




## Verification and certification report form for CDM project activities

(Version 01.0)

Complete this form in accordance with the "Attachment: Instructions for filling out the verification and certification report form for CDM project activities" at the end of this form.

### VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION REPORT

<b>Title of the project activity</b>	Bagepalli CDM Biogas Programme
<b>Reference number of the project activity</b>	0121
<b>Version number of the verification and certification report</b>	02
<b>Completion date of the verification and certification report</b>	16/05/2017
<b>Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period</b>	5th Monitoring Period project activity and the 1st monitoring period for the second crediting period 01/09/2013 to 31/12/2016 (including both days)
<b>Version number of monitoring report to which this report applies</b>	02
<b>Crediting period of the project activity corresponding to this monitoring period</b>	01st September 2013 to 31st August 2020 (Renewable)
<b>Project participant(s)</b>	Agricultural Development and Training Society (ADATS).
<b>Host Party</b>	India
<b>Sectoral scope(s), selected methodology(ies), and where applicable, selected standardized baseline(s)</b>	Sectoral Scope 1, Energy industries (renewable-/non-renewable sources) AMS.I.E – "Switch from Non-Renewable Biomass for Thermal Applications by the User" ver.5
<b>Estimated GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals for this monitoring period in the registered PDD</b>	62,218 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
<b>Certified GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals for this monitoring period</b>	52,088 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
<b>Name of DOE</b>	KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd
<b>Name, position and signature of the approver of the verification and certification report</b>	 Kaushal Goyal Managing Director

## SECTION A. Executive summary

KBS has been commissioned by “Agricultural Development and Training Society (ADATS)” to perform an independent verification of its registered CDM project “Bagepalli CDM Biogas Programme”, UNFCCC Ref# 0121 for the reported GHG emission reductions for the given monitoring period 01/09/2013 to 31/12/2016 (both dates included). The CDM projects must undergo independent third party verification and certification of emission reductions as the basis for issuance of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs)

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

- The project activity has been implemented and operated as per the registered PDD and that all physical features (technology, project equipment, and monitoring and metering equipment) of the project are in place;
- Monitoring report and other supporting documents are complete;
- The actual monitoring systems & procedures and monitoring report conforms with the requirements of the approved monitoring plan and the approved monitoring methodology;
- The data is recorded and stored as per the monitoring methodology and approved monitoring plan.

### Scope:

The scope of the verification is the independent and objective review and ex post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emission by the project activity. The verification is based on review of monitoring report, supporting information and

- (a) The registered PDD, including the monitoring plan and the corresponding validation opinion(s);
- (b) Previous verification reports, deviation requests, requests for revision of monitoring plan;
- (c) Monitoring report for the monitoring period under verification including CER calculations sheets and all supporting documents;
- (d) The applied monitoring methodology;
- (e) The applied standardized baseline (if applicable);
- (f) Relevant decisions, clarifications and guidance from the CMP and the CDM Executive Board;
- (g) All information and references relevant to the project activity's resulting in emission reductions

The project is assessed against the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM Modalities and Procedures and related rules and guidance.

KBS has, based on the recommendations in the latest version of CDM Validation and Verification Standard, employed a rule-based approach in the verification, focusing on the identification of significant reporting risks and the reliability of project monitoring.

### Description of project:

The project activity is the installation of biogas plants (digesters) of 2 m<sup>3</sup> capacity each for single households in 5 taluks (Bagepalli, Chickballapur, Chintamani, Gudibanda and Siddalaghatta) in Chickballapur District, Karnataka, India. The biogas units will be fed by cattle dung generated from the households. The biogas stoves will replace the traditional fire wood stoves used for cooking and heating purposes.

In baseline situation, households uses traditional fire wood stove which is inefficient. In the project situation the biogas stoves are used for cooking and hence completely avoiding the usage of traditional stoves which results in savings in non-renewable biomass. Thereby, it avoids the related CO<sub>2</sub> emission from the avoidance of non-renewable biomass in cooking. The PP planned to install 5500 biogas units of 2 m<sup>3</sup> capacity each for single households out of which 5485 units were commissioned.

### Methodology:

KBS follows a rule based verification approach, wherein, as a first step, the contract review is undertaken as per latest version of CDM Accreditation Standard. Subsequently, after the contract is signed, the monitoring report of the project activity is made publicly available at UNFCCC website as per CDM procedures. A desk review of the project documentation is undertaken, which is followed by an onsite visit by the members of verification team in accordance with the latest version of CDM AS. The verification protocol is filled by the verification team that is based on standard auditing practices and version 9 of CDM VVS, to capture the assessment of applicable CDM requirements viz., version 9 of CDM Project Standard, registered PDD, applied methodology/ies, applied standardized baseline and/or tools and recent decisions. The verification protocol provides transparent means to record the observations and compliances by the verification team

members and the nonconformities, if any. The verification protocol is an internal document, and is available on request. Following are the major milestones for the verification under consideration.

Verification contract	07/02/2017
Publication of MR	10/02/2017
On site verification	27/03/2017 to 28/03/2017
Draft Verification Report	28/03/2017
Final Verification Report	16/05/2017

**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/ Technical Expert/Local Expert	IR	Puratchikkanal	Ma Paa	Central Office	x	x	x	X
2.	Technical Expert	IR	Narendra Kumar	R	Central Office		x	x	

**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	Kandari	Sanjay	Central Office
3	Manager (Technical & Certification)	IR	Sharma	Chetan Swaroop	Central Office
4	Approver	IR	Goyal	Kaushal	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.	Transfer of data from sampling survey sheet to excel ER spreadsheet	Low	Possible human error during transfer of data to ER spreadsheets and MR	Thorough cross-check required on the transfer of data to the ER spreadsheet and MR.
2	Wrong data collection/misinterpretation of household situation	Low	It s not complicated monitoring process. Appropriate trainings are conducted for the monitoring personnel.	By means of site visit check of actual situation to sample number of households.

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

>>

The prescribed thresholds for materiality, as per §361 of VVS V9.

Prescribed range of ERs/annum	500,000+	300,000+ to 500,000	300,000	SSC PAs	MSC PAs
Prescribed Threshold	0.5%	1.0%	2.0%	5.0%	10.0%

The identified/selected materiality threshold for the project activity under current monitoring period is 5% as project activity is small scale project activity.

	MR Version (Draft)	MR Version (Final)
Emission reductions/annum	15,609 tCO <sub>2</sub> e	15,609 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Identified Threshold	5.0%	5.0%

The impact of errors observed during verification for each monitoring parameter on the emission reduction calculation is provided below:

Parameter	Verification approach	Error identified	Corrected	Within Threshold
Number of installed 2 m <sup>3</sup> systems	Complete data check	No error identified	NA	Yes
Number of biogas plants operating	Complete data check	No error identified	NA	Yes
Confirmation that non-renewable biomass has been substituted	Acceptance sampling	Refer CL-01	Yes	Yes
Non-usage days of installed and operational biogas plants	Complete data check	Refer CL-02	Yes	Yes

## SECTION D. Means of verification

### D.1. Desk review

A desk review is undertaken, involving but not limited to,

- A review of the data and information presented to verify their completeness;
- A review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures;
- 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 is included in the section 'Appendix 3' of this report.

**D.2. On-site inspection**

Duration of on-site inspection: 27/03/2017 to 28/03/2017				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	Opening Meeting, Office Inspection, Verification of monitoring records, interviews and database inspection	ADATS office	27/03/2017 & 28/03/2017	Ma Paa Puratchikkanal  Narendra Kumar
2	Visit to sampled of households	Beneficiary households	27/03/2017 & 28/03/2017	Ma Paa Puratchikkanal  Narendra Kumar

**D.3. Interviews**

No.	Interviewee		Date	Subject	Team member
	Name	Affiliation			
1.	Ram Esteves	ADATS	27/03/2017 & 28/03/2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General aspects of the project</li> <li>- Changes since validation / previous verification</li> <li>- Remaining issues from validation/ previous verification</li> <li>- Quality management system</li> <li>- Involved personnel and responsibilities</li> <li>- Training and practice of the operational personnel</li> <li>- Implementation of the monitoring plan</li> <li>- Monitoring data management</li> </ul>	Ma Paa Puratchikkanal  Narendra Kumar
2	Sudha Padmanabha	FCN	27/03/2017 & 28/03/2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data Analysis</li> <li>- Issues in the MR</li> <li>- ER calculation</li> </ul>	Ma Paa Puratchikkanal  Narendra Kumar
3	Mukhaem Pasha	ADATS	27/03/2017 & 28/03/2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Involved personnel and responsibilities</li> <li>- Training and practice of the operational personnel</li> <li>- Implementation of the monitoring plan</li> <li>- Monitoring data management</li> <li>- Data uncertainty and residual risks</li> <li>- Procedural aspects of the Monitoring</li> <li>- Maintenance</li> </ul>	Ma Paa Puratchikkanal  Narendra Kumar
No	Beneficiaries Name	Unit No	Date	Subject	Team Member
4	Manjunatha	7198	27/03/2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Verification of data collected through survey</li> <li>- Awareness about ownership of CERs</li> </ul>	Ma Paa Puratchikkanal  Narendra Kumar
5	Ugalappa	1941	27/03/2017		
6	venkatanarasappa	1946	27/03/2017		

7	Subbarayappa	1938	27/03/2017	- Working condition of biogas digester unit - SD parameters verification
8	Nagesha	7270	27/03/2017	
9	Chikka Venkataravanappa	3912	27/03/2017	
10	Leelamma	7199	27/03/2017	
11	Laxminarasappa	7404	27/03/2017	
12	Aswathmma	7405	27/03/2017	
13	Nagendra	4059	27/03/2017	
14	Srinivas	4730	27/03/2017	
15	Ramakrishnappa	4731	27/03/2017	
16	Daddamathappa	3613	28/03/2017	
17	Varalaxmiamma	3612	28/03/2017	
18	Papamma	3861	28/03/2017	
19	Savithamma	7173	28/03/2017	
20	Vandana	7170	28/03/2017	
21	Ramadevi	4951	28/03/2017	
22	Byappa Reddy	4298	28/03/2017	
23	Sarojamma	5653	28/03/2017	
24	Mallappa	5670	28/03/2017	
25	Nagaraj	4865	28/03/2017	
26	Nagamani	4976	28/03/2017	
27	Shivamma	8942	28/03/2017	
28	Amaravathi	8216	28/03/2017	
29	Prameelamma	5652	28/03/2017	
30	Keshav Reddy	3280	28/03/2017	

#### D.4. Sampling approach

:

During the on-site verification a sampling approach has been used by the verification team to verify the reported values for the monitored parameters as listed in section D.2 of the MR which are determined through sample survey by PP.

For the determination of DOE's acceptance sample size, verification team assumed the following factors:

1. Acceptable quality level (AQL) or the Level of Assurance- 1% (i.e. the proportion of discrepancies between the project participants' sample records and the DOE sample that are acceptable up to 1% limit)
2. Unacceptable Quality Level (UQL) – 15% (ie, the proportion of discrepancies between the project participants' sample records and DOE sample records that are unacceptable above 20% limit)
3. Producer risk -10% (ie, There is 10% chance that the DOE will wrongly reject the project participants' records of acceptable quality)
4. Consumer risk -10% (ie, There is 10% chance that the DOE will wrongly accept the project participants' records of records of unacceptable quality)

Verification team has determined acceptance sample size for all the sample survey parameters based on the table 1 of standard "Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities" version 5. From the above assumed factors, the verification team determined the minimum sample size (n) as 25 and acceptance number (c) as 1. The same is intimated to PP prior to the site visit. The actual number of sample size where the acceptance survey was done given below:

Parameters	Total Population	PP's sample size	Acceptance sample size	Acceptance Number	Sampling method used
------------	------------------	------------------	------------------------	-------------------	----------------------

Confirmation that non-renewable biomass of has been substituted	5485	2013-14 – 79 2014-15 – 82 2015-16 - 82	25	1	stratified random sample
---	------	--	----	---	--------------------------

During site visit, verification team visited the selected sample households and interviewed the biogas plant user to check the data reported by PP. The result of the survey is given below:

Parameters	DOE Sample size	No of CME's record beyond unacceptable level	Accepted/ Rejected
Confirmation that non-renewable biomass of has been substituted	25	0	Accepted

Verification team finds no error in the PP's survey records. Hence verification team accepts all the data determined through sample survey by PP.

#### 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	-	-	-
Compliance of the project implementation with the registered PDD	-	-	-
Post-registration changes	1	-	-
Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool and standardized baseline	-	1	-
Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan	1	-	-
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	-	-	-
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals	1	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>-</b>

### SECTION E. Verification findings

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	Verification team checked the monitoring report with latest version of MR available in the UNFCCC website (ie, version 5.1) and "Instructions for filling out the monitoring report form" mentioned as attachment to Monitoring report form (version 05.1).
<b>Findings</b>	No CAR/CL is raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	Verification team confirms that final monitoring report is completed using the latest valid version of the applicable monitoring report form/9/.

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

Verification team checked validation opinion report/4/ and found that no FAR has been raised.

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>The verification team determined the conformity of the actual project activity and its operation with the validated project design document. Verification team has, by means of a desk review and an on-site visit, assessed that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the validated PDD/3/ are in place, and that the project participants have operated the CDM project activity as per the validated PDD/3/ .</p> <p>The verification team has checked the information in the monitoring report and compared against the registered / revised PDDs.</p> <p>During the onsite inspection, the verification team has checked the project locations, implementation, technology applied, project equipment, and monitoring system against the information in the approved PDD. Interviews with operational personnel and households and random samplings have been carried out.</p>
<b>Findings</b>	-
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>The verification team has reviewed the biogas units commissioning records, application forms, end user agreements/14/ and non-working &amp; repair log records/18/. The verification team has observed at the site that all physical locations of the biogas units and found that the details are correctly matching with the monitoring report and monitoring records maintained by PP. Thus the verification team concludes that the project activity was implemented and operated as per validated PDD. The verification team, based on the site visit and document review, was able to conclude that the project activity has been commissioned and implemented as per the validated PDD/3/ and that all physical features of the project are in place.</p>

**E.4. Post-registration changes****E.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline**

No temporary deviation from registered monitoring plan or monitoring methodology is sought.

**E.4.2. Corrections**

There is typographical correction to the PDD in the section B.7.1 for the monitoring parameter, “Confirmation that non-renewable biomass has been substituted”. In revised PDD/5/, the corrected confidence /precision level 90/10 (conservative option) is as per the calculations in section B.7.2 “Sampling plan” of the PDD and in line with sampling guideline and the methodology and hence acceptable.

Verification team has confirmed during site visit interviews that the sampling for the parameter “Confirmation that non-renewable biomass has been substituted” has been done as per 90/10 confidence/ precision level only. The correction is in line with para 1 of Appendix of Project Standard, version 9. As per para 1 of Appendix of PS, no prior approval is required for the same and hence the request for approval of PRC is submitted along with the request for issuance of the current monitoring period.

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

This is the 2<sup>nd</sup> crediting period, continued from the end of the first crediting period. The start date of this crediting period is 01/09/2013.

During the first crediting Period the start date was changed from 18<sup>th</sup> December 2005 – 17<sup>th</sup> December 2012 to 1<sup>st</sup> September 2006 to 31<sup>st</sup> August 2013.

**E.4.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan to a registered project activity**

Not applicable as the PP provided the monitoring plan in registered PDD itself.

**E.4.5. Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline**

No permanent change from registered monitoring plan or monitoring methodology is sought.

**E.4.6. Changes to the project design of a registered project activity**

No changes to the project design of the registered project activity.

**E.4.7. Types of changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities**

Not applicable

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	The verification team checked compliance of project monitoring plan with the applied methodology (AMS I.E, version 05) and including applicable tools.
<b>Findings</b>	CAR-01 was raised and closed satisfactorily.
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>All parameters stated in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology has been fulfilled in the current monitoring report. All baseline emission parameters have been verified and found satisfactory. The discussion regarding each parameter has been elaborated in the further sections of this report. The monitoring plan as mentioned in the registered PDD is in accordance with the applied methodology. However CAR 01 was raised with respect to applied precision level. The precision level was corrected in line with sampling guideline and methodology and hence the finding was closed.</p> <p>In the opinion of the verification team the monitoring report complies with the requirement of the registered PDD/3/ and applied methodologies (AMS I.E)/6/ in the context of the project activity. Thus, it conforms to the requirement of §386 of VVS V9/12/. ( sampling tool)</p>

**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**

<b>Means of verification</b>	The verification team has checked the ex-ante parameters and data stated in Section D.1 of MR and compared with section B.6.2 of the registered PDD whether all parameters fixed ex-ante for the crediting period have been applied correctly.		
	<b>Ex-ante Parameter</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Consistent with the PDD/3/ &amp; the source mentioned in it</b>
	<b>B<sub>v</sub></b>	3.0733 tonnes/year/family	Yes
	<b>f<sub>NRB,y</sub></b>	0.95	Yes
	<b>NCV<sub>biomass</sub></b>	0.015 TJ/tonne	Yes
	<b>EF<sub>projected fossilfuel</sub></b>	81.6 tCO <sub>2</sub> /TJ	Yes
	<b>Diversion of non-renewable biomass saved under the project activity by non-project households</b>	2.92 t/HH/yr for all 365 days	Yes
<b>Findings</b>	No CAR/CL is raised		
<b>Conclusion</b>	The values of ex ante fixed parameters have been verified from the registered PDD/3/.Same has been crosschecked with the source mentioned in the PDD and found to be consistent. The verification team confirms that the values used/applied are correct and justified. Also, the ex-ante values have been correctly applied in the calculation of emission reductions.		

## E.6.2. Data and parameters monitored

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>The verification team has determined whether the registered monitoring plan has been properly implemented and followed by the PP that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the registered monitoring plan; and determined whether all parameters including project emission parameters, baseline emission parameters and leakage parameters used for emission reduction calculation stated in the registered monitoring plan are monitored or used appropriately as per the registered PDD.</p> <p>During the verification all monitoring parameters listed in Section D.2 of MR were compared with section B.7.1 of the registered PDD have been verified with regard to the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) appropriateness of the applied measurement / determination method,</li> <li>(ii) the correctness of the values applied for ER calculation,</li> <li>(iii) the accuracy, and applied QA/QC measures.</li> </ul> <p>The monitored values are assessed as follows:</p> <p><b>Number of installed 2 m<sup>3</sup> systems</b>(Number of biogas units installed under the project activity):This parameter is monitored as and when a digester is commissioned/started producing gas and the same is entered into the monitoring database. The reported data is cross checked with the online monitoring solution/14/ maintained in ADATS' office during site visit. The value reported in the monitoring report (ie, 5485) is found to be correct.</p> <p><b>Number of biogas plants operating</b> (Number of plants operating in year): PP will repair the plants as and when an issue is found by staff or reported by end user. So, PP continuously monitors the non-working days when the unit is not operational. The emission reduction will be adjusted based on the non-operational days. Hence, the number of biogas plants operating is monitored as 80.68% of 5,485 units . The values were cross verified with Log book records, digitized monitoring database during site visit by the verification team. Hence, the value reported for this parameter is correct.</p> <p><b>Confirmation that non-renewable biomass of B<sub>y</sub> has been substituted</b> (<i>Confirmation that non-renewable biomass has been substituted</i>): This parameter was monitored through stratified sample survey. PP has conducted survey during the year 2013, 2014 &amp; 2015 in 79,82 and 82 households selected randomly in each year/15/. As verified from the survey result/15/, all the sample households confirm that the bio digester usage substitute non-renewable biomass used in the baseline situation. All the survey sheets/15/ are verified and found that the data mentioned in the excel sheet is correct. During the site visit verification team has done acceptance sampling survey where verification team conducted survey in 25 households (randomly selected from PP's sample population). All the data collected are consistent with PP's record/15/. No error found. Hence, the verification team confirms that the non-renewable biomass of B<sub>y</sub> has been substituted by the project activity.</p> <p><b>Non-usage days of installed and operational biogas plants</b> (<i>Usage of non-renewable biomass in case of non-performance of biogas units</i>): Non-usage days of biogas plants are monitored daily. When the biogas unit is not working, the beneficiaries report to the village level women volunteer, who in turn reports to the Case Worker of the project for the repair of the unit. The date when the plant stopped working and the date when the issue is fixed are noted down in the village level breakdown log book/18/ by the staffs/volunteers and the same will be entered into monitoring solutions/14/. Verification team checked all the breakdown log records/18/ and data in the monitoring solution/14/. However CL 02, CL 03 were raised and PP had revised MR and ER sheet with inclusion of value non-operational biogas days and hence the findings were closed. The entire breakdown data reported in the ER sheet/2/ was checked and found to be ok. Verification team confirms the data reported in the revised MR (ie, 1,080,572 non-usage days) is found to be correct.</p>
<b>Findings</b>	CL-02 , CL -03 are raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	Corresponding to the §389 of VVS V9/12/, the team confirm that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the approved PDD/3/.

	The monitoring system is in compliance with the information flow for the parameters as mentioned in monitoring plan in approved PDD/3/. The monitored data for the parameters has been verified by checking the procedure for information flow and found to be complete and consistent.
--	---

**E.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan**

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>The verification team checked whether the PP has applied a sampling approach to determine the monitored values. For the parameters determined through sampling, the verification team checked the sampling approach followed for each monitoring parameters to confirm the sampling plan mentioned in the registered PDD. The following parameters are monitored through sampling:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 25%;">Parameter</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Sample size required as per PDD/3/</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Actual sample size considered for survey/1/</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Is sample size is sufficient?</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Confirmation that non-renewable biomass of By has been substituted</td> <td>Sample size for 5500 household units with 75% assumed proportion was mentioned as 88.</td> <td>Actual sample size for 5485 household units with actual proportions [(0.95.53% in 2014; 93.76% in 2015 and 87.38% in 2016) ] are:-  2013-14 – 79 2014-15 – 82 2015-16 - 82</td> <td>Yes. The sample size calculated based on 90/10 confidence / precision level seems to be acceptable and conservative. Moreover PP has considered more sample than required.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Verification team has conducted acceptance sampling to verify the parameter monitored through sampling. The verification team calculated the minimum sample size (n) as 22 and acceptance number (c) as 1 (considering AQL - 1%, UQL - 20%, producer risk – 5% &amp; consumer risk – 5%). Verification team has done survey in randomly in 25 numbers of households (selected from the PP’s sample population) and verified the PP’s survey data.</p>	Parameter	Sample size required as per PDD/3/	Actual sample size considered for survey/1/	Is sample size is sufficient?	Confirmation that non-renewable biomass of By has been substituted	Sample size for 5500 household units with 75% assumed proportion was mentioned as 88.	Actual sample size for 5485 household units with actual proportions [(0.95.53% in 2014; 93.76% in 2015 and 87.38% in 2016) ] are:-  2013-14 – 79 2014-15 – 82 2015-16 - 82	Yes. The sample size calculated based on 90/10 confidence / precision level seems to be acceptable and conservative. Moreover PP has considered more sample than required.
Parameter	Sample size required as per PDD/3/	Actual sample size considered for survey/1/	Is sample size is sufficient?						
Confirmation that non-renewable biomass of By has been substituted	Sample size for 5500 household units with 75% assumed proportion was mentioned as 88.	Actual sample size for 5485 household units with actual proportions [(0.95.53% in 2014; 93.76% in 2015 and 87.38% in 2016) ] are:-  2013-14 – 79 2014-15 – 82 2015-16 - 82	Yes. The sample size calculated based on 90/10 confidence / precision level seems to be acceptable and conservative. Moreover PP has considered more sample than required.						
<b>Findings</b>	CAR-01 raised and closed satisfactorily.								
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>Verification team concludes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sample size considered for the parameter (which is monitored through sampling basis) is found to be appropriate</li> <li>• PP’s sample population was selected in all the taluks proportionally based on the number units installed in the respective taluks.</li> <li>• The sampling plan is implemented seems to be appropriate.</li> <li>• Through acceptance sampling, the verification team confirmed that the all the data collected by PP through sample survey are correct.</li> </ul> <p>As the precision level in sample size calculation was revised to the standard level (10%), the revised sample size calculation was accepted and hence CAR-01 was closed.</p>								

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	Not applicable as no monitoring equipments involved.
<b>Findings</b>	NA
<b>Conclusion</b>	NA

**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>	<p>As per the methodology the emission reduction is directly calculated. Baseline &amp; project emissions are not calculated separately.</p> <p>The verification team has checked whether calculations of GHG emission reduction calculation have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods</p>
------------------------------	--

	<p>described in the registered monitoring plan. In detail the following has been verified: <u>Transparency</u>: It has been checked whether the calculation of baseline emissions is fully traceable and, where used, the Excel calculation provides all calculation formulae. <u>Parameter consistency</u>: It has been checked whether all internal and external parameters and data used for the calculation are applied consistently in the monitoring report and the calculation spreadsheet. <u>Correctness</u>: It has been checked whether the applied formulae and methods for calculating baseline emissions are in accordance with the monitoring plan and the approved methodology. <u>Completeness</u>: It has been checked whether all calculations are complete and without omissions The equations applied for the determination of GHG emissions reduction is consistent with the registered PDD and applied methodology: The emission reduction is calculated using the formula:</p> $ER_y = B_y * f_{NRB,y} * NCV_{biomass} * EF_{projected\_fossilfuel}$ <p>Emission reduction is adjusted with 0.95 factor for leakage (considering 5% leakage) as per the latest version of methodology AMS I.E, version 5) PP has submitted the emission reduction calculation in the excel sheet/2/. The calculation in the excel sheet is checked whether the calculation is in accordance with the formula given in the approved PDD/3/ and the selected methodology/6/.</p>
<b>Findings</b>	CL-03 was raised and closed satisfactorily..
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>The verification team confirms the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The calculations of baseline GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the equations and methods described in the registered monitoring plan and applied methodology.</li> <li>• The emission factor applied is an ex-ante value valid for the fixed crediting period.</li> <li>• Any assumptions used in emission or removal calculations have been justified.</li> <li>• Appropriate emission factor and other reference values have been correctly applied. It can be confirmed that the emission reduction calculation is correct.</li> <li>• The ER calculation sheet/2/ provided is clear, transparent and the calculations provided in the sheet are reproducible.</li> <li>• Hence, the emission reduction reported in the monitoring report/1/ for the monitoring period (ie, 54,829 tCO<sub>2</sub>e without leakage adjustment and 52,088 tCO<sub>2</sub>e with leakage adjustment) is verified to be correct</li> </ul>

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	Not applicable as the emission reduction is directly calculated. No project emission is calculated. This is as per the registered PDD & selected methodology.
<b>Findings</b>	NA
<b>Conclusion</b>	NA

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	PP has considered 5% leakage as per the latest version of the methodology (AMS I.E, version 5). As per the latest version, if PP apply 5% leakage (ie, using the adjustment factor of 0.95) then monitoring of the same is not necessary. Hence, verification team accepts the usage of adjustment factor of 0.95.
<b>Findings</b>	No CAR/CL is raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	The PP has applied 0.95 leakage adjustment factor in emission reduction which is acceptable considering the provision in the latest version of the methodology (AMS I.E, version 5). Verification team has accepted the same. The leakage estimated in the MR (ie, 2,741 tCO <sub>2</sub> e) is found to be correct.

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	MR demonstrates the summary of GHG emission reductions for the monitoring period and calculated according to the applied methodologies as follows: $ER_y = BE_y - PE_y - L_y$ $= 54,829 - 0 - 2,741 = 52,088 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$ The ER calculation sheet and monitoring report is verified to check the calculation.
<b>Findings</b>	No CAR/CL is raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	The verification team confirms the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The emission reduction value reported (ie 52,088 tCO<sub>2</sub>e) is verified to be correct.</li> <li>• The summary table in the MR has been filled correctly and the values are in line with the related emissions reduction spreadsheet.</li> <li>• Since the monitoring period starts after 31/12/2012, the complete verified emission reductions are correctly reported under the respective column in the MR.</li> </ul>

#### 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>	The verification team has checked whether the MR includes a comparison of actual values of the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered PDD/3/. Section E.4 of the MR includes a comparison of the calculated actual emission reductions with the ex-ante calculated values in the registered PDD	
	Emission reduction estimated as per the approved PDD/3/	Actual emission reduction achieved as per Monitoring report/1/
	62,218 t CO <sub>2</sub> e	52,088 t CO <sub>2</sub> e
	The actual emission reduction achieved during the monitoring period is 16.28% less than the estimation in the PDD.	
<b>Findings</b>	No CAR/CL is raised	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The estimated emission reduction as per PDD and the actual emission reduction achieved for the monitoring period are correctly reported in the section E.5 of MR. The actual achieved emission reduction is 16.28% less than the PDD estimation as only 80.68% biogas units were operational. Since the actual ER is less than estimated ER, hence no justification is required.	

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	The verification team has determined the CER achieved during this monitoring period with the estimated value and reason for increase if any.
<b>Findings</b>	No CAR/CL is raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	The actual achieved emission reduction is 16.28% less than the PDD estimation. Hence no justification is required.

#### 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>	The verification team has determined the CER achieved during first commitment period and second commitment period
<b>Findings</b>	No CAR/CL is raised
<b>Conclusion</b>	Since the complete monitoring period falls after the first commitment period, the complete emission reductions are correctly reported under the respective column in the MR.

### SECTION F. Internal quality control

The draft verification report prepared by team leader is reviewed by an independent technical reviewer (having competence of relevant technical area himself/herself or through an independent technical area expert) to confirm the internal procedures established by KBS are duly followed and the verification report/opinion is reached in an objective manner and complies with the applicable CDM requirements.

The independent technical reviewer may approve or reject the draft verification report. The findings may be identified even at this stage, which needs to be satisfactorily resolved, before the request for issuance is submitted to UNFCCC. The final decision is taken by the Manager Technical and Certification. The technical reviewer and Manager (Technical & Certification) can be same person.

The final decision is authorized by Managing Director, KBS once the report is approved by the Manager (Technical & Certification).

**SECTION G. Verification opinion**

The verification team confirms that the the evidence is of sufficient quantity, appropriate quality and reliable. The reported values, notation, units and sources in the monitoring report for all the monitoring parameters have been cross checked with the emission reduction sheet and monitoring report. During the course of verification and on site visit, the data submitted by PP was cross verified with the values mentioned in the emission reduction sheet/2/ and monitoring report/1/. The procedure for data monitoring, recording, transfer and compilation was also verified and found in compliance with the monitoring plan as mentioned in the approved revised PDD/3/.

Evidences (Documents/interview/site visit) referred for verification of individual monitoring parameter and fixed parameters are defined in section E.6 above. It is confirmed by the assessment team that the reported emission reductions have been conservatively calculated. A list of referred documents for verification is also included in Appendix 3 of this report.

Based on the information seen and evaluated we confirm that the implementation of the project has resulted in 52,088 tCO<sub>2</sub>e emission reductions during period 01/09/2013 to 31/12/2016.

**SECTION H. Certification statement**

KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd. has been contracted by 'M/s Agricultural Development and Training Society (ADATS)' to undertake independent verification and certification for the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions reported from the CDM Project activity "Bagepalli CDM Biogas Programme" and UNFCCC Reference Number 0121 for the monitoring period 01/09/2013 to 31/12/2016 (including both dates) in the Monitoring Report Version 01 (first version) dated 09/02/2017.

The verification is based on the approved PDD, revised PDD and the monitoring report for this project. Our verification approach was based on the requirements as defined under the Kyoto Protocol, Marrakech accord, as well as those defined by the CDM Executive Board.

The management of the Agricultural Development and Training Society (ADATS) is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions on the basis set out within the project Final Monitoring Report Version 02 dated 31/03/2017. The calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project is the responsibility of the management of the 'Agricultural Development and Training Society (ADATS)'. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures are in accordance with the Monitoring Report Version 02 dated 31/03/2017.

It is our responsibility to express an independent GHG verification opinion on the GHG emissions and on the calculation of GHG emission reductions from the project for the monitoring period 01/09/2013 to 31/12/2016 (including both dates) based on the reported emission reductions in the Final Monitoring Report Version 02 dated 31/03/2017 for the same period.

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

KBS confirms the following;

**Reporting period:** 01/09/2013 to 31/12/2016 (including both dates)

**Verified and certified emission in the above reporting period:**

	Amount	Unit
Baseline emissions (BE)	<b>54,829</b>	tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Project emissions (PE)	0	tCO <sub>2</sub> e

Leakage emissions (LE)	<b>2,741</b>	tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Certified emission reductions (CERs)	<b>52,088</b>	tCO <sub>2</sub> e

## Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
ADATS	Agricultural Development and Training Society
BE	Baseline Emissions
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CDM EB	CDM Executive Board
CERs	Certified Emission Reductions
CH4	Methane
CL	Clarification Request
CO2e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
COP	Conference of Parties
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EF	Emission Factor
ERPA	Emission Reduction Purchase Agreement
ERs	Emission Reductions
FAR	Forward Action Request
FCN	Fair Climate Network
GHGs	Greenhouse Gas(es)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HH	Household
ISO	International Organization of Standardization
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
KBS	KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd.
KP	Kyoto Protocol
LE	Leakage Emissions
MR	Monitoring Report
MP	Monitoring Plan
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
PE	Project Emissions
PDD	Project Design Document
PS	Project Standard
PCP	Project Cycle Procedure
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VLV	Village Level Volunteers
VVS	Validation & Verification Standard

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

<b>Personnel Name:</b>		<b>M.P. Kanal</b>	
<b>Qualified to work as:</b>			
Team Leader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Technical Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Validator/Verifier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial Expert	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Reviewer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Expert (India)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Area(s) of Technical Expertise</b>			
<b>Sectoral Scope</b>		<b>Technical Area</b>	
Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)		TA 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energy sources	
Energy demand		TA 3.1. Energy Demand	
Waste Handling and Disposal		TA 13.1 Waste Handling and Disposal	
Agriculture		TA 15.1 Agriculture	
Approved by (Manager C & T)		Gagandeep Kakkar	
Approval date:		03/11/2015	

<b>Personnel Name:</b>		<b>Narendra Kumar</b>	
<b>Qualified to work as:</b>			
Team Leader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Technical Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Validator/Verifier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Technical Reviewer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Area(s) of Technical Expertise</b>			
<b>Sectoral Scope</b>		<b>Technical Area</b>	
Energy Industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)		TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation from fossil fuels and biomass including thermal electricity from solar	
Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)		TA 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energy sources	
Energy Demand		TA 3.1: Energy Demand	
Approved by (Manager C & T)		Akhilesh Joshi	
Approval date:		16/01/2016	

<b>Personnel Name:</b>		<b>Sanjay Kandari</b>	
<b>Qualified to work as:</b>			
Team Leader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Technical Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Validator/Verifier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Technical Reviewer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Expert (India)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Area(s) of Technical Expertise</b>			

Sectoral Scope	Technical Area
Energy Industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation from fossil fuels and biomass including thermal electricity from solar
Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	TA 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energy sources
Waste Handling and Disposal	TA 13.1 Waste Handling and Disposal TA 13.2 Manure
Approved by (Manager C & T)	Gagandeep Kakkar
Approval date:	03/11/2015

### Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1	ADATS	Monitoring Report,	Version 01, dated 09/02/2017	ADATS
	ADATS	Monitoring Report,	Version 02, dated 31/03/2017	ADATS
2	ADATS	ER Calculation Sheet	Version 01, dated 09/02/2017	ADATS
	ADATS	ER Calculation Sheet	Version 02, dated 31/03/2017	ADATS
3	ADATS	Registered PDD (PRC Approved)	Version 05, 02/08/2013	Publicly available
4	DNV	Validation opinion Report	dated 06/08/2013	Publicly available
5	ADATS	Revised PDD	Version 06, dated 11/05/2017	ADATS
6	UNFCCC	AMS.I.E – “Switch from Non-Renewable Biomass for Thermal Applications by the User”	Version 05	Publicly available
7	IPCC	1. 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book 2. 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book	<a href="#">Web Link</a>	Publicly available
8	UNFCCC	Kyoto Protocol (1997)	<a href="#">Web Link</a>	Publicly available
9	UNFCCC	Monitoring Report Form (CDM-MRFORM)	<a href="#">Version 05.1</a>	Publicly available
10	UNFCCC	CDM Project Standard	<a href="#">Version 09</a>	Publicly available
11	UNFCCC	Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities	<a href="#">Version 05</a>	Publicly available
	UNFCCC	Guidelines for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities	<a href="#">Version 04</a>	Publicly available
12	UNFCCC	CDM Validation and Verification Standard	<a href="#">Version 09</a>	Publicly available
13	UNFCCC	Glossary “CDM terms”	<a href="#">Version 08</a>	Publicly available
14	ADATS	Biogas basic record set: - Biogas application form - End user agreement for CER ownership - Completion certificate - Online monitoring solution	-	ADATS
15	ADATS	Sample survey monitoring sheets for the year 2013, 2014 & 2015	-	ADATS
16	ADATS	Non-project household survey sheets for the year 2014 & 2015	-	ADATS
17	ADATS	Training Records: - Training conducted for end user - Training conducted for Mason - Training conducted for staffs Training conducted for Village Level Volunteers	-	ADATS
18	ADATS	Village level plant breakdown log sheets maintained by village level volunteers	-	ADATS
19	ADATS	Photographs and end user details for the biogas units constructed during previous monitoring period but not considered for the emission reduction during the previous monitoring periods.	-	ADATS

## 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>	xx	<b>Section no.</b>		<b>Date:</b> DD/MM/YYYY
<b>Description of FAR</b>				
NA				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date:</b> DD/MM/YYYY
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date:</b> DD/MM/YYYY

Table 2. CL from this verification

<b>CL ID</b>	01	<b>Section no.</b>	MR section B.2.2	<b>Date:</b> 28-03-2017
<b>Description of CL</b>				
Clarify whether the correction to the PDD is in line with the appendix 1 of the project standard.				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date:</b> 04-04-2017
This section has been revised. There is a typographic correction to the registered PDD in the section B.7.1. Under the monitoring parameter, "Confirmation that non-renewable biomass has been substituted", the statistically determined number of households which was mentioned at 90/30 confidence/precision level, has been corrected to 90/10 confidence/precision level as per the calculations in section B.7.2. "Sampling plan" of the PDD. This is in line with the methodology.				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
Revised Monitoring Report Version 2.				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date:</b> 06-04-2017
There is typographical correction to the registered PDD in section B.7.1 for the monitoring parameter, "Confirmation that non-renewable biomass has been substituted". The revised PDD /5/ has been checked by the verification team and the correction meets the criteria under appendix 1 of Project standard. The corrected confidence /precision level 90/10 (conservative option) is as per the calculations in section B.7.2. "Sampling plan" of the PDD and in line with sampling guideline and the methodology. The correction is acceptable and hence the finding is closed.				

<b>CL ID</b>	02	<b>Section no.</b>	MR section D.2	<b>Date:</b> 28-03-2017
<b>Description of CL</b>				
The monitoring value of the parameter "Non-usage days of installed and operational biogas plants" is missing?				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date:</b> 04-04-2017
The monitoring value of the parameter Non-usage days of installed and operational biogas plants has been included in the revised Monitoring Report.				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
Revised Monitoring Report Version 2.				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date:</b> 06-04-2017
The monitored values of the parameter "Non-usage days of installed and operational biogas plants" have been correctly included in the revised MR. The values have been cross verified with log book data and monitoring database and found to be correct. Hence the finding is closed.				

<b>CL ID</b>	03	<b>Section no.</b>	ER sheet- non usage days	<b>Date:</b> 28-03-2017
<b>Description of CL</b>				

ER sheet- non usage days	
The heading of table 2 mentions “Total operational days”. PI rectify	
<b>Project participant response</b>	<b>Date:</b> 04-04-2017
The heading of Table 2 has been corrected. It is the total non-operational days of biogas units.	
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>	
Revised Excel sheet for Emission Reductions Calculations has been submitted.	
<b>DOE assessment</b>	<b>Date:</b> 06-04-2017
The revised ER sheet has been checked to have rectified the changes correctly. The finding is closed.	

**Table 3. CAR from this verification**

<b>CAR ID</b>	01	<b>Section no.</b>	MR section D.3	<b>Date:</b> 28-03-2017
<b>Description of CAR</b>				
The applied precision (30%) for sample size calculation is not in line with the standard and guideline of sampling and surveys as well as the methodology. PI clarify				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date:</b> 04-04-2017
In section B.7.1 of the registered PDD, for the parameter “Confirmation that non-renewable biomass has been substituted”, the confidence/precision level is mentioned as 90/30. But the applied precision has been revised to 10% in line with the standard and guideline of sampling and surveys as well as the methodology in the revised Monitoring Report Version 2.				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
Revised Monitoring Report Version 2.				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date:</b> 06-04-2017
The applied precision level (10%) for sample size calculation is in line with the standard and guideline of sampling and surveys and methodology and also with section B.7.2 of the registered PDD). Thus calculated sample size with 90/10 confidence/precision level is found to be conservative and acceptable. Hence the finding is closed.				

**Table 4. FAR from this verification**

<b>FAR ID</b>	xx	<b>Section No.</b>		<b>Date:</b> DD/MM/YYYY
<b>Description of FAR</b>				
NA				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date:</b> DD/MM/YYYY
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date:</b> DD/MM/YYYY

- - - - -

**Document information**

---

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.0	23 March 2015	Initial publication.

---

Decision Class: Regulatory  
Document Type: Form  
Business Function: Issuance  
Keywords: project activities, verifying and certifying

---