



**Verification and certification report form for
CDM project activities
(Version 03.0)**

Complete this form in accordance with the instructions attached at the end of this form.

BASIC INFORMATION

Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity	GHG abatement through Solar Power Generation at Jaisalmer, Rajasthan, India (UNFCCC Ref. No. 7461 ¹)
Scale of the project activity	☐ Large-scale ☒ Small-scale
Version number of the verification and certification report	01
Completion date of the verification and certification report	13/03/2020
Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period	Monitoring period number: 02 Monitoring period: 01/09/2017 to 01/02/2020 (Inclusive of both days)
Version number of the monitoring report to which this report applies	02
Crediting period of the project activity corresponding to this monitoring period	31 Oct 13 - 30 Oct 23 (Fixed)
Project participants	M/s Precision Technik Private Limited
Host Party	India
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	Sectoral Scope 1: Energy Industries (renewable - /non-renewable sources) Methodology: - AMS I.D – Grid connected renewable electricity generation – version 17 Standardized Methodology: Not Applicable
Mandatory sectoral scopes	1: Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)
Conditional sectoral scopes, if applicable	NA
Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring duration in the registered PDD	19,107 tCO ₂ e
Certified amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring period	GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks reported up to 31 December 2012: 0 tCO ₂ e GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks reported from 1 January 2013 onwards: 19,695 tCO ₂ e
Name and UNFCCC reference number of the	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)

¹ <https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1348660371.78/view>

DOE	UNFCCC reference number: E-0032
Name, position and signature of the approver of the verification and certification report	Juan Sendín Caballero, LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification). B.U. Managing Director

SECTION A. Executive summary

M/s Precision Technik Private Limited (PTPL) incorporated on 19th December 1995 under the Companies Act, 1956 is a part of the Sonthalia Group. The Sonthalia Group is a Kolkata based business house with diversified business interests in Polymers, Textiles & Readymade Garments, Jewellery, Steel, Solar Module manufacturing and Infrastructure Development.

PTPL has developed a 5 MW grid connected solar Photovoltaic power project in Nokh Village, Pokhran Tehsil in Jaisalmer District in the State of Rajasthan in Western India. The entire power generated from this project is being sold to NTPC Vidyut Vyapar Nigam (NVVN) by connecting it to state grid through a power purchase agreement with NVVN. The project activity has been commissioned on 8th February 2012 and is continuing operation since then.

As the project activity is a Greenfield activity and in the absence of the project activity the electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity would have otherwise been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources in the grid.

During the present monitoring period 01/09/2017 to 01/02/2020 (inclusive of both days), the project activity has achieved emission reductions 19,695 tCO₂e.

1. Verification Scope: The verification scope encompasses an independent and objective review and ex-post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions by the DOE. The verification is based on the submitted monitoring report, the validated and registered PDD as well as its validation report, the applied monitoring methodology, relevant decisions, clarifications and guidance from the CMP and the EB and any other information and references relevant to the project activity's resulting emission reductions. These documents are reviewed against the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM Modalities and Procedures and related rules and guidance. Based on the requirements in the "CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, Version 02", Applus+ Certification has applied a rule-based approach for the verification of the project. The principles of accuracy, completeness, relevance, reliability and credibility were combined with a conservative approach to establish a traceable and transparent verification opinion. The verification considers both quantitative and qualitative information on emission reductions. The verification is not meant to provide any consultancy towards the client. However, stated requests for clarifications, corrective and/or forward actions may provide input for improvement of the monitoring activities.

2. Methodology:

LGA Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) – Hereinafter referred as Applus+ Certification - approach to the verification is a two-stage process.

In the 1st stage, Applus+ Certification completed a strategic review and risk assessment of the project activities and processes in order to gain a full understanding of:

- Activities associated with all the sources contributing to the project emissions and emission reductions, including leakage if relevant;
- Protocols used to estimate or measure GHG emissions from these sources;
- Collection and handling of data;
- Controls on the collection and handling of data;
- Means of verifying reported data; and
- Compilation of the monitoring report

Applus+ Certification used a Periodical Verification Checklist that, based on the risk-based assessment of the parameters and data collection and handling processes for each of those parameters, describes the verification approach and the sampling plan.

3. Desk Review

In the 1st stage, using the Verification Checklist, Applus+ Certification verified the implementation of the monitoring plan and the data presented in the Monitoring Report for the period in question. This involved a site visit and a desk review of the Monitoring Report. This Verification Report describes the findings of this assessment.

The Monitoring Report version 01 submitted by the PP was made publicly available on the UNFCCC website before the verification activities started. The published MR was assessed based on all the relevant documents. The aim of the assessment in the desk review was to:

- verify the completeness of the data and the information presented in the MR;
- Check the compliance of the MR with respect to the monitoring plan depicted in the registered PDD and verify that the applied methodology was carried out. Particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of the metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures was paid;
- Evaluate the data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions.

4. Assessment team

According to the sectoral scope / technical area and experience in the sectoral or national business environment, LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) has composed a project assessment team in accordance with the appointment rules in the internal Quality Management System of LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification).

The LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) ensuring that the required skills are covered by the team shall approve the composition of audit team

The four qualification levels for team members that are assigned by formal appointment rules are as presented below:

- Lead Auditor (LA)
- Auditor (A) / Auditor in Training (AiT)
- Technical Expert (TE)
- Technical Reviewer (TR)

The assessment team shall cover the sectoral scope / technical area knowledge linked to the applied methodology/ies.

Name	Role	SS Coverage	TA Coverage	Financial aspect
Mr. Sukanta Das	LA/TE	YES	YES	NA
Mr. Simon Shen	TR	YES	YES	NA

The curriculum vitae of the DOE's Verification team members are provided in Appendix 2 of this report.

4. Review of Documentation:

The Monitoring Report version 01 submitted by the PP was made publicly available on the UNFCCC website before the verification activities started. The published MR was assessed based on all the relevant documents. A cross-check between information provided and information from other sources has been done. A complete list of documents reviewed is available in Appendix 3 of this report.

5. On-site Assessment and follow-up Interviews:

As a part of the verification, the assessment team has performed the on-site inspection. The objective of the on-site assessment is to:

- confirm the implementation and operation of the project;

- review the data flow for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters;
- confirm the correct implementation of procedures for operations and data collection;
- Cross-check the information provided in the MR documentation with other sources;
- Check the monitoring equipment against the requirements of the PDD and the approved methodology, including calibrations, maintenance, etc.
- Review the calculations and assumptions used to obtain the GHG data and ER;
- Identify if the quality control and quality assurance procedures are in place to prevent or correct errors or omissions in the reported parameters.

The details are mentioned in section D.2 of this report.

6. Quality of Evidences

Sufficient evidence covering the full verification period in the required frequency is available to verify the figures stated in the final MR. The source of the evidences will be discussed in Appendix 3 of this report. Specific cross-checks have been done in cases that further sources were available. The assessment team against the raw data checked the monitoring report's figures. The data collection system meets the requirements of the monitoring plan as per the methodology.

7. Reporting of Findings

As an outcome of the verification process, the assessment team can raise different types of findings.

Where a non-conformance arises the assessment team shall raise a Corrective Action Request (CAR). A CAR is issued, where:

- a) Modifications to the implementation, operation and monitoring of the registered project activity has not been sufficiently documented by the project participants;
- b) Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions that will impact the quantity of emission reductions;
- c) Issues identified in a FAR during validation to be verified during verification or previous verification(s) have not been resolved by the project participants.

The assessment team shall raise a Clarification Request (CL) if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM requirements have been met.

All CARs and CLs raised during verification shall be resolved prior to submitting a request for issuance.

Forward Action Requests (FARs) may be raised during verification for actions where the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period. All the CARs/CLs/FARs are being discussed in Appendix 4 of this report

8. Internal Quality Control

As a final step of verification, the final documentation including the verification report has to undergo an internal quality control by the Technical Reviewer. Each report has to be finally approved by either the DOE's Technical Manager or the Deputy. In case one of these two persons is part of the assessment team, the approval can only be given by the person who is not a part of the assessment team. If the documents have been satisfactorily approved, the request of issuance is submitted to CDM EB along with the requisite documents.

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/document review	On-site inspection	Interviews	Verification findings
1.	Lead Auditor/ Technical Expert	O R	Das	Sukanta	True Quality Certifications private Limited- Outsourced entity	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

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	EI	Shen	Simon	Applus+ Certification
2.	Approver	IR	Sendin Caballero	Juan	Applus+ Certification

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	Human errors: Readings from Meters (if not automatic)	LOW	Human error is likely to occur if the monitoring personnel are not trained well or inexperienced in data recording procedures and monitoring processes.	All the personal are well trained to monitor and collect data and thus risk associated with Human error is minimized. Assessment team checked the training records to confirm that all the personal are well trained to handle the activities related to monitoring. Assessment team checked the training records for the complete monitoring period and confirm that the personal are well trained to monitor and collect data for the project activity.
2	Human error: Quantification of emission reduction	LOW	Use of spread-sheets without adequate data control, changes/updates, version	All the Monthly energy meter reading i.e. JMR by State electricity board for the complete monitoring period are checked and thus the assessment team confirms that the ER value is conservative and correct.

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	
			tracking, traceability and security	

C.2. Consideration of materiality in conducting the verification

In line with Guidelines for Application of materiality in verifications, the verification team has conducted a complete verification of all the information presented in the monitoring report and data monitored as presented in the emission reduction calculation spread sheet. There are no material errors, overestimation of ER, omission or misstatement

SECTION D. Means of verification

D.1. Desk/document review

The verification was performed primarily based on the review of the monitoring report and the supporting documentation. This process included review of data and information presented to verify their completeness and review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment used including calibration requirements, and the QA/QC procedures, and an evaluation of data management and the QA/QC system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reduction.

The initial MR Version 01 submitted by the project participant and additional background documents related to the emission reductions are reviewed as an initial step of the verification process. The subsequent step involved the identification of corrective action requests, clarification requests and Forward action request (CAR, CL and FAR) which are presented in Appendix 4 of this report. As a result of these findings, the MR is revised to MR Version 02. A complete list of all documents and records reviewed is as attached in Appendix 03 of this report.

D.2. On-site inspection

Duration of on-site inspection: 10/03/2020				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	The verification team conducted visit to the project site to confirm the information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. An on-site assessment was conducted as a part of verification activity and involved: 1) an assessment of the implementation and operation of the CDM project activity as per the registered PDD 2) a review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting of the monitoring parameters 3) interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the Monitoring Plan 4) a cross-check between information provided in the MR and data from other sources 5) a check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance, and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the applied methodology 6) a review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and ERs, and 7) an identification of QA/QC procedures in place to prevent, or identify and correct, any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters	The project location are described below: Village : Nokh Tehsil: Pokhran District : Jaisalmer State: Rajasthan Country: India	10/03/2020	Mr. Sukanta Das

D.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Kumar	Yogesh	Site In-charge- (Rajasthan), PTPL	10/03/2020	As mentioned above in section D.2 of this report	Mr. Sukanta Das

D.4. Sampling approach

No sampling is used as the verification team has visited site along with the substations. The verification team has reviewed all the documents like commissioning certificates, JMR report sheets etc.

D.5. Clarification requests (CLs), corrective action requests (CARs) and forward action requests (FARs) raised

Areas of verification findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form	00	01	00
Compliance of the project implementation and operation with the registered PDD	00	02	00
Post-registration changes	00	00	00

Areas of verification findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with the methodologies including applicable tools and standardized baselines	00	00	00
Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan	00	00	00
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	00	01	00
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals	00	01	00
Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits	00	00	00
Global stakeholder consultation	00	00	00
Others (please specify) –	00	00	00
Total	00	05	00

SECTION E. Verification findings

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

Means of verification	The verification team has determined whether the monitoring report was completed using the valid version of the applicable monitoring report form. The verification team has checked whether all the sections of the monitoring report follows the guidelines provided in the template.
Findings	CAR 01 was raised during the verification process and closed successfully. Please refer Appendix 4 of this report for the detail closure of the CAR.
Conclusion	The MR was web hosted in version 07.0 of the MR form, which was the current and active version in the UN platform. PP used the latest version of the MR template available on UN web site i.e. version 07 for correction of the CAR/CL raised and submitted the same to DOE for further assessment. The monitoring report has been prepared as per the instructions provided in the template. DOE has made the version 01 of the monitoring report covering the monitoring period from 01/09/2017 to 01/02/2020 (inclusive of both days) publicly available through its dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website before undertaking the site visit for the verification on 10/03/2020. The verification team has concluded that the monitoring report was completed using the valid version of the applicable monitoring report form and is followed the guidelines contained in the template.

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

This is 2nd periodic verification of the project activity. No FAR was raised during the 1st verification of the project activity.

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

Means of verification	The verification team determined the conformity of the actual implemented project activity and its operation with the registered project design document. DOE has, by means of a desk review and an on-site visit, assessed whether all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place, and that the project participants have operated the CDM project activity as per the registered PDD.
Findings	CAR 02 and CAR 03 were raised during the verification process that was closed successfully. Please refer Appendix 4 of this report for the detailed closure of the CAR
Conclusion	The verification team has reviewed the commissioning certificates (commissioning date: 8th February 2012) to conclude that the capacity of the project is same as mentioned in the registered PDD. The capacity does not change after the registration of the project activity as confirmed by the assessment team during verification site visit. The project is a small-scale project activity and the DOE confirm the same during the onsite visit. The project is in Continuous operation since inception and no unforeseen incident observed during the monitoring period, which can affect the applicability or additionality of the methodology. The project undergone scheduled maintenance and operation, which is as per

the requirement of the Manufacturer and no unforeseen incident observed or forced major, observed during the monitoring period for the power plant.

The above-mentioned investors employed the Solar PV Modules of poly crystalline technology for the proposed 5 MW project. The Solar power system has been designed with number of sub main plants, solar PV arrays and inverters of suitable capacity. The electricity exported by the proposed project activity would displace an equivalent amount of electricity generated by the power plants already operational and proposed to be added in the North-East-West-North East (NEWNE) Grid which relies predominantly on fossil fuels. Thus, it contributes towards reduction in the demand-supply gap during periods of electricity shortage and increase in the share of renewable energy in the grid mix.

The solar PV power plant has got solar PV modules, inverters, transformers and other protection system and supporting components as well. The various components of the plant include:

- Solar Photovoltaic modules
- Inverters
- Transformers
- Circuit breakers
- Lightening arrester
- Isolator
- Current transformer
- Switchyard
- LT panel
- Earthing system

The Direct Current (DC) from modules is converted into Alternating Current (AC) by inverters. The inverter outputs are fed into a junction box, which in turn is connected to the LV Panel in the control room. The output from LV Panel is stepped up by outdoor type transformers located near the control room.

The HV side of transformer is connected to HT Panel in the control room. The LV and HT Panels have all necessary metering and protection as per Power evacuation schematic.

- 5 MW divided into 5 number of 1 MW
- 1 MW divided in to 2 number of 500 KW inverter
- 500 kw system is connected by 113 strings of solar panel
- Each string consists of 22 solar modules connected in series

Basic System Design:

Parameter	Specifications
Power Generation Units	5 no's each with a proposed capacity of 1MW.
Inverter	Each of the 1 MW units are divided into 2 nos of 500 kW each. Inverter input voltage range 500-820 volt
Modules	230 Wp 30 volts modules have been used. 4348 modules (1 MW) have been used.
Strings	String voltage is 660 volt, 226 strings per MW have been used
Wires	Each inverter has got 5 wires

The plant is connected to RVPN's 132 kV GSS (PS-2) District Jodhpur, the metering equipment installed at delivery points having the main meter and check meter serial number 11071570 and 11071571 respectively.

The project location are described below:

Village : Nokh
Tehsil: Pokhran
District : Jaisalmer

	State: Rajasthan Country: India The latitude and longitude of the project are as follows: Latitude: 26° 54'56.69" N Longitude: 70° 54' 30.03" E The above details are checked by the assessment team during the verification site visit, latitude and longitude are also checked via Google earth, and GPS meters during the site visit. The detail also forms the part of Monitoring report and thus acceptable to the assessment team. Assessment team confirm that the solar plant is connected to the RVPN's 132 kV GSS (PS-2) District Jodhpur. Based on the documentary evidence of commissioning certificates and physical verification DOE concludes that the project was implemented as per the registered PDD.
--	---

E.4. Post-registration changes

E.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents²

There are no temporary deviations observed for this monitoring period.

E.4.2. Corrections

No correction approval is required from EB.

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

This is 2nd periodic verification. The project activity involves change in start date of crediting period. The start date of crediting period is already **changed from 31 Oct 12 - 30 Oct 22 to 31 Oct 13 - 30 Oct 23 (Fixed)** (<https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1348660371.78/view.>)

No change envisaged for the present verification of the project activity.

E.4.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan

Not applicable for present Monitoring period

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

Not applicable for present Monitoring period

E.4.6. Changes to the project design

Not applicable for present Monitoring period

² 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.4.7. Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities

Not applicable for the project activity.

E.5. Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with applied methodologies, applied standardized baselines, and other applied methodological regulatory documents

Means of verification	The verification team determined whether the registered monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology AMS I.D version 17 including applicable tools.
Findings	No finding was raised regarding Compliance of monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool and standardized baseline.
Conclusion	The verification team was able to confirm that the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the project activity, i.e. AMS I.D version 17 and its applicable tools.

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**

Means of verification	The assessment team checked the registered PDD to confirm the ex-ante fixed parameter mentioned in the current monitoring report. Assessment team also interviewed the personal onsite to check further regarding the ex-ante values used for emission reduction calculation.
Findings	No finding were raised on the Data and parameters fixed ex ante.
Conclusion	EF_{grid, CM, y} / EF_{grid, CO₂, y}, EF_{grid, BM, y}, EF_{grid, OM, y} were mentioned as ex-ante fixed parameter. Assessment team checked the values, source of data, choice of data, purpose of the data mentioned in the MR from the registered PDD and confirms that the similar approach was considered for the current monitoring period also. 1. EF_{grid, OM, y}: Operating Margin emissions factor for grid connected power generation in year y calculated using the latest version of "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system." EF_{grid, OM, y} is computed using the Simple Operating margin CO₂ emission factor. Simple Operating margin CO₂ emission factor is calculated from the weighted average CO₂ emissions per unit net electricity generation of all power plants serving the system, not including low-cost / must-run. This is in agreement with the guidance provided in the Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system. The value is considered from CEA version 06 and registered PDD. Assessment team checked the registered PDD and found that value considered for emission reduction calculation in this present monitoring period is sourced from the registered PDD. Thus assessment team conclude that the emission reduction calculation for the present monitoring period is conservative and correct. 2. EF_{grid, BM, y}: Build Margin emissions factor for grid connected power generation in year y calculated using the latest version of "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system." Build margin emission factor is the generation-weighted average emission factor of all power plants <i>m</i> during the most recent year y for which generation data is available. Equation 13 of Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system is used to calculate EF_{grid, BM, y}. The value is considered from CEA version 06 and registered PDD. Assessment team checked the registered PDD and found that value considered for emission reduction calculation in this present monitoring period is sourced from the registered PDD. Thus assessment team conclude that the emission reduction calculation for the present monitoring period is conservative and correct. 3. EF_{grid, CM, y} / EF_{grid, CO₂, y}: Combined Margin emissions factor for grid connected power generation in year y calculated using the latest version of "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system." EF_{grid, CM, y} is computed using the official data sources and is in-line with the guidance provided in the tool. The value is considered from CEA version 06

	and registered PDD. Assessment team checked the registered PDD and found that value considered for emission reduction calculation in this present monitoring period is sourced from the registered PDD. Thus assessment team conclude that the emission reduction calculation for the present monitoring period is conservative and correct. The value for EF grid, CM, y / EF grid,CO₂,y, EFgrid,BM,y, EFgrid,OM,y were considered from the CO₂ baseline database (Version 06) published by Central Electricity Authority (CEA). The default value as mentioned in the registered PDD and MR are same. The value of combined margin in India is being given by CEA and thus assessment team conclude that the value is correct and appropriate. The default value in turn is used for baseline calculation as per the formula given in the registered PDD for the current monitoring period.
--	---

E.6.2. Data and parameters monitored

Means of verification	The assessment team checked the registered PDD to confirm the ex-post parameter mentioned in the current monitoring report. Assessment team also interviewed the personal onsite to check further regarding the ex-post parameter monitoring and confirms that the same is in line with the registered PDD. AMS.I.D version 17 which was the applied methodology during the registration of the project is also checked to ensure that monitoring parameter as mentioned in the registered PDD and current MR are in compliance with the methodology.
Findings	No findings were raised regarding this issue
Conclusion	As per the registered monitoring plan and requirement of the registered methodology following parameters needs to be monitored: 1. EG_{BL, y}: Net electricity supplied to the grid by the project activity in year y The parameter is a calculated using the difference of export and import value measured from the electricity meter. The source of data of the parameter is Measured by the meter and as noted in the JMR provided by the agency. Electricity export and import is measured via Bi-directional electricity meter installed on the high tension side of the transformer and the value of export and import forms the part of Meter reading statement issued by State electricity board. The meter reading is taken during a fixed billing cycle of every month and representative of state electricity board and Operation and maintenance personal onsite present during the process. Assessment team checked all the values of the electricity exported and electricity imported from the Meter reading statement issued by State electricity board. The electricity meters are under the custody of the DISCOM and calibrated by DISCOM as per their standard procedures. However, project proponent had ensured that the meters calibrated at least once in three years. The meters are calibrated in line with Indian regulations for such installations. Accuracy of the meters is 0.2S. The accuracy class of active energy measurement is in accordance to Indian national Standards. The meter is of Larson and turbo make which is confirmed by the assessment team during the verification site visit. The net electricity exported to the grid is then calculated from the difference of export and import value. The value of EG_{BL, y} is then cross checked from the invoices raised to state electricity board by the project participant. The invoices also matched with EG_{BL, y} calculated from export and import values which is in accordance with approved methodology and registered PDD. The parameter is a calculated using the difference of export and import value measured from the electricity meter. The parameter also forms the part of JMR as in line with the registered PDD. The value can also be cross check from the invoice details as per the requirement of applied methodology and registered PDD. As the parameter is a calculated value hence calibration is not applicable and the data will be kept for two years after the end of the crediting period or the last issuance of CERs for this project activity, whichever occurs later.

E.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan

Means of verification	The verification assessed whether the compliance of the sampling efforts and surveys with the registered sampling plan in accordance with the "Standard for
------------------------------	---

	sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities" if PP had applied a sampling approach to determine data and parameters monitored.
Findings	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
Conclusion	PP did not apply sampling plan to determine data and parameters monitored during this monitoring period. The verification team has checked all the documents such as Monthly Joint Energy Meter Reading Report etc. and hence sampling plan was not required. The verification team hereby confirms that are checked all the documents

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

Means of verification	The verification team determined whether the calibration of the measuring equipment that has an impact on the claimed emission reductions is conducted by the PP at a frequency specified in the registered monitoring plan																																				
Findings	CAR 05 was raised during the verification process and closed successfully. Please refer Appendix 4 of this report for the detail closure of the CAR.																																				
Conclusion	Assessment team checked the calibration details of the installed meters and found that meters were not calibrated as per the frequency mentioned in the registered PDD. The period 29 November 2017 to 08 March 2018 is not covered under the validity of calibrated energy meters. Therefore, error factor as per the accuracy class (0.2%) of meters is applied during the duration. As a conservative approach, full month from November 2017 to March 2018 have been considered for the application of error factor. The applied error factor is found acceptable and hence calculated ER value for the present monitoring period is conservative. Moreover, during the onsite visit it was also observed that the Old main meter number 11071570 is replaced by new main meter having meter number 16113796 on 11-Sep-2019 which is in between the monitoring period. The meter replacement detail are checked by the assessment team and confirm that meter replacement is in accordance to national and statutory requirement and there were no recuperation in the ER calculation for the change in meter. The same is thus acceptable to the assessment team. The calibration is conducted by Darsh Calibration private Limited, Jodhpur on behalf of DISCOM. The calibration agency follows the guideline for National Accreditation Board for Testing and Calibration Laboratories (NABL=http://www.nabl-india.org/), Govt of India. The calibration details are as below: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Main Meter</th><th>Check Meter</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Serial Number</td><td>11071570</td><td>11071571</td></tr> <tr> <td>Accuracy Class</td><td>0.2s</td><td>0.2s</td></tr> <tr> <td>Make</td><td>Larsen & Turbo Limited</td><td>Larsen & Turbo Limited</td></tr> <tr> <td>Previous verification Calibration Date</td><td>30/Nov/2014</td><td>30/Nov/2014</td></tr> <tr> <td>Calibration Due Date</td><td>29/Nov/2017</td><td>29/Nov/2017</td></tr> <tr> <td>Calibration Date for the present verification</td><td>8/Mar/2018</td><td>8/Mar/2018</td></tr> <tr> <td>Calibration Due Date</td><td>7/Mar/2021</td><td>7/Mar/2021</td></tr> <tr> <td>Meter Change and Calibration date</td><td>11/Sep/2019</td><td rowspan="5"></td></tr> <tr> <td>Serial Number</td><td>16113796</td></tr> <tr> <td>Accuracy Class</td><td>0.2s</td></tr> <tr> <td>Make</td><td>Larsen & Turbo Limited</td></tr> <tr> <td>Calibration Due Date</td><td>10/Sep/2022</td></tr> </tbody> </table> *Note: The period 29 November 2017 to 08 March 2018 is not			Main Meter	Check Meter	Serial Number	11071570	11071571	Accuracy Class	0.2s	0.2s	Make	Larsen & Turbo Limited	Larsen & Turbo Limited	Previous verification Calibration Date	30/Nov/2014	30/Nov/2014	Calibration Due Date	29/Nov/2017	29/Nov/2017	Calibration Date for the present verification	8/Mar/2018	8/Mar/2018	Calibration Due Date	7/Mar/2021	7/Mar/2021	Meter Change and Calibration date	11/Sep/2019		Serial Number	16113796	Accuracy Class	0.2s	Make	Larsen & Turbo Limited	Calibration Due Date	10/Sep/2022
	Main Meter	Check Meter																																			
Serial Number	11071570	11071571																																			
Accuracy Class	0.2s	0.2s																																			
Make	Larsen & Turbo Limited	Larsen & Turbo Limited																																			
Previous verification Calibration Date	30/Nov/2014	30/Nov/2014																																			
Calibration Due Date	29/Nov/2017	29/Nov/2017																																			
Calibration Date for the present verification	8/Mar/2018	8/Mar/2018																																			
Calibration Due Date	7/Mar/2021	7/Mar/2021																																			
Meter Change and Calibration date	11/Sep/2019																																				
Serial Number	16113796																																				
Accuracy Class	0.2s																																				
Make	Larsen & Turbo Limited																																				
Calibration Due Date	10/Sep/2022																																				

	covered under the validity of calibrated energy meters. Therefore, error factor as per the accuracy class (0.2%) of meters is applied during the duration. As a conservative approach, full month from November 2017 to March 2018 have been considered for the application of error factor.	
--	--	--

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

Means of verification	The verification team assessed whether the data and calculations of GHG emission reductions achieved resulting from the registered CDM project activity. The verification team has checked whether calculations of baseline GHG emissions, project GHG emissions and leakage GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan
Findings	CAR 04 was raised during the verification process. The description of the CAR and its closure is described below in Appendix 4 of this report.
Conclusion	Baseline emission (BE_y): The baseline emissions is the product of electrical energy baseline $EG_{BL,y}$, expressed in MWh of electricity produced by the renewable generating unit multiplied by the grid emission factor. Baseline emission factor is calculated as combined margin, consisting of a combination of operating margin (OM) and build margin (BM) factors. $BE_y = EG_{BL,y} \times EF_{CO_2,grid,y}$ Where, BE_y is the baseline emissions in year y, tCO₂ $EG_{BL,y}$ is the quantity of net electricity supplied to the grid as a result of the implementation of the CDM project activity in year y (MWh) $EF_{CO_2,grid,y}$ is the CO₂ emission factor of the grid in year y, tCO₂/MWh Therefore, $BE_y = 20775.388 \times 0.9480$ $BE_y = 19,695 \text{ tCO}_{2e}$

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

Means of verification	The verification team assessed whether the data and calculations of GHG emission reductions achieved resulting from the registered CDM project activity. The verification team has checked whether calculations of baseline GHG emissions, project GHG emissions and leakage GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan.
Findings	No findings raised
Conclusion	The project activity being a Wind Power Project falls under the category of renewable energy project as defined in the methodology AMS-I.D and thus project emission is zero.

E.8.3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions

Means of verification	The verification team assessed whether the data and calculations of GHG emission reductions achieved resulting from the registered CDM project activity. The verification team has checked whether calculations of baseline GHG emissions, project GHG emissions and leakage GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring
------------------------------	---

	plan.
Findings	No findings were raised.
Conclusion	The leakage emissions are regarded as zero according to the applied methodology and registered PDD.

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

Means of verification	The verification team assessed whether the data and calculations of GHG emission reductions achieved resulting from the registered CDM project activity. The verification team has checked whether calculations of baseline GHG emissions, project GHG emissions and leakage GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan.
Findings	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
Conclusion	Emission reductions in this monitoring period are: Total Baseline Emissions: 19,695 tCO₂e Total Project Emission: 0 tCO₂e Total Leakage: 0 Total Emission Reduction: Emission reduction calculation is done based on following formula, $\text{Emission reduction (ER}_y\text{)} = \text{Baseline Emission (BE}_y\text{)} - \text{Project Emission (PE}_y\text{)}$ $= 19,695 - 0 - 0 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e} = 19,695 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$

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

Means of verification	The verification team has determined the CER achieved during this monitoring period with the estimated value and reason for increase if any.
Findings	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
Conclusion	The Actual emission reduction for the project activity is 19,695 tCO₂e (Checked from the actual emission reduction sheet). The estimated emission reduction in the registered PDD is provided for 365 days i.e. 7889 tCO₂e. However, present monitoring period contains 884 days. Hence, the value is thus calculated based on pro-rata basis from the estimated value in the registered PDD. The calculation is checked by the assessment team in the actual emission reduction sheet and found correct. The estimated value for the present monitoring period is thus 19,107 tCO₂e The actual emission reduction is 3.08% more than the estimated value. The reason for increase in actual value is higher Solar Intensity received by the plant for the monitoring period. Moreover, for the 1st verification, the actual ER was 1.31% less than the estimated value, hence the variation is not constant, and hence the slight increase of the actual value for the present monitoring period is acceptable to the assessment team. In addition, assessment team confirmed during the site visit there was no technical change in the equipment-installed on-site, which could have triggered the increase in actual ER value, and hence the increase of 3.08% is acceptable to the assessment team.

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

Means of verification	The verification team has determined the CER achieved during this monitoring period with the estimated value and reason for increase if any.
Findings	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
Conclusion	The Actual emission reduction for the project activity is 19,695 tCO₂e (Checked from the actual emission reduction sheet). The estimated emission reduction in the registered PDD is provided for 365 days i.e. 7889 tCO₂e. However, present monitoring period contains 884 days. Hence, the value is thus calculated based on pro-rata basis from the estimated value in the registered PDD. The calculation is checked by the assessment team in the actual emission reduction sheet and found correct. The estimated value for the present monitoring period is thus 19,107 tCO₂e The actual emission reduction is 3.08% more than the estimated value. The reason

	for increase in actual value is higher Solar Intensity received by the plant for the monitoring period. Moreover, for the 1st verification, the actual ER was 1.31% less than the estimated value, hence the variation is not constant, and hence the slight increase of the actual value for the present monitoring period is acceptable to the assessment team. In addition, assessment team confirmed during the site visit there was no technical change in the equipment-installed on-site, which could have triggered the increase in actual ER value, and hence the increase of 3.08% is acceptable to the assessment team.
--	--

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

Means of verification	The verification team has determined the GHG emission reductions achieved during first commitment period and second commitment period
Findings	There is no CAR/CL raised in this section.
Conclusion	1. GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks reported up to 31 December 2012: 0 tCO₂e 2. GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals by sinks reported from 1 January 2013 onwards: 19,695 tCO₂e 3. Total emission reduction for the monitoring period: 19,695 tCO₂e

E.9. Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits

Means of verification	Not applicable for the present monitoring period
Findings	Not applicable for the present monitoring period
Conclusion	Not applicable for the present monitoring period

E.10. Global stakeholder consultation

Means of verification	Not applicable for the present monitoring period
Findings	Not applicable for the present monitoring period
Conclusion	Not applicable for the present monitoring period

SECTION F. Internal quality control

As a final step of verification, the final documentation including the verification report has to undergo an internal quality control by the Technical Reviewer. Then each report has to be finally approved by either the DOE's Technical Manager or the Deputy. In case one of these two persons is part of the assessment team, the person who is not a part of the assessment team can only give the approval. If the documents have been satisfactorily approved, the request of issuance is submitted to CDM EB along with the requisite documents. Internal quality control ensures impartiality and quality of the report.

SECTION G. Verification opinion

Applus+ Certification has been engaged by M/s Precision Technik Private Limited (PTPL) Limited to perform the 2nd periodical verification of the project entitled GHG abatement through Solar Power Generation at Jaisalmer, Rajasthan, India (UNFCCC reference number: 7461)

The management of M/s Precision Technik Private Limited (PTPL) is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions on the basis set out within the project's Monitoring Plan in the registered PDD version 03 completed on 18/07/2012 and the applied methodology AMS.I.D version 17.

Our verification approach was based on the requirements as defined under the Kyoto Protocol, Marrakesh accord, as well as those defined by the CDM Executive Board. Our approach is risk-based, drawing on an understanding of the risks associated with reporting GHG emissions data and the controls in place to mitigate these. The verification can confirm that:

- the project is operated as planned and described in the project design document approved by the EB;
- the monitoring plan is as per the applied methodology;
- the monitoring in Monitoring Report is as per the PDD and the monitoring plan approved by the EB;
- the development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures are in accordance with the registered monitoring plan;
- the installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately;
- the monitoring system is in place and generates GHG emission reductions data;
- the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements.

In our opinion, the GHG emission reductions for GHG abatement through Solar Power Generation at Jaisalmer, Rajasthan, India or the monitoring period 01/09/2017 to 01/02/2020 (inclusive of both days) as reported in Monitoring Report, prepared on the basis of the project's Monitoring Plan are fairly stated.

Based on the information we have seen and evaluated, we confirm the following statement:

Reporting period: From 01/09/2017 to 01/02/2020
(inclusive of both days)

Verified emissions in the above reporting period:

Leakage emissions	0 tCO ₂ equivalents
Project emissions	0 tCO ₂ equivalents
Baseline emissions	19,695 tCO ₂ equivalents
Emission reductions	19,695 tCO ₂ equivalents

SECTION H. Certification statement

Same as above

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
BM	Build Margin
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction(s)
CEA	Central Electricity Authority
CL	Clarification request
CM	Combined Margin
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
DISCOM	Distribution Company (<i>India</i>)
DR	Document Review
EF	Emission Factor
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ER	Emission Reductions sheet
FAR	Forward Action Request
JMR	Joint Meter reading
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
GWP	Global Warming potential
RBI	Reserve Bank Of India
PP	Project Participant

PPA	Power purchase agreement
PTPL	Precision Technik Private Limited

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

1. **Mr. Sukanta DAS**, has done M. SC in (Electronics and Photonics) and M. Tech in (Energy technology) from Tezpur Central University/ Indian Institute of technology Bombay in India. He is a certified lead auditor for ISO 14001 EMS LA and ISO 9001 QMS LA from International registry for Certified Auditors (IRCA) and Certified Lean Management practitioner from Quality Council of India (QCI). He has more than Nine (9) years of working experience at TUV NoRD/ Re-consult/CRA/APPLUS certifications under various categories of projects stating from Renewable to waste to supercritical projects. He was JI/ CDM Lead Assessor in TUV NoRD and was involved in more than 100 CDM validation and verifications activities in Gold Standard, VCS, CDM projects as a team leader/technical reviewer / validator / verifier covering the sectoral scope 1, 13 technical areas 1.2/1.1/13.1. Currently he is associated with True Quality Certifications Private Limited and is empanelled with APPLUS certification to carry out GHG audit
2. **Meng (Simon) Shen** (Master Degree in Thermal Energy Engineering, Bachelor Degree in Environmental Engineering) is a Lead Auditor appointed by Applus+ LGAI for the GHG project assessment. He is based in Shanghai. He has several years of work experience in environmental protection field. Before he joined Applus+ LGAI, he had been worked for TÜV SÜD as a GHG Validator/Assessment team and ISO 9001/14001 Lead Auditor for 3.5 years

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1	NA	Commissioning certificates of the solar power plant	The commissioning certificate is dated 8th February 2012	Project participant
2	NA	Contract of the project participant with the DOE	Contract document signed between PP and DOE	Project participant
3	NA	VVS standard-version 02	UNFCCC web site	UNFCCC

4	NA	Joint Meter reading and Invoices for the complete monitoring period	Joint Meter reading and Invoices for the complete monitoring period	Project participant
5	NA	MR version 01 MR version 02	MR version 01 dated 22/01/2020 MR version 02 dated 12/03/2020	Project participant
6	NA	ER sheet version 01 ER sheet version 02	ER sheet version 01 dated 22/01/2020 ER sheet version 02 dated 12/03/2020	Project participant
7	NA	Actual geo-coordinates by GE	Actual coordinates for the project activity via GPS meters	Project participant
8	NA	Break Down details of both the Units	Log book records onsite	Project participant
9	NA	Guidelines for Application of materiality in verifications version 2.0	UNFCCC web site	UNFCCC
10	NA	Calibration details for the complete monitoring period	Calibration certificates for the installed meters. Minutes of meeting for the meter replacement dated 11/09/2019	Project participant

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

Table 1 Remaining FAR from validation and/or previous verifications

FAR ID	xx	Section no.	E.2	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR				
<i>No FAR is remaining from validation or previous verifications.</i>				
Project participant response				Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by project participant				
DOE assessment				
Date: DD/MM/YYYY				

Table 2 CL from this verification

CL ID	xx	Section no.		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of CL				
N/A				
Project participant response				Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by project participant				
DOE assessment				
Date: DD/MM/YYYY				

Table 3 CAR from this verification

CAR ID	01	Section no.	E.1	Date: 11/03/2020
Description of CAR				
The Editorial comments are compiled in one CAR. The same is described below:				
- As per MR, the project activities commissioned details are provided. However, the certificates are missing. Corrective action is sought for the same. - Information on the implementation and actual operation in section B.1 of the MR of the project activity, including relevant dates (e.g. construction, commissioning, start of operation). - In accordance with the Project Standard Ver.02, Para 256(A), Project participant mentioned the details regarding the technologies used in the project activity but to verify the same, no such document (i.e. technical equipment's details, etc.) is provided to DOE team				
Project participant response				Date: 12/03/2020
- Commissioning certificate is being provided. - Information on actual implementation in the section B.1 of the MR version 2 have been updated, - Project Technical documents are being provided to the DOE for the assessment.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Commissioning Certificates, MR V2 and the project technical documents.				
DOE assessment				Date: 13/03/2020
The required documents like Commissioning certificate are provided to the assessment team. The actual implementation of the project is now detailed out in section B.1 of the MR. The technical documents are now submitted to the assessment team. CAR is closed.				

CAR ID	02	Section no.	E.3.	Date: 11/03/2020
Description of CAR				
During the document review it was observed that the details of feeder wise Solar Panel location is missing in the MR. Corrective action is sought in the respective section of the MR				
Project participant response				Date: 12/03/2020
<i>The solar plant is connected to the RVPN's 132 kV GSS (PS-2) District Jodhpur.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<i>MR V2.</i>				
DOE assessment				Date: 13/03/2020
The connecting feeder is as per the onsite practice and hence the CAR is closed.				

CAR ID	03	Section no.	E.3.	Date: 11/03/2020
Description of CAR				
In accordance with the Project Standard Ver.02, Para 260, Project Participant should provide Operation Log book records to DOE Team in orders to verify that does any plant shutdown happen or affects the calculation of GHG emission reduction or net anthropogenic GHG removal. Moreover, the supporting document regarding the breakdown details are also not provided to the assessment team. Corrective action is sought in the respective section of the MR and supporting documents for further analysis				
Project participant response				Date: 12/03/2020
<i>Breakdown details have been added to the MR V2 and the supporting is also provided.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<i>Breakdown details and MR V2.</i>				
DOE assessment				Date: 13/03/2020
The breakdown details log sheet is submitted to the assessment team. The details are found correct and there is no unforeseen incident observed for the present monitoring period. CAR is thus closed.				

CAR ID	04	Section no.	E.8.1	Date: 11/03/2020
Description of CAR				
Following are the observation on the ER sheet:				
1. ER sheet is not submitted to the assessment team and hence the ER value is thus reserved. 2. The cross check mechanism is not included in the ER sheet as per the requirement of Methodology. Moreover, JMR/Invoices are not provided to DOE for the complete monitoring period. 3. The estimated calculation is not correct. The pro-rata calculation for estimated emission reduction is missing in the ER sheet. Appropriate correction is sought in the respective section of the MR.				
The ER value is not rounded down which is not conservative. Corrective action is sought.				
The emission reduction calculation is thus reserved till the submission of proper documents.				
Project participant response				Date: 12/03/2020
1. ER sheet is now being submitted to the assessment team 2. JMR and Invoices is being provided 3. The estimation is now being corrected and added to the MR.				
<i>ER values is now being rounded down as a conservative approach.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<i>ER V2, the JMR and Invoices</i>				
DOE assessment				Date: 13/03/2020

Following are the observation of the DOE:

1. The ER sheet is now submitted to the assessment team. The ER value is found correct. CAR is thus closed
2. The cross check mechanism is now introduced in the ER sheet which is as per the requirement of the methodology and registered PDD. CAR is closed
3. The pro-rata calculation is now introduced in the ER sheet. The value is checked and found correct. CAR is thus closed
4. The ER value is now rounded down and hence conservative approach is applied. CAR is thus closed.

CAR ID	05	Section no.	E.7	Date: 11/03/2020
Description of CAR				
The calibration details are provided in the MR. Moreover, Calibration certificates for the complete monitoring period are also missing. Corrective action is sought for the same.				
Project participant response				Date: 12/03/2020
<i>Calibration certificates is being provided. The period 29 November 2017 to 08 March 2018 is not covered under the validity of calibrated energy meters. Therefore error factor as per the accuracy class (0.2%) of meters is applied during the duration. As a conservative approach, full month from November 2017 to March 2018 have been considered for the application of error factor.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<i>Calibration Certificate and the MR V2.</i>				
DOE assessment				Date: 13/03/2020
The Calibration reports are checked for the monitoring period and found correct. The period 29 November 2017 to 08 March 2018 is not covered under the validity of calibrated energy meters. Therefore error factor as per the accuracy class (0.2%) of meters is applied during the duration. As a conservative approach, full month from November 2017 to March 2018 have been considered for the application of error factor. CAR is closed.				

Table 4 FAR from this verification

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

Document information

Version	Date	Description
03.0	31 May 2019	Revision to: • Ensure consistency with version 02.0 of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (CDM-EB93-A05-STAN); • Make structural and editorial improvements.
02.1	11 January 2018	Editorial revision to correct the numbering of appendices in the instructions.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
02.0	31 October 2017	Revision to align with the requirements of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (version 01.0).
01.0	23 March 2015	Initial publication.

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