

# **GS4GG Verification (Performance Certification) Report**



Project Title  
**20 MW Solar Project in Sanwreej, Jodhpur, Rajasthan**

For  
**Janardan Wind Energy Pvt. Ltd.**

Report No- GS.VER.20.17

Revision No-01

Date: 11/03/2021

## SECTION A. Executive summary

The basic details of the GS project activity are mentioned below:

Project title	20 MW Solar Project in Sanwreej, Jodhpur, Rajasthan
ESPL ref.No.	GS.VER.20.17
GS ID	GS5575
UNFCCC registration number	10392
Date of GS registration	11/07/2017
GS4GG Version	1.2
GS4GG Activity Requirements	Renewable Energy Activity Requirements GS4GG Code 201 RE
Technical Area (TA)	TA 1.2
Selected Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	SDG 3, SDG 7, SDG 8 and SDG 13
Sectoral scope (UNFCCC)	1
GS4GG Sectoral Scope:	2
GS4GG Certified Product	GHG Emission Reductions
GS4GG SDG Impact Statement	Not applicable

This verification is an independent and objective review for the additional Gold Standard (GS4GG) requirement, for the monitoring period from 01/08/2018 to 29/02/2020 for the project activity “20 MW Solar Project in Sanwreej, Jodhpur, Rajasthan” (GS ID-5575 & UN Ref. No - 10392), this verification report doesn’t include the verification of the GHG parameters but only review the additional requirements for GS labelling the already issued CER. The current monitoring period covers the period from 01/08/2018 to 29/02/2020 and CERs for this period are currently in the process of issuance/18/.

The emission reductions which are being verified for the period 01/08/2018 to 29/02/2020, in this report, will only be deemed final after the successful issuance of the CERs from the CDM EB.

The verification report addresses the implementation and operation of the GS PA and tests the data and assertions set out in the monitoring report based on the following:

- (i) The registered GS/CDM PDD, Passport and approved transition annex
- (ii) The approved methodology mention in the PDD and passport
- (iii) UNFCCC criteria referred to in the Kyoto Protocol criteria and the CDM modalities and procedures as agreed in the Bonn Agreement and the Marrakech Accords
- (iv) The latest GS4GG principles and requirements v 1.2
- (v) CDM Validation and Verification Standard (VVS) for PAs
- (vi) CDM Project Standard (PS) and Project Cycle Procedure (PCP) for PAs
- (vii) Relevant decisions, guidance and clarifications of the CMP and CDM Executive Board and any other information and references relevant to the project activity’s reported emission reductions

The verification has considered both quantitative and qualitative aspects on stated/reported emission reductions. The monitoring report (all versions) and corresponding supporting documentation was assessed in accordance with the rules defined by UNFCCC and GS4GG, as appropriate to the PA.

The verification is not meant to provide any consulting or recommendations to the CME/others. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the monitoring activities.

The verification process involved following;

- Contract with Janardan Wind Energy Pvt. Ltd.
- for the scope of verification;
- Submission of monitoring report and supporting documents
- Desk review
- Remote audit
- Issuance of verification findings
- Reporting, calculation checks, QA/QC and resolution of findings
- Issuance of draft verification report
- Independent technical review of the project documentation
- Issuance of the final verification report
- Submission of the request for issuance, as appropriate

## SECTION B. Verification team, technical reviewer and approver

### B.1. Verification team member

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)	Involvement in			
						Desk review	On-site inspection	Interview(s)	Verification findings
1.	Team Leader and Local Expert	EI	Soni	Ravi Kant	Central office	Y	N	Y	Y
2.	Verifier	IR	Gupta	Anshika	Central office	Y	N	N	Y
3.	Meth Expert	EI	Soni	Ravi Kant	Central office	Y	N	Y	Y
4.	Technical Expert	EI	Soni	Ravi Kant	Central office	Y	N	Y	Y
5.	Financial/ Other Expert	EI/IR	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6.	Trainee	EI/IR	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

### B.2. Technical reviewer and approver of the verification and certification report

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)
1.	Technical reviewer	IR	Garg	Shreya	Central office
2.	TA expert to TR	IR	Garg	Shreya	Central office
3.	Approver	IR	Singh	Kaviraj	Central office

## SECTION C. Application of materiality

### C.1. Consideration of materiality in planning the verification

No.	Risk that could lead to material errors, omissions or misstatements	Assessment of the risk		Response to the risk in the verification plan and/or sampling plan
		Risk level	Justification	
1.	Omissions and misstatements in data transfer from hand written data in the JMR to ER calculation sheet.	Low	Ineffective quality control of data transfer due to unclear QA/QC procedure.	Quality procedure followed at site to be checked.  It is to be demonstrated by the PP that how to transfer data and how this can be crosschecked.  Relevant site personnel have been interviewed to confirm whether procedure is actually Conducted.
2.	Missing data due to failure of measurement equipment	Low	The monitoring plan defines emergency procedures in	It is to be checked if related main meters are installed as

			<p>case malfunctioning or failure of meter. Further, check meters are also installed onsite.</p>	<p>per monitoring plan.</p> <p>Relevant site personnel have been interviewed to confirm whether the emergency procedure is known to them.</p> <p>To be checked if the equipment is malfunctioning and the accuracy and reliability of data for the concerned period cannot be ensured, the relevant emission reductions have been claimed or not.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

## C.2. Consideration of materiality in conducting the verification

>> The project activity is large scale project and applicable threshold for materiality in accordance with CDM VVS for PAs Version 02.0 paragraph 3269(c) is 2%. All the monthly reported figures for parameter  $EG_{\text{facility},y}$  were verified with monthly JMRs and were found to be consistent. Therefore, it can be stated that the verified value is free from any potential error / omission / misstatement. The project activity, being a solar PV project, has assumed the project emission and leakages to be zero which is in line to the applied methodology and is also reasonable in the opinion of assessment team. Therefore, there are no additional factors which might lead to introduction of error in emission reduction estimation.

## SECTION D. Means of verification

### D.1. Desk review

The verification is performed primarily as a desk review of the documents submitted at various stages of assessments. The review is performed by assessment team using dedicated protocols (checklists). The assessment team cross checks the information provided in the documents (MR) and information from sources other than those used, if available, and also conducts independent background investigations. Earthood conducted a desk review as under;

- a) A review of the data and information presented to verify their completeness
- b) A review of the monitoring plan (as described in PDD and passport), the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures
- c) A review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions;
- d) An evaluation of data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions

The list of documents reviewed during the verification is provided under appendix 3 of this report.

### D.2. On-site inspection

No site visit was conducted for this verification due to outbreak of global pandemic Covid-19 and increased risk of exposure and contraction due to travel. However, following section-4 of the GS4GG's Rule Update- "COVID-19: INTERIM MEASURES"/07/, the assessment team opted and applied the alternative means of conducting the remote audit.

As per the guidance provided under Clause 4.1.1 of interim measures- Alternative Measures relating to mandatory on-site visits for VVBs audits include:

- (a) A VVB may postpone site visits for on-site inspections, taking into account the rules of relevant national and local authorities (local to the DOE offices as well as to locality of the site visits), World Health Organization (WHO) recommendations, policies of the VVB (if any) and other relevant travel restrictions and guidance (for example, a requirement to self-isolation upon return from specific countries).
- (b) If site visit cannot be postponed due to significant impact of delaying the site visit on VVB and/or project developer due to timeline/commitment as per validation/verification or GS-VERs delivery agreement, VVB may replace mandatory on-site visits with remote audits. The audit may include but not limited to validation, verification, the inclusion of VPAs, design change review etc.

As per the COVID-19 interim measures (v03, dated 18/12/2020) published by SustainCERT regarding the relaxation for mandatory site visits by VVBs till 30/06/2021, due to COVID-19 pandemic, it is recommended that site visit should be postpone as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Project participant has signed the ERPA/19/ with buyer and as per the contract the credits shall be delivered on or before 31/03/2021, hence it is not possible to postpone the site visit for indefinite period and the contract might be terminated in case if the credits not delivered as per the timeline agreed in the contract. Since the duration of current monitoring period (01/08/2018 to 29/02/2020) is less than 2 years, hence remote audit could be conducted for the verification in line with the paragraph 4.3.1 of interim measures/07/. Therefore, to avoid the risk of exposure to the infection the assessment team opted for conducting the remote audit during the current monitoring period using standard auditing techniques as part of the alternative measures in line with the section 4.2.2 of the interim measures published on 18/12/2020.

Duration of on-site inspection:				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	-	-	-	-

### D.3. Interviews with project participants

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject
	Last name	First name	Affiliation		
1.	Kodali	Praveen	Assistant Manager (renewable) JWEPL	15/06/2020	Operation and maintenance Procedures, Calibration, JMR Local employment, trainings, Monitoring of SDG parameters
2.	Yadav	Vikash	Consultant (Infinite Solutioun)	15/06/2020	Project implementation, ER calculation, monitoring plan, Monitoring of SDG parameters

### D.4. Sampling approach

>> No sampling approach has been applied by the verification team as all the monthly reported figures in the MR/05/ and the ER sheet/06/ were checked from the actual records.

### D.5. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests raised

Areas of verification findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form	-	CAR #1	-
Compliance of the project implementation with the GS registered PDD/Passport	-	-	-
Post-registration changes	-	-	-
Compliance of the implementation of grievances	-	CAR #2	-

mechanism in line with the registered GS PDD/Passport			
Compliance of SDG outcomes monitoring activities with the approved GS PDD/Transition annex	-	CAR #1	-
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	-	-	-
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals		-	-
Compliance with the GS4GG principle and requirements	CL #1		FAR #1
Others (please specify)	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	01	02	1

## SECTION E. Verification findings

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	The monitoring report form used is GS4GG MR template form version 1.1, which was the appropriate form and the latest version available at the time of verification. All the sections of the form were filled as per the guidelines and gave all the relevant details.
<b>Findings</b>	CAR #1 was raised and resolved.
<b>Conclusion</b>	The monitoring report is found to be complying with the monitoring report form.

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

>> This is second verification of the project activity under GS and no FAR(s) from validation /02 / that need to be closed during this verification.

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>This project activity is the generation of electricity from solar PV supplying the generated electricity to the Indian grid. The project is located in Jodhpur district of Rajasthan state in India and has an installed capacity of 20 MW AC (23.9976 MWp DC). The project activity was commissioned in two phases, commercial operation of the first phase of project activity had been started on 30/03/2017 and for second phase on 18/04/2017, which was verified vide commissioning certificate/10/.</p> <p>The technical specifications of equipments (Solar PV module, Inverter, Transformers were verified through the actual photographs/22/,and were found to be consistent with the details provided in the registered PDD /02/.</p> <p>The project is located between latitude 26.98°N and longitude 72.25° E. Location of the project was verified through the website (<a href="https://www.gps-coordinates.net/">https://www.gps-coordinates.net/</a>) and found consistent with the same mentioned in the registered PDD and MR.</p> <p>The assessment team has reviewed the registered PDD/02/, previous GS verification report/23/ and confirmed that the project activity having dedicated metering arrangement at project site. There is one set of energy meters (Main and check meter) installed for phase-1 and phase-2 at site and the electricity exported and imported by the project activity is continuously monitored through these meters.</p> <p>The project activity is further connected at 132 kV DISCOM substation where the generated electricity fed to the Indian grid. There is one set of meters (Main and Check) is installed at substation end also and known as billing meters.</p> <p>The project implementation, with reference to the approved transition annex, was checked through document review and remote audit, to confirm the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The monitoring system including the measurement of parameters, data collection and archiving was also implemented and operated inline to the transition annex /01/.</li> <li>• The emission reduction was achieved in compliance with applied methodology, transition annex.</li> </ul>
------------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project contributes to the sustainable development which includes, but not limited to, enhancement of local economy, creating employment and many other benefits to the rural population.</li> </ul>
<b>Findings</b>	No issues identified and hence finding was not raised for this section
<b>Conclusion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In view of the information's verified during the remote audit and review of supporting documents, the verification team is able to confirm that all physical features (technology, project equipment, and monitoring and metering equipment) of the registered GS project activity are in place and that the project participants have operated the project activity as per the registered PDD and transition annex.</li> <li>No information with regard to data and variables was identified that may surpass the estimated quantity of ERs in the registered PDD.</li> <li>The emission reductions achieved during the current monitoring period are (61,273 tCO<sub>2</sub>e), that is within the estimated quantity (55,238 tCO<sub>2</sub>e) in the registered PDD for the comparable period.</li> </ul>

#### **E.4. Post-registration changes**

##### **E.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents<sup>1</sup>**

>> There are no temporary deviations from registered monitoring plan or applied methodology. It was verified and confirmed from the registered PDD/02/; the applied methodology/08/ and the on-site verification.

##### **E.4.2. Corrections**

There is a correction in the value of the parameter  $EF_{grid,BM,y}$  as reported under section B.6.2 of the registered CDM PDD is identified and the validation report on post registration changes is submitted to UNFCCC /24/.

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

>> There is no change to the start date of the crediting period. It was verified and confirmed from the UNFCCC project webpage/12/.

##### **E.4.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan**

>> Not applicable

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

>> There are no permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan/1.1/ or applied methodology/08/ during the current monitoring period.

##### **E.4.6. Changes to the project design**

>> Changes to the project design are identified during the current monitoring period. The CDM registered PDD mentions that 72,960 solar PV modules are installed, however the actual number of solar PV modules installed at site are 77,760, resulting the increase in the DC capacity of project activity. In the revised PDD the PP has updated the number of solar PV modules and corresponding DC capacity of the project. Detailed assessment on project design change is provided in the validation report on post registration changes submitted to UNFCCC for approval /24/.

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

>> Not applicable

<sup>1</sup> Other standards, methodologies, methodological tools and guidelines (to be) applied in accordance with the applied(selected) methodologies are collectively referred to as the other (applied) methodological regulatory documents).

### E.5. Compliance of monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool and standardized baseline

<b>Means of verification</b>	Compliance of the monitoring activities related to parameters used in the emission reduction calculations were already verified during CDM verification/18/. The monitoring plan outlined in the registered PDD is in accordance with the applied methodology and correctly applied by the registered CDM project activity. The verification team has verified the sustainability monitoring plan and found to be in compliance with the approved transition annex.
<b>Findings</b>	No issues identified in section hence finding was not raised.
<b>Conclusion</b>	The monitoring plan outlined in the approved transition annex is in accordance with the applied methodology /08/ and correctly applied by the project activity.

### E.6. Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan

#### E.6.1. Data and parameters fixed ex ante or at renewal of crediting period

Relevant SDG Indicator 13: Climate Action

#### Operating Margin emission factor in year y ( $EF_{grid,OM,y}$ tCO<sub>2</sub>e/MWh)

<b>Means of verification</b>	The value of this parameter is considered as 0.9941. This was checked with the registered PDD /02/ and CO2 Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector”, version 11 published by the Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of Power, Government of India.
<b>Findings</b>	No finding was raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	The value in the monitoring report /05/ and corresponding emission reduction calculations spreadsheet /06/ are consistent with the registered PDD (page 24). The applied value is correct and justified.

#### E.6.1.2 Build Margin emission factor in year y ( $EF_{grid,BM,y}$ tCO<sub>2</sub>e/MWh)

<b>Means of verification</b>	The value of this parameter is considered as 0.9285. This was checked with the registered PDD /02/ and CO2 Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector”, version 11 published by the Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of Power, Government of India.
<b>Findings</b>	No finding was raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	The value in the monitoring report /05/ and corresponding emission reduction calculations spreadsheet /06/ are consistent with the registered PDD (page 24). The applied value is correct and justified.

#### E.6.1.3 Combined Margin CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor in year y ( $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ tCO<sub>2</sub>e/MWh)

<b>Means of verification</b>	The value of this parameter is considered as 0.9777. This was checked with the registered PDD /02/ and CO2 Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector”, version 11 published by the Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of Power, Government of India.
<b>Findings</b>	No finding was raised.
<b>Conclusion</b>	The value in the monitoring report /05/ and corresponding emission reduction calculations spreadsheet /06/ are consistent with the registered PDD (page 25). The applied value is correct and justified.

### E.6.2. Data and parameters monitored (Carbon Verification)

The verification of monitoring parameters is in accordance with the monitoring plan described in the registered PDD; the emission reductions (ER) achieved during the period from 01/08/2018 to 29/02/2020 are currently under issuance at UNFCCC /18/.

### E.6.3. Data and parameters monitored (SDG outcomes monitoring)

#### E.6.3.1: Parameter: Access to affordable and clean energy services

**Description: Quantity of net electricity supplied by the project plant to the grid,  $EG_{\text{facility},y}$  (MWh)**

**Relevant SDG Indicator 7.2.: By 2030, increase substantially the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix**

Means of verification	Criteria/Requirements	
	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	The parameter is calculated as difference of $EG_{\text{Export}}$ and $EG_{\text{Import}}$ and recorded monthly basis in line with the approved monitoring plan. $EG_{\text{facility},y} = EG_{\text{Export}} - EG_{\text{Import}}$ Where, $EG_{\text{Export}}$ = Electricity exported by the project activity to the grid $EG_{\text{Import}}$ = Electricity imported by the project activity to the grid
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes. In line with the approved monitoring plan, this parameter is recorded on monthly basis in the monthly meter reading (JMR) issued by state utility.	
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The monthly values of this parameter are directly sourced from JMRs prepared by state utility /21/. The PP has correctly reported the monthly values in the emission reduction spread sheet/06/.  The value of $EG_{\text{facility},y}$ for the current monitoring period is 62,670.75 MWh.	
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Monthly reported values of $EG_{\text{facility},y}$ for the current monitoring period were further cross-checked with the monthly invoices raised by the PP /20/ to state utility and found to be consistent.	
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, all the stakeholders, namely, the Grid Authority (RVPNL)), and the PP implemented the adequate QA/QC procedures.  The electricity exported and imported by project activity is recorded by main and check meters (billing meters) installed at DISCOM substation. All the energy meters have the capability of continuous measurement.  Joint meter reading is taken by the officials of RRVPNL in the presence of the PPs representative at the metering points. JMR records the readings of both the main and check meter. Both values have been checked and are found to be comparable.	
<b>Findings</b>	CAR #1 was raised and resolved	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The parameter has been monitored appropriately, in accordance with the registered monitoring plan (as per measurement methods and procedures to be applied) and applied methodology. The monitoring results were recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.	

**E.6.3.2: Air quality (tCO<sub>2</sub>)**

**Relevant SDG Indicator: Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning**

<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Criteria/Requirements</b>	
	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	Emission reductions achieved due to implementation of the wind power plant is monitored once during each monitoring period.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	The monitoring of parameter has been implemented in accordance with the registered monitoring plan.
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The value is calculated in line with the procedure as described under the transition annex and registered PDD.  Value of this parameter for the current monitoring period is 61,273 tCO <sub>2</sub> .
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Not applicable
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	No separate QA/QC procedures is required.
<b>Findings</b>	No issues identified and hence finding was not raised for this section	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The parameter has been monitored appropriately, in accordance with the registered monitoring plan (as per measurement methods and procedures to be applied) and applied methodology. The monitoring results were recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.	

**E.6.3.3: Quantitative employment and income generation**

**SDG 8.5: By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value**

<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Criteria/Requirements</b>	
	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	This is a sustainable development parameter to monitor the total number of employment opportunities created. Total number of jobs created for the local population is monitored on annual basis.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes. The monitoring frequency is in line with the registered PDD /02/.

	<p>How were the values in the monitoring report verified?</p>	<p>Total number of jobs created by the project is 34 which include skilled and unskilled employees. It is verified from the HR records that 6 employees are from outside and rest 28 belong to the local areas/09/.</p> <p>Out of 34, there are 28 personnel on contract basis and 6 employees are permanent. The assessment team has interviewed the guards and observed that almost all of the personnel were unemployed before taking up the job of security guards with the project developer. Therefore, the assessment team is in opinion that the project activity contributes to the livelihood of the poor.</p> <p>The total O&amp;M cost incurred in the current monitoring period is verified as INR 13,486,667.This is verified through the declaration submitted by the PP/09/ and found to be satisfactory.</p>
	<p>If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?</p>	<p>The reported data has been cross checked with the O&amp;M contract signed by the project developer with the technology supplier.</p>
	<p>Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?</p>	<p>The HR department monitors and maintains the up-to-date records of total number of jobs created and O&amp;M expenses, necessary QA/QC processes in place.</p>
<p><b>Findings</b></p>	<p>CAR #1 was raised and resolved.</p>	
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p>	<p>The parameter has been monitored appropriately, in accordance with the sustainability monitoring plan (as per measurement methods and procedures to be applied). The monitoring results were recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.</p>	

**E.6.3.4: Quality of employment**

**SDG 8.5: By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value**

<p><b>Means of verification</b></p>	<p><b>Criteria/Requirements</b></p>	
	<p>Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency</p>	<p>Quality of employment generated by the project activity is monitored. Project participant conducts various activities on regular basis for improving the skills and thereby quality of employment of its employees. Various indicators of quality of employment viz. quality job creation, working conditions, health care facilities, skill build-up through workshops and trainings, putting safeguard in place and living standard of the plant staff are monitored as and when such activities are organised/09,11,14,15/.</p>
	<p>Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)</p>	<p>The measuring and recording frequency are in line with the monitoring plan of registered passport.</p> <p>The project passport requires the quality of employment to be monitored on annual basis. The assessment team confirms that the monitoring of quality of employment with reference to various parameters viz. training, occupational health, safety of employees and working environment is being done on annual basis /09,11,14,15/.</p>

	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The following training programs/11/ to enhance the safety awareness, operational skills and occupational health management have been organized during the current monitoring period. <table border="1" data-bbox="651 362 1430 797"> <thead> <tr> <th>Training Objective</th> <th>Date</th> <th>Number of participants</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Operation and maintenance Training of Inverter</td> <td>12/06/2019</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Operation &amp; Maintenance Training of HT Panels</td> <td>06/08/2019</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Operation &amp; Maintenance Training of Transformer</td> <td>10/11/2019</td> <td>09</td> </tr> <tr> <td>How to use the equipment's of safety purpose like Fire Extinguisher, Fire Bucket, Safety Belt etc.</td> <td>07/01/2020</td> <td>19</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Training Objective	Date	Number of participants	Operation and maintenance Training of Inverter	12/06/2019	12	Operation & Maintenance Training of HT Panels	06/08/2019	11	Operation & Maintenance Training of Transformer	10/11/2019	09	How to use the equipment's of safety purpose like Fire Extinguisher, Fire Bucket, Safety Belt etc.	07/01/2020	19
	Training Objective	Date	Number of participants														
	Operation and maintenance Training of Inverter	12/06/2019	12														
Operation & Maintenance Training of HT Panels	06/08/2019	11															
Operation & Maintenance Training of Transformer	10/11/2019	09															
How to use the equipment's of safety purpose like Fire Extinguisher, Fire Bucket, Safety Belt etc.	07/01/2020	19															
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data has been cross checked with the quantitative information about the quality of employment which includes the records of HR, training, health care facilities etc. are maintained /9,11/.																
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Counting of the number of trainings and respective attendees is done by a training attendance sheet which states the programme name, venue, faculty, date and timing, attendee details (employee code, name, designation and department). Each training attendance sheet has a unique form number. Numbers of jobs created has been categorized and records are maintained accordingly. Records of any activity related to the quality of employment is maintained by HR.																
<b>Findings</b>	CAR #1 was raised and resolved																
<b>Conclusion</b>	The parameter has been monitored appropriately, in accordance with the sustainability monitoring plan (as per measurement methods and procedures to be applied). The monitoring results were recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.																

### E.6.3.5: Human and institutional capacity

**Relevant SDG Indicator (SDG 3.8): Achieve universal health coverage, including financial risk protection, access to quality essential health-care services and access to safe, effective, quality and affordable essential medicines and vaccines for all**

<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Criteria/Requirements</b>	
	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	It's a sustainable development parameter which monitors the number of number of initiatives, events and programmes, primarily Health and Education Camps and villagers directly or indirectly benefited by the CSR activity initiatives, referring to the project, undertaken by the project proponent. This parameter is monitored on annual basis.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	The number of local villagers, directly and indirectly benefited by the project activity, is monitored annually which is found in line to the frequency set in transition annex /01/.

	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	During the current monitoring period, the following initiatives/15/ taken by the project developer:									
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of program</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Donation the projector to Govenerment School</td> <td>Village: Sanwreej District: Jodhpur</td> <td>15/08/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Health &amp; Hygiene awareness program to promote healthy life education</td> <td>Village: Sanwreej District: Jodhpur</td> <td>15/08/2019</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of program	Location	Date	Donation the projector to Govenerment School	Village: Sanwreej District: Jodhpur	15/08/2018	Health & Hygiene awareness program to promote healthy life education	Village: Sanwreej District: Jodhpur	15/08/2019
	Name of program	Location	Date								
Donation the projector to Govenerment School	Village: Sanwreej District: Jodhpur	15/08/2018									
Health & Hygiene awareness program to promote healthy life education	Village: Sanwreej District: Jodhpur	15/08/2019									
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The parameter was verified through the actual photographs and Newspaper copy /15/ and interviewing the site personnel during remote audit.										
Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, during the remote site-visit it is assured that the project proponent has appropriately maintained the records for the CSR activities, hence it can be confirmed that the QA/QC process is in place.										
<b>Findings</b>	No issues identified and hence finding was not raised for this section										
<b>Conclusion</b>	The parameter has been monitored appropriately, in accordance with the sustainability monitoring plan (as per measurement methods and procedures to be applied). The monitoring results were recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.										

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	The requirements have already been verified during CDM verification and issuance of CERs for the current monitoring period is awaited/19/.
<b>Findings</b>	Not applicable
<b>Conclusion</b>	No further verification is required in this regard.

### E.8. Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals

#### E.8.1. Calculation of baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks

<b>Means of verification</b>	The assessment team has verified the verification reports for the monitoring period from 01/08/2018 to 29/02/2020, the amount of CERs verified as 61,273 tCO <sub>2</sub> and request for issuance is submitted to UNFCCC/18/.
<b>Findings</b>	No issues identified and hence finding was not raised for this section
<b>Conclusion</b>	The verification team confirms that <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The complete data was available and is duly reported;</li> <li>Appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals were followed;</li> <li>Appropriate emission factors and other reference values were correctly applied.</li> </ol>

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	The requirements have already been verified during CDM verification and issuance of CERs for the current monitoring period is awaited/18/.
<b>Findings</b>	Not applicable
<b>Conclusion</b>	No further verification is required in this regard.

### E.8.3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions

<b>Means of verification</b>	The requirements have already been verified during CDM verification and issuance of CERs for the current monitoring period is awaited/18/.
<b>Findings</b>	Not applicable
<b>Conclusion</b>	No further verification is required in this regard.

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	The requirements have already been verified during CDM verification and issuance of CERs for the current monitoring period is awaited EB/18/.
<b>Findings</b>	Not applicable
<b>Conclusion</b>	No further verification is required

### E.8.5. Comparison of actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks with estimates in registered PDD

<b>Means of verification</b>	As verified and evident from the final Monitoring Report /05/ and corresponding ER sheet /06/, the actual emission reductions achieved by the project activity in the current monitoring period were found more than (10.93% higher) the estimated quantity in the registered PDD/02/ for the comparable period.	
	Estimated ERs for comparable period as per registered PDD (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)	Actual ERs achieved in the current monitoring period (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
	55,238	61,273
<b>Findings</b>	No issues identified and hence finding was not raised for this section	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The actual emission reductions achieved by the project activity are higher than the estimated quantity of ERs in the registered PDD/02/. The explanation for increase in the achieved ERs is provided in section E.8.6 below.	

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	The actual emission reductions were 10.93% more than the estimation in the registered PDD/18/ for an equivalent length of the monitoring period, this due to higher PLF achieved during the monitoring period. It is to be noted that PLF is completely governed by the availability of solar radiation, which is natural phenomenon and same is beyond the control of PP, hence the assessment team has concluded the increase in emission reduction of the project activity is justified and acceptable
<b>Findings</b>	No finding was raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	The assessment team checked the revised PDD and verified that in the sensitivity analysis, increase in PLF is well within the threshold limit sensitivity analysis margin of 12.77% assumed in the financial calculation and does not have any impact on additionality; hence, the assessment team has concluded the increase in emission reduction of the project activity is justified and acceptable.

### E.8.7. Actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks during the first commitment period and the period from 1 January 2013 onwards

<b>Means of verification</b>	Based on the assessment done, the verification team is able to certify that the emission reductions from the GS project activity 5575 “20 MW Solar Project in Sanwreej, Jodhpur, Rajasthan” in India during the period 01/08/2018 to 29/02/2020 (including both days) is 61,273 tCO <sub>2</sub> e.	
		First commitment period (up to 31 Dec 2012) (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
	Emission Reductions	NA
		01 Jan 2013 onwards (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
		61,273
<b>Findings</b>	No finding was raised	
<b>Conclusion</b>	Actual GHG emission reductions achieved during period starting from 1 <sup>st</sup> January 2013 onwards was verified as 61,273 tCO <sub>2</sub> e.	

## SECTION F. Internal quality control

A draft verification report prepared by assessment team is reviewed by an independent Technical Review team (one or more members) to confirm if the internal procedures established and implemented by Earthood were duly complied with and such opinion/conclusion is reached in an objective manner that complies with the applicable Gold Standard and CDM requirements. The technical review team is collectively required to possess the technical expertise of all the technical area/sectoral scope the project activity relates to. All team members of technical review team are independent of the validation team. The report approved by Quality Manager is endorsed by Managing Director, who is overall responsible to ensure quality, before final release. The further details of applicable procedures and responsibilities about Earthood Quality Management System (QMS) are available on its website ([www.earthood.in](http://www.earthood.in)).

## SECTION G. Verification opinion

Earthood Services Private Limited (ESPL), contracted by Janardan Wind Energy Pvt. Ltd., has performed the independent verification of the emission reductions for the GS Project 5575 “20 MW Solar Project in Sanwreej, Jodhpur, Rajasthan” in “India” for the monitoring period 01/08/2018 to 29/02/2020 as reported in the Monitoring Report, Version 04 dated 27/02/2021. The Janardan Wind Energy Pvt. Ltd. is responsible for the collection of data in accordance with the monitoring plan and the reporting of GHG emissions reductions from the project activity. Earthood commenced the verification against the baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002, version 17.0 the monitoring plan contained in the PDD Version 03 dated 11/07/2017, GS Passport Version 03 dated 28/02/2018 and Monitoring Report Version 04 dated 27/02/2021.

ESPL confirms that the monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements. This verification report has been prepared using the latest available template specified by UNFCCC and complies with the instructions to follow as per para 22 and 23 of CDM VVS for PAs Version 02.0. The verification activities were conducted in accordance with ESPL’s CDM Quality Manual System as per the steps indicated under Section A of this report.

As a result, it is confirmed that the emission reductions from the GS PA (5575) “20 MW Solar Project in Sanwreej, Jodhpur, Rajasthan” are correctly reported in the Monitoring Report (final) Version 04 dated 27/02/2021 and corresponding ER sheet for the monitoring period 01/08/2018 to 29/02/2020 (including both days) amounted as 61,273 tCO<sub>2</sub>e. Therefore, this will be submitted as part of request for issuance as per CDM PCP for PAs Version 02.0 and GS4GG principles and requirements v 1.2.

## SECTION H. Certification statement

ESPL’s verification approach is based on the understanding of the risks associated with reporting of GHG emission data and the controls in place to mitigate these. ESPL planned and performed the verification by obtaining evidence and other information and explanations that ESPL considered necessary to give reasonable assurance that reported GHG emission reductions are fairly stated.

In our opinion the GHG emissions reductions reported for the project activity are fairly stated in the Monitoring Report (final) Version 04 dated 27/02/2021. ESPL, based on outcome of verification activities, certifies in writing that, during the monitoring period 01/08/2018 to 29/02/2020 (including both days), the registered GS PA “20 MW Solar Project in Sanwreej, Jodhpur, Rajasthan” in the registered GS PA achieved the verified amount of 61,273 tCO<sub>2</sub>e reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that would not have occurred in the absence of the PA.

ESPL would like to confirm that amount of CERs for the period from 01/08/2018 to 29/02/2020 are verified as 61,273 tCO<sub>2</sub>e and request for issuance for this period has been submitted to UNFCCC which is currently under process. Hence this report will be finalized by ESPL once the request for issuance for the concerned monitoring period got approved by CDM EB. In case if any issues raised by UNFCCC during the registration process that may impact on amount of CERs verified, shall be addressed by the assessment team in this report on its final issuance.

The verified amount of emission reductions is stated below as per each vintage covered under the current monitoring period.

Year	Emission Reductions (Amount) in this monitoring period	
	Duration	Emission reduction

---

2018	01/08/2018 to 31/12/2018	16,559 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
2018	01/01/2019 to 31/12/2019	40,191 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
2019	01/01/2020 to 29/02/2020	4,523 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
<b>Total</b>	<b>Nil</b>	<b>61,273 tCO<sub>2</sub>e</b>

**Approved by**

**Dr. Kaviraj Singh**



**Managing Director  
Earthood Services Privated Limited**

**Date: 07/04/2021  
Place: Gurgaon,Haryana**

## Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
ABT	Availability Based Tariff
DISCOM	Distribution Company
EPC	Engineering and Procurement Contractor
EPC	Engineering and Procurement Contractor
ESIA	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
GOI	Government of India
GS	Gold Standard
GS4GG	Gold Standard for Global Goals
JMR	Joint Meter Reading
JMR	Joint Meter Reading
JWEPL	Janardan Wind Energy Pvt. Ltd.
L&T	Larsen & Toubro
LCS	Local Controller System
NTPC	National Thermal Power Corporation Limited
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
RMP	Revision in Monitoring Plan

## Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

Competence Statement			
<b>Name</b>	Ravi Kant Soni		
<b>Country</b>	India		
<b>Education</b>	B. Tech. (Mechanical Engineering) M. Tech. (Energy Management)		
<b>Experience</b>	8 Years +		
<b>Field</b>	Energy and Climate Change		
Approved Roles			
<b>Team Leader</b>	YES		
<b>Validator</b>	YES		
<b>Verifier</b>	YES		
<b>Methodology Expert</b>	AMS-I.D., AMS-I.C., ACM0002		
<b>Local expert</b>	YES (India)		
<b>Financial Expert</b>	No		
<b>Technical Reviewer</b>	No		
<b>TA Expert</b>	YES (TA 1.2)		
<b>Reviewed by</b>	Shreya Garg	<b>Date</b>	04/06/2019
<b>Approved by</b>	Anshika Gupta	<b>Date</b>	04/06/2019

Competence Statement
----------------------

<b>Name</b>	Anshika Gupta		
<b>Country</b>	India		
<b>Education</b>	M.Sc. (Climate Science & Policy), TERI University		
<b>Experience</b>	4 Years +		
<b>Field</b>	Climate Change		
<b>Approved Roles</b>			
<b>Team Leader</b>	YES		
<b>Validator</b>	YES		
<b>Verifier</b>	YES		
<b>Methodology Expert</b>	AMS-I.A., AMS-II.G., ACM0002, AMS-III.A.V.		
<b>Local expert</b>	YES (India)		
<b>Financial Expert</b>	NO		
<b>Technical Reviewer</b>	YES		
<b>TA Expert</b>	Yes (TA 1.2, TA 3.1)		
<b>Reviewed by</b>	Shreya Garg	<b>Date</b>	12/03/2019
<b>Approved by</b>	Kaviraj Singh	<b>Date</b>	12/03/2019

<b>Competence Statement</b>			
<b>Name</b>	Shreya Garg		
<b>Country</b>	India		
<b>Education</b>	M.Sc. (Climate Science & Policy), TERI University		
<b>Experience</b>	6 Years +		
<b>Field</b>	Climate Change		
<b>Approved Roles</b>			
<b>Team Leader</b>	YES		
<b>Validator</b>	YES		
<b>Verifier</b>	YES		
<b>Methodology Expert</b>	AMS.I.A., AMS.I.C., AMS.I.D., AMS.I.F., AMS.II.D., AMS.II.G., AMS.II.J., AMS.III.AV., ACM0002, ACM0012		
<b>Local expert</b>	YES (India)		
<b>Financial Expert</b>	NO		
<b>Technical Reviewer</b>	YES		
<b>TA Expert</b>	YES (TA 1.2, TA 3.1)		
<b>Reviewed by</b>	Abhishek Mahawar	<b>Date</b>	01/03/2018
<b>Approved by</b>	Ashok Gautam	<b>Date</b>	01/03/2018

### Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1	PP	GS Passport	Version 03, dated 28/02/2018	Other
		Approved transition annex	-	
2	PP	CDM registered PDD	Ver.03, dated 11/07/2017	Other
3	PP	ER spread sheet (initial)	Version 1.0 dated 09/03/2020	PP
4	PP	Monitoring Report	Version 1.0 dated 09/03/2020	PP
			Version 02 dated 10/07/2020	
			Version 03 dated 30/01/2021	
5	PP	Monitoring Report (final)	Version 04 dated 27/02/2021	PP
6	PP	ER spread sheet (final)	Version 04 dated 27/02/2021	PP
7	GS Registry	GOLD STANDARD FOR THE GLOBAL GOALS - Principles & Requirements,	Version 1.2, dated Oct 2019	Other
		Renewable Energy Activity Requirements	Version 1.2, dated Oct 2019	
		COVID-19: INTERIM MEASURES	V 03, dated 18/12/2020	
8	UNFCCC	Methodology ACM0002	Version 17.0	Other
9	PP	HR records for various parameters viz. total number of employees, type of employment, daily attendance sheets of employees	-	PP
		Declaration for the O&M expenses incurred in the monitoring period		
10	State utility	Commissioning certificate of the project activity	-	Other
11	PP	Training records (Attendance and photographs)	-	PP
12	UNFCCC	UNFCCC project web page <a href="https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/Plus1501572247.73/view">https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/Plus1501572247.73/view</a>	-	Other
13	GS	GS project webpage <a href="https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects/details/1376">https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects/details/1376</a>	-	Other
14	PP	Records of Safety system and procedures implemented on site	-	PP
15	PP	Photographs of Health & Hygiene awareness program to promote healthy life education & Sweet distribution program in Govt School	-	PP
		Photograph and Newspaper copy for Donation the projector to Government School		
16	PP	Policy, procedure and records for occupational safety	-	PP
17	PP	Copy of grievance register	-	PP

18	ESPL	Issuance request (UNFCCC ref. No-10392) For the period: 01/08/2018 to 29/02/2020 (Ref: <a href="https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/Applus1501572247.73/iProcess/ESPL1586775664.11/view">https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/Applus1501572247.73/iProcess/ESPL1586775664.11/view</a> )	-	Other
19	Confidential	ERPA signed with buyer	-	-
20	JWEPL	Monthly Invoices raised by the PP to state NTPC	-	PP
21	RVPNL	Monthly meter reading reports (JMRs) issued by state utility	-	PP
22	PP	Actual photographs of project site including solar panels, monitoring system, invertors	-	PP
23	RINA	GS verification report (MP01-30/03/2017 to 31/07/2018)	Version 03, dated 25/12/2018	Other
24	ESPL	Validation report on PRC	Version 03, dated 14/11/2020	Other

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

Table 1. Remaining FAR from validation and/or previous verification

<b>FAR ID</b>	-	<b>Section no.</b>	-	<b>Date :</b> -
<b>Description of FAR</b>				
-				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date :</b> -
-				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
-				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date:</b> -
-				

Table 2. CL from this verification

<b>CL ID</b>	01	<b>Section no.</b>	D	<b>Date :</b> 25/06/2020
<b>Description of CL</b>				
Start date of crediting period as mentioned in section A.4 of the MR is not consistent with the same indicated at page 1 of the MR.				
Start date of current monitoring period is 01/08/2018, however crediting period starts from 01/04/2017 (MR p.1). Please clarify why dates of previous monitoring period is not mentioned at page 1 of the MR.				
Please submit the approved transition form with reference to transition of the project activity from GS version 2.2 to GS4GG.				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date :</b> 19/08/2020
<i>PP hereby clarifies that the start date of the Crediting Period is 30/03/2017. Also, revised the MR to report the start date of Crediting Period consistently throughout the document i.e.30/03/2017.</i>				
<i>PP has revised MR page 1 to provide the dates of previous monitoring period which is from 30/03/2017 to 31/07/2018.</i>				
<i>Please find the link below to verify the same: <a href="https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects?q=janardan&amp;page=1">https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects?q=janardan&amp;page=1</a></i>				
<i>PP is hereby submitting the approved transition form with reference to transition of the project activity from GS version 2.2 to GS4GG.</i>				

<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>	
GS MR Version 2 Approved GS Transition Form Previous verification document link: <a href="https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects?q=janardan&amp;page=1">https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects?q=janardan&amp;page=1</a>	
<b>DOE assessment</b>	<b>Date:</b> 31/12/2020
Start date of crediting period is corrected in section A.4 of the MR and made consistent with the same indicated at page 1 of the MR.  The PP has corrected that start date of crediting period starts as 30/03/2017 (MR p.1). Also, the dates of previous monitoring period are correctly mentioned at page 1 of the MR.  The PP has submitted the approved transition form with reference to transition of the project activity from GS version 2.2 to GS4GG.  CL #1 is closed.	

**Table 3. CAR from this verification**

CAR ID	01	Section no.	E.6.3	Date	: 25/06/2020
<b>Description of CAR</b>					
<b>SDG 13: Climate Action:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Value of emission reductions achieved in the current monitoring period as reported in the table is inconsistent with the ER sheet.</li> <li>Please submit DPR, log book and O&amp;M policy document.</li> <li>Value of the parameter reported under section E.5 of the MR is not consistent with the ER calculation sheet.</li> </ul>					
<b>SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please submit the training records and employee feedback forms. Also clarify why the details of employees undergone training and specific objective of training is not reported in the MR.</li> <li>Please submit the employment records for the current monitoring period.</li> <li>Please clarify why no initiatives undertaken by the Project Developer to enhance the human and institutional capacity of the local stakeholders in the current monitoring period.</li> </ul>					
<b>Project participant response</b>					<b>Date</b> : 19/08/2020
SDG13: 1. PP has revised GS MR to correct the value of emission reductions achieved in the current monitoring period throughout the document to maintain the consistency. 2. PP is hereby submitting the DPR, logbook & O&M Policy document 3. PP has revised the MR section E.5 to correctly report the value of the parameter consistent with ER sheet.  SDG 8: 1. PP is hereby submitting the training records and employees feedback forms. Also, PP has revised MR to provide the details of employees undergone training and specific objective of training in the MR. 2. PP is hereby submitting the employment records for the current monitoring period. 3. PP has updated the MR to report the initiatives undertaken by the Project Developer to enhance the human and institutional capacity of the local stakeholders in the current monitoring period. PP is also submitting the photos & documents confirming the same.					
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>					
GS MR Ver 02 The training records and employee feedback forms DPR, log book and O&M policy document Employment Record					
<b>DOE assessment</b>					<b>Date:</b> 31/12/2020

<b>SDG 13: Climate Action:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Value of emission reductions achieved in the current monitoring period as reported in the table is inconsistent with the CDM MR &amp; verification report. Open</li> <li>The PP has submitted the DPR, log book and O&amp;M policy document, found to be satisfactory, hence accepted.</li> <li>Value of the parameter <math>EG_{facility,y}</math> reported in the MR is not consistent with the CDM MR &amp; verification report. Open</li> </ul>	
<b>SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PP has submitted the training records and employee feedback forms. Also, the details of employees undergone training and specific objective of training is reported in the MR, found to be satisfactory. Closed</li> <li>The PP has submitted employment records for the current monitoring period, found to be satisfactory. Closed</li> <li>The Project Developer has described the initiatives taken to enhance the human and institutional capacity of the local stakeholders in the monitoring report and submitted the relevant evidences. Closed</li> </ul>	
Please clarify why all the changes identified in the registered CDM PDD are not reported in the MR.	
<b>Project participant response</b>	<b>Date : 30/01/2021</b>
<b>SDG 13: Climate Action:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Value of emission reductions achieved in the current monitoring period is now made consistent with the CDM MR &amp; verification report.</li> <li>Value of the parameter <math>EG_{facility,y}</math> reported in the MR is now made consistent with the CDM MR &amp; verification report.</li> </ul>	
All the changes identified in the registered CDM PDD are now reported in the MR.	
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>	
GS MR Ver 03 ER Sheet Ver 03	
<b>DOE assessment</b>	<b>Date: 10/02/2021</b>
<b>SDG 13: Climate Action:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PP has updated the value of emission reductions achieved in the current monitoring period in the table (section E.3), consistent with the CDM MR &amp; verification report. Closed</li> <li>Value of the parameter <math>EG_{facility,y}</math> reported in the MR is corrected and found consistent with the CDM MR &amp; verification report. Closed</li> </ul>	
The PP has reported all the changes identified in the registered CDM PDD in the MR, found to be satisfactory. Closed	
Please clarify why the latest version of the GS MR template is not used. Open	
Please clarify how the actual O&M expenses incurred in the current monitoring period are determined and provide the relevant evidences. Open	
<b>Project participant response</b>	<b>Date :27/02/2021</b>
The latest version of the GS-MR template (Version v.1.1) has been now used and the monitoring report has been revised.	
As per the O & M Agreement, the PP shall pay the fixed quarterly (3 months) O& M service fee in the amount of INR 21,00,000 till 4 years from the commissioning date of the project activity.	
The Declaration for the actual cost incurred as O & M cost is being submitted along with this submission.	
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>	
GS MR Ver 04 O & M Cost Declaration O & M Agreement	
<b>DOE assessment</b>	<b>Date: 05/03/2021</b>
The PP has submitted the revised MR referring the latest version of template, found to be satisfactory.	
The O&M expenses incurred in the current monitoring period, are in accordance with the payment terms as defined in the O&M contract and the amount is also verified through the declaration provided by the project developer, found to be satisfactory.	
CAR #1 is closed.	

<b>CAR ID</b>	02	<b>Section no.</b>	E.6	<b>Date</b>	25/06/2020	
<b>Description of CAR</b>						
Grievance Mechanism: Please clarify why the name of concern person who had raised comments/suggestions is not mentioned in this section. Also submit the evidences regarding the objections/suggestions recorded as a part of grievance mechanism.						
<b>Project participant response</b>					<b>Date</b>	19/08/2020
PP would like to clarify that there were no Grievance raised during the current monitoring period. However, PP is submitting copy of grievance register to confirm the same.						
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>						
Grievance Register						
<b>DOE assessment</b>					<b>Date:</b>	31/12/2020
There were no grievance/complaints raised during the current monitoring period and the same is confirmed through the grievance register submitted by the PP, hence accepted. CAR #2 is closed.						

**Table 4. FAR from this verification**

<b>FAR ID</b>	01	<b>Section No.</b>	E.4	<b>Date</b>	10/02/2021	
<b>Description of FAR</b>						
During the verification process physical site visit is not conducted, since the current monitoring period involves project design change. Hence in accordance with the guidance provided under paragraph 36 of VVS for PAs version 02.0, the verifying DOE shall check/review the project implementation (including project design change) in accordance with the approved PDD, during next verification of the project activity.						
<b>Project participant response</b>					<b>Date</b>	DD/MM/YYYY
NA						
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>						
NA						
<b>DOE assessment</b>					<b>Date:</b>	DD/MM/YYYY
NA						