



page 1

## Final Ruling Regarding the Request for Issuance of CERs of

# "Bundled Wind power project in Tamilnadu, India co-ordinated by the TamilNadu Spinning Mills Association (TASMA)" (0991)

The CDM-Execuitve Board decided to reject the request for issuance of certified emission reductions (CERs) for the above project activity on 3 May 2011, for the monitoring period 1 July 2009 to 31 March 2010, in accordance with of the "Procedures for review of requests for issuance of CERs", version 1.3, EB 55 Annex 41, paragraphs 20 and 29 ("the procedures"). According to paragraph 28 of the procedures, the rulings shall contain the reasons and rationale for the final decision, which are as follows:

- The DOE failed to verify the project implementation as per the registered PDD. The DOE verified that 148 wind turbines of 0.225 MW and 6 wind turbines of 0.230 MW with a total capacity of 467.79 MW were implemented and operated. Whereas, the PDD stated that the project activity was to implement and operate 114 wind turbines of 0.225 MW and 10 wind turbines of 0.23 MW with a total capacity of 467.81 MW. A notification for changes to the project activity should have been submitted prior to the conclusion of the verification/certification for the corresponding monitoring period as per paragraph 196 of VVM (v1.1).
- The verification activity has not been conducted in a manner that fully complied with the paragraph 197(c) of the VVM (v1.1). Throughout the past 6 years, the project has constantly generated more electricity than the estimated in the PDD whereas the sensitivity analysis was carried out with +/-4% variation over the electricity generation. The DOE has partially explained the reason for the increased electricity generation for years 2006 to 2009 whereas no explanation was provided for the increased generation for years 2004 and 2005. Therefore, the continuously increased electricity generation in the past 6 years was not sufficiently explained.
- The DOE failed to provide evidence as to how it verified the change in the meters in association with the spreadsheet submitted which contains no reference to these meter changes:
  - a) The DOE has provided reasons as to why some spreadsheet cells contained two values being added and two values being deducted whereas the monthly values were expected to be aggregated figures out of electricity export minus import. However, the additional information submitted in response to the request for review has raised a new issue related to the change in the meters (related to the measurements in cells I284 and O373), which was not reported in the submitted spreadsheet where only one meter was indicated and no reference was made to the-above-mentioned meter changes.
  - b) Paragraph 184(v) of the VVM (v1.1) requires an on-site assessment involving a check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the selected methodology.
  - c) The DOE has not provided evidence on how it verified the change in the meters in association with the spreadsheet submitted which contained no reference to these meter changes.

#### UNFCCC/CCNUCC





page 2

Please note that, however, according to paragraph 96 of the Report of the 28<sup>th</sup> EB Meeting, in cases where the reasons for rejection can be addressed by means of a revised verification report based on a revised monitoring report, the DOE may request permission (including explanation of reasons) to submit a revised request for issuance for the same monitoring period covered by the rejection. The Board will consider such a request at the subsequent EB meeting following that request in accordance with the procedures and decide on a case-by-case basis. In these cases the Board will provide further guidance, as appropriate. In cases where such a revised request for issuance is also rejected it shall not be possible to resubmit for a third time.

### ----

## History of the document

Project	Related to EB 55	Decision Class: Ruling
0991	Annex 41	Document Type: Information Note
	Paragraph 20, 28 & 29	Business Function: Issuance
	03 May 2011	