



“WIND POWER PROJECT AT ANTHIYUR, TAMIL NADU”



Document Prepared By: LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)

Project Title	Wind Power Project at Anthiyur, Tamil Nadu.
Version	02
Report ID	BELL_CDM_2020_IND WPP Anthiyur_VCS_VER

Report Title	Verification Report “Wind Power Project at Anthiyur, Tamil Nadu.”
Client	Windage Power Company (P) LTD. (Formerly name is Nuziveedu Seeds Limited)
Pages	41
Date of Issue	24- March-2021
Prepared By	LGA Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Contact	Campus UAB – Ronda de la Font del Carme, s/n

	08193 Bellaterra – Barcelona (Spain) Tel.:+34 93 567 20 08 Fax.:+34 93 567 20 01 www.appluscertification.com agustin.calle@applus.com carla.debat@applus.com
Approved By	LGAI Technological Center S.A. (Applus+ Certification) VVB Technical Manager – Mr. Agustín Calle de Miguel
Work Carried Out By	Lead Auditor & Technical Expert: Vivek Kumar Ahirwar, Technical Reviewer & Technical Expert: Simon Shen

Summary:

LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) has performed the verification of the project “Wind Power Project at Anthiyur, Tamil Nadu” VCS ID 682, against VCS Standard Version 4. The scope of verification includes confirming the implementation of the monitoring plan of the approved revised VCS PD (version 01) dated 20/03/2017 and the application of the monitoring methodology as per AMS ID version 18: “Grid connected Renewable Electricity Generation”.

The verification is consisted of three phases: i) desk review of the project; ii) Remote audit ; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and opinion. The overall verification, from Contract Review to Verification Report & Opinion, was conducted following Applus+ Certification internal quality procedures.

During the verification process 08 CARs, 04 CL and 00 FARs were raised. All the findings have been closed satisfactorily and the same has been discussed in Appendix 4.

Applus+ Certification confirms that the monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements. The emission reductions from the project activity “Wind Power Project at Anthiyur, Tamil Nadu” in India during the period 01/11/2019 - 31/10/2020 (including both days) amount to 30,183 tonnes of CO₂e.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	5
1.1 Objective	5
1.2 Scope and Criteria	5
1.3 Level of Assurance	5
1.4 Summary Description of the Project	5
2. Verification Process.....	6
2.1 Method and Criteria	6
2.2 Document Review.....	6
2.3 Interviews.....	7
2.4 Site Inspections	7
2.5 Resolution of Findings.....	8
2.5.1 Forward Action Requests.....	9
2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities.....	9
3. Validation Findings	9
3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs.....	9
3.2 Methodology Deviations	10
3.3 Project Description Deviations	10
3.4 Grouped Project.....	10
4. Verification Findings	11
4.1 Project Implementation Status.....	11
4.2 Safeguards	12
4.2.1 No Net Harm	12
4.2.2 Local Stakeholder Consultation.....	12

4.3	AFOLU-Specific Safeguards.....	12
4.4	Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations.....	13
4.5	Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals.....	13
4.6	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis	26
5.	Verification conclusion.....	26
	<i>APPENDIX 1: References.....</i>	<i>28</i>
	APPENDIX 2: Competency Statement.....	30
	APPENDIX 3: Abbreviations	32
	APPENDIX 4: Findings Overview	34

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

Windage Power Company (P) LTD has contracted LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) to perform VCS Verification of the 'Wind Power Project at Anthiyur, Tamil Nadu' in India (hereafter called project). This project has already been registered as a VCS project (VCS ID 682). The objective of this verification is a thorough and independent assessment of registered project activities against the applicable VCS requirement by the VVB. The verification process shall determine whether the proposed project activity complies with the requirements of latest VCS guidelines, applicability conditions of the selected methodology, relevant host country regulations and guidance issued by the VCS Board.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of verification is to assess the claims and assumptions made in the VCS monitoring report (MR) against the VCS criteria, including but not limited to, VCS standard, applied methodology and other relevant rules and requirements established for VCS project activities.

The Verification is not meant to provide any consulting towards the project participants. However, stated requests for clarification and/or correction actions request may have provided inputs for improvement of the project design.

1.3 Level of Assurance

The verification team verified the complete monitoring data for all the parameters of the monitoring plan and confirms that the reported emission reductions are free from any type of material errors. Therefore, Applus+ Certification confirms that the verification is conducted with reasonable level of assurance.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The project activity involves electricity generation by wind electric convertors and supplying the generated electricity to the Southern Grid. The project being a renewable energy generation activity, it leads to removal of fossil fuel dominated electricity generation. The project activity results in reductions of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that are real, measurable, and verifiable and also plays beneficial role in the mitigation of climate change.

The project activity consists of 9 WTGs (1650 kW capacity each), making the total installed capacity to be 14.85 MW at Anthiyur Village of Udumalpet and Pollachi Talukas of Coimbatore District in Tamil Nadu.

Location of the project was verified through Google Map (<https://www.gps-coordinates.net/>) and found consistent with the data provided in the registered PD /01/. The WTGs generate 3-phase power at 400 V ($\pm 12.5\%$) in the frequency range of 47.5 – 51.5 Hz. It is further stepped up to 33 kV for further distribution by the state utility. This information was verified during remote audit and found to be in line with the details provided in the registered PD /01/.

The WTGs have been commissioned between 26/03/2005 and 17/05/2005. The same was verified against the latest revised VCS PD/01/ and commissioning certificates/12/. The emission reductions from the project activity during the period 01/11/2019 - 31/10/2020 (including both days) amount to 30,183 tonnes of CO_{2e}.

2. VERIFICATION PROCESS

The registered VCS project is undergoing fourth verification under VCS (2nd Crediting period), the approach adopted to ensure the quality of emission reductions is described in the following sections.

2.1 Method and Criteria

Applus+ Certification assessed and determined whether the proposed implementation and operation of the project activity, and the steps taken to report emission reductions comply with the criteria and relevant guidance provided by the VCS Board. The validation/verification process consist of the following three phases;

- A desk review of the VCS PD and VCS MR
- Remote site inspection, interview with project representatives and issuance of findings.
- The resolution of outstanding issues and issuance of final report and opinion.

2.2 Document Review

The verification is performed primarily as a document review of the approved revised VCS PD, previous MR and Verification report and associated documents as stated in detail in appendix 1 of this document. The assessment is performed by a verification team using a protocol. The cross checks between information provided in the Monitoring report, VCS PD and information from sources other than those used, if available, the team's sectoral or local expertise and, if necessary, independent background investigations.

2.3 Interviews

Due to the current situation with the global COVID-19 pandemic scenario and country wide lock down in India, an on-site inspection has not been performed by the assessment team. However, the representatives of the PP and O&M contractors were interviewed telephonically on 08/12/2020 i.e. personnel responsible for monitoring of the project activity, data collection and management, and QA/QC procedure. The details of the people interviewed are mentioned in the table below:

S N	Name	Organization
1	Mr. Ravikiran MRV	M/s Windage Power Company (P) LTD
2	Mr. Deepjyoti Borah	WeAct Pty Ltd

The topics covered during interview ranges from general features and implementation of project to technical details of the project like calibration details, monitoring and measuring system and data collection, recording and archiving procedures. The assessment was drawn based on the feedback received during interview coupled with the documentation.

2.4 Site Inspections

Due to COVID-19 a remote visit is undertaken by members of Applus+ Certification team, involving but not limited to,

- An assessment of the implementation and operation of the proposed VCS project activity as per the approved VCS PD/01/;
- A review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters;
- Interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the approved monitoring plan;
- A cross-check between information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records or similar data sources;/08/
- A check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PD and the selected methodology;
- A review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions;
- An identification of quality control and quality assurance procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters.

Verification team has checked the Plant name/GPS Location/date of commissioning/Unique id/project location/Capacity/Monitoring practice etc. and found the information consistent with the registered VCS PD /01/ and the Monitoring report.

Furthermore the project activity already verified under VCS previously and currently undergoing fourth verification, hence based on the information's available through approved documents (VCS verifications), it can be confirmed that project is implemented and being operated as described in the registered PD.

The assessment team has verified sufficient appropriate audit evidences, to reduce audit risk to an acceptably low level as requisite to achieve reasonable level of assurance for the current verification.

2.5 Resolution of Findings

The objective of this step is to identify, discuss and conclude on the issues related to the monitoring, implementation and operations of the registered project activity that could impair the capacity of the registered project activity to achieve emission reductions or influence the monitoring and reporting of emission reductions. This is done based on the desk review and telephonic interview of site personnel. The verification team prepares and/or updates a verification protocol (internal document) that records the conformities and non-conformities, which may be of following types;

CAR (Corrective Action Request) is raised if one of the following occurs:

- Non-compliance with the monitoring plan, the methodology or the standardized baseline are found in monitoring and reporting and has not been sufficiently documented by the project participants, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;
- Modifications to the implementation, operation and monitoring of the registered project activity has not been sufficiently documented by the project participants;
- Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions that will impact the quantity of emission reductions;
- Issues identified in a FAR during validation to be verified during verification or previous verification(s) have not been resolved by the project participants.

Clarification request (CL) is raised if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM requirements have been met. All CARs and CLs raised by the Applus+ Certification during verification shall be resolved prior to submitting a request for issuance.

FAR (Forward Action Request) is raised during verification if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.

All the findings that are raised and communicated to project participant during the verification are included under Appendix 4. The section also includes the response, if provided, by the project participants and an assessment by the verification team if it was closed out or otherwise.

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

The project activity is undergoing fourth verification of 2nd crediting period under VCS; there were no FARs raised during the validation or previous verification/03/.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

Not applicable, as Applus+ holds the accreditation to perform validation activities in this Sectoral Scope.

3. VALIDATION FINDINGS

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

The project activity is registered under the VCS only (VCS Project ID 682) and is not registered under any other emissions trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading. PP also confirms that net GHG emission reductions or removals generated during this monitoring period 01/11/2019 to 31/10/2020 (including both dates) shall not be used for compliance under any such programs or mechanisms. This was confirmed through a declaration/15/ submitted by the PP and hence accepted by the assessment team.

3.2 Methodology Deviations

There is no methodology deviation identified during the current monitoring period.

3.3 Project Description Deviations

As per section 13.18.2 para 2 of VCS standard v.4 “Where the deviation does not impact the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario, and the project remains in compliance with the applied methodology, the deviation shall be described and justified in the monitoring report.” Same has been explained and justified below. In Current Monitoring Period, a deviation has been taken on account of delay in meter calibration.

As per VCS PD “The project adheres to all the mandatory regulatory and statutory requirements at the state as well as national level.”

It was proposed that meters will be calibrated annually; however as per prevailing practice in the project region there is no dedicated interval for meter calibration. Therefore, PP has referred to national practice as per CEA order dated 17 Mar 2016; which prescribes in the para 18(b) that “all the meters shall be tested once in five years”. Details of calibration of energy meters are provided in Section 4.3 of the MR. The validity of calibration from the previous date is still within the five years period. However, as a conservative approach PP has considered the delay in calibration of existing energy meters and appropriate error factor has been applied. Therefore, this delay has been considered as project deviation in line with the guidance provided under section 13.18.2 para 2 of VCS standard v.4. However, it does not impact the existing applicability conditions of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario.

The assessment team is able to confirm that the deviation identified during the current monitoring period is appropriately described and justified and the project remains in compliance with the VCS rules. Also the deviation does not have an impact on the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario.

3.4 Grouped Project

Not applicable. The project activity is not a grouped project

4. VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Implementation Status

The project activity consists of 9 WTGs installed at Anthiyur Village of Udumalpet and Pollachi Talukas of Coimbatore District in Tamil Nadu. The WTGs under the project activity have been commissioned between 26/03/2005 and 17/05/2005. The WTGs are of M/s Vestas Wind Technology with an individual capacity of 1.65 MW, summing up to 14.85 MW of total installation capacity.

The installation and specification of WTGs has been checked with commissioning certificates/12/ and confirm during remote visit. The commissioning has also been duly validated in the VCS validation report of the project activity/02/. There was no major breakdown or shutdowns during the monitoring period which might affect the applicability of methodology or might cause material errors in emission reductions.

Assessment team concludes the following:

- a) There is no material discrepancies between project implementation and the project description provided in the registered PD/01/.
- b) The monitoring plan is implemented completely and monitoring system (i.e., process and schedule for obtaining, recording, compiling and analysing the monitored data and parameters) is appropriate.
- c) There is no material discrepancies between the actual monitoring system, and the monitoring plan set out in the project description and the applied methodology/09/.
- d) The GHG emission reductions or removals generated by the project have not included in an emissions trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading/17/.
- e) The project has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit, or has become eligible to do so since validation or previous verification/03/.
- f) The GHG emissions generated from the project activity are not included in any other emissions trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading or other binding limits.
- g) The project is registered under VCS only.
- h) The project activity complies with indicators for sustainable development in the interim approval guidelines for Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) projects from India as discussed under section 1.11 of MR.

In view of the information's as verified above the assessment team is able to conclude that the project has been implemented as described in the project description.

4.2 Safeguards

4.2.1 No Net Harm

Being renewable wind power generation project there is no negative environmental and socio-economic impacts in fact project activity contributes positively by providing environment friendly power generation leading to sustainable development of the region. Also, the generation of employment supports upliftment of socio-economic status of region.

4.2.2 Local Stakeholder Consultation

The Project is already registered with VCS and registered VCS Project Description; sections 5.3 & 5.4 provide the reference for the Local Stakeholder Consultation Process as in-line with VCS requirement.

For ongoing communication, the PP has placed a grievance register onsite where the stakeholders can put down his/her complain/feedback/comments etc. and the same if found genuine will be addressed immediately and necessary actions shall be taken. However, there is no feedback/grievance has been reported within this monitoring period. Therefore, no action was required. The photo and scan copy of the grievance register has been submitted by the PP.

4.3 AFOLU-Specific Safeguards

Not applicable for this verification.

4.4 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

The project monitoring has been carried in accordance with the registered VCS PD/01/ and the VCS MR/04/. The monitoring plan laid in the registered PD is being followed at the site/18/. The assessment team has verified the information flow (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting for these parameters including the values) in the MR/04/.The emission reductions are purely based on the net electricity generated and exported from the machines. PP has provided all the sufficient data for current monitoring period. The values of the parameter net electricity generation supplied to the grid by each phase used in deriving the GHG emission reduction could be very well correlated between the data sets and ER spreadsheet/06/ provided by PP. The verification of each monitoring parameter has been discussed later in section 4.5.

The calculation method and formulae used in calculating baseline emission is in compliance to the methodology used i.e. AMS- I. D. version 18 /10/. Since project activity is a wind power project, leakage emission and project emission has been considered as zero.

4.5 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

The below tables describe how the parameter, that is to be measured according to the monitoring plan, has been verified to confirm that the actual monitoring complies with the monitoring plan, monitoring data has been thoroughly assessed and that the calibration requirements are met.

Parameter	Gross Electricity export to the grid by the project during the year y, $EG_{Gross,y}$ (kWh)	
Means of verification	Criteria/Requirements	Assessment/Observation
	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	The electricity exported to the grid is measured through energy meters at the WTG metering location on continuous basis and reported monthly.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes. The reporting frequency is in line with the monitoring plan as outlined in the revised PD/01/ and monitoring methodology/10/.
	Monitoring equipment	There is one set of dedicated energy meters

		(main & check meter) provided for each WTGs owner at 33 kV metering points.
	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	All the energy meters are two-way tri-vector meters of accuracy class 0.2s. Accuracy of the monitoring equipment's is in accordance with the monitoring plan as outlined in the revised PD.
	Is the accuracy valid for the entire measuring range or do different accuracy levels apply to different measuring ranges?	Yes the accuracy valid for the entire measuring range.
	Calibration frequency /interval:	Annual
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's	There was delay in meter calibration. The PP has considered the same under deviation and appropriate error factor was applied.

	specifications?	
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	Calibration of the measuring equipment's is carried out by an accredited entity i.e. by state utility (TNEB)/07/
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	There was delay in meter calibration and the same is addressed applying the error factor to the measured parameter during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.
	Is the calibration carried out for a measuring range comparable with the range for which measurements have been carried out?	Yes, calibration carried out for a measuring range comparable with the range for which measurements have been carried.
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Reported values of this parameter have been verified with monthly joint metering report/08/during remote audit and desk review. Value of this parameter for the current monitoring period is verified as 31,218,374.13 kWh. Furthermore monthly values of this parameter is reported in the ER calculation sheet/06/ are also verified with the MR/04/ and found to be consistent.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The monthly reported values of this parameter were further cross checked with the monthly invoices raised by the PP /09/ and found to be consistent.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions	Yes, the adequate QA/QC procedures were implemented by all the stakeholders, namely, the Grid Authority, the PP and the O&M Contractor. The data transfer process for the said parameter is as follows:

	and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The monthly Joint meter reading is taken by the representatives of TNEB (State utility) in the presence of NSL officials in the form of JMRs.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either i) a deviation been approved by the CDM EB or ii) has the parameter been estimated as stipulated by Appendix 1 to the CDM Project Standard?	No such issues.
Findings	CL #4 and CAR #6 and CAR#8 was raised and resolved	
Conclusion	The parameter has been monitored appropriately, in accordance with the registered monitoring plan (as per measurement methods and procedures to be applied) and applied methodology/10/. The monitoring results were recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.	

Parameter	Net electricity supplied to the grid, $EG_{net,y}$ (MWh)	
Means of verification	Criteria/Requirements	Assessment/Observation
	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	The net electricity supplied to the grid is measured through energy meters at the WTG metering location on continuous basis and reported monthly.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes. The reporting frequency is in line with the monitoring plan as outlined in the revised PD/01/ and monitoring methodology/10/.
	Monitoring equipment	There is one set of dedicated energy meters (main & check meter) provided for each WTGs owner at 33 kV metering points.

	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	All the energy meters are two-way tri-vector meters of accuracy class 0.2s. Accuracy of the monitoring equipment's is in accordance with the monitoring plan as outlined in the revised PD.
	Is the accuracy valid for the entire measuring range or do different accuracy levels apply to different measuring ranges?	Yes the accuracy valid for the entire measuring range.
	Calibration frequency /interval:	Annual
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications?	There was delay in meter calibration which was mainly due to the replacement of old meters with new set of meters. However, PP has considered the same under deviation and appropriate error factor was applied.
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or	Calibration of the measuring equipment's is carried out by an accredited entity i.e. by state utility (TNEB)/07/

	institution?	
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	There was delay in meter calibration and the same is addressed applying the error factor to the measured parameter during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.
	Is the calibration carried out for a measuring range comparable with the range for which measurements have been carried out?	Yes, calibration carried out for a measuring range comparable with the range for which measurements have been carried out.
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Reported values of this parameter have been verified with monthly joint meter reading report/08/during remote audit and desk review. Value of this parameter for the current monitoring period is verified as 30,871.559 MWh. . Furthermore monthly values of this parameter is reported in the ER calculation sheet/06/ are also verified with the MR/04/ and found to be consistent.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The monthly reported values of this parameter were further cross checked with the monthly invoices raised by the PP /09/ and found to be consistent.
	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the adequate QA/QC procedures were implemented by all the stakeholders, namely, the Grid Authority, the PP and the O&M Contractor. The monthly Joint meter reading is taken by the representatives of TNEB (State utility) in the presence of NSL officials in the form of JMRs.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the	No such issues.

	parameter, has either i) a deviation been approved by the CDM EB or ii) has the parameter been estimated as stipulated by Appendix 1 to the CDM Project Standard?	
Findings	CL #4 and CAR #6 and CAR #8 was raised and resolved	
Conclusion	The parameter has been monitored appropriately, in accordance with the registered monitoring plan (as per measurement methods and procedures to be applied) and applied methodology/10/. The monitoring results were recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.	

Parameter	Electricity imported from the grid by the project during the year y EG _{import,y} (kWh)	
Means of verification	Criteria/Requirements	Assessment/Observation
	Measuring /Reading /Recording frequency	The electricity imported to the grid is measured through energy meters at the WTG metering location on continuous basis and reported monthly.
	Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes. The reporting frequency is in line with the monitoring plan as outlined in the revised PD/01/ and monitoring methodology/10/.
	Monitoring equipment	There is one set of dedicated energy meters (main & check meter) provided for each WTGs owner at 33 kV metering points.

	Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the accuracy of the monitoring equipment comply with local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	All the energy meters are two-way tri-vector meters of accuracy class 0.2s. Accuracy of the monitoring equipment's is in accordance with the monitoring plan as outlined in the revised PD.
	Is the accuracy valid for the entire measuring range or do different accuracy levels apply to different measuring ranges?	Yes the accuracy valid for the entire measuring range.
	Calibration frequency /interval:	Annual
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan and/or methodology? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, is the selected frequency in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per	There was delay in meter calibration which was mainly due to the replacement of old meters with new set of meters. However, PP has considered the same under deviation and appropriate error factor was applied.

	the manufacturer's specifications?	
	Is the calibration of measuring equipment carried out by an accredited person or institution?	Calibration of the measuring equipment's is carried out by an accredited entity i.e. by state utility (TNEB)/07/
	Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Calibration of energy meters was delayed and the same is addressed applying the error factor to the measured parameter during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.
	Is the calibration carried out for a measuring range comparable with the range for which measurements have been carried out?	Yes, calibration carried out for a measuring range comparable with the range for which measurements have been carried out.
	How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Reported values of this parameter have been verified with monthly joint meter reading report/08/during remote audit and desk review .Value of this parameter for the current monitoring period is verified as 3,46,815.25 kWh. Furthermore monthly values of this parameter is reported in the ER calculation sheet/06/ are also verified with the MR/04/ and found to be consistent.
	If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The monthly reported values of this parameter were further cross checked with the monthly invoices raised by the PP /09/ and found to be consistent.

	Does the data management ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the adequate QA/QC procedures were implemented by all the stakeholders, namely, the Grid Authority, the PP and the O&M Contractor. The monthly Joint meter reading is taken by the representatives of TNEB (State utility) in the presence of NSL officials in the form of JMRs.
	In case project participants have temporarily not monitored the parameter, has either i) a deviation been approved by the CDM EB or ii) has the parameter been estimated as stipulated by Appendix 1 to the CDM Project Standard?	No such issues.
Findings	CL #4 and CAR #6 and CAR#8 was raised and resolved	
Conclusion	The parameter has been monitored appropriately, in accordance with the registered monitoring plan (as per measurement methods and procedures to be applied) and applied methodology/10/. The monitoring results were recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.	

Parameter fixed ex-ante:

EF_{Gridy}; tCO_{2e}/MWh: It is the combined margin emission factor of Indian grid fixed at the time of project renewal of crediting period the mentioned value of 0.9777 tCO_{2e}/MWh is consistent with the revised PD/01/.

Calibration of meters:

During the verification assessment of the project activity, accuracy of all the metering have been checked and found appropriate. The installation and working conditions of the meters were checked during the on-site inspection and were found to be satisfactory. Details of meters are provided in below table:

Location Name	Month	Energy Meter - Sl. No	Make	Accuracy Class	Type	Date of Calibration / Date of replacement	Validity of Calibration*
	HTSC. No						
NSL-1	507	4321904	Genus	0.2s	03D-183 (DLMS)	08-05-2017	07-05-2022
NSL-2	508	4321911	Genus	0.2s	03D-183 (DLMS)	08-05-2017	07-05-2022
NSL-3	510	4321912	Genus	0.2s	03D-183 (DLMS)	08-05-2017	07-05-2022
NSL-4	533	4321910	Genus	0.2s	03D-183 (DLMS)	08-05-2017	07-05-2022
NSL-5	509	4321907	Genus	0.2s	03D-183 (DLMS)	08-05-2017	07-05-2022
NSL-6	551	4321909	Genus	0.2s	03D-183 (DLMS)	08-05-2017	07-05-2022
NSL-7	497	4321903	Genus	0.2s	03D-183 (DLMS)	08-05-2017	07-05-2022
NSL-8	511	4321905	Genus	0.2s	03D-183 (DLMS)	08-05-2017	07-05-2022
NSL-9	482	4322619	Genus	0.2s	03D-183 (DLMS)	08-05-2017	07-05-2022

The verification team has confirmed that the current HTSC Nos. are valid, which have been assigned by TNEB as per their internal practice. The HTSC nos. were different at the time of validation, however change in HTSC nos. affected by TNEB during the previous year, same was reported under the ER calculation sheet along with the previous HTSC nos. This practice of assigning HTSC nos. is not under the control of PP.

The details of monitoring equipment that are involved in the project activity and their calibration details/07/ are mentioned in the table under Section 4.3 of the VCS MR/04/. The energy meters installation dates and calibration dates were verified with respective energy meter replacement and calibration certificate issued by TNEB and also each meter has been inspected during the remote audit and the meter details are found to be consistent with the photographs provided by PP.

Accordance with the guidelines outlined under paragraph 366(a) of VVS version 02, an error factor had to be applied for the measured values in the delayed calibration period. However, the monthly statements issued by the state utility only provide the calculated value of electricity exported and imported applied for the project activity. Hence the error factor negative (-ve) i.e. 0.2% is applied for export values (therefore deduction of 0.2% from the exported value for delay month) and positive (+ve) i.e. 0.2% for import values (therefore, addition of 0.2% for the import value for delay month). The approach followed by the PP was found to be conservative and appropriate, hence accepted.

Meters used to measure the parameters are of accuracy class 0.2s, as verified through calibration certificates/07/ and checked through latest photographs, supplier clarification on no calibration requirement and were found to be satisfactory. The CEA Notification No. 502/70/CEA/DP&D dated 17/03/2006 and its amendments Notified on 26/06/2010 No. 502/6/2009/DP&D/D-I /16/ which is considered as national standard, mentions that for voltage of 650 V up to 33 kV, 0.5s accuracy class or above is recommended. Hence, the accuracy classes of 0.2s for the energy meters installed at the project activity site are found to be appropriate.

The meters have been inspected during the remote visit and the meter details are found to be consistent with that observed during the audit. The CEA Notification No. 502/70/CEA/DP&D dated 17/03/2006/16/ which is considered as national standard mentions that "All interface meters shall be tested at least once in five years." Hence, the stipulated calibration frequency once in a year is appropriate.

The assessment team has verified the monthly joint meter reading report issued by respective state utility and confirmed that only the data recorded through main meters is used to calculate net electricity supplied to the grid by the WTGs belongs to particular developer and consequently for ER calculations. As verified through the calibration certificates, that meters were working satisfactorily during the current monitoring period. The revised VCS PD/01/ & MR /04/ and remote assessment observations confirm that the metering equipment are sealed and maintained by the state utility.

In view of the above discussion the assessment team able to confirm that evidence used to determine the GHG reductions and removals are sufficient and appropriate with respect to quality and quantity.

GHG Calculations

The emission reduction as per the applied methodology equals the baseline emissions (project emissions and leakage emissions for such project activities is considered zero). The formula provided for the calculation of baseline emissions is:

$$BE_y = EG_y * EF_y$$

Where:

BE_y : Baseline emissions in year y (tCO₂e/yr)

EG_y : Electricity supplied by the project activity to the grid in year y (MWh/yr)

EF_y : Combined Margin (CM) Emission Factor of Indian grid (tCO₂e/MWh)

Thus, $BE_y = EG_y * EF_y$

Thus, $BE_y = 30,871.559 \text{ MWh} * 0.9777 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/MWh} = 30,183 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$

The verification team confirms that appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline emissions have been followed. The assumptions, emission factors and default values that were applied in the calculations are justified. All the data were made available and have monitored as per required monitoring frequency. The means of verification for the values of parameters, used for baseline emission calculation, is described above.

However, verification team has observed that the actual ER achieved during the current monitoring period is lower than the estimated ER as per registered PD for the comparable period. This comparison is submitted in the ER sheet along with a justification confirming that this event of lower power generation was an unforeseen situation and also not under the direct control of PP. The verification team has reviewed and verified the facts and supporting documents provided by PP and able to conclude that justification is valid and such condition is an unforeseen event which is not a regular affair in the project activity, moreover PP does not have any direct control on it.

The verification team has assessed the cause of any variation in the actual GHG emission reductions achieved during the current monitoring period. There is decrease of around 2.67% in the actual emission reductions achieved during the current monitoring period from that stated in the registered VCS PD. This is largely due to lower plant load factor (PLF) achieved during the current monitoring period. It is to be noted that PLF is completely governed by the availability of wind, which is natural phenomenon and it is beyond the control of PP. Thus, verification team concludes that this change in ER (which corresponds to change in PLF) does not impact on additionality.

4.6 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

Not applicable for the project activity.

5. VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification), contracted by Windage Power Company (P) LTD, has performed the independent verification of the emission reductions for the VCS project activity (VCS ID- 682) “Wind Power Project at Anthiyur, Tamil Nadu” in India for the monitoring period 01/11/2019 to 31/10/2020 (both dates are included) as reported in the Monitoring Report Version 02.1 dated 13/03/2021. The Windage Power Company (P) LTD is responsible for the collection of data in accordance with the monitoring plan and the reporting of GHG emissions reductions from the project activity. It is our responsibility to express an independent verification statement on the reported GHG emission reductions from the project activity.

Applus+ Certification commenced the verification on the basis of the baseline and monitoring methodology AMS I.D. version 18, the monitoring plan contained in the registered PD Version 01 dated 20/03/2017 and VCS guidelines version 4, Monitoring Report Version 02.1 dated 13/03/2021 as per the process described under Section 2 of this report.

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

In our opinion the GHG emissions reductions reported for the project activity for the period 01/11/2019 to 31/10/2020 are fairly stated in the Monitoring Report Version 02.1 dated 13/03/2021. The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly on the basis of the approved baseline and monitoring methodology AMS I D, Version 18, and the VCS standard.

Verification period: From 01/11/2019 to 31/10/2020 (including both days)

Verified GHG emission reductions and removals in the above verification period:

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)
Year 2019 (1 st Nov to 31 st Dec 2019)	1,104	0	0	1,104
Year 2020 (1 st Jan to 31 st Oct 2020)	29,079	0	0	29,079
Total	30,183	0	0	30,183

APPENDIX 1: <REFERENCES>

S. No	Title of Document	Version	Date
1.	Revised approved VCS PD	1.0	20/03/2017
2.	VCS Validation Report for Renewal Crediting Period	1.0	29/08/2018
3.	Previous VCS Verification report (Monitoring period: 01/09/2018- 31/10/2019)	02	16/12/2019
4.	VCS Monitoring Report (Final) (Monitoring period: 01/11/2019- 31/10/2020)	02.1	13/03/2021
5.	Registered VCS PD	2.0	27/10/2009
6.	ER spread sheet (corresponding to the final monitoring report)	02	12/12/2020
7.	Certificates of Calibration for all the meters belongs to project activity	-	-
8.	Monthly joint meter reading report issued by state TNEB	-	01/11/2019 to 31/10/2020
9.	Invoice issued by PP to respective state TNEB	-	01/11/2019 to 31/10/2020
10.	"Grid connected Renewable Electricity Generation", AMS I D,	18.0	-
11.	CEA Database	11.0	April/2016
12.	Commissioning certificate for all the WTGs of the project activity issued by state electricity authority	-	-
13.	Power Purchase Agreements signed between Project Proponent and state electricity authority	-	-
14.	VCS webpage for the project, VCS ID 682; http://www.vcsprojectdatabase.org/#/project_details/682	-	Last accessed on 15/12/2020
15.	Letter of declaration dated from PP regarding not having created or sought any other form of environmental credit for the same period	-	-
16.	Central Electricity Authority (Installation and Operation of Meters)	-	-

S. No	Title of Document	Version	Date
	Regulations Notified on 17/03/2006 <u>No. 502/70/CEA/DP&D</u> Amendments Notified on 26/06/2010 <u>No. 502/6/2009/DP&D/D-I</u>		
17.	VCS Standard	Version 4	19/09/2019
18.	VCS Program Guide	Version 4	19/09/2019
19.	On site assessment –interviews of staff personnel, photographs, physical inspection of monitoring system	-	02/12/2019
20.	VCS Monitoring Report	1.0	22/11/2020
21.	Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard for Project Activity (CDM-VVS for PA), as per EB 101, Annex 2	2.0	29/11/2018
22	VCS Monitoring Report (Monitoring period: 01/11/2019- 31/10/2020)	02	12/12/2020

APPENDIX 2: <COMPETENCY STATEMENT>

According to the sectoral scope / technical area and experience in the sectoral or national business environment, Applus+ Certification has composed a project assessment team in accordance with the appointment rules in the internal Quality Management System of Applus+ Certification. The composition of audit team shall be approved by the Applus+ Certification ensuring that the required skills are covered by the 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 sectoral scope / technical area knowledge linked to the applied methodology/ies shall be covered by the assessment team.

Name	Qualification	Coverage of scope	Coverage of technical Area	Financial aspect	Host country Experience	Attendance to the On-Site Assessment
Vivek Kumar Ahirwar	Lead Auditor (LA) & Technical Expert (TE)	Yes (1)	Yes (1.2)	N/A	Yes	Yes
Simon Shen	Technical Reviewer (TR)	Yes (1)	Yes (1.2)	N/A	N/A	N/A

The curricula vitae of the DOE's team members are provided below:

Vivek Kumar Ahirwar is a BEE-Certified Energy Auditor by Govt of India with over eight years of relevant experience in energy efficiency, energy audit, thermal and electrical energy generation technology from renewable source and energy conservation in energy intensive industries, designated consumers and commercial buildings, implementation of energy conservation building codes, research, process and green building projects. He is a certified lead auditor for ISO 14001 EMS and 14064. He has experience under various categories of projects stating from renewable to waste to supercritical projects and WCD. He has successfully audited more than 400 GHG (CDM/VCS/GS) projects in different states across the India. He has done Master in Technology (Energy Management) from a premier institute, School of Energy & Environmental Studies, DAVV, Indore (M.P.), India and Bachelor of Engineering (Mechanical Engineering) from Govt. Engineering college, Rewa, RGPV, India. Vivek K. Ahirwar is based in Indore, India. Vivek K. Ahirwar may participate in the Audit Team as Lead Auditor and Technical Expert.

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/Verifier and ISO 9001/14001 Lead Auditor for 3.5 years.

APPENDIX 3: <ABBREVIATIONS>

ABT	Availability Based Tariff
BEF	Baseline Emission Factor
BM	Build Margin
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CEA	Central Electricity Authority
CERC	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission
CL	Clarification Request
CMS	Central Monitoring System
CMP	Conference of Parties Serving as Meeting of Parties
CO2	Carbon dioxide
DISCOM	Distribution Company
EB	Executive Board
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
MW	Megawatt
MWh	Megawatt-hour

O&M	Operation and Maintenance
PD	Project Description
PLF	Plant Load Factor
PP	Project Proponent
QA/QC	Quality Assurance and Quality Control
TNEB	Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
TANGEDCO	Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation Limited
TOD	Time of the Day
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WEC	Wind Energy Convertor
WEG	Wind Energy Generator
WTG	Wind Turbine Generator
VCS	Voluntary Carbon Standard
VCSA	Voluntary Carbon Standard Association
VCS PD	VCS Project Description
VCUs	Voluntary Carbon Units

APPENDIX 4: <FINDINGS OVERVIEW>

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

FAR ID	N/A	Section no.	N/A	Date:N/A
Description of FAR				
N/A				
Project participant response				Date:N/A
N/A				
Documentation provided by project participant				
N/A				
DOE assessment				Date: N/A
N/A				

Table 2. CL from this verification

CL ID	01	Section no.	1.8	Date :10/12/2020
Description of CL				
PP is requested to clarify why the tools used by the Project Participant is not mentioned in 1.8 section of VCS MR version 01.				
Project participant response				Date : 12/12/2020
MR Section 1.8 has been revised to provide the reference of the tools in line with the registered VCS PD.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
MR version 02				
DOE assessment				Date:15/12/2020
Assessment team confirms that PP has provided the reference tool in the revised VCS MR version 02 submitted to DOE. Hence acceptable.				
CL#1 closed				

CL ID	02	Section no.	1.10,4.3,ER	Date :10/12/2020
Description of CL				
PP is requested to provide the:				
1. Declaration document pertaining to section 1.10 section of VCS MR version 01 2. Meter Calibration Detail of the current Monitoring Period				
Project participant response				Date : 12/12/2020
1. Declaration pertaining to section 1.10 of VCS MR has been submitted along with the revised set of MR & ER, version 02. 2. Meter Calibration certificate is submitted with the revised set of MR & ER.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Declaration from PPMeter Calibration Certificate				
DOE assessment				Date:15/12/2020
Assessment team confirms that PP has submitted declaration and meter calibration certificate for current monitoring period which is in line with requirements. Hence acceptable.				
CL #2 Closed				

CL ID	03	Section no.	2.2	Date :10/12/2020
Description of CL				
PP is requested to clarify the mechanism for ongoing communication with local stakeholders in section 2.2 of VCS MR version 01				
Project participant response				Date : 12/12/2020
PP has revised MR Section 2.2 to provide mechanism for ongoing communication with local stakeholders.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
MR Version 02				
Photos of the Grievance/Feedback Register				
DOE assessment				Date:15/12/2020

Assessment team confirms that PP has included the mechanism for ongoing communication with local stakeholders in the revised VCS MR version 02. Hence acceptable

CL #3 Closed

CL ID	04	Section no.	ER and 3.2 of MR	Date :10/12/2020
Description of CL				
PP is requested to clarify how the conservative approach and error factor is applied for ER calculation in the ER sheet version 1 and VCS MR version 01				
Project participant response				Date : 12/12/2020
PP has transparently explained in MR that “All meters were supposed to be tested for accuracy every year in accordance with the VCS PD. However, the calibration and maintenance of energy meters is beyond the control of project participant and is sole responsibility of state utility. The consumption by equipment’s / electricity exported to the grid registered by main meters hold good for purpose of billing as long as errors in main meters are within the permissible limits. Therefore, as per the provision of CEA Order 2016, PP has considered testing of energy meters once in five years.” Nevertheless, as a conservative approach PP has applied maximum permissible error (i.e. 0.2%) for the whole monitoring period i.e. from 01/11/2019 to 31/10/2020, and also considered this under the project design deviation. Please refer ER sheet version 02 “Tab-VCUs” under Column C & D.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Meter Calibration Certificate MR Version 02 ER sheet Version 02				
DOE assessment				Date:15/12/2020
Assessment team confirms that PP has clarified how the conservative approach is applicable and clearly applied maximum permissible error (i.e. 0.2%) in the revised ER sheet version 02. Hence acceptable CL #4 Closed				

Table 1. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	01	Section no.	MR	Date :10/12/2020
Description of CAR				
According to the instructions mentioned in the VCS MR Template Version4.0, PP is requested to use Font size of 24 points for all the main headings in the entire document.				
Project participant response				Date :12/12/2020
MR has been revised appropriately to use prescribed font size for all the main headings in the entire document.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
MR Version 02				
DOE assessment				Date:15/12/2020
Assessment team confirms that PP has updated the font size in revised MR, now it's in line with VCS MR template Version 4.0 sheet. Hence acceptable				
CAR#1 Closed.				

CAR ID	02	Section no.	Title page	Date :10/12/2020
Description of CAR				
According to the instructions mentioned in the VCS MR Template Version4.0, PP is requested to make the required changes on Title page:-				
1. Remove the brackets from the name of the entity 2. Complete all items in the box on the title page using 10.5 font size 3. Provide the website detail in contact section				
Project participant response				Date : 12/12/2020
MR has been revised appropriately to make the required changes on the Title page.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
MR Version 02				
DOE assessment				Date:15/12/2020

Assessment team confirm that PP has removed the brackets from the name of entity and updated all the information in the title page box. Hence acceptable

CAR#2 Closed.

CAR ID	03	Section no.	Table of Contents	Date :10/12/2020
Description of CAR				
PP is requested to follow the VCS MR template Version4.0 format and accordingly link the content list to the irrespective headings in VCS MR version 01				
Project participant response				Date : 12/12/2020
MR has been revised appropriately to follow the VCS MR template Version4.0 format and accordingly the content list has been linked to the respective headings and sub-heading of the VCS				
Documentation provided by project participant				
MR Version 02				
DOE assessment				Date:15/12/2020
Assessment team confirms that PP has linked the content list to their respective headings in the revised VCS MR version 02. Hence acceptable				
CAR#3 Closed				

CAR ID	04	Section no.	1	Date :10/12/2020
Description of CAR				
- PP is requested to mention the correct S.F. No. in 1.1 and 1.7 section of VCS MR - PP is requested to mention the coordinates in correct format in section 1.7 of VCS MR.				
Project participant response				Date : 12/12/2020
MR has been revised appropriately to make the correction under the section 1.1 and 1.7 of the MR. Also, the geo-coordinates are now reported as per prescribed format under the section 1.7 of the MR.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
MR Version 02				
DOE assessment				Date:15/12/2020

Assessment team confirms that PP has mentioned the correct S.F no. and Geocoordinates in the revised VCS MR version 02. Hence acceptable

CAR#4 Closed.

CAR ID	05	Section no.	3	Date : 10/12/2020
Description of CAR				
- PP is requested to use the correct numbering system for sub-headings of Section-3 as per the VCS MR template version 4.0. - PP is also requested to use the Font size of 11 points for these two sub-headings as per the VCS MR template version 4.0.				
Project participant response				Date : 12/12/2020
PP would like to clarify that the numbering system of the Sub-heading in the MR Template version 4.0 is not in sequential order. However, as per sequential numbering the continuity has been maintained in the MR across all sections. However, all sections of the MR have been now revised appropriately to bring prescribed formatting as per the VCS MR template version 4.0				
Documentation provided by project participant				
MR Version 02				
DOE assessment				Date:15/12/2020
Assessment team confirms that PP has used correct numbering format and font size in line with VCS MR template Version 4.0, in the revised VCS MR version 02. Hence acceptable CAR#5 Closed.				

CAR ID	06	Section no.	4.2	Date :10/12/2020
Description of CAR				
PP is requested to merge the cells of table to make it consistent with MR template Version 4.0				
Project participant response				Date : 12/12/2020
MR has been revised appropriately to merge the cells of table to make it consistent with MR template Version 4.0				
Documentation provided by project participant				
MR Version 02				
DOE assessment				Date :15/12/2020
Assessment team confirms that PP has merged the cells(updated the table in section 4.2) in the revised VCS MR version 02. Hence acceptable				
CAR#6 Closed.				

CAR ID	07	Section no.	4.3	Date :10/12/2020
Description of CAR				
PP is requested to mention the latest schematic diagram of Project activity which is used in PD version 1 dated 20/03/2017				
Project participant response				Date : 12/12/2020
MR has been revised appropriately to mention the latest schematic diagram of the Project activity which is used in PD version 1 dated 20/03/2017				
Documentation provided by project participant				
MR Version 02				
DOE assessment				Date :15/12/2020
Assessment team confirms that PP has included the latest schematic diagram of Project activity in the revised VCS MR version 02. Hence acceptable				
CAR#7 Closed.				

CAR ID	08	Section no.	5.4 and ER	Date : 10/12/2020
Description of CAR				
- PP is requested to clarify the correct Monitoring period start date in section 5.4 of VCS MR version 01 - PP is requested to mention the conservative value for “Estimated VER in VCS PD for the equivalent period of the current MP” in section 5.4 of VCS MR V 01 and ER sheet Version 01				
Project participant response				Date : 12/12/2020
MR has been revised appropriately to correct Monitoring period start date under the section 5.4. MR & ER versions have been revised to consider the rounded down value being conservative for “Estimated VER in VCS PD for the equivalent period of the current MP” in section 5.4 of VCS MR and ER sheet				
Documentation provided by project participant				
MR & ER Version 02				
DOE assessment				Date: 15/12/2020
Assessment team confirms that PP has mentioned correct start date for the monitoring period and also mentioned the conservative value in the revised VCS MR version 02. Hence acceptable CAR#8 Closed.				

Table 2. FAR from this validation

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