
VERIFICATION REPORT

44 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Maharashtra managed by Enercon India limited.

VCS ID 489

Monitoring Period 3: 01/10/2010 to 30/11/2011

(Both days inclusive)

SGS Climate Change Programme

SGS United Kingdom Ltd

SGS House

217-221 London Road

Camberley Surrey

GU15 3EY

United Kingdom

Project Title	44 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Maharashtra managed by Enercon India limited.
Version	02

Report Title	Verification Report for “44 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Maharashtra managed by Enercon India limited.”
Client	Enercon (India) Limited
Pages	36
Date of Issue	12/05/2012
Prepared By	SGS United Kingdom Limited
Contact	SGS Climate Change Programme, SGS United Kingdom Ltd, SGS House, 217-221, London Road, Camberley Surrey, GU15 3EY, United Kingdom
Phone	+44 20 3008 7882
E-mail	ukclimatechange@sgs.com
Approved By	Ramkrishna Patil – Technical Reviewer 14/05/2012
Work Carried Out By	Vikas Bankar – Lead Assessor/Team Leader/Local Assessor/ Sectoral Expert (TA 1.2 wind)

Summary

SGS United Kingdom Ltd has performed the verification of the project “44 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Maharashtra managed by Enercon India limited.” and VCS Project ID: 489 against VCS Standard Version 3.2. The verification includes confirming the implementation of the monitoring plan of the VCS Project Description dated 20/07/2009 and the application of the monitoring methodology as per ACM0002 version 10 valid from 11/06/2009. A site visit was conducted to verify the data submitted in the monitoring report.

This project activity is a bundled wind power generation project with total installed capacity of 44 MW. This project activity consists of the installation of 55 Wind Turbine Generators of capacity 800 kW each. The electricity generated from these wind mills is being supplied to the NEWNE Grid; hence replacing fossil fuel dominated grid connected electricity generation.

The report describes a total of 08 findings which include:

- 05 Corrective Action Requests (CARs);
- 03 Clarification Requests (CLs);
- 00 Forward Action Requests (FARs); and

All findings have been closed satisfactorily and same has been discussed in section A.1 of this verification report.

SGS confirms that the project is implemented in accordance with the validated VCS Project Description. The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements. Our opinion relates to the projects GHG emissions and the resulting GHG emission reductions reported and related to the valid and validated project baseline and monitoring and its associated documents. Based on the information seen and evaluated we confirm that the implementation of the project has resulted in **79,803** tCO₂e emission reductions during period 01/10/2010 up to 30/11/2011.

Abbreviations

BEF	Baseline Emission Factor
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CEA	Central Electricity Authority
CER	Certified Emission Reductions
CERC	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission
CL	Clarification Request
CMP	Conference of Parties Serving as Meeting of Parties
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
DISCOM	Distribution Company
EB	Executive Board
EIL	Enercon India Limited
EPC	Engineering, Procurement and Construction
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Green House Gas
ISO	International Standards Organization
JMR	Joint Meter Reading
kW	Kilowatt
kWh	Kilowatt hour
MFR	Multi-Function Relay
MR	Monitoring Report
MSEDCL	Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited
MW	Megawatt
MWh	Megawatt-hour
NEWNE	Northern Eastern Western Northern-Eastern
PDD	Project Design Document
PLF	Plant Load Factor
PP	Project Participant
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
SCADA	Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition
SGS	SGS United Kingdom Limited
QA/QC	Quality Assurance and Quality Control
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVM	Validation and Verification Manual
WTG/WEG/W	Wind Turbine Generator/Wind Energy Generator/Wind Energy Converter

EC	
VCS	Voluntary Carbon Standard
VCSA	Voluntary Carbon Standard Association
VCS PD	VCS Project Description
VCUs	Voluntary Carbon Units
VVM	Validation and Verification Manual

Table of Content

1.	Introduction	6
1.1	Objective	6
1.2	Scope and Criteria	6
1.3	Level of assurance	6
1.4	Summary Description of the Project	6
2.	Validation Process, Findings and Conclusion	8
2.1	Validation Process	8
2.2	Validation Findings	8
2.3	Validation Conclusion	8
3.	Verification Process	9
3.1	Method and Criteria	9
3.2	Document Review	9
3.3	Interviews	9
3.4	Site Inspections	10
3.5	Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy	10
3.6	Internal Quality Control	11
4.	Verification Findings	12
4.1	Project Implementation Status	12
4.2	Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations	19
4.3	Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals	20
4.4	Management and Operational System	21
5.	Verification Conclusion	22
6.	Document References	24
A.1.	Annex 1: Overview of Findings	26
A.2.	Annex 2: Team Members Statements of Competency	35

1. Introduction

1.1 Objective

SGS United Kingdom Ltd has been contracted by Enercon (India) Limited to perform an independent verification of its project “44 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Maharashtra managed by Enercon India limited.” against VCS Standard Version 3.2. The verifiers have reviewed the GHG data collected to date for the period between 01/10/2010 and 30/11/2011.

The purposes of this verification exercise are, by review of objective evidence, to independently review:

- Whether the project has resulted in emission reductions as declared by the organisation or GHG project’s GHG assertion;
- The data reported are accurate, complete, consistent, transparent and free of material error or omission.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

This engagement covers verification of emission reductions from anthropogenic sources of greenhouse gases included within the project boundary of “44 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Maharashtra managed by Enercon India limited”.

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. Our examination includes assessment, on a test basis, of evidence relevant to the amounts and disclosures in relation to the project’s GHG emission reductions for the defined reporting period.

The verification is not meant to provide any consulting towards the Client. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the project design.

1.3 Level of assurance

The level of assurance of the verification report is reasonable assurance engagements as selected by the Client. Materiality for the project is 5%.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

This engagement covers emissions and emission reductions from anthropogenic sources of greenhouse gases included within the project boundary of the following project and period.

Title of Project Activity:	44 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Maharashtra managed by Enercon India limited
Project database ID	VCSPD 489
Registry ID	VCSR 328
Monitoring Period Covered in this Report	01/10/2010 up to 30/11/2011
Project Proponent	Enercon (India) Limited (India-host)
Location of the Project Activity:	Villages in Kadvekhurd, Varekarwadi, Bhambarwadi & Panchpatta, in Satara, Sangli, Nasik & Ahmednagar district in the state of Maharashtra (India)

The project activity is located in districts Satara, Sangli, Nasik and Ahmednagar in the state of Maharashtra, India. The project activity consists of the installation of 55 WTGs of capacity 800 kW each invested by 29 investors. The electricity generated from these wind mills is being supplied to Maharashtra State grid which is integral part of NEWNE Grid. The equivalent amount of electricity would have been generated through fossil fuel fired power plants connected to NEWNE Grid resulting in higher GHG emissions in absence of



the project activity. Hence generation of power through the project activity contributes to GHG emission reductions. The project activity is already commissioned^{/11/} and it is found to be running satisfactorily.

2. Validation Process, Findings and Conclusion

2.1 Validation Process

This project activity is registered under VCS standard 2007.1 and PP hasn't applied the project activity to any other GHG program; hence not registered under any other GHG program. Thus it is concluded that all the rules and validation requirements set by VCS are already taken care at the time of VCS validation of the project activity under 2007.1. Thus no further validation is required for the project activity.

2.2 Validation Findings

2.2.1 Gap Validation

This project activity is not registered under CDM; gap validation with reference to the cover page and sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12.1, 1.12.2, 1.12.3, 1.12.4 and 1.13 of the VCS Project Description template is not required as the project activity is registered under VCS 2007.1 (Project I.D 489).

2.2.2 Methodology Deviations

Not applicable as no methodological deviations are found. Monitoring plan implemented at project site is in line with registered VCS PD^{/1/} as well as applied methodology^{/2/} for the project activity.

2.2.3 New Project Activity Instances

Not applicable as no new project activity instances are included in the project activity. During site visit to the project activity, it is confirmed that the implementation of the project activity is in accordance with the project description mentioned in registered VCS PD^{/1/}.

2.3 Validation Conclusion

Since the project activity is not registered under CDM or any other GHG program, no further validation is required for the project activity. It is concluded that all the rules and validation requirements set by VCS are already taken care at the time of VCS validation of the project activity under 2007.1 (<https://vcsprojectdatabase2.apx.com/myModule/Interactive.asp?Tab=Projects&a=2&i=489&lat=17%2E554167&lon=73%2E924444&bp=1>) and it is also found in line with VCS version 03 and 3.2.

3. Verification Process

3.1 Method and Criteria

SGS' approach to the verification is a two-stage process.

In the first stage, SGS completed a strategic review and risk assessment of the projects 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.

At the end of this stage, SGS produced a Verification Checklist which, based on the risk assessment of the parameters and data collection and handling processes for each of those parameters, describes the verification approach and the sampling plan.

Using the Verification checklist, SGS 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.

3.2 Document Review

The VCS PD, the monitoring report submitted by the client and additional background documents related to the project performance were reviewed. A complete list of all documents reviewed is attached in section 6 of this report.

3.3 Interviews

The site visit to the project activity was conducted during period 15/02/2012 to 17/02/2012. During site visit to the project activity, personnel responsible for monitoring of the project activity, data collection and management, QA/QC procedure to be followed for the project activity is interview. Summary of the same is discussed in table as below;

Date	Name	Position	Short Description of Subject Discussed
15/02/2012 – 17/02/2012 and onwards	Ms. Poorvi Joshi	Project Consultant – Enercon (India) Limited	• Plant Operations • Project boundary • Monitoring & Measuring System • Collections and recoding of data • Data archiving system • Calibration of measuring Equipments • Operation and Maintenance procedures • VCS monitoring & Reporting documentation • Quality Assurance-Management & Operating System • Training procedures
15/02/2012 – 17/02/2012	Mr. Ramesh Nikam Mr. Bhupinder Singh	Assistant Engineers –	• Plant Operations • Monitoring & Measuring System

Date	Name	Position	Short Description of Subject Discussed
	Mr. R. S. Deshmane Mr. Ulkesh Sonawane	Enercon (India) Limited	• Collections and recoding of data • Data archiving system • Calibration of measuring Equipments • Operation and Maintenance procedures • Quality Assurance-Management & Operating System • Training procedures

3.4 Site Inspections

As part of the verification, the following on-site inspections have been performed by Lead Assessor/Team Leader/Local Assessor/Sectoral Scope Expert.

Location: Villages in Kadvekhurd, Varekarwadi, Bhambarwadi & Panchpatta, in Satara, Sangli, Nasik & Ahmednagar district in the state of Maharashtra	
Date: 15/02/2012 – 17/02/2012	
Coverage:	Source of Information / Persons Interviewed
Assessment of project boundary	Ms. Poorvi Joshi, Project Consultant – Enercon (India) Limited
Plant Operations	Mr. Ramesh Nikam Mr. Bhupinder Singh Mr. R. S. Deshmane Mr. Ulkesh Sonawane, Assistant Engineers – Enercon (India) Limited
Monitoring and measuring system • Collection of measurements • Observations of established practices Data Verification of monitoring parameters	Ms. Poorvi Joshi, Project Consultant – Enercon (India) Limited, Mr. Ramesh Nikam Mr. Bhupinder Singh Mr. R. S. Deshmane Mr. Ulkesh Sonawane, Assistant Engineers – Enercon (India) Limited
VCS monitoring and reporting documentation	Ms. Poorvi Joshi, Project Consultant – Enercon (India) Limited
Quality Assurance – Management and operating system	Mr. Ramesh Nikam Mr. Bhupinder Singh Mr. R. S. Deshmane Mr. Ulkesh Sonawane, Assistant Engineers – Enercon (India) Limited

3.5 Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy

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

In general, where insufficient or inaccurate information is available and clarification or new information is required the team shall raise a Clarification Request (CL) specifying what additional information is required.

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

- I. the verification is not able to obtain sufficient evidence for the reported emission reductions or part of the reported emission reductions. In this case these emission reductions shall not be verified and certified;
- II. the verification has identified misstatements in the reported emission reductions. Emission reductions with misstatements shall be discounted based on the verifiers ex-post determination of the achieved emission reductions

The verification process may be halted until this information has been made available to the assessors' satisfaction. Failure to address a CL may result in a CAR. Information or clarifications provided as a result of a CL may also lead to a CAR.

FARs may be raised which are for the benefit of future projects and future verification actors. These have no impact upon the completion of the verification activity.

Corrective Action Requests and Clarification Requests are detailed in Verification Checklist. The Project Developer is given the opportunity to "close" outstanding CARs and respond to CLs and FARs.

3.6 Internal Quality Control

Following the completion of the assessment process and a recommendation by the Assessment Team, all documentation will be forwarded to a Technical Reviewer. The task of the Technical Reviewer is to check that all procedures have been followed and all conclusions are justified. The Technical Reviewer will either accept or reject the recommendation made by the assessment team.

4. Verification Findings

4.1 Project Implementation Status

4.1.1 Implementation status of the project activity

Project activity is implemented and equipments are installed^{/11/} as described in the registered VCS PD.

This is the third verification for the project activity. The project activity has been commissioned^{/11/} and implemented satisfactorily. The same has been checked and verified during the site visit to the project activity.

Sr. No	Customer Name	Capacity of Each WTG	Loc No.	Capacity	Date of Commissioning
1	G. B. Rubber Products	0.8	1	1.6	14/02/2006
2	G. B. Rubber Products	0.8	2		14/02/2006
3	Shah Lulla Estate Developers	0.8	4	0.8	14/02/2006
4	Liberty Oil Mills Ltd.	0.8	6	2.4	07/02/2006
5	Liberty Oil Mills Ltd.	0.8	7		07/02/2006
6	Liberty Oil Mills Ltd.	0.8	8		07/02/2006
7	Liberty Oil Mills Ltd.	0.8	1	1.6	08/02/2006
8	Liberty Oil Mills Ltd.	0.8	2		08/02/2006
9	Paceman Sales Promotion P. Ltd.	0.8	36	0.8	22/03/2006
10	Delta Enterprises	0.8	37	1.6	22/03/2006
11	Delta Enterprises	0.8	38		15/06/2006
12	Delta Enterprises	0.8	19	0.8	15/06/2006
13	Mahanagar Developers	0.8	53	4.8	05/01/2007
14	Mahanagar Developers	0.8	54		06/03/2007
15	Mahanagar Developers	0.8	55		05/01/2007
16	Mahanagar Developers	0.8	56		05/01/2007
17	Mahanagar Developers	0.8	57		05/01/2007
18	Mahanagar Developers	0.8	61		05/01/2007
19	Mahanagar Developers	0.8	62	2.4	06/03/2007
20	Mahanagar Developers	0.8	63		05/01/2007
21	Mahanagar Developers	0.8	60		06/03/2007
22	Mahanagar Developers	0.8	30	0.8	28/02/2007
23	Kishor Food Products P. Ltd.	0.8	47	0.8	10/12/2008
24	Mr. J. P. Patel	0.8	95	0.8	29/03/2007
25	Mr. C. P. Patel	0.8	84	0.8	31/03/2007
26	Mr. V. V. Patel	0.8	80	0.8	31/03/2007
27	Mr. J. V. Patel	0.8	83	0.8	29/03/2007
28	Mr. S. V. Patel	0.8	94	0.8	29/03/2007
29	Mr. V. L. Patel	0.8	76	0.8	29/03/2007

Sr. No	Customer Name	Capacity of Each WTG	Loc No.	Capacity	Date of Commissioning
30	Laxmi Narayan Best Chiwda	0.8	81	0.8	29/03/2007
31	New Sahyadri Industries Ltd.	0.8	74	1.6	27/01/2007
32	New Sahyadri Industries Ltd.	0.8	75		27/01/2007
33	Mr. P. L. Patel	0.8	45	0.8	06/02/2007
34	Elpro International	0.8	52	0.8	30/12/2006
35	Prachar Energy	0.8	31	1.6	03/03/2007
36	Prachar Energy	0.8	32		03/03/2007
37	D.J. Malpani ¹	0.8	47	1.6	30/12/2006
38	D.J. Malpani	0.8	48		30/12/2006
39	International Conveyors Ltd.	0.8	51	0.8	30/12/2006
40	Shreem Capacitors Pvt. Ltd.	0.8	50	3.2	10/12/2008
41	Shreem Capacitors Pvt. Ltd.	0.8	51		10/12/2008
42	Shreem Capacitors Pvt. Ltd.	0.8	52		10/12/2008
43	Shreem Capacitors Pvt. Ltd.	0.8	58		10/12/2008
44	Metalfab Hightech Private Limited	0.8	46	0.8	06/02/2007
45	Atlas Tours & Travels Pvt. Ltd.	0.8	5	0.8	07/02/2007
46	Om Shanti Wind Farms P. Ltd.	0.8	82	0.8	31/03/2007
47	Gargi Construction Co. Pvt. Ltd.	0.8	49	1.6	30/12/2006
48	Gargi Construction Co. Pvt. Ltd.	0.8	50		30/12/2006
49	Mohite & Mohite	0.8	59	2.4	30/12/2006
50	Mohite & Mohite	0.8	60		30/12/2006
51	Mohite & Mohite	0.8	61		30/12/2006
52	Indiana Engineering Works (Bombay) P. Ltd.	0.8	33	1.6	03/03/2007
53	Indiana Engineering Works (Bombay) P. Ltd.	0.8	34		03/03/2007
54	Welpack Industries Ltd.	0.8	29	0.8	28/02/2007
55	Sunilkumar Ramanlal Shah	0.8	77	0.8	30/03/2008

The WTGs have been commissioned between 07/02/2006 & 10/12/2008 as mentioned in the monitoring report^{/3.3/} and this has been cross verified with the commissioning certificates^{/11/}. The monitoring report for the third monitoring period is in compliance with the monitoring plan of the registered VCS PD.

The start date of this monitoring period is 01/10/2010 which is found to be consistent with end date of second monitoring period i.e. 30/09/2010

A verification site visit to the project activity has been carried out by members of the verification team during period of 15/02/2012 to 17/02/2012. The Operation and Implementation of the project activity have been checked and the same has been confirmed during the site visit to the project activity. It is also found to be consistent with the registered VCS PD^{/1/}.

The monitoring report version 04 dated 07/05/2012^{/3.3/} has been checked for consistency with the registered VCS PD^{/1/}; it is found to be consistent. The PP has considered the monitoring parameters in the monitoring report as per the registered monitoring plan except the deviation mentioned in section 4.1.4 of this report.

¹ The Panama Wind Energy transferred WTGs to D.J. Malpani on April 2011

The recording frequency and completeness of the data for the monitoring period have been checked and it is found to be appropriate as per the registered monitoring plan^{/1/}.

The locations of the monitoring instruments i.e. energy meters have been checked and confirmed during the site visit to the project activity conducted during period 15/02/2012 to 17/02/2012. The same is found to be appropriate and consistent with the registered VCS PD^{/1/}.

Comparison of actual emission reductions with the same projected in the registered VCS PD:

The actual verified emission reductions for the current monitoring period (01/10/2010 to 30/11/2011) for the project activity is 79,803 tCO₂ which is found to be lesser as compared to estimated emission reductions of 81,482 tCO₂ (considering 426 days of monitoring period) as per registered VCS PD^{/1/}. This difference between estimated and actual emission reductions was due to the variability in the wind pattern (i.e. PLF) during the current monitoring period. This was checked and confirmed during the site visit conducted and in the emission reduction spreadsheet^{/4.1/} submitted for the project activity.

Corresponding to paragraphs 200 to 203 of VVM 1.2, the verification team confirms that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the approved methodology ACM0002 version 10, which was applied to the project activity. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

Discussion on CAR/CL:

CAR #1 was raised to ask PP to clarify below points;

1. Project ID mentioned on page 1 of MR was inconsistent with VCS project webpage
2. Contact details provided for project participant on page 1 of MR was not found to be in line with guidelines provided in VCS MR template available on <http://v-c-s.org/program-documents>.
3. Italic indicative guidelines from MR template wasn't found to be removed. Also font, font size and color were not in line with indicative guidelines as per MR template.
4. The number of monitoring period was mentioned incorrectly.

In response, PP submitted revised MR^{/3.3/} with project ID and contact details mentioned consistent with VCS project webpage. Also PP removed italic guidelines and PP revised text in all section of the MR with font Arial 10, regular, black throughout the MR. Also PP mentioned the current monitoring period as third monitoring period in revised MR^{/3.3/} submitted for the project activity. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. Thus **CAR #1** is closed out.

Contact information and roles/responsibilities for the project proponent(s) and other entities involved in the project activity were not included in section 1.3 and 1.4 of VCS MR version 01; thus **CAR #2** was raised. In response, PP submitted revised MR^{/3.3/} with roles/responsibilities of project proponent and other entities involved in the project activity in section 1.3 and 1.4 of the MR in line with indicative guidelines provided in VCS MR template available on <http://v-c-s.org/program-documents>. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; thus **CAR #2** is closed out.

CL #3 was raised to ask PP to clarify below points;

1. Documentary evidences against start date of the project activity weren't submitted.
2. Section 1.5 of VCS MR version 01 was mentioned projects start date 01/04/2006 whereas VCS PD mentions the same as 07/02/2006. Please clarify the inconsistency observed.
3. Section 2.1 of VCS MR version 01 doesn't include shutdown/runtime details of the WTGs involved in the project activity and it is not in line with indicative guidelines available in VCS MR template.
4. Information on occurrence of events that may impact the GHG emission reductions and monitoring in current monitoring period considered for the project activity.
5. Runtime/shut down time details mentioned in section 2.1 was not found to be clear.

In response PP submitted revised MR^{/3.3/} with shut down hours mentioned in section 2.1 of the MR and revised MR clearly confirms that there were no occurrence of events that may impact the GHG emission reductions and monitoring in current monitoring period considered for the project activity. This is checked and confirmed during site visit to the project activity and it is accepted. PP submitted commissioning certificates as evidences against start date of the project activity. Also PP clarified that the start date of the project activity is 07/02/2006; however start date of the monitoring period is considered as 01/04/2006. This

is checked and confirmed from registered VCS PD^{1/} for the project activity. Also revised MR^{3.3/} includes appropriate details for runtime and shut down time details for the project activity in the current monitoring period. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; thus **CL #3** is closed out.

During site visit, it is observed that 2 WTGs are found to be sold to D J Malpani by earlier owned by Panama Energy. However, MR version 01 wasn't mentioned anything on the same; thus **CL #4** was raised. In response, PP submitted No objection certificate from MEDA (Ref. PGN-I/Panama Wind Energy/1.60 MW/2010-2011/ISO) dated 11/01/2011^{16/} which clearly mentions about this asset transfer. Since this not impacting either capacity of the project activity or emission reductions happened in anyway; hence it is accepted. Also the transfer of asset doesn't impact additionality of the project activity which is checked and confirmed from CDM clarification AM_CLA_0223. Thus **CL #4** is closed out.

Detailed discussion on above CAR/CLs can be referred in section A.1 of this verification report.

4.1.2 Remaining Issues from Previous Validation or Verification

This is the third verification for the project activity. During the current verification assessment of the project activity, project validation report and previous verification reports^{9/} have been checked and reviewed by the verification team. There are no pending or open issues observed for the project. The monitoring methodology observed to be followed in the current monitoring period is in accordance with the registered monitoring plan^{1/}.

4.1.3 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology

The monitoring plan of the registered project is in accordance with the applied methodology ACM0002 version 10^{2/}.

The project had been registered with the small scale approved baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002, "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources," version 10 valid from 11/06/2009^{2/}. The monitoring plan implemented for the current verification is in accordance with the registered monitoring plan^{1/} except the deviation mentioned in section 4.1.4 below. The registered monitoring plan has been checked and it is found to be consistent with the requirements of applied monitoring methodology ACM0002 version 10 valid from 11/06/2009^{2/}. Also the project boundary was found to be consistent with the registered VCS PD^{1/}. It was checked and confirmed during the site visit that there is no other additional source of GHG emissions which are attributable to the project activity.

This is in line with paragraphs 199 – 202 of Validation and verification manual, version 01.2.

4.1.4 Implementation Status of the Monitoring Plan and Completeness of Monitoring

Monitoring of reductions in GHG emissions to result from the project have been implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the VCS PD. The monitoring mechanism is effective and reliable.

Monitoring of reductions in GHG emissions to result from the project have been implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the VCS PD except the deviation mentioned as below. The monitoring mechanism is effective and reliable.

The project activity was registered under VCS 2007.1 with VCS project ID 489. The monitoring report version 01^{3/} as well as final monitoring report version 04^{3.3/} for the current verification mentions the monitoring period from 01/10/2010 up to 30/11/2011. During the site visit, personnel involved at various levels of operation of the project activity have been interviewed. It has been confirmed that the onsite personnel are conscious of the importance of monitoring related activities. The onsite verification of measurement records also substantiate consistency in recording and reporting of the monitored data.

The following parameters have been verified for current monitoring period:

(1) Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, EG_y, net

This parameter is being calculated based on the apportioned values of electricity export and import at MSEDCL's meter at substation^{/6/}. The value of this parameter is being sourced from JMR reports^{/6/} and it is further crosschecked with invoices^{/5/} raised by individual investors involved in the project activity. This parameter is being used for the calculation of the emission reductions for the project activity. This is found to be consistent with the monitoring methodology as per registered VCS PD^{/1/}; hence this is accepted. Since MSEDCL is the third party government agency; this parameter has been considered from the JMR reports^{/6/} for emission reductions calculations for the project activity. The value of this parameter for the current monitoring period is **88,348.069 MWh**.

(2) Electricity exported to the grid by the project activity in year y, EG_{Export y}

This parameter is apportioned value of electricity export being measured at the meter installed at MSEDCL's substation based on proportion of electricity generation by WTGs involved in the project activity in total electricity generation by all WTGs connected to a particular feeder at the MSEDCL substation. The value of this parameter is being used for calculation net electricity supplied to grid by project activity. As per the registered VCS PD, this parameter is being monitored at energy meter located at MSEDCL's substation. However, this parameter is not directly being measured but it is apportioned value of electricity export measured at meter installed at the MSEDCL substation. Electricity is being measured hourly and same is being recorded monthly at substation. PP calculated and reported electricity exported to the grid by the project activity on monthly basis. This is in line with the applied methodology ACM0002 version 10. Joint Meter Reading is being taken on a monthly basis and it is signed by MSEDCL's and EIL's. The value of this parameters is directly sourced from JMR Reports^{/6/} and this is further crosschecked with invoices^{/5/} raised by individual investors involved in the project activity. The value of this parameter for the current monitoring period is **88,407.894 MWh**.

(3) Electricity imported from the grid, EG_{Import y}

This parameter is apportioned value of electricity import being measured at meter installed at MSEDCL's substation based on proportion of electricity generation by WTGs involved in the project activity in total electricity generation by all WTGs connected to a particular feeder at MSEDCL substation. The value of this parameter is being used for calculation net electricity supplied to grid by project activity. As per the registered VCS PD, this parameter is being monitored at energy meter located at MSEDCL's substation. However, this parameter is not directly being measured but it is apportioned value of electricity import measured at meter installed at MSEDCL substation. Electricity is being measured hourly and same is being recorded monthly at substation. PP calculated and reported electricity imported from the grid by the project activity on monthly basis. This is in line with the applied methodology ACM0002 version 10. Joint Meter Reading is being taken on a monthly basis and it is signed by MSEDCL's and EIL's. The value of this parameters is directly sourced from JMR Reports^{/6/} and this is further crosschecked with invoices^{/5/} raised by individual investors involved in the project activity. The value of this parameter for the current monitoring period is **59.795 MWh**.

The registered VCS PD^{/1/} mentions that calibration/testing of monitoring equipments installed for the project activity will be done annually. During the site visit to the project activity, it is observed that MSEDCL is carrying out calibration of these energy meters annually. Also CEA Notification No. 502/70/CEA/DP&D dated 17/03/2006^{/17/} which is considered as national standard mentions that *"All interface meters shall be tested at least once in five years."* Hence annual calibration frequency considered for the project activity is found to be conservative. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. The test results are found to be within the permissible limit and they are found to be accepted. However, a delay in calibration is observed for the period of October 2010 to September 2011 for meter (Sr. No. 04760188) and October 2010 to August 2011 for meter (Sr. No. 04760189) considering the annual calibration frequency. Thus the project participant applied the maximum permissible error of 0.2% conservatively to both the values i.e. electricity exported and imported in line with paragraph 4 (a) of EB 52 Annex 60 i.e. Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

Project participant had proposed deviation to exclude monitoring parameter EG_{Gross, y} i.e. electricity generation at controller from section 3.2 of the monitoring report. Since emission reductions calculations are based net electricity supplied to grid by the project activity which is being calculated as difference of electricity exported and electricity imported by the project activity and it is being sourced from JMRs/credit

reports issued by MSEDCL for the project activity. Also the VCS PD mentions about the monitoring parameters electricity exported and imported as measured parameters. However, during site visit, it is observed that the electricity exported and imported by the project activity are being calculated by apportioning of electricity export and import monitored at MSEDCL substation based on proportion of electricity generation by WTGs involved in the project activity in total electricity generation by all WTGs connected to a particular feeder at substation. Net electricity supplied to grid by the project activity is difference of apportioned values of electricity export and import measured at substation. Section 2.2 and 3.2 of the revised MR version 04^{/3.3/} are not revised accordingly. Since these deviations from the registered monitoring plan don't impact emission reduction calculations for the project activity in anyway, same are accepted.

Discussion on CAR/CL:

CAR #6 was raised to ask PP to clarify below points;

1. The grid emission factor wasn't mentioned in section 3.1 of VCS MR version 01.
2. Monitoring parameter net electricity supplied to the grid was not found to be included in section 3.1 of VCS MR version 01 and it is not as per indicative guidelines available in VCS MR template available on VCS website <http://v-c-s.org/program-documents>.
3. Calibration details mentioned in section 3.3 of VCS MR version 01 are not covering whole monitoring period considered for the project activity.

In response, PP submitted revised MR^{/3.3/} with grid emission factor mentioned in section 3.1. Also PP removed monitoring parameter net electricity supplied to the grid from section 3.1 and same is included in section 3.2 of the MR. Also PP submitted revised ER sheet with maximum permissible error applied to electricity exported and imported by the project activity for the period of October 2010 to September 2011 for meter (Sr. No. 04760188) and October 2010 to August 2011 for meter (Sr. No. 04760189). This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. Thus **CAR #6** is closed out.

CAR #5 was raised to ask PP to include latest calibration details covering whole monitoring period in section 3.3 of the VCS MR along with documentary evidences indicating the same. In response, PP submitted revised MR incorporating the same and it is found to be appropriate; thus **CAR #5** is closed out.

CAR #9 was asked PP to clarify below points;

1. The monitoring parameter $EG_{Gross, y}$ is not included in section 3.2 of the monitoring report.
2. The monitoring report was mentioned the parameters $EG_{Export, y}$ and $EG_{Import, y}$ are measured parameters.

In response, PP submitted revised MR with deviation proposed in section 2.2. Deviation to registered monitoring plan mentions that the parameters $EG_{Export, y}$ and $EG_{Import, y}$ are apportioned value of electricity exported and imported measured at MSEDCL substation based on proportion of electricity generation by WTGs involved in the project activity in total electricity generation by all WTGs connected to a particular feeder at substation. PP revised section 3.2 of the MR accordingly. Also deviation clearly mentioned since emission reduction calculations are being calculated based on net electricity supplied grid by the project activity which are being directly sourced from JMRs/credit reports issued by MSEDCL for the project activity, the parameter $EG_{Gross, y}$ need not to be included in section 3.2 of the MR. Also these deviations from the registered monitoring plan don't impact emission reduction calculations for the project activity in anyway, same are accepted; thus **CAR #9** is closed out.

Detailed discussion on above CARs can be referred in section A.1 of this verification report.

4.1.5 Accuracy of Equipment

During the verification assessment of the project activity accuracy and calibration of all the metering and plant installations have been checked and found appropriate. The details of monitoring equipments involved in the project activity and their calibration details are mentioned in below table;

Sr. No.	Meter Serial No.	Accuracy Class	Calibration Dates	Validity dates	Delayed Calibration Period	Date of Calibration Certificates
---------	------------------	----------------	-------------------	----------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------

Sr. No.	Meter Serial No.	Accuracy Class	Calibration Dates	Validity dates	Delayed Calibration Period	Date of Calibration Certificates
1	04760188	0.2s	08/09/2011	07/09/2012	October 2010 – September 2011	10/10/2011
2	04760189	0.2s	26/08/2011	25/08/2012	October 2010 – August 2011	10/10/2011
3	04862746	0.2s	21/06/2010, 12/10/2010, 18/03/2011, 22/06/2011	20/06/2011, 11/12/2011, 17/03/2012, 21/06/2012	-	01/07/2010, 29/12/2010, 13/04/2011, 06/07/2011
4	04862747	0.2s	21/06/2010, 12/10/2010, 18/03/2011, 22/06/2011	20/06/2011, 11/10/2011, 17/03/2012, 21/06/2012	-	01/07/2010, 29/12/2010, 13/04/2011, 27/06/2011
5	04862984	0.2s	28/07/2010, 14/06/2011	27/07/2011, 13/06/2012	-	21/10/2010, 30/07/2011
6	04862987	0.2s	28/07/2010, 14/06/2011	27/07/2011, 13/06/2012	-	21/10/2010, 30/07/2011
7	04862989	0.2s	28/07/2010, 14/06/2011	27/07/2011, 13/06/2012	-	21/10/2010, 30/07/2011
8	04862978	0.2s	28/07/2010, 14/06/2011	27/07/2011, 13/06/2012	-	21/10/2010, 30/07/2011

The installation and working condition of the plant equipments and meters were checked during the site visit for the project activity and it was found to be satisfactory. It is also evident from the above table that calibrations for all monitoring equipment involved in the project activity are valid for current monitoring period. Delay in calibration is observed for the period of October 2010 to September 2011 for meter (Sr. No. 04760188) and October 2010 to August 2011 for meter (Sr. No. 04760189) considering the annual calibration frequency. Thus the project participant applied the maximum permissible error of 0.2% conservatively to both the values i.e. electricity exported and imported in line with paragraph 4 (a) of EB 52 Annex 60 i.e. Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements.. During the site visit to the project activity, the accuracy class of the meters are found to be 0.2s which is found to be consistent with the registered VCS PD^{1/}. The Gadget of India (Registered NO. DL (N) – 04/0007/2003 – 15) dated 26/07/2010^{13/} which is a gadget for metering regulations in India clearly mentions that for voltage of 650 V up to 33 kV, 0.5s and better is recommended. Hence, the accuracy classes of 0.2s of energy meters installed at sites are found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

As per Para 205 c), VVM, version 01.2, the verification team is able to confirm that the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is in accordance with the relevant guidance provided by the CDM Executive Board and it is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan;

- (i) Monitoring results are consistently recorded as per approved frequency;
- (ii) Quality assurance and quality control procedures have been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan.

4.1.6 Data from External Sources

Since, the combined margin grid emission factor was calculated based on ex-ante approach indicated by Tool to calculate emission factor of an electricity system, the value of “**Operating margin emission factor of NEWNE Grid, $EF_{OM,y}$** ” will remain ex-ante as **1.00862 tCO₂/MWh** throughout the crediting period and same has been considered from the registered VCS PD^{1/}. The basis for the same was “CO₂ Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector”, version 4.0 published by the Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of Power, Government of India. The “CO₂ Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector” is available at www.cea.nic.in/reports/planning/cdm_co2/cdm_co2.htm. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

The value of “**Build margin emission factor of NEWNE grid, $EF_{BM,y}$** ” is **0.59771 tCO₂e/MWh** considered from the registered VCS PD^{/1/} and same will remain ex-ante throughout the crediting period. The basis for the same was “CO₂ Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector”, version 4.0 published by the Central Electricity Authority, Ministry of Power, Government of India. The “CO₂ Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector” is available at www.cea.nic.in/ressports/planning/cdm_co2/cdm_co2.htm. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

The “**Combined margin emission factor of NEWNE grid, $EF_{grid,y}$** ” has been fixed ex-ante during the validation stage^{/1/} as **0.90589 tCO₂e/MWh** and it is applicable for the crediting period considered for the project activity.

4.2 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations

4.2.1 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations

The calculation of the emission reductions is found to be correct. The details of the reported and the verified values for all parameters are listed in section 4.2.2 of this report, ‘Calculation of Emission Reductions’.

The net electricity supplied to grid by the project activity is used for the emission reduction calculations. The project participant has provided a complete set of data for the specified monitoring period of 01/10/2010 up to 30/11/2011. The values of parameters reported in the ER spreadsheet^{/4.1/} by the PP and the same were checked and confirmed with the same mentioned in the JMR reports^{/6/} and invoices raised by the project participant^{/5/}. The values are found to be consistent and accurate.

The formula and method used to calculate the baseline emissions are appropriate. Since the project is a wind power generation project, project emissions and leakage emissions are not involved in the project activity. This is found to be in line with the approved methodology ACM0002 version 10 and as defined in the registered VCS PD^{/1/}.

Discussion on CAR/CL:

CAR #8 was raised to ask PP to clarify below points;

1. Net export values reported for investors C. P Patel, V. V. Patel and J. V. Patel and Laxmi Narayan are not found to be consistent with the JMRs.
2. ER sheet mentions only net export values for all entities which were not found to be in line with registered monitoring plan.
3. PP is requested to mention appropriate units for monitored data reported in ER sheet submitted for the project activity.

In response, PP revised ER sheet with corrected values of Net export for investors C. P Patel, V. V. Patel and J. V. Patel and Laxmi Narayan. Also revised ER sheet now includes electricity exported and imported by the project activity along with appropriate data units mentioned. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. Thus **CAR #8** is closed out.

4.2.2 Detailed discussion on above CAR can be referred in section A.1 of this verification report. Calculation of Emission Reductions or Removals

Parameter	Reported Value	Verified Value
Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, EG _{y, net} (MWh)	92,325.225	88348.069
Electricity exported to the grid by the project activity in year y, EG _{Export y} (MWh)	Not Reported	88407.894
Electricity imported from the grid, EG _{Import y} (MWh)	Not Reported	59.795
Combined margin emission factor of NEWNE	0.90589	0.9058975

grid, EF _{grid, y} (tCO ₂ e /MWh)		
---	--	--

Grid emission factor is determined ex-ante and fixed throughout the crediting period.

The emission reduction is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Baseline emission} &= \text{Net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project, } EG_y \text{ } EG_y, \text{ net (MWh) } \times \\
 &\quad \text{Combined margin emission factor of NEWNE grid, } EF_{\text{grid, y}} \text{ (tCO}_2\text{e /MWh)} \\
 &= 88,348.069 \times 0.9058975 \\
 &= 79,803 \text{ t CO}_2\text{e}
 \end{aligned}$$

As per methodology, leakage emissions and project emissions are zero.

Thus emission reductions are calculated as follow:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Emission reductions} &= \text{Baseline emissions} - \text{Project emissions} - \text{Leakage emissions} \\
 &= 79,803 - 0 - 0 \\
 &= \mathbf{79,803 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}}
 \end{aligned}$$

Vintage-wise VERS

Vintage	VERs (tCO₂e)
01/10/2010 to 31/12/2010	10,807
01/01/2011 to 30/11/2011	68,996
Total	79,803

4.3 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals

Critical parameters used for the determination of the Emission Reductions are discussed in section 3.4 above. All the data recorded is in compliance with the monitoring report.

The data pertaining to the parameters mentioned in section 4.2.2 of this report are maintained in the identified records^{/6/, /5/, /7/}. The external sources data have been discussed in section 4.1.6 of this report. All the data is in compliance with the figures stated in the updated monitoring report version 04 dated 07/05/2012^{/3,3/} and the ER calculation excel spreadsheet^{/4.1/}.

According to the registered VCS PD, the verification team has checked the JMR reports^{/6/} signed by MSEDCL's and Enercon's officials. The same have being cross checked against the invoices raised to MSEDCL by individual investors.

The verification team reviewed the comparison of the actual VCUs claimed in the monitoring period with the same estimated in the VCS PD; the same has been discussed in section 4.1.1 above.

Corresponding to the paragraph 206 of VVM version 1.2, it has been ensured that:

1. The data used for the determination of the emission reductions are available and monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan.
2. The appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage have been properly followed the applied methodology and registered VCS PD;

3. The emission factor of NEWNE Grid determined ex-ante during validation of the project activity. The same is applied in the current monitoring report and the calculations have been justified.

4.4 Management and Operational System

The company involved in the project have quality assurance system ISO 9001:2008^{/14/} (<http://www.enerconindia.net/background-note.jsp>) implemented; therefore the assessment team can confirm that the management system the VCS project is in place; with the responsibilities properly identified and in place.

The company involved has assigned personnel with proper roles and responsibilities in the project and the same is as per the registered VCS PDD^{/1/}. During the site visit, the roles and responsibility for data monitoring and management have been checked. It was also found during the interview with plant personnel that project has a defined well responsibility matrix and execution system to ensure the quality of VCS monitoring system. The same was found acceptable; therefore the assessment team can affirm that the management system of the VCS project is in place; with the responsibilities properly identified and in place.

In order to verify data quality, the company involved in the project works in accordance with a quality assurance procedure of Standard Operating Procedure which establishes the operational and management structure implemented.

Discussion on CAR/CL:

CL #7 was raised to ask PP to clarify below points;

1. Section 3.3 of VCS MR version 1 doesn't describe procedures for handling internal auditing and non-conformities. Also line diagram indicating GHG collection and management system was not found to be included in section 3.3 of VCS MR version 01.
2. ISO certificate of EPC contractor for the project activity is not submitted.

In response, PP submitted manual on O&M and training procedure. Same was checked and found to be appropriate. PP submitted revised MR^{/3.3/} with inclusion of baseline emissions calculations in section 4.1 of the MR and it is found to be appropriate. Also PP submitted ISO certificate for Enercon (India) Limited who is also acting as EPC contractor for the project activity. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted; thus **CL #7** is closed out.

Detailed discussion on above CL can be referred in section A.1 of this verification report.

5. Verification Conclusion

The scope of the verification

We, SGS have been engaged by Enercon (India) Limited to certify that the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions reported for the “44 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Maharashtra managed by Enercon India limited” for the period from 01/10/2010 to 30/11/2011 in the verification report and the monitoring report Version 04 dated 07/05/2012 are eligible for registration as Voluntary Carbon Units.

This engagement covers the verification of emission reductions from anthropogenic sources of greenhouse gases included within the project boundary of the “44 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Maharashtra managed by Enercon India limited.”, as well as an additional confirmation of the compliance of the VCS PD with the requirements of VCS Standard version 3.2.

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. Our examination includes assessment, on a test basis, of evidence relevant to the amounts and disclosures in relation to the project’s GHG emission reductions for the defined reporting period.

The verification is not meant to provide any consulting towards the Client. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the project design.

Conclusions of the verification

(a) SGS is an entity accredited by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to undertake certification and verification services in the sector in which the Project is undertaken. The accreditation is accepted by VCSA as indicated in Clause 5 of VCS Program Guide Version 3.2.

(b) The monitoring report, together with other information examined, was prepared as per the VCS Monitoring Report Template, Version 3.0.

(c) The information in the monitoring report together with other information examined by the assessment team, including all the information necessary to determine that the emission reductions achieved have been determined correctly.

(d) Based on the examination of the monitoring report and other relevant information, the project meets all the requirements of the VCS Standard Version 3.2.

(e) Based on our examination of the monitoring report and other relevant information, the claiming emission reductions during the monitoring period from 01/10/2010 to 30/11/2011 are verified as 79,803 tonnes CO₂ equivalent.

Liability statement with regards to the accuracy of the verification statement

The management of Enercon (India) Limited is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions. SGS is responsible for verification and confirming emission estimates for the project, as described in the monitoring report.

Our certification approach draws on an understanding of the risks associated with reporting GHG emissions data and the controls in place to mitigate these. Our examination includes an assessment of evidence, through desk review, and where necessary, interviews, stakeholder discussions and site visits, relevant to certifying the rightfulness of the amounts and disclosures in relation to the Project’s GHG emission reductions.

We 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 the amount of GHG emission reductions for the given period, prepared on the basis of the monitoring report, are fairly stated.

This assessment included:

- Collection of evidence supporting the reported data;

- Checking whether the provisions of the Monitoring Plan in the registered VCS PDD, were consistently and appropriately applied;
- Site visit and interview of relevant staff.

We have verified whether the information included in the monitoring report representing the emission reductions achieved has been determined correctly for the given period from the baseline figure.

Certification statements

Based on process and procedures conducted, in our opinion, the monitoring report Version 04 dated 07/05/2012 on emission reductions for "44 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Maharashtra managed by Enercon India limited." during the reporting period from 01/10/2010 to 30/11/2011 is materially correct and is a fair representation of the GHG data and information and the emission reductions are fairly stated. All relevant facts have been found correct by our examination. The GHG emission reductions calculation is correct.

Therefore, SGS is able to certify that the project is in full compliance with the VCS Standard Version 3.2, and the quantity of the reported emission reductions during below reporting period are completely, comparably, accurately and correctly reported.

(1) Reporting period: From 01/10/2010 to 30/11/2011

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

GHG Emission Reductions or Removals	tCO ₂ e
Baseline Emissions	79,803
Project Emissions	0
Leakage	0
Net GHG emission reductions or removals	79,803

Statement of Confidentiality

SGS will hold all information confidential until the client instructs otherwise or until it has been released in accordance with the VCS Standard Version 3.2 requirements.

Signed on behalf of the Verification Body by Authorized Signatory

SGS United Kingdom Limited

Dated: 12/05/2012

14/05/2012

Signature:

Signature:




Lead Assessor

Vikas Bankar

Technical Reviewer

Ramkrishna Patil

6. Document References

- /1/ Registered VCS PD version 01 dated 16/09/2009
- /2/ ACM0002 version 10 valid from 11/06/2009
- /3/ Monitoring report version 01 dated 11/01/2012
- /3.1/ Monitoring report version 02 dated 14/03/2012
- /3.2/ Monitoring report version 03 dated 30/03/2012
- /3.3/ Monitoring report version 04 dated 07/05/2012
- /4/ CER calculation excel sheet, version 01 dated 11/01/2012
- /4.1/ CER calculation excel sheet version 02 dated 14/03/2012
- /5/ Invoices for project activity for current monitoring period
- /6/ Joint Meter Reading for all wind mills including project activity
- /7/ SCADA system reading for project activity and total generation of all wind mills and log book records
- /8/ CEA data for emission factor
www.cea.nic.in/reports/planning/cdm_co2/cdm_co2.htm
- /9/ VCS Project Site:
<https://vcsprojectdatabase2.apx.com/myModule/Interactive.asp?Tab=Projects&a=2&i=489&lat=17%2E554167&lon=73%2E924444&bp=1>
- Validation Report dated 13/11/2009
- First Verification Report dated 27/05/2010
- Second Verification Report dated 05/04/2011
- /10/ Calibration Certificates for the substation meters

Sr. No.	Meter Serial No.	Accuracy Class	Calibration Dates	Validity dates	Delayed Calibration Period	Date of Calibration Certificates
1	04760188	0.2s	08/09/2011	07/09/2012	Oct 2010 – Sep 2011	10/10/2011
2	04760189	0.2s	26/08/2011	25/08/2012	Oct 2010 – Aug 2011	10/10/2011
3	04862746	0.2s	21/06/2010, 12/10/2010, 18/03/2011, 22/06/2011	20/06/2011, 11/10/2011, 17/03/2012, 21/06/2012	-	01/07/2010, 29/12/2010, 13/04/2011, 06/07/2011
4	04862747	0.2s	21/06/2010, 12/10/2010,	20/06/2011, 11/10/2011,	-	01/07/2010, 29/12/2010,

			18/03/2011, 22/06/2011	17/03/2012, 21/06/2012		13/04/2011, 27/06/2011
5	04862984	0.2s	28/07/2010, 14/06/2011	27/07/2011, 13/06/2012	-	21/10/2010, 30/07/2011
6	04862987	0.2s	28/07/2010, 14/06/2011	27/07/2011, 13/06/2012	-	21/10/2010, 30/07/2011
7	04862989	0.2s	28/07/2010, 14/06/2011	27/07/2011, 13/06/2012	-	21/10/2010, 30/07/2011
8	04862978	0.2s	28/07/2010, 14/06/2011	27/07/2011, 13/06/2012	-	21/10/2010, 30/07/2011

- /11/ Commissioning Certificates from Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company (MSEDCL)
- /12/ Power Purchase Agreement signed between Entities involved (other investors) and MSEDCL
- /13/ The Gadget of India (Registered NO. DL (N) – 04/0007/2003 – 15) dated 26/07/2010
- /14/ ISO 9001: 2008 Certificate (Ref. QS-898HH) dated 08/02/2010
- /15/ Validation and Verification Manual, version 1.2
- /16/ No objection certificate from MEDA (Ref. PGN-I/Panama Wind Energy/1.60 MW/2010-2011/ISO) dated 11/01/2011
- /17/ CEA Notification No. 502/70/CEA/DP&D dated 17/03/2006
- /18/ VCS Standard Version: v3.2 Issued on: 1 February 2012

A.1. Annex 1: Overview of Findings

Findings Overview Summary

	CARs	CLs	FARs
Total Number raised	06	03	-

Date:	27/02/2012		Raised by:	Vikas Bankar		
Type:	CAR	Number:	01	Reference:	Project Information (Page 1), Section 1.1	

Lead Assessor Comment:

Date: 27/02/2012

PP is requested to check appropriateness of project ID mentioned on page 1 of the MR version 01 in line with VCS project webpage <https://vcsprojectdatabase1.apx.com/myModule/Interactive.asp?Tab=Projects&a=2&i=489&lat=17%2E554167&lon=73%2E924444&bp=1>.

PP is requested to clarify the appropriateness of MR version and contact details provided in line with guidelines provided in VCS MR template available on <http://v-c-s.org/program-documents>.

PP is requested to remove italic indicative guidelines as per MR template from VCS MR version 01. Please check font, font type and color in line with indicative guidelines as per MR template.

PP is requested to clarify the monitoring period considered for the project activity in line with history of project issuance documents available on VCS project webpage.

Project Participant Response:

Date: 14/03/2012

The project ID has been checked & corrected in revised version of VCS MR.

The version of VCS MR has been corrected & contact details has been provided in line with guidelines of VCS MR template in the revised version of VCS MR.

The font, font type & colour has been changed & corrected in the revised version of MR.

The documentary proof for history of project issuance documents has been submitted along with revised version of VCS MR.

Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:

Issuance Record

Information Verified by Lead Assessor:

Revised MR version 02 dated 14/03/2012 is checked for appropriateness of incorporation of above mentioned queries.

Screenshot of issuance records from VCS registry is checked for consistency of monitoring period considered for the project activity.

Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:

Date: 28/03/2012

Page 1 of revised MR version 02 now mentions correct project ID 489 for the project activity and it is found to be consistent with project database. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

Section for contact details on page 1 of revised MR version 02 now mentions email id of project participant which is found to be in line with MR completion guidelines; hence this is accepted.

PP now used font Arial 10, regular, black throughout the MR and it is found to be in line with MR completion guidelines. Also italic guidance is removed from the MR. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

PP submitted screenshot of issuance records from VCS registry. It is found that the monitoring period considered for the project activity i.e. 01/10/2010 to 30/11/2011 is found to be in line with end date of previous monitoring period (fourth) i.e. 30/09/2010. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

Thus CAR #1 is closed out.					
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:				Date: 28/03/2012	
Date:	27/02/2012	Raised by:	Vikas Bankar		
Type:	CAR	Number:	02	Reference:	Section 1.3 and 1.4
Lead Assessor Comment:				Date: 27/02/2012	
Please clarify why contact information and roles/responsibilities for the project proponent(s) and other entities involved in the project activity are not included in section 1.3 and 1.4 of VCS MR version 01 in line indicative guidelines provided in VCS MR template available on http://v-c-s.org/program-documents .					
Project Participant Response:				Date: 14/03/2012	
The roles/responsibilities for the project proponent(s) and other entities involved in the project activity has been included in the revised version of VCS MR.					
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:					
Revised MR version 02					
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:					
Revised MR version 02 dated 28/02/2012 is checked for appropriateness of contact details and roles of responsibilities of project participant and other entities involved.					
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:				Date: 28/03/2012	
PP now mentioned contact details and roles and responsibilities of project participant and other entities involved in the project activity in line with indicative guidelines provided in VCS MR template available on http://v-c-s.org/program-documents . This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.					
Thus CAR #2 is closed out.					
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:				Date: 28/03/2012	

Date:	27/02/2012	Raised by:	Vikas Bankar		
Type:	CL	Number:	03	Reference:	Section 1.5, 1.7, 2.1
Lead Assessor Comment:				Date: 27/02/2012	
PP is requested to submit documentary evidences against start date of the project activity mentioned in section 1.5 and commissioning dates in section 1.7 and 2.1 of VCS MR version 01.					
Section 1.5 of VCS MR mentions projects start date 01/04/2006 whereas VCS PD mentions the same as 07/02/2006. Please clarify the inconsistency observed.					
Section 2.1 of VCS MR version 01 doesn't include shutdown/runtime details of the WTGs involved in the project activity. Please clarify the same in line with indicative guidelines available in VCS MR template available on http://v-c-s.org/program-documents .					
Please clarify occurrence of events that may impact the GHG emission reductions and monitoring in current monitoring period considered for the project activity.					
Project Participant Response:				Date: 14/03/2012	
The documentary evidences against start date of the project activity and commissioning dates has been submitted along with revised version of VCS MR.					
The project start date has been corrected in the revised version of VCS MR.					
There have not been any special events comprising of major overhauls and downtime of project activity during the said monitoring period; thus there has not been any change in the operation of project activity during the monitoring period.					
There have not been any events that may impact the GHG emission reductions and monitoring in current monitoring period.					
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:					

<i>Commissioning Certificates</i>	
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
Commissioning Certificates for the project activity is checked for appropriateness of start date of the project activity and commissioning dates of all WTGs involved in the project activity	
Revised MR version 02 is checked for appropriateness of project start date in section 1.5 and shutdown/runtime details in section 2.1.	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	Date: 28/03/2012
PP had submitted commissioning certificates for all WTGs involved in the project activity. Commissioning certificates submitted are checked and found to be consistent with details provided in section 2.1 of MR version 02. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. Details of commissioning certificates submitted are as follows;	
1. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 23/02/2006 (DOC 07/02/2006) for WTG LOC 5, 6, 7, 8 2. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 23/02/2006 (DOC 14/02/2006) for WTG LOC 1, 2, 4 3. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 23/02/2006 (DOC 08/02/2006) for WTG LOC 1, 2 4. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 28/03/2006 (DOC 22/03/2006) for WTG LOC 36 5. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 28/03/2006 (DOC 22/03/2006) for WTG LOC 37 6. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 28/06/2006 (DOC 15/06/2006) for WTG LOC 19, 38 7. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 09/01/2007 (DOC 05/01/2007) for WTG LOC 53, 55, 56, 57, 61, 63 8. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 09/03/2007 (DOC 06/03/2007) for WTG LOC 54, 60, 62 9. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 01/03/2007 (DOC 28/02/2007) for WTG LOC 30 10. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 12/12/2008 (DOC 10/12/2008) for WTG LOC 47 11. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 30/03/2007 (DOC 29/03/2007) for WTG LOC 94 12. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 30/03/2007 (DOC 29/03/2007) for WTG LOC 95 13. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 02/04/2007 (DOC 31/03/2007) for WTG LOC 84 14. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 30/03/2007 (DOC 29/03/2007) for WTG LOC 83 15. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 30/03/2007 (DOC 29/03/2007) for WTG LOC 76 16. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 30/03/2007 (DOC 29/03/2007) for WTG LOC 81 17. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 29/01/2007 (DOC 27/01/2007) for WTG LOC 74, 75 18. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 13/02/2007 (DOC 06/02/2007) for WTG LOC 45 19. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 04/01/2007 (DOC 30/12/2006) for WTG LOC 52 20. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 05/03/2007 (DOC 03/03/2007) for WTG LOC 31, 32 21. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 04/01/2007 (DOC 30/12/2006) for WTG LOC 47, 48 22. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 04/01/2007 (DOC 30/12/2006) for WTG LOC 51 23. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 12/12/008 (DOC 10/12/2008) for WTG LOC 50, 51, 52, 58 24. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 12/02/2007 (DOC 06/02/2007) for WTG LOC 46 25. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 02/04/2007 (DOC 31/03/2007) for WTG LOC 82	

26. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 04/01/2007 (DOC 30/12/2006) for WTG LOC 49, 50
27. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 04/01/2007 (DOC 30/12/2006) for WTG LOC 59, 60, 61
28. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 05/03/2007 (DOC 03/03/2007) for WTG LOC 33, 34
29. Commissioning Certificate from MSEDCL dated 01/03/2007 (DOC 28/02/2007) for WTG LOC 29

Commissioning certificate for V. V. Patel (LOC 80) and Sunilkumar Ramanlal Shah (LOC 77) are not found to be submitted. Please clarify.

Also dates of commissioning mentioned in section 2.1 of the MR are not found to be consistent with the commissioning certificates submitted for investors Delta Enterprises (LOC 37 & 19), Mahanagar Developers (54 & 63) and Elpro International (LOC 52). Please clarify the inconsistencies observed.

Section 1.5 of VCS MR now mentions projects start date as 07/02/2006 which is found to be consistent with the same mentioned in registered VCS PD. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

Section 2.1 of VCS MR version 01 doesn't include shutdown/runtime details of the WTGs involved in the project activity. Please clarify the same in line with indicative guidelines available in VCS MR template available on <http://v-c-s.org/program-documents>.

Section 2.1 of the MR version 02 mentions occurrence of no such events that may impact the GHG emission reductions and monitoring in current monitoring period considered for the project activity. This is checked and confirmed during site visit carried out for the project activity and this is accepted.

Thus CL #3 is open.

Project Participant Response:

Date: 30/03/2012

Commissioning certificate for V. V. Patel (LOC 80) and Sunilkumar Ramanlal Shah (LOC 77) has been submitted along with revised version of VCS MR.

Dates of commissioning mentioned in section 2.1 of the MR has been made consistent with the commissioning certificates submitted for investors Delta Enterprises (LOC 37 & 19), Mahanagar Developers (54 & 63) and Elpro International (LOC 52) in the revised version of VCS MR.

The shutdown/runtime details of the WTGs involved in the project activity has been inserted in the revised version of VCS MR.

Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:

Commissioning certificate for V. V. Patel (LOC 80) and Sunilkumar Ramanlal Shah (LOC 77).

Information Verified by Lead Assessor:

Commissioning certificate for V. V. Patel (LOC 80) dated 02/04/2007, commissioned on 31/03/2007 and,

Commissioning certificate for Sunilkumar Ramanlal Shah (LOC 77) dated 01/04/2008, commissioned on 30/04/2008 are checked for appropriateness of commissioning dates

Revised MR is checked for appropriateness of commissioning dates for WTGs installed by investors Delta Enterprises (LOC 37 & 19), Mahanagar Developers (54 & 63) and Elpro International (LOC 52)

Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:

Date: 10/04/2012

Reopen: 05/05/2012

PP submitted commissioning certificates for WTGs installed by investors V. V. Patel (LOC 80) and Sunilkumar Ramanlal Shah (LOC 77). Same are checked and it is found to be appropriate; hence it is accepted.

Revised MR version 03 now mentions correct dates of commissioning for WTGs installed by investors Delta Enterprises (LOC 37 & 19), Mahanagar Developers (54 & 63) and Elpro International (LOC 52) in section 2.1. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

Revised MR version 03 now mentions shutdown/runtime details of the WTGs in section 2.1 and it is found to be in line with indicative guidelines as per VCS MR template. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.

However, monthly performance data is not clear. PP is requested to check no of WECs as per registered VCS PD. Also please clarify what different/multiple rows are indicating.

Thus CL #3 is open.

Project Participant Response:	Date: 07/05/2012
<i>The monthly performance data has been corrected, the number of WTG has been corrected as per registered PD in revised version of VCS MR.</i>	
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:	
<i>Revised MR</i>	
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
<i>Revised MR version 04 dated 07/05/2012 is checked for appropriateness of</i>	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	Date: 11/05/2012
<i>Revised MR version 04 dated 07/05/2012 now mentions clear runtime details for all the WTGs involved in the project activity. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.</i>	
<i>Thus CL #3 is closed out.</i>	
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:	Date: 11/05/2012

Date:	27/02/2012	Raised by:	Vikas Bankar		
Type:	CL	Number:	04	Reference:	Section 2.3
Lead Assessor Comment:			Date: 27/02/2012		
During site visit, it is understood that the subproject of Panama Wind Energy Private Limited (for 02 machines) had been sold out to D J Malpani. PP is requested to clarify how PP has taken care of ownership of the project activity while claiming emission reductions for the project activity.					
VCS PD doesn't provide any information on this fact. Please clarify.					
Project Participant Response:			Date: 14/03/2012		
M/s Panama Wind Energy Private Limited two machines (Location No. 47 & 48) located at Panchpatta in Nasik District of Maharashtra has been transferred to M/s D.J. Malpani on 01 st April 2011 in accordance with the MEDA NOC No: PGN-1/Panama Wind Energy/1.60MW/2010-2011/150 . Hence, the generation for the said machine has been considered in the name of M/s D.J. Malpani for the monitoring period from 1 st April 2011. The NOC copy has been submitted to the DOE.					
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:					
MEDA NOC.					
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:					
No objection certificate from MEDA (Ref. PGN-I/Panama Wind Energy/1.60 MW/2010-2011/ISO) dated 11/01/2011 is checked for appropriateness of transfer of asset from Panama Energy to D J Malpani					
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:			Date: 28/03/2012		
It is understood that 2 WTGs of 800 kW capacity of each are sold to D J Malpani earlier owned by Panama Energy. Same is checked and confirmed from No objection certificate from MEDA (Ref. PGN-I/Panama Wind Energy/1.60 MW/2010-2011/ISO) dated 11/01/2011. Since this not impacting either capacity of the project activity or emission reductions happened in anyway. Also the transfer of asset doesn't impact additionality of the project activity which is checked and confirmed from CDM clarification AM_CLA_0223 hence it is accepted.					
Thus CL #4 is closed out.					
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:			Date: 28/03/2012		

Date:	21/02/2012		Raised by:	Vikas Bankar		
Type:	CAR	Number:	05		Reference:	Section 3.3

Lead Assessor Comment:		Date: 21/02/2012				
Also PP is requested to include latest calibration details covering whole monitoring period and meter change details (if any) in section 3.3 of the VCS MR along with documentary evidences indicating the same.						
Project Participant Response:		Date: 14/03/2012				
The calibration certificate has been submitted to DOE with previous version of VCS MR, for the period calibration certificate is not available error factor has been applied.						
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:						
ER Sheet						
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:						
Calibration certificates submitted for the project activity are checked for whether it covers whole monitoring period for the project activity						
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:		Date: 28/03/2012				
Calibration Certificates for the meters involved in the project activity are submitted by PP and below are details of the same;						
Sr. No.	Meter Serial No.	Accuracy Class	Calibration Dates	Validity dates	Delayed Calibration Period	Date of Calibration Certificates
1	04760188	0.2s	08/09/2011	07/09/2012	Oct 2010 – Sep 2011	10/10/2011
2	04760189	0.2s	26/08/2011	25/08/2012	Oct 2010 – Aug 2011	10/10/2011
3	04862746	0.2s	21/06/2010, 12/10/2010, 18/03/2011, 22/06/2011	20/06/2011, 11/10/2011, 17/03/2012, 21/06/2012	-	01/07/2010, 29/12/2010, 13/04/2011, 06/07/2011
4	04862747	0.2s	21/06/2010, 12/10/2010, 18/03/2011, 22/06/2011	20/06/2011, 11/10/2011, 17/03/2012, 21/06/2012	-	01/07/2010, 29/12/2010, 13/04/2011, 27/06/2011
5	04862984	0.2s	28/07/2010, 14/06/2011	27/07/2011, 13/06/2012	-	21/10/2010, 30/07/2011
6	04862987	0.2s	28/07/2010, 14/06/2011	27/07/2011, 13/06/2012	-	21/10/2010, 30/07/2011
7	04862989	0.2s	28/07/2010, 14/06/2011	27/07/2011, 13/06/2012	-	21/10/2010, 30/07/2011
8	04862978	0.2s	28/07/2010, 14/06/2011	27/07/2011, 13/06/2012	-	21/10/2010, 30/07/2011
It is understood the period wherever calibrations are not available; PP applied maximum permissible error to both the values of electricity exported and imported by the project activity conservatively in line with EB 52 Annex 60. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted.						
Thus CAR #5 is closed out.						
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:		Date: 28/03/2012				

Date:	27/02/2012		Raised by:	Vikas Bankar		
Type:	CAR	Number:	06		Reference:	Section 3.1, 3.2, 3.3

Lead Assessor Comment:	Date: 27/02/2012
PP is requested to clarify why grid emission factor is not included in section 3.1 of VCS MR version 01. PP is requested to clarify the appropriateness of inclusion of monitoring parameter net electricity supplied to the grid in section 3.1 of VCS MR version 01. Please refer indicative guidelines available in VCS MR template available on VCS website http://v-c-s.org/program-documents. Calibration details mentioned in section 3.3 of VCS MR version 01 are not covering whole monitoring period considered for the project activity. Please clarify.	
Project Participant Response:	Date: 14/03/2012
The grid emission factor has been included in the revised version of VCS MR. The monitoring parameter has been corrected in the revised version of VCS MR. Calibration details mentioned in section 3.3 of VCS MR version 02 are covering whole monitoring period considered for the project activity if the documentary evidence not available the error factor has been applied.	
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:	
Revised MR version 02	
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
Revised MR version 02 is checked for appropriateness of grid emission factor, value of monitoring parameters reported and calibration details	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	Date: 28/03/2012
PP had mentioned the values of operating margin and build margin consistent with data unit mentioned in section 3.1 of MR version 02. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. Monitoring parameter net electricity supplied to the grid is removed from section 3.1 of the MR and it is accepted. It is understood the period wherever calibrations are not available; PP applied maximum permissible error to both the values of electricity exported and imported by the project activity conservatively in line with EB 52 Annex 60. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. Thus CAR #6 is closed out.	
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:	Date: 28/03/2012

Date:	21/02/2012	Raised by:	Vikas Bankar
Type:	CL	Number:	07
		Reference:	Section 3.3, 4.1
Lead Assessor Comment:	Date: 21/02/2012		
Section 3.3 of VCS MR version 1.1 doesn't describe procedures for handling internal auditing and non-conformities. Also line diagram indicating GHG collection and management system is not found to be included in section 3.3 of VCS MR version 01. Please clarify the same in line with indicative guidelines available in VCS MR template available on VCS website http://v-c-s.org/program-documents. PP is requested to submit ISO certificate of EPC contractor for the project activity. Also please submit internal audit and training procedure being followed for data recording and management in the project activity			
Project Participant Response:	Date: 14/03/2012		
The procedure for handling internal auditing & non-conformities has been mentioned in Section 3.3 of VCS MR. The line diagram for GHG collection has been inserted in revised version of VCS MR & management system diagram has been there in VCS MR, kindly refer section 3.3. The ISO certificate of EPC contractor & documentary evidence for internal audit & training procedure followed has been submitted along with revised version of VCS MR.			
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:			
ISO Certificate & Training Manual Enercon			

Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
Revised MR is checked for appropriateness of QA/QC procedure to be followed for the project activity	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	Date: 28/03/2012
Section 3.3 of VCS MR version 2 now mentions procedures towards internal auditing and non-conformities along with inclusion of line diagram indicating GHG collection and management system. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. PP had submitted training manual and ISO certificate of Enercon India Limited who is acting as EPC contractor for the project activity. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. Thus CL #7 is closed out.	
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:	Date: 28/03/2012

Date:	27/02/2012	Raised by:	Vikas Bankar
Type:	CAR	Number:	08
		Reference:	ER Sheet
Lead Assessor Comment:		Date: 27/02/2012	
PP is requested to clarify the appropriateness of net export values report for investors C. P Patel, V. V. Patel and J. V. Patel and Laxmi Narayan. ER sheet mentions only net export values for all entities. However, VCS PD mentions power exported and imported by the project activity as monitoring parameters. Please clarify the inconsistency observed. PP is requested to mention appropriate units for monitored data reported in ER sheet submitted for the project activity.			
Project Participant Response:		Date: 06/03/2012	
<i>The net export values for C.P. Patel, V.V. Patel & J.V. Patel has been corrected & ER sheet has been submitted along with revised version of MR.</i> <i>The export, import & net export values has been defined in the revised ER Sheet which has been submitted along with revised version of VCS MR.</i> <i>The appropriate units for monitoring data has been inserted in the revised ER sheet & has been submitted along with revised version of VCS MR.</i>			
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:			
ER Sheet			
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:			
Revised ER sheet is checked for appropriateness of accuracy and adequacy of emission reductions calculations for the project activity.			
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:		Date: 28/03/2012	
Revised ER sheet now mentions correct values of net export values for investors C. P Patel, V. V. Patel and J. V. Patel and Laxmi Narayan consistent with JMRs submitted for the project activity. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. PP now reported electricity exported as well as imported by the project activity in line with registered monitoring plan. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. Appropriate units are found to be mentioned in revised ER sheet for the project activity and it is accepted. Thus CAR #8 is closed out.			
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:		Date: 28/03/2012	

Date:	05/05/2012	Raised by:	Vikas Bankar
Type:	CAR	Number:	09
		Reference:	Deviation Applied
Lead Assessor Comment:		Date: 05/05/2012	

Please clarify how parameters EG export and EG import are followed as per VCS registered PDD and deviation mentioned. If deviation is mentioned in MR, then why monitoring information is not revised as per deviation. There is no involvement of energy meters directly for export and import of project activities and these values are calculated based on apportioning principle from controller readings and substation reading. Deviation is not transparent. EG Gross parameter is not mentioned in MR and excels spreadsheet. VCS PD mentioned EG export and EG import for project activity which should mention as calculated parameter and metering information in VCS PD is not applicable for this parameter. Please clarify what is exactly deviation and justify the reason for deviation. The monitoring parameters need to revise as per deviation. The sentence is not appropriate "Net electricity supplied to the grid will be calculated by the values of import and export from the common meter"	
Project Participant Response:	Date: 07/05/2012
<i>The deviation has been clarified, the monitoring information has been revised in the revised version of VCS MR.</i> <i>The energy meter is used for taking the reading by MSDECL.</i> <i>The deviation has been taken from the current monitoring period, as there is no requirement of apportioning the Electricity Export & Electricity Import, it has been directly taken from credit breakup issued on monthly basis, hence there is no requirement to take EG_{Gross} parameter.</i> <i>The deviation & reason for deviation has been mentioned in detail in the revised version of VCS MR.</i>	
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:	
Revised MR version 04	
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:	
Revised MR version 04 is checked for appropriateness of proposed deviation proposed in section 2.2 of the MR.	
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:	Date: 11/05/2012
Section 2.2 of the revised monitoring report dated 07/05/2012 is checked and deviation proposed is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. Deviation from registered monitoring plan proposed in section 2.2 of the revised MR version 4 now clearly mentions that electricity exported and imported by the project activity is being sourced from monthly JMRs/credit reports issued by MSDECL. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. Since emission reduction calculations for the project activity are directly being calculated based on the values of net electricity supplied to grid by the project activity which are being sourced from JMRs/credits report issued MSDECL for the project activity, monitoring parameter EG Gross y is not included section 3.2 of the monitoring report. This is found to be appropriate and it is accepted. Thus CAR #9 is closed out.	
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:	Date: 11/05/2012

A.2. Annex 2: Team Members Statements of Competency

Statement of Competence

Name: Vikas Bankar

Status

- Lead Assessor	x	- Expert	x
- Assessor	x	- Financial Expert	
- Local Assessor	Indi a	- Technical Reviewer	

Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)	x
Technical Area(s): TA 1.2 Energy generation from renewable energy sources	
2. Energy Distribution	x
Technical Area(s): TA 2.1 Electricity distribution TA 2.2 Heat distribution	
3. Energy Demand	x
Technical Area(s): TA 3.1 Energy Demand	
4. Manufacturing	
Technical Area(s):	
5. Chemical Industry	
Technical Area(s):	
6. Construction	
Technical Area(s):	
7. Transport	
Technical Area(s):	
8. Mining/Mineral Production	
Technical Area(s):	
9. Metal Production	
Technical Area(s):	
10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas)	
Technical Area(s):	
11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride	
Technical Area(s):	
12. Solvent Use	
Technical Area(s):	
13. Waste Handling and Disposal	
Technical Area(s):	
14. Afforestation and Reforestation	
Technical Area(s):	
15. Agriculture	
Technical Area(s):	

Approved Member of Staff by: Siddharth Yadav Date: 06/02/2012

Statement of Competence

Name: Ramkrishna Patil

Status

- Lead Assessor	X	- Expert	x
- Assessor	X	- Financial Expert	
- Local Assessor	India	- Technical Reviewer	x

Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)	x
Technical Area(s): TA 1.2 Energy generation from renewable energy sources	
2. Energy Distribution	x
Technical Area(s): TA 2.1 Electricity distribution TA 2.2 Heat distribution	
3. Energy Demand	x
Technical Area(s): TA 3.1 Energy Demand	
4. Manufacturing	
Technical Area(s):	
5. Chemical Industry	
Technical Area(s):	
6. Construction	
Technical Area(s):	
7. Transport	
Technical Area(s):	
8. Mining/Mineral Production	
Technical Area(s):	
9. Metal Production	
Technical Area(s):	
10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas)	
Technical Area(s):	
11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride	
Technical Area(s):	
12. Solvent Use	
Technical Area(s):	
13. Waste Handling and Disposal	
Technical Area(s):	
14. Afforestation and Reforestation	
Technical Area(s):	
15. Agriculture	
Technical Area(s):	

Approved Member of Staff by: Siddharth Yadav Date: 22/02/2012