



VCS VERIFICATION REPORT

33.9 MW BUNDLED WIND POWER PROJECT IN THE STATES OF KARNATAKA AND TAMILNADU, INDIA

MONITORING PERIOD:
30 MARCH 2008 TO 20 DECEMBER 2010

REPORT N°2011-0667
REVISION No. 1.0

Project Title	33.9 MW Bundled wind Power project in the states of Karnataka and Tamilnadu, India
Version	1.0

Report Title	Verification Report for 33.9 MW Bundled wind Power project in the states of Karnataka and Tamilnadu, India
Client	Simran Wind project Pvt Ltd.
Pages	20
Date of Issue	28 December 2011
Prepared By	DNV Climate Change Services AS
Contact	Veritasveien 1, 1322 HØVIK, Norway Tel: +47 67 57 99 00 Email:climatechange@dnv.com http://www.dnv.com
Approved By	Edwin Aalders
Work Carried Out By	Murali Govindarajulu

Summary:

DNV Climate Change Services AS (DNV) has performed the verification of the emission reductions reported for the “33.9 MW Bundled wind Power project in the states of Karnataka and Tamilnadu, India” (VCS Project ID:676) for the period 30 March 2008 to 20 December 2010 to review and determine the monitored reductions in GHG emissions that have occurred as a result of the project activity.

The verification was performed on the basis of VCSA Programme Guidelines & Standard version 3.0 for the VCS projects, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. The verification was conducted by means of document review, follow-up interviews and site inspection, and the resolution of outstanding issues.

In our opinion, the GHG emission reductions reported for the project in the monitoring report (version 02) of 29 November 2011) are fairly stated. The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly on the basis of approved methodology ACM0002 (version 10) and the monitoring plan contained in the VCS PD of 29 March 2010.

Hence, DNV Climate Change Services AS (DNV) is able to certify that the emission reductions from the “33.9 MW Bundled wind Power project in the states of Karnataka and Tamilnadu, India” during the period 30 March 2008 to 20 December 2010 amount to 149 574 tonnes CO₂ equivalent.

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	III
2 INTRODUCTION	1
2.1 OBJECTIVE	1
2.2 SCOPE AND CRITERIA	1
2.3 LEVEL OF ASSURANCE	2
2.4 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT	2
3 VALIDATION PROCESS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION	2
3.1 VALIDATION PROCESS	2
3.1.1 METHOD AND CRITERIA	2
3.2 METHOD AND CRITERIA	2
3.2.1 DOCUMENT REVIEW	3
3.2.2 INTERVIEWS	3
3.2.3 SITE INSPECTIONS	3
3.2.4 RESOLUTION OF ANY MATERIAL DISCREPANCY	3
3.3 VALIDATION FINDINGS	3
3.3.1 GAP VALIDATION	3
3.3.2 METHODOLOGY DEVIATIONS	6
3.3.3 NEW PROJECT ACTIVITY INSTANCES	6
3.4 VALIDATION CONCLUSION	6
4 VERIFICATION PROCESS	6
4.1 METHOD AND CRITERIA	6
4.2 DOCUMENT REVIEW	7
4.3 INTERVIEWS	8
4.4 SITE INSPECTIONS	8
4.5 RESOLUTION OF ANY MATERIAL DISCREPANCY	8
5 VERIFICATION FINDINGS	9
5.1 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS	9
5.2 ACCURACY OF GHG EMISSION REDUCTION OR REMOVAL CALCULATIONS	11
5.3 QUALITY OF EVIDENCE TO DETERMINE GHG EMISSION REDUCTIONS OR REMOVALS	12
5.4 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL SYSTEM	12
6 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION	13
7 REFERENCES	15
Appendix A Corrective Action Requests, clarification requests and Forward Action Requests	

1 INTRODUCTION

Simran Wind project Pvt. Ltd. has commissioned DNV Climate Change Services AS (DNV) to carry out the verification and certification of emission reductions reported for the “33.9 MW Bundled wind Power project in the states of Karnataka and Tamilnadu, India” (the project) in the period 30 March 2008 to 20 December 2010. This report contains the findings from the verification and a verification statement for the verified carbon units.

1.1 Objective

Verification is the periodic independent review and ex-post determination by an accredited verification body of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions that have occurred as a result of the registered VCS project activity during a defined verification period.

A verification statement is the written assurance by a verification body that, during a specific period in time, a project activity achieved the emission reductions as verified.

The objective of this verification was to verify and provide a verification statement of emission reductions reported for the “33.9 MW Bundled wind Power project in the states of Karnataka and Tamilnadu, India” for the period 30 March 2008 to 20 December 2010.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of the verification is:

- To verify that actual monitoring systems and procedures are in compliance with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan.
- To evaluate the GHG emission reduction data and express a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emissions reduction data is free from material misstatement.
- To verify that reported GHG emissions data is sufficiently supported by evidence.

The criteria of the verification are:

- VCS Program Guide version 3.0
- VCS Standard version 3.1 and other relevant requirements defined by VCSA /13/.
- The approved methodology ACM0002 (version 10) /12/.

The verification shall ensure that reported emission reductions are complete and accurate in order to be verified.

1.3 Level of assurance

The verification report expresses a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emissions reduction data is free from material misstatement. DNV applied a materiality threshold of 1% with respect to omission or misstatements concerning reported quantities as per VCS standard 5.3.1 4). The emission reductions for the current six monthly period amount to 149 574 tCO₂e /1/ /7/

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The purpose of the project is to harness the power generation potential wind energy in the region of Tamil Nadu and Karnataka and enable displacement of fossil fuel based electricity generating systems. The project activity consists of 28 wind electricity generators (WEG), 19 WEGs with a capacity of 1.5 MW each and 9 WEGs with a capacity of 0.6 MW each, thus making the total installed capacity of the project as 33.9 MW. The electricity generated for the project activity is supplied to the southern regional grid of India. The first WEG of the bundle activity was commissioned on 30 March 2008 and the last WEG commissioned on 5 February 2009. The location and details of the turbines with respect to the project activity have been verified to be as per details provided in the VCS PD /2/.

2 VALIDATION PROCESS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The project is a registered project with VCS as confirmed from the website of VCS with a project id of 676 as confirmed from the VCS website /2/

<https://vcsprojectdatabase1.apx.com/myModule/Interactive.asp?Tab=Projects&a=2&i=676&lat=10%2E57225&lon=77%2E457053&bp=1>

3 VERIFICATION PROCESS

3.1 Method and Criteria

The verification was performed through means of the following three phases in accordance with the requirement of the registered VCS PD /2/, the applied methodology, and the VCS Standard version 3.1 and other relevant VCS requirements.

- A desk review of the monitoring report and all support documents.
- Follow-up interviews with project stakeholders and site inspection.
- The resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the verification report and statement.

The following sections outline each step in more detail.

The verification of the emission reductions has assessed all factors and issues that constitute the basis for emission reductions from the project. These include:

- The emission reduction calculations and the relevant data records.
- The calibration and maintenance records for the monitoring instruments.
- The management systems to support the project operation and monitoring.

Verification team

Role	Last Name	First Name	Country	Type of involvement					
				Desk review	Site visit	Reporting	Supervision of work	Technical review	TA 1.2 competence
Team leader and TA competent (Validator & Verifier)	Govindarajulu	Murali	India	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Technical reviewer	Astakala	Vidyacharan	India					✓	✓

Duration of verification

Preparations: From 22 June 2011-7 July 2011
 On-site verification: From 11 July 2011 to 12 July 2011
 Reporting, calculation checks and QA/QC: 28 December 2011

3.2 Document Review

The monitoring report /1/ (version 1 dated 30 May 2011, version 2 dated 29 November 2011) and the monthly joint meter readings reports covering the monitoring period /9/ were assessed as a part of the verification. In addition, the VCS project design document /2/, in particular the baseline estimations and the monitoring plan contained in the VCS PD /2/. The monthly invoices raised by SWPPL on the state utility companies (Tamil Nadu Electricity Board and Bangalore Electricity Supply Company Limited) /10/ were also reviewed to cross check the generation details as a part of the documentation in line with the requirements of the methodology /12/.

3.3 Interviews

From 11 July 2011 to 13 July 2011, Murali Govindarajulu of DNV carried out a site visit WEGs located at Chitradurga district in Karnataka and Dindigul, Coimbatore and Erode districts in Tamil Nadu.

See detail requirement in the below Section 3.4

3.4 Site Inspections

From 11 July 2011 to 12 July 2011, DNV carried out a site visit at the wind farm locations. During the visit, DNV verified the actual implementation of the project as described in the VCS PD /2/. The commissioning

certificates of the WEGs were also checked and found to be correct /4/. The electricity meters and their test certificates were checked and found to be in order /8/. The evidence of the reported net electricity generation was also verified, which in the project activity case is the monthly electricity generation joint meter reading reports signed by SWPPL and state utility companies /9/. In addition, the invoices raised by SWPPL on state utility company /10/ were also verified to cross-check the joint meter readings /9/.

3.5 Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy

A corrective action request (CAR) is issued, where:

- i. Non-conformities with the monitoring plan or methodology are found in monitoring and reporting, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;
- ii. Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions which will impair the estimate of emission reductions;
- iii. Issues identified in a FAR during validation to be verified during verification have not been resolved by the project participants.

A clarification request (CL) shall be raised if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable VCS requirements have been met.

A forward action request (FAR) is issued for actions if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next monitoring period.

There are two CARs that were raised during the current verification, the same have been addressed satisfactorily and the details can be found in appendix A of this report. No CLs or any FARs has been raised during this verification.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Implementation Status

As part of the site visit DNV was able to confirm that the project implementation is in accordance with the project description contained in registered VCS PD /2/ of 29 March 2010, and that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS PD /2/ of 29 March 2010.

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	EG _y (Electricity supplied to the Grid by the project activity during the period y)
Measuring frequency:	Continuous
Reporting frequency:	Monthly
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Type of monitoring equipment:	Electricity Meters
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in the VCS PD/CDM PDD? If the VCS PD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Accuracy of the meters installed in the Karnataka region: 0.2s. Accuracy of the meters installed in Tamil Nadu region: 0.5s.
Calibration frequency /interval:	Annual for the meters associated with WEGs installed in the state of Karnataka and Once in two years for the meters associated with WEGs installed in the state of Tamil Nadu.
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	Gap in the validity of calibration noticed for all the meters.
Company performing the calibration:	KPTCL in case of Karnataka and TNEB in case of Tamil Nadu region.
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	Yes.
Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	Gap in the validity of calibration noticed for few meters. Details of the calibration has been given below:

WEGs in Tamilnadu.

WEG ID No.	SI No.	Class	Fixed on	Test 1
H-29	6760723	0.2	30-Sep-08	11-Jan-11
H-34	7041049	0.2	30-Sep-08	11-Jan-11
K-75	8001330	0.2	31-Dec-08	20-Jun-10
K-76	8001334	0.2	5-Feb-09	20-Jun-10
E767	4954907	0.2	30-Sep-08	26-Apr-11
E777	4954363	0.5	28-Jul-08	26-Apr-11
E778	4954892	0.5	30-Sep-08	26-Apr-11
E779	4954702	0.5	28-Jul-08	26-Apr-11
E780	4954705	0.5	28-Jul-08	26-Apr-11
E781	4954307	0.5	28-Jul-08	26-Apr-11
E782	4954685	0.5	5-Aug-08	26-Apr-11
E797	4901341	0.5	28-Sep-08	7-May-11
E86	4954683	0.5	1-Sep-08	7-May-11
G-557	4940859	0.5	31-Mar-08	26-Apr-11
G-970	4940857	0.5	31-Mar-08	28-Apr-11
Q-48	4901332	0.5	30-Mar-08	7-May-11
Q-51	4901311	0.5	31-Mar-08	7-May-11
Q-199	4901307	0.5	31-Mar-08	3-May-11
Q-220	4901309	0.5	31-Mar-08	3-May-11
Q-394	4940874	0.5	30-Mar-08	3-May-11

WEGs in Karnataka.

WEG ID No.	SI No.	Class	Fixed on	Test 1
K-342	7041790	0.2	31-Dec-08	19-Nov-10
K-345	7041803	0.2	31-Dec-08	20-Nov-10
K-346	7041796	0.2	30-Sep-08	20-Nov-10
K-347	7041778	0.2	31-Dec-08	20-Nov-10
K-350	7041817	0.2	30-Sep-08	20-Nov-10

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>K-69</td> <td>7341551</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>30-Sep-08</td> <td>18-Jun-10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>K-70</td> <td>7341559</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>30-Sep-08</td> <td>18-Jun-10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>K-71</td> <td>7341571</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>30-Sep-08</td> <td>19-Jun-10</td> </tr> </table> <p>As per “Guidelines for assessing the frequency of calibration” issued by the executive board of the UNFCCC, the project participants have applied the maximum inaccuracy of the metering equipment on the measured values. The values of the parameter electricity exported to the grid have been taken after applying the maximum inaccuracy of the meters.</p>	K-69	7341551	0.2	30-Sep-08	18-Jun-10	K-70	7341559	0.2	30-Sep-08	18-Jun-10	K-71	7341571	0.2	30-Sep-08	19-Jun-10
K-69	7341551	0.2	30-Sep-08	18-Jun-10												
K-70	7341559	0.2	30-Sep-08	18-Jun-10												
K-71	7341571	0.2	30-Sep-08	19-Jun-10												
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The reported net generation has been cross checked with the invoices raised by the PP on state utility companies.															
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values were verified using the joint meter readings taken by the representatives of State utility companies and the PP.															
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes															
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA															

4.2 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations

The electricity exported to the project from the project activity is measured through electricity meters installed at the grid interconnection points. These meters measure the electricity export to grid continuously and these meters readings are recorded monthly through the joint meter readings. The monthly Joint meter readings are taken jointly by the project participants and the officials of the state utility company. At the conclusion of each meter reading an appointed representative of the State utility company and the project participants sign a document indicating the amount of kWh recorded by the

meter as exported power to the grid. This is then translated to a format (Joint Energy Meter Reading) and signed by both parties. This document clearly indicates the net electricity exported /9/ and become the basis for calculations of the emission reductions.

Each meter is jointly inspected and sealed on behalf of the parties and is not interfered with by either party except in the presence of the other party or its accredited representatives. The general conditions set out for metering, recording, meter readings, meter inspections, test & checking and communication are as per the power purchase agreement (PPA) with State utility companies /5/. If the variation between the main meter and the check meter during any of the monthly meter readings is more than the permissible limit for meters, all the meters will be re-tested and calibrated. Test and joint calibration reports have been verified /8/. During the last calibration of the meters the performance of the meters were found to be satisfactory, but there were gaps noticed in the validity of calibration. As per “Guidelines for assessing the frequency of calibration” issued by the executive board of the UNFCCC, the project participants have applied the maximum inaccuracy of the metering equipment on the measured values. The values of the parameter electricity exported to the grid have been taken after applying the maximum inaccuracy of the meters.

Based on the above, DNV is of the opinion that for the current verification period (from 30 March 2008 to 20 December 2010), the project developer has taken sufficient steps to ensure the accuracy of reported emission reductions.

4.3 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals

The emission reductions ER_y by the project activity is the difference between baseline emissions (BE_y), project emissions (PE_y) and emissions due to leakage (L_y):

- 1) Baseline emissions: Baseline emissions (BE_y in tCO_2) are the product of the grid emission factor (EF_y in tCO_2/MWh) times the net electricity supplied by the project activity to the grid (EG_y in MWh)/7/.
- 2) Project emissions: As per the applied methodology of the project and being a wind based power project no project emissions are associated with this project activity.
- 3) Leakage: No leakage has to be considered for the proposed project activity.

The amount of electricity delivered to the grid during the verification period has been verified to be 158 312.5 MWh which results in emission reductions of 149 574 tCO_2e (net of project emissions) reported for the period from 30 March 2008 to 20 December 2010. The data was verified by reviewing the electricity generation joint meter reading reports issued by the state utility company /9/ which has been cross checked with the invoices raised by the project participants /10/. It has been checked that the monthly generation of the individual WEG has not exceeded the name plate capacity.

The energy generated and emission reductions claimed for the proposed period were as shown in the following table:

Period	Energy Generated (MWh)	Baseline (tCO ₂)	Project Emissions (tCO ₂)	VCUs (tCO ₂)
30 March 2008 to 31 December 2008	24 918.5	23 543	0	23 543
1 January 2009 to 31 December 2009	67598.2	63 867	0	63 867
1 January 2010 to 31 December 2010	65795.8	62 164	0	62 164
Total for the monitoring period	158 312.5	149 574	0	149 574
Estimated ER in the PD corresponding to the monitoring period		213 055	0	213 055

The emission reductions have been estimated in the validated PD /2/ based on the total power exported to the grid from the project activity for the year. This on a pro rata basis for the monitoring period works out to be 213 055 tCO₂. The actual emission reductions are lower than the estimated emission reductions. The GHG calculations are complete and transparent, and their accuracy has been verified.

4.4 Management and Operational System

The operation and maintenance of the project activity is carried out by the equipment supplier as part of the O&M agreement between the project participants and the equipment supplier. The quality of meter readings is assured through calibration of electricity meters /8/ and through cross checking of the joint meter readings /9/ with the invoices raised/10/. DNV confirms that the management and operational system: the responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting are in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the monitoring plan of the registered VCS PD /2/.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

DNV Climate Change Services AS (DNV) has performed the verification of the emission reductions that have been reported for the “33.9 MW Bundled wind Power project in the states of Karnataka and Tamilnadu, India” (VCS Registration No. 676) for the period 30 March 2008 to 20 December 2010.

The project participants are responsible for the collection of data in accordance with the monitoring plan and the reporting of GHG emissions reductions from the project.

It is DNV’s responsibility to express an independent verification statement on the reported GHG emission reductions from the project.

DNV conducted the verification on the basis of the approved methodology ACM0002 (version 10), the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS PD of 29 March 2010 and the monitoring report (version 2 dated 29 November 2011). The verification included i) checking whether the provisions of the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan were consistently and appropriately applied and ii) the collection of evidence supporting the reported data.

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

In our opinion the GHG emissions reductions of the “33.9 MW Bundled wind Power project in the states of Karnataka and Tamilnadu, India” (VCS Project IDNo. 676) for the period 30 March 2008 to 20 December 2010 are fairly stated in the monitoring report (version 02) dated 29 November 2011.

The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly on the basis of the approved methodology ACM0002 (version 10) and the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS PD of 29 March 2010.

DNV Climate Change Services AS is able to certify that the emission reductions from the “33.9 MW Bundled wind Power project in the states of Karnataka and Tamilnadu, India” during the period 30 March 2008 to 20 December 2010 amount to 149 574 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent, detailed as below.

Reporting period: 30 March 2008 to 20 December 2010

Verified GHG emission reductions or removals in the above reporting period:

GHG Emission Reductions or Removals	tCO ₂ e
Baseline Emissions	149 574
Project Emissions	0
Leakage	0
Net GHG emission reductions or removals	149 574

The yearly emission reductions for the monitoring period has been given below:

Period	Baseline (tCO₂)	Project Emissions (tCO₂)	VCUs (tCO₂)
30 March 2008 to 31 December 2008	23 543	0	23 543
1 January 2009 to 31 December 2009	63 867	0	63 867
1 January 2010 to 31 December 2010	62 164	0	62 164

DNV does not assume any responsibility towards the issuance and utilization of the VCUs hereby verified and certified. Request for issuance of VCUs shall be made by the project proponent to an approved VCS Program Registry based on the requirements set out under the most recent version of the VCS Program Guidelines clause on VCS Registration.

The verification of reported emission reductions is based on the information made available to DNV and the engagement conditions detailed in this report. DNV cannot be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on this report.

6 REFERENCES

Documents provided by the Project Participants that relate directly to the GHG components of the project. These have been used as direct sources of evidence for the periodic verification conclusions, and are usually further checked through interviews with key personnel.

- /1/ Monitoring reports of “33.9 MW Bundled wind Power project in the states of Karnataka and Tamilnadu, India” version 1 dated 30 May 2011 and version 2 dated 29 November 2011, for the period from 30 March 2008 to 20 December 2010.
- /2/ Project design document – “33.9 MW Bundled wind Power project in the states of Karnataka and Tamilnadu, India”, dated 29 March 2010 ;Project Id 676 as available on the website <https://vcsprojectdatabase1.apx.com/myModule/Interactive.asp?Tab=Projects&a=2&i=676&lat=10%2E57225&lon=77%2E457053&bp=1>
- /3/ VCS validation report: PRJ CDM Inc validation report for the project “33.9 MW Bundled wind Power project in the states of Karnataka and Tamilnadu, India” dated 29 March 2010.
- /4/ TNEB & KPTCL: Commissioning certificates confirming the dates of commissioning of the individual WEGs forming part of the project activity.
- /5/ Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) signed with TNEB, Chamundeshwari Electricity supply corporation limited, Bangalore electricity supply company limited for the purchase of power generated from the project activity.
- /6/ Deed of Representation submitted by PJR CDM Inc for the validation of the project activity “33.9 MW Bundled wind Power project in the states of Karnataka and Tamilnadu, India”.
- /7/ Excel spreadsheet documenting the ER calculations for the period from 30 March 2008 to 20 December 2010.
- /8/ Calibration certificates of the meters connected to this project activity.
- /9/ Monthly joint meter readings for the period from 30 March 2008 to 20 December 2010 for the net generation of electricity and export to the grid.
- /10/ Monthly invoices raised by SWPPL on State utility companies for the period 30 March 2008 to 20 December 2010 for the export of power to the grid.

Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents.

- /11/ CDM Executive Board: Validation and Verification Manual, version 1.2
- /12/ CDM Executive Board: ACM0002 – Consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, version 10.
- /13/ Verified Carbon Standard –version 3 effective 8 September 2011 <http://www.v-c-s.org>
- /14/ Central Electricity Authority: CO₂ database, version 6, dated March 2011 for confirming the emission factor of grid electricity used for power import. http://cea.nic.in/reports/planning/cdm_co2/cdm_co2.htm
- /15/ Deed of representation submitted by the project participant for the project activity 33.9 MW Bundled wind

Power project in the states of Karnataka and Tamilnadu, India dated 19 July 2011.

Persons interviewed during the initial verification, or persons who contributed with other information that are not included in the documents listed above.

/16/	Mr.Kannan, Simran Wind Farm Private Limited
/17/	Mr.Sharique Ahamad, PwC india.

APPENDIX A

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS, CLARIFICATION REQUESTS AND FORWARD ACTION REQUESTS

Corrective action requests

CAR ID	Corrective action request	Response by Project Participants	DNV's assessment of response by Project Participants
CAR 1	The details of the VCS registration of this project activity have not been submitted.	The details of the VCS registration and the related documents have been submitted to DoE.	Details on the VCS registration has been checked from the www.V-C-S.org website. CAR closed.
CAR 2	The monitoring report do not indicate the details of the gap in the period of calibration validity and the application of the guidelines to assess the calibration frequency requirements.	The revised monitoring report dated 29 November 2011 has been submitted after addressing the requirements.	Received the revised monitoring report and the same has been found to be adequate. CAR closed.

Clarification requests

CAR ID	Corrective action request	Response by Project Participants	DNV's assessment of response by Project Participants
CL 1	No CL raised for this verification		

Forward action requests from previous verification

FAR ID	Forward action request	Summary of how FAR has been addressed in this reporting period	Assessment of how FAR has been addressed
FAR 1	This is the first verification and not applicable.		

Forward action requests from this verification

FAR ID	Forward action request	Response by Project Participants	DNV's assessment of response by Project Participants
FAR 1	No FAR raised for this verification		