for the purpose? No information has been provided	The detail investment analysis is submitted to DOE which mentions all necessary assumptions along with references used to calculate project IRR. According to CDM guidelines it is not required to mention the site selection for PDD.	The IRR analysis has been submitted to the validation team along-with all supporting documents. The validation team noted that the site selection is dependant on the availability of

Sr. No.	*Details of the commenter*	*Date of Comment*	*Comment [unedited]*	*Response by project participant*	*Explanation on how account is taken by DOE*
			about the land type of acquired land and its previous use. In local stake holder's consultation meeting, only 19 stakeholders were presented. The low participation of stakeholders shows that company had not taken it seriously. The company had not made adequate efforts to inform and aware stakeholders regarding consultation. No commitment has been shown by the company regarding sustainable development as well as additionality as per CDM requirement.	However, Site selection was done by PP as suggested by Technology suppliers. Type of land acquired is non agricultural land and total measuring of 101,117 Sq meter as mentioned in land documents.. PP has published the advertisement in local news paper to invite local stakeholders. PP had also circulated questionnaire to invited the comments. PP had also obtained NOC from Gram Panchayat for the said projects. It shows there are no negative effects to the surrounding people due to wind energy project. For the small scale CDM projects, it is not mandatory to provide the sustainable development plan to NCDMA. However, section A of the PDD mentions about the social, economical, environmental and technical parameters of sustainable	wind resources at the particular site and many other factors which are considered by the Project Participant, in consultation with the Wind Turbine Generator supplier, prior to making an investment decision. The type of land used for the proposed project activity is non-agricultural land. The validation team reviewed the advertisement placed in the local newspaper inviting stakeholder comments for the project activity and also noted that separate questionnaires were circulated to invite comments. Further the validation team is of the opinion that the presence of 19 stakeholders for a 1.65

Sr. No.	*Details of the commenter*	*Date of Comment*	*Comment [unedited]*	*Response by project participant*	*Explanation on how account is taken by DOE*
				development.	MW capacity wind power project is adequate. The Project Participant has adequately justified the sustainable development parameters of the host country in the PDD and have also provided detailed description to demonstrate additionality of the project activity in line with the CDM requirements. Hence the comment is considered to be closed.

Comments received during the re-webhosting of the project activity

Sr. No.	*Details of the commenter*	*Date of Comment*	*Comment [unedited]*	*Response by project participant*	*Explanation on how account is taken by DOE*
1.	Falguni Joshi Gujarat forum On CDM (Email – gujaratforumoncdm @gmail.com) (Gujarat Forum on CDM – is a network of Individuals & Organizations working on Environmental issue & Monitoring of CDM projects in Gujarat, India.) Submitted by: Gujarat Forum on CDM	Between 01/08/2012 – 30/08/2012	Employment Opportunities In answering stakeholders' question PP said, "The project activity will indirectly contribute to local employment generation in lower economic sector of the region."– How many local people will get employment from this project? 2. Regarding SECTION E. - Local stakeholder consultation There is no mention of newspaper's name in which the public notice of the consultation published. Around 10 people were present in the local stakeholder consultation – The low participation of stakeholder shows that company had not taken it seriously. The company had not made adequate efforts to inform and aware stakeholders regarding consultation. 3. Host Country Approval – Project proponent has still to obtain host country approval – How can a PP applied to UNFCCC without	The project activity generates direct and indirect employment opportunities for skilled/semi-skilled manpower, during the construction and operational phase of the project. Indirect employment has been generated for the equipment supplier, contractors, and technical consultants. The project activity indirectly supports creation of local infrastructure like roads and other basic civic amenities leads to the economic development around the project area. PP has published the advertisement in leading news paper "Gujarat Samachar" to invite local stakeholders. PP had also circulated questionnaire to invite the comments. PP had also obtained NOC from Gram Panchayat for the said projects. It shows there are no negative effects to the	The validation team during the site visit observed that local people have been employed by the O&M contractor for security services and pantry related services. Further the team noted that several local people were employed during the construction and commissioning phase of the Wind Turbine Generator. Apart from this, the setting o wind farm project in the region has boosted the local economy. The validation team noted that the Project Participant invited local stakeholder comments by providing an advertisement in the local language newspaper namely

Sr. No.	*Details of the commenter*	*Date of Comment*	*Comment [unedited]*	*Response by project participant*	*Explanation on how account is taken by DOE*
			getting host country approval? PDD says "PP has got the necessary approvals from local government body for the implementation for the project activity." From which local government body PP got the approvals?	surrounding people due to wind energy project. According to CDM procedure defined by UNFCCC, PP can publish the PDD for the Global Stakeholders comments without HCA. However, PP needs to submit the HCA at the time of Request for Registration. PP has obtained all the necessary approval from Gujarat Energy Development Agency (GEDA) for commissioning of wind mill. Wind mill can not be commissioned without required approvals. PP has also obtained Gram Panchayat NOC.	"Gujarat Samachar". The number of local people [10 persons] attending the stakeholder meeting for a single 1.65 MW project capacity is considered adequate by the validation team. The validation team noted that an HCA is not a mandatory requirement at the time of webhosting the PDD for GSC or during the validation process. However the HCA is mandatory before the project activity is submitted to the UNFCCC with a request for registration. The Project Participant has got approvals from the GEDA, GUVNL and the local Panchayat. Hence the comment is closed.

Sr. No.	*Details of the commenter*	*Date of Comment*	*Comment [unedited]*	*Response by project participant*	*Explanation on how account is taken by DOE*
2	Lasith	Between 01/08/2012 – 30/08/2012	Is the project equipment purchased second hand equipment or sourced from cheap foreign sources? If yes, the issue must be probed by DOE since invoices will invariably be inflated and forged. Total project costs mentioned by PP will not be the same as originals. Hence no additionality. These facts must be probed in full by DOE by checking all documents and money transactions along with bank statements and certified accounts by a legally acceptable financial analyst.	PP has not purchased second hand equipments. All the required documents i.e. Purchase order etc have been submitted to DOE.	The project activity is a Greenfield project with new installation of turbines which were confirmed from the Purchase order placed by the project participant on the WEG manufacturer. Hence the comment is closed.
	Lasith	Between 01/08/2012 – 30/08/2012	From DOE side which auditor has done marketing and business development for acquiring this business of validating this project? With whom he or she was co-ordinating at PP or CER buyer? The same person who has done the marketing and business development to acquire the business do validation or participate in any manner what so ever in the validation process? One cannot do like that. It is against the accreditation rules and norms followed since ages. DOE should	DOE may please provide response to the stakeholder query.	The DOE would like to clarify that it has a well established system of having an independent team for marketing its services and the marketing team do not, in any manner, have any linkages with the final outcome of the project validations / verifications. The validation / verification activity is conducted by technical

Sr. No.	*Details of the commenter*	*Date of Comment*	*Comment [unedited]*	*Response by project participant*	*Explanation on how account is taken by DOE*
			send auditors from different offices or countries to do this validation audit. DOE must take care of impartiality and accreditation rules. Due to the targets set by the DOE managements auditors are doing marketing and meeting clients and giving promises that the project will be taken care. Is it acceptable and fair? This must be stopped. No auditor should do marketing. Only non-auditing staff should do marketing. DOE to ensure the same please.		teams comprising of team leaders and team members and none of the marketing personnel are involved in the actual technical evaluation of the project activity. Hence the DOE would like to confirm and assure the stakeholder that the process of marketing the services is conducted by a different team than the technical team. Hence the comment is closed.
	Lasith	Between 01/08/2012 – 30/08/2012	If applicable only: Is these machines, equipment was a part of any bundle of CDM activity envisaged and developed earlier. DOE to check the same through independent sources also. Once some bundles are non-additional and getting negative validation from a DOE, PP is rolling out the same project as an individual project which is not a CDM project at all. DOE to verify the same from	This project activity is stand alone CDM project activity and not the part of any other bundled project activity in previous years.	The WEGs are new installation and they are not a part of any bundle. The same was verified from the purchase orders placed by the project participant on the WEG supplier. Hence the comment is

Sr. No.	*Details of the commenter*	*Date of Comment*	*Comment [unedited]*	*Response by project participant*	*Explanation on how account is taken by DOE*
			independent sources and also take undertaking in the form of an affidavit from the PP's that any misrepresentation or false statement with respect this would attract strict legal action from UNFCCC and DOE. Furthermore the registered project must be de-registered in case of any future findings contradicting the submissions made by the project owner.		closed.
	Lasith	Between 01/08/2012 – 30/08/2012	DOE to ensure that the PDD values are consistent and ensure that the CDM project is a genuine project	PDD values are taken from reliable sources available at the time of investment decision.	The validation team has ensured that the input values used in the financial analysis is consistent throughout the PDD. Hence the comment is closed.
	Lasith	Between 01/08/2012 – 30/08/2012	DoE to check the Detailed Project Report and Feasibility Report which is submitted to the other agencies and Banks by Project owner and ensure that the values match with the DPR/FR submitted to DoE also.	DOE may please provide response to the stakeholder query.	The project participant has not prepared or referred to a DPR or FSR but has based the financial calculations on the initial offer letter and relevant publicly available references and validation team

Sr. No.	*Details of the commenter*	*Date of Comment*	*Comment [unedited]*	*Response by project participant*	*Explanation on how account is taken by DOE*
					found to be appropriate inline with EB 62, Annex 5. Hence the comment is closed.
	Lasith	Between 01/08/2012 – 30/08/2012	Careful study must be done so that the DPR/FR is not in different versions made and submitted with different purposes to different agencies, which is totally unacceptable, illegal and unethical.	No DPR was prepared for this project.	As stated above, there is no DPR/FSR prepared for the proposed CDM project activity. Hence the comment is closed.
	Lasith	Between 01/08/2012 – 30/08/2012	DPR/FR values must be probed fully. DOE must take a written undertaking from the PP/Consultant about the list of parties to whom this DPR/FR is submitted and for what purposes. Then DOE should cross check with all the parties and confirm that the same DPR/FR is submitted to all the parties correctly without any changes. DOE must not accept any reports and undertakings from PP/Consultant. DOE must make independent evaluation and use totally different parties without informing the PP or Consultant to	There was no DPR available for this project as mentioned in the reply no. 1 above.	No DPR/FR is prepared / referred by the project participant. Hence the comment is closed.

Sr. No.	*Details of the commenter*	*Date of Comment*	*Comment [unedited]*	*Response by project participant*	*Explanation on how account is taken by DOE*
			cross check the facts.		
	Lasith	Between 01/08/2012 – 30/08/2012	DOE to write to the party who prepared the DPR/FR which is submitted to the banks and other agencies and the same is verified against the one submitted to the DOE by PP/Consultant.	The project was not appraised based on any DPR as clarified in the reply above.	No DPR/FSR is prepared / referred by the project participant Hence the comment is closed.
	Lasith	Between 01/08/2012 – 30/08/2012	DOE must not entertain this project any more if found the DPR/FR is tampered with at any point in time. PP can not give different DPR's and FR's. They must submit only the one given to Banks and other agencies while obtaining loans and decision making time.	The project was not appraised based on any DPR as clarified in the reply above.	No DPR/FSR is prepared / referred by the project participant Hence the comment is closed.
	Lasith	Between 01/08/2012 – 30/08/2012	How is the base line defined in this project? Is Base line hypothetically defined with no proper evidences and proper justification? In such case, DOE cannot take the base line as suggested by the PDD. Please check that there are real emission reductions beyond the real and factual base line. It may so happen that this project qualifies for no CER's. DOE cannot assume values and things as giving by this PP. Whatever values are considered	Baseline is defined according to Approved small scale methodology AMS I –D. DOE has carried out the Validation in line to VVS guidelines and necessary actions have been taken to check the documents and data. All input parameter has been sourced from offer letter provided by WEC supplier, GERC Tariff Order which was	The project activity is the installation Wind Turbine to generate renewable power. The methodology applicable for such category project is AMS I D which itself gives the baseline and no hypothetical baseline is considered by the project participant.

Sr. No.	*Details of the commenter*	*Date of Comment*	*Comment [unedited]*	*Response by project participant*	*Explanation on how account is taken by DOE*
			throughout the project in all documents including the real DPR (not the one prepared for CDM, the one given to the banks and others), they must be validated, verified and double checked. Do not ask PP for DPR. Ask the parties who have been given DPR by the PP. Get directly from the bank and others by each page of the DPR and Feasibility report signed. Such document can be considered as a real DPR or FR. UNFCCC CDM process cannot be degraded by fabricating and misinterpreting the project base line and additionality.	available at the time of investment decision. Hence, input values are not sourced from DPR/FSR.	The project participant has not prepared or referred to a DPR or FSR but has based the financial calculations on the initial offer letter and relevant publicly available references and validation team found to be appropriate inline with EB 62, Annex 5. Hence the comment is closed.
	Lasith	Between 01/08/2012 – 30/08/2012	DOE to be more careful so that this is a genuine CDM project. What is the exact project cost? The project cost is covering what? Each value considered must be validated with proof. The machinery is second hand purchased or fresh and new from an OEM? In either case DOE to check all the quotations, proposals, purchase orders, invoices, way bills, transport bills, proof of payments like bank statements. DOE to check with banks by way of written confirmation	The project cost has been taken from supplier offer provided by the supplier to the PP. This is line with the Guidelines on the Assessment of Investment Analysis, EB 62, Annex 5. The machinery purchased is new and the purchase orders have been provided to the DoE.	The validation team verified that actual project cost from the purchase orders placed by the project participant on the WEG supplier and has subjected the same to a sensitivity analysis also. The team further verified that the project activity equipments are new and are not

Sr. No.	*Details of the commenter*	*Date of Comment*	*Comment [unedited]*	*Response by project participant*	*Explanation on how account is taken by DOE*
			the amount transacted, to whom the money is paid, when the money is paid, is the party paid is the correct party as shown in the purchase orders. It may so happen that the values, party names, dates are fabricated and misrepresented in this project. DOE should terminate their contract for this project immediately. This is the only way out to protect the value of CDM process. If the PP is purchasing second hand or second quality equipment and inflating the purchase order values and invoices, this must be probed thoroughly and real values to taken for additionality calculation. Then I'm sure the additionality is not there at all in such a situation.		transferred, by reviewing the purchase orders, commissioning certificates, approvals by GEDA/GUVNL etc. Further the validation team would like to clarify that the investment analysis for the project activity has been validated completely in line with the requirements of the latest version of the Guidelines of Investment Analysis. Hence the comment is closed.
	Lasith	Between 01/08/2012 – 30/08/2012	Project owner should show some undertaking letter from bank manager to DoE stating that both DPR's are same. These kinds of letters should not be accepted and entertained by DoE at face value, but must be checked independently. While collecting the DPR/FR from banks and other agencies, all	DOE has carried out the Validation in line to VVS guidelines and necessary actions have been taken to check the documents and data.	No DPR/FSR was prepared / referred by the project participant Hence the comment is closed.

Sr. No.	*Details of the commenter*	*Date of Comment*	*Comment [unedited]*	*Response by project participant*	*Explanation on how account is taken by DOE*
			DPR/FR pages should be counter signed by Banks and other agencies so that the real DPR/FR given to other parties by the PP/Consultant is same as the one submitted to DOE.		
	Lasith	Between 01/08/2012 – 30/08/2012	Has the PP considered the CDM revenues while envisaging the project? Without CDM the project was not viable, is it right? This project is having a debt component? Then how bankers or lenders gave the loan? Have the bankers or lenders considered the CDM revenues while agreeing to give loan to this projects? If not this project should be rejected right away by DOE by terminating the contract forthwith. If yes, where is the proof? What is the date of the evidence document from bank? Is this document printed now a days or earlier. DOE to independently check the same. If the document is available from Bank it must be checked from all angles so that it is genuine and not forged and date changed by putting back dated. This is normally done, DOE to be aware of this please. Please check the	Yes, the PP has considered CDM revenue while envisaging the project due to its low profitability that makes the investment less viable. Yes, the project has applied for loan and it was also known to the bankers that the project is being considered and developed under CDM for alleviating its profit. Therefore PP ensures the genuineness of the project to all the stakeholders and also invites DOE to conduct independent evaluation if required any.	The validation team confirms on validation of the board resolution that the CDM revenue was envisaged during the board decision. Further the validation has verified the loan sanction letter and it confirms that project participant has taken loan of approximately 70% of the project cost. Hence the comment is closed.

Sr. No.	*Details of the commenter*	*Date of Comment*	*Comment [unedited]*	*Response by project participant*	*Explanation on how account is taken by DOE*
			communication the PP had during that time with banks, emails and postal receipts and the weights and dates mentioned on the receipts. Do not believe in courier bills and receipts since these can be cooked up easily. Insist on government owned postal service receipts only. If the project is fully equity project then on what basis the PP has invested full equity in to the project while considering the CDM revenue? DOE to check the same in detail and bring out the facts. Is there any past record of this PP to invest or not to invest at returns what he is talking about in this project? Proper evidences must be reviewed and digged out by the DOE and take decision on the project based on established facts. Do not ask documents from PP, DOE to collect the same from different sources to do independent evaluation.		