Project
RoU Verification
Report

2022

COVER PAGE

RoU Project Verification Report Form (VR)

| , , | , | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | |
| BASIC INFORMATION | | | | | |
| Name of approved UWR Project Verifier / Reference No. | Enviance Services Private limited | | | | |
| Type of Accreditation | ☒ RoU Accreditation UWR☐ Water Audit/Water Footprint Expertise | | | | |
| Approved UWR RoU Scopes for Project Verification | RoU Scope 5: Conservation measures taken to recycle and/or reuse water, spent wash, wastewater etc. across or within specific industrial processes and systems, including wastewater recycled/ reused in a different process, but within the same site or location of the project activity. Recycled wastewater used in offsite landscaping, gardening or tree plantations/forests activity are also eligible under this Scope. | | | | |
| Validity of UWR approval of Verifier | 30/09/2027 | | | | |
| Completion date of this VR | 08/02/2025 | | | | |
| Title of the project activity | Wastewater Recycling and Reuse by Kunnankalpalayam Common Effluent Treatment Plant Pvt Ltd, Tamil Nadu, India | | | | |
| Project reference no. | UWR ID: 475 | | | | |
| (as provided by UWR RoU Program under Approved for Verification tab) | | | | | |
| Name of Entity requesting verification service | Viviid Emissions Reductions | | | | |
| (can be Project Owners themselves or any Entity having authorization of Project Owners, example aggregator.) | Universal Pvt. Ltd. Name: Lokesh Jain | | | | |
| authorization of Project Owners, example aggregator.) | Email ID – lokesh.jain@viviidgreen.com | | | | |
| Contact details of the representative of the Entity, requesting verification service | Viviid Emissions Reductions Universal Pvt. Ltd. | | | | |
| (Focal Point assigned for all communications) | Name: Lokesh Jain | | | | |
| | Email ID – lokesh.jain@viviidgreen.com | | | | |

| Country where project is located | India |
|--|---|
| Applied reference documents used for estimation | Water Data Guide |
| (approved water data and reference guides under the UWR Rou Standard used) | |
| Project Verification Criteria: Mandatory requirements to be assessed | ☑ UWR Standard ☑ Applicable Approved Calculations ☑ Applicable Legal requirements /rules of host country ☑ Eligibility of the Project Type ☑ Start date of the Project activity ☑ Meet applicability conditions in the applied methodology ☑ Credible Water Data Sets ☑ Do No Harm Test ☑ RoU calculations ☑ PCNMR ☑ No Double Counting ☐ Others (please mention below) |
| Project Verification Criteria: Optional requirements to be assessed | ☑ Environmental Safeguards Standard and do-no-harm criteria ☑ Social Safeguards Standard do-no-harm criteria |
| Project Verifier's Confirmation: The UWR Project Verifier has verified the UWR project activity and therefore confirms the following: | The UWR RoU Project Verifier [Enviance Services Private Limited], certifies the following with respect to the UWR Project Activity [Wastewater Recycling and Reuse by Kunnankalpalayam Common Effluent Treatment Plant Pvt Ltd, Tamil Nadu, India] \[\textstyle The Project Owner has correctly described the Project Activity in the PCNMR version 2.0 (dated 24/01/2025) including the applicability of the guidance documents and water data as outlined in the UWR RoU Standard [RoU Scope 5: Conservation measures taken to recycle and/or reuse water, spent wash, wastewater etc. across or within specific industrial processes and |

systems, including wastewater recycled/ reused in a different process, but within the same site or location of the project activity. Recycled wastewater used in offsite landscaping, gardening or tree plantations/forests activity are also eligible under this Scope and meets the applicability conditions and has achieved the estimated RoUs, complies with the monitoring methodology and has calculated RoU estimates correctly and conservatively. ☐ The Project Activity is likely to generate 40,11,801 RoUs as indicated in the PCNMR version 2.0, which are applicable with UWR rules ☐ The Project Activity is not likely to cause any net-harm to the environment and/or society ☐ The Project Activity complies with all the applicable UWR rules1 and therefore recommends UWR Program to register the Project activity with RoUs. Project Verification Report, reference number and date of Verification Report UWR Project approval ID: 475 Date: 12/02/2025 Name of the authorised personnel of UWR Project Verifier and his/her signature with date Vidhya Murali Krishna **Quality Manager**

¹https://a23e347601d72166dcd6-

PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

Executive summary

The project activity is titled – "Wastewater Recycling and Reuse by Kunnankalpalayam Common Effluent Treatment Plant Pvt Ltd, Tamil Nadu, India". The project is located in Chinnakarai, Tiruppur, Murugampalayam, Tamil Nadu, India.

| Company's Name | Plant Treatment Capacity (m³/d) | Cor | nmissioning Date | Location | Geo co- ordinates of Location |
|---|---|------|------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Kunnankalpalayam Common Effluent Treatment Plant Pvt Ltd | Installed capacity = 5,500 m³/d (5.5 MLD) Operational capacity = 4,950 m³/d (4.95 MLD) | CETP | 01/04/1999 | Chinnakarai, Tiruppur, Murugampalayam, Tamil Nadu, India | 11°03'27"N &, 77°19'33"E |

The project activity includes Kunnankalpalayam Common Effluent Treatment Plant (CETP), located in Chinnakarai, Tiruppur, Murugampalayam, Tamil Nadu, India.

Tirupur is an industrial town located about 450 kms Southwest of the city of Chennai, Tamil Nadu State. Tirupur is famous as one of the top knitwear exports centers of India. There are about 700 plus dyeing & bleaching units in and around Tirupur who are engaged in the dyeing and bleaching operations of the yarn & fabric. Currently 15 dyeing industries are under this CETP. These units generate effluents, which are currently being subjected to primary treatment, RO, MEE, ZLD and reused in the dyeing process to respective member unit.

The Kunnankalpalayam Common Effluent Treatment Plant (CETP) was commissioned on 01 April, 1999 with the capacity of 5.5 MLD. Present Processing capacity of the CETP is 4.95 MLD. Currently Kunnankalpalayam has 15 Dyeing members with total CETP capacity of 5.5 MLD.

Kunnankalpalayam Common Effluent Treatment Plant consists of 19 textile dyeing member units with 15 units operational currently with 5.5 MLD capacity. The plant is designed to treat the effluent with complete biological oxidation process and reverse osmosis system.

The Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board (TNPCB) has laid down specifications for the discharge of treated effluents into inland surface waters. One of the stipulations is that the TDS level has to be maintained below 2100 ppm in the discharge after treatment apart from the stipulations for other parameters. The TDS of the effluents discharged presently is higher than this limit. Therefore as a measure of pollution abatement the TNPCB has now mandated the industries to implement zero discharge facilities so that the pollution from the dyeing & bleaching units can be contained once and for all. The ZLD system helps in eliminating the discharge of liquid waste by treating all effluent and recovering water for reuse, thus effectively reducing the TDS concentration and achieving the desired standards.

The Project Proponent (PP) affirms that they meet all the requirements outlined in the management plan regarding ownership, legal rights, permits, and cost details for the successful implementation of the project. Specifically:

Water User Rights: The PP holds the necessary water user rights for the area within the project's boundary. These rights are legally secured and ensure that the PP has full entitlement to use the water resources required for the project's operations.

Legal Land Title: The PP holds an uncontested legal land title for the entire project area within the project's boundary. The title is fully documented and free of any disputes, confirming the PP's legal right to utilize the land for project purposes.

Necessary Permits: The PP has obtained all the required permits for the implementation of the project. In cases where certain permits are pending, the PP has already applied for the necessary approval and is working in full compliance with the relevant regulatory requirements to ensure the timely commencement of the project.

Cost Details: The PP has thoroughly assessed and documented the cost details for project implementation that is around 67.93 crores.

By meeting these criteria, the PP ensures that all legal and regulatory requirements for the project are satisfied, enabling the project to proceed without hindrance.

Nowadays, the treatment of water occupies a predominant place in modern industries. Moreover, treatment of water is required for various purposes, from portable use to industrial applications such as food, beverages, leather, textiles and heavy chemical industries. Also, the treatment of wastewater especially effluent from toxic disposals attracts attention nowadays due to increase global awareness of ecological & environmental protection.

Treatment of water implicitly means changing its physical & mainly its chemical properties by removing undesirable suspended & dissolved impurities of both organic & inorganic nature. The level of chemical dosing involved, and method adopted for treatment are according to the end consumers requirement as well as the nature of composition of raw water sources, which are all mainly from surface wells, lakes, rivers or from underground sources such as deep wells in some places from sea.

If the wastewater is released into the environment without proper treatment, it can cause severe pollution, affecting aquatic life, soil quality, and human health.

Therefore, this project activity helps reduce the environmental impact by treating wastewater and recirculating it back to the textile industries which minimizes their dependency on fresh water sources, further promoting sustainability.

The project activity qualifies under the UCR RoU program since the PP has undertaken water conservation measures to recycle and reuse Industrial wastewater. Industrial Wastewater is a highly potential source of water for various purposes and is highly underutilized in the country. All the water quality reports are in line with the Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board (TPCB).

The current monitoring period is from 01/01/2014 to 31/12/2023 and the RoU's generated by the project activity in this monitoring period are 40,11,801 RoU's.

Scope of Verification

The scope of the services for the project is to perform Project Verification of concerned Project Activity. The scope of verification is to assess the claims and assumptions made in the Project Concept Note & Monitoring Report (PCNMR) against the UWR criteria, including but not limited to, UWR program verification guidance document, UWR Standard, UWR Program Manual, and related rules and guidelines established under Program process.

Verification Process and Methodology

The verification process was undertaken by a competent verification team and involved the following,

- Desk review of documents and evidence submitted in context of the reference rules and guidelines issued by UWR,
- Undertaking/conducting site visit/remote audit, interview or interactions with the representative of the project owners/representatives,
- Reporting audit findings with respect to clarifications and non-conformities and the closure of the findings, as appropriate and preparing a draft verification opinion based on the auditing findings and conclusions
- Finalization of the verification opinion (this report)

Desk/Document review

A detailed desk review of the PCNMR, Methodology and all other associated documentation and references took place in advance of the remote site visit, and additional documents that were not available for the desk review were requested for review during the remote site visit. Additional information can be required to complete the verification, which may be obtained from other public and reliable sources or through telephone and face to face interviews with key stakeholders (including the project developers and where necessary, government and NGO representatives in the host country).

A list of all documents reviewed or referred to in the course of this verification is included below in Appendix 3.

Follow up interviews/site visit

The verifier conducted remote audit and had requested for site photographs, short videos. A remote interview was conducted with the project owners and stakeholders.

Conclusion

Based on the work performed, the verifier concludes that in the project "Wastewater Recycling and Reuse by Kunnankalpalayam Common Effluent Treatment Plant Pvt Ltd, Tamil Nadu, India", the information and data presented in the PCNMR version 2.0 dated 24/01/2025 meets all relevant requirements of the UWR for UWR project activities.

For the current monitoring period, verified RoU's achieved by the project activity were as below;

| Start date of monitoring period | 01/01/2014 |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| End date of monitoring period | 31/12/2023 |
| RoU's achieved | 40,11,801 RoU's |

Project Verification team, technical reviewer and approver

Project Verification team

| No. | Role | Last | First | Affiliation | Involvement in | | |
|-----|--|---------|--------|---|--------------------|---------------------|------------|
| | | name | name | (e.g. name of central or other office of UWR Project Verifier or outsourced entity) | Document review | Off-Site inspection | Interviews |
| 1. | Team Leader/ Technic al Expert | Kumar | Pankaj | Enviance Services Private Limited | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2. | V- V/Tech nical Expert | Jain | Vipul | Enviance Services Private Limited | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 3. | V-V Trainee / Technic al Expert in Trainee | Mahajan | Swati | Enviance Services Private Limited | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Technical reviewer and approver of the Project Verification report

| No. | Role | Type of resourc e | Last name | First name | Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of UWR Project Verifier or outsourced entity) |
|-----|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------|------------|---|
| 1. | Technical reviewer | Contracted | - | Vijayanand | Enviance Services Private Limited |

Means of Project Verification

Desk/document review

- A detailed desk review of the PCNMR, methodology and all other associated documentation and references took place in advance of the remote audit, and additional documents that were not available for the desk review were requested for review during the remote audit. Additional information can be required to complete the verification, which may be obtained from other public and reliable sources or through telephone and face-to face interviews with key stakeholders (including the project developers and where necessary, Government and NGO representatives in the host country).
- A list of all documents reviewed or referred to in the course of this verification is included in Appendix 3 below.

Off-site inspection

Date of off-site inspection

| : | 24/12 | 2/2024 | | |
|-----|-------|--|--|------------|
| No. | | Activity performed Off-Site | Site location | Date |
| 1. | a) | An assessment of the implementation and operation of the project activity as per the PCNMR and UWR requirements | Chinnakarai, Tiruppur, Murugampalayam, Tamil Nadu, India | 24/12/2024 |
| | b) | Verification of the project design, as documented is sound and reasonable, and meets the identified criteria of UWR Standard Requirements and associated guidance | | |
| | c) | Assessment to conformance with the certification criteria as laid out in the UWR Standards; | | |
| | d) | Evaluation of the conformance with the certification scope, including the water project and baseline scenarios, additionality; scopes of water project; and the physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the water project to the requirements of the UWR; | | |
| | e) | Evaluation of the calculation of RoU's, including the correctness and transparency of formulae and factors used; assumptions related to estimating RoU's. | | |
| | f) | Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting of the parameters to bemonitored | | |
| | g) | To confirm that the operational and data collection procedures can be implemented in | | |

| | accordancewith the Monitoring Plan | |
|----|--|--|
| h) | Cross-check of information provided in the | |
| | submitted documents and data from other | |
| | sources available at site | |
| i) | Review of calculations and assumptions made | |
| | in determining RoU's, and an identification of | |
| | QA/QC procedures in place to prevent, or | |
| | identify and correct, any errors or omissions in | |
| | the reported monitoring parameters | |
| j) | Interviews of local Stakeholders | |

Interviews

| No. | | Interview | | | subject |
|-----|------------|------------|----------------------------------|------------|--|
| | Last name | First name | Affiliation | | |
| 1. | Kaviyarasu | K | Kunnankalpalayam | 20/01/2025 | Project |
| | | | Common Effluent | | Implementation, |
| 2. | Mothilal | D. | Treatment Plant Pvt | | Monitoring plan, |
| | | | Ltd | | Project Boundary, |
| 4. | Mahanta | Sarashi | Viviid emissions | | Eligibility criteria, Host country requirements, |
| 5. | Girigosavi | Tushar | reductions universal private Ltd | | RoU calculations |
| 6. | Nachimuthu | - | Local stakeholders | | Project |
| 7. | Srinivasan | R. | | | implementation, monitoring, Local |
| 8. | Natarajan | T. | | | stakeholder |
| 9. | Nachimuthu | - | | | consultation |
| 10. | Ramasamy | K. | | | |

Clarification request (CLs), corrective action request (CARs) and forward action request (FARs) raised

| Areas of Project Verification findings | No. of CL | No. of CAR | No. of FAR |
|---|------------|---------------|---------------|
| Rainwater Offset Units or Water Cred | lits (RoU) | | |
| Identification and Eligibility of project type | - | - | - |
| General description of project activity | 04 | - | - |
| Application and selection of methodologies and standardized sets | - | - | - |
| Application of RoU methodologies and standardized data sets | - | - | - |
| Deviation from methodology and/or methodological tool | - | - | - |
| Clarification on applicability of methodology, tool and/or standardized data sets | 02 | 01 | - |
| Project boundary and unutilized water sources | - | - | - |
| Likely scenario without RoU Project | - | - | - |
| - Estimation of RoUs | - | - | - |
| - PCNMR | 02 | - | - |
| Start date, crediting period and duration | - | - | - |

| Positive environmental impacts on water table and/or | - | - | - |
|--|----|----|---|
| groundwater recharge and/or water security in the area | | | |
| Project Owner- Identification and communication | - | - | - |
| Others (please specify) Positive social impacts | - | - | - |
| Total | 80 | 01 | - |

Project Verification findings

Identification and eligibility of project type (Approved Project Activities (Positive List))

| Means of Project Verification | The project is an effluent treatment plant with installed treatment capacity of 5,500 m³/day (5.5 MLD) and operational capacity of 4,950 m³/day (4.95 MLD). This is confirmed based on the commissioning certificate, operational capacity document and technical specifications. Since the project is a effluent treatment plant which recycles and reuses industrial wastewater it comes under scope 5 project as per UWR Rainwater (RoU) Standard, version 7.0 (https://a23e347601d72166dcd6-16da518ed3035d35cf0439f1cdf449c9.ssl.cf2.rackcdn.com//Documents/RainWaterOffsetStandardver7 130824144129526582.pdf) The Project owner has used valid PCNMR form available at the UWR website for the preparation of PCNMR for the current project activity. The project has prepared PCNMR in line with UWR |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Findings | guidance and requirements. No findings raised |
| Conclusion | The UWR-approved format is used for description and the project meets the requirement of the UWR RoU verification standard version 2.0 and UWR RoU standard version 7.0. UWR project communication agreement was submitted to the verifier and the same has been verified. Methodology referenced and applied appropriately describing the project type. The eligibility of the project aggregator is verified using the UWR communication agreement, project correctly applies the verification standard, UWR project standard, and UWR regulations. The project activity is overall meeting the requirements of the UWR Verification standard and UWR project standard. |

General description of project activity

| Means of Project Verification | The project is an effluent treatmed capacity of 5,500 m³/day (5.5 Ml 4,950 m³/day (4.95 MLD) and its through the commissioning celedocuments confirm the treatment dyeing member units in this project Assessment team conducted documents the UWR RoU verification RoU standard version 7.0 and th 3.0. By checking the supporting documents an effluent treatment Chinnakarai, Tiruppur, Murugampa The approximate geo-coordinate mentioned below. Plant Treatment Capacity (m³/d) | LD) and operational capacity of a commissioning date is verified entificate of the project. The standard version 2.0 and UWR at a tandard version 2.0 and UWR at a ta |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | Installed capacity = 5,500 m³/d (5.5 MLD) Operational capacity =4,950 m³/d (4.95 MLD) Assessment team performed an confirmed that the location describ | |
| Findings | CL 02, CL 03, CL 04 and C successfully. More information pres | sented appendix below. |
| Conclusion | The description of the project active the review of PCNMR, Common submitted documents. | |

Application and selection of water data and calculation parameters

| Application and selection of water data and calculation parameters | | |
|--|--|--|
| Means of Project Verification | Verification criteria is as per the requirements of UWR RoU program | |
| | for the scope – 5. | |
| | For applicability mentioned in the PCNMR, commissioning | |
| | certificates, DPR, technical specifications, flow meter data were | |
| | checked. | |
| Findings | No findings raised. | |
| Conclusion | The project has effectively implemented the water treatment unit | |
| | following the guidelines of UWR RoU standards by recycling and | |
| | reusing the industrial wastewater and has a positive impact of local | |
| | hydrology and community water resources. | |

Clarification on applicability of tool and/or RoU estimates

| Means of Project Verification | The documents reviewed are ETP basics, ensuring proper operation of flow meters, RoU estimates by reviewing the flow details, UWR RoU standard, and UWR RoU Verification Standard. |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Findings | CL 07, CL 08 and CAR 01 were raised and closed successfully. More information presented appendix below. |

| Conclusion | The verification team confirms that all the applicability criteria set by |
|------------|---|
| | the UWR RoU standard are met. The relevant information against |
| | those criteria is also included in the PCNMR. The selected scope for |
| | the project activity is applicable. |

Project boundary, sources and RoUs

| Means of Project Verification | Conducting remote inspections of the project site to assess the effluent treatment plant setup and its integration with the Kunnankalpalayam Common Effluent Treatment Plant Pvt Ltd. Document Review: Examining the project's documentation, including permits, ownership documents, flow details. |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Findings | No findings raised |
| Conclusion | The project boundary is correctly defined in the PCNMR. The CETP is the project boundary in this project which treats the industrial wastewater by enhancing the water conservation and sustainability of the local water reserves. |

Baseline scenario of the water shed or activity prior to project commissioning

| Means of Project Verification | As per the UWR scope 5 project the baseline scenario is as following: "The net quantity of treated ETP effluent / wastewater that would be discharged directly into the local drain/sewer without further being recycled and/or reused daily post treatment per year" Remote audit conducted and document review showed that in absence of the project activity, the waste water would have been directly discharged in the sewer without treating it and further contaminating the local water reserves. |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Findings | No findings raised |
| Conclusion | The approved baseline methodology has been correctly applied to identify a realistic and credible baseline scenario, and the identified baseline scenario most reasonably represents what would occur in the absence of the proposed UWR project activity. |
| | All the assumption and data used by the project participants are listed in the PCNMR and/or supporting documents. All documentation relevant for establishing the baseline scenario are correctly quoted and interpreted in the PCNMR. Assumptions and data used in the identification of the baseline scenario are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable. |

Implementation Benefits to Water Security

| Means of Project Verification | Examining the PCNMR, commissioning certificate, legal |
|-------------------------------|---|
| | documentation and any other relevant documentation. |
| | By conducting interviews with the project proponent, owners. By |
| | assessing the water quality reports, as well as the impact of |
| | untreated water on local water reserves and quality testing was |
| | conducted by analyzing the quality of water post treatment. |
| Findings | No findings raised. |
| Conclusion | The Implementation Benefits to Water Security emphasizes the |
| | significant positive impact in safeguarding aquatic ecosystem in |
| | Upper River and soil health. The project successfully significantly |
| | reduces the reliance on groundwater, a precious natural resource. |

By minimizing the demand for fresh water, Kunnankalpalayam Common Effluent Treatment Plant Pvt Ltd. can contribute to water conservation efforts and alleviate pressure on depleting aquifers. Overall, the project demonstrates effective strategies for reducing captive water consumption and responsibly managing groundwater, the project hopes to foster a broader adoption of environmentally responsible approaches within the industry.

Estimation of RoUs or net water saved/recycled/reused

Means of Project Verification

Remote inspection of the ETP unit to ensure it matches the project documentation. Examination of PCNMR, Commissioning Certificate, Project plan was carried out and other relevant documentation provided by the project proponent. Measurement Verification was carried out by checking the flow details.

The net quantity of treated water used is measured via flow meters installed at the site. RoUs are calculated based on total quantity of treated water being recycled & reused.

RoU's achieved during the first monitoring period as per the Project Activity:

| Year | Total ROUs (1000 liters)/yr UCR Cap(1 million RoUs/yr |
|------------|--|
| 2014 | 253856 |
| 2015 | 272743 |
| 2016 | 301933 |
| 2017 | 329681 |
| 2018 | 337763 |
| 2019 | 415047 |
| 2020 | 372665 |
| 2021 | 550380 |
| 2022 | 530472 |
| 2023 | 647262 |
| Total RoUs | 40,11,801 |

The project is an CETP plant means the water budget component is surface inflow. According to the RoU Standard version 7, PP has accounted 1% each as the uncertainty factor in inflow and outflow volumes to remain conservative. Therefore, an uncertainty factor of 0.98 is applied to all ROUs.

Findings

Conclusion

No findings raised.

In summary, the calculation of RoU's was correctly demonstrated by the PP.

It is confirmed by the assessment team that:

For the estimation of Rainwater Offset Units (RoUs) or net water saved/recycled/reused at Kunnankalpalayam Common Effluent

Treatment Plant Pvt Ltd. CETP, would highlight the successful implementation of a project activity that has effectively treated the industrial wastewater. The quantification tools and calculations detailed in the document indicate a total of 40,11,801 RoUs (1000 liters each) were collected over the monitoring period from 01/01/2014 to 31/12/2023. This initiative not only treated a significant amount of wastewater that would have otherwise gone untreated but also contributed to the improvement of Upper River water quality, demonstrating the project's positive impact on water security and sustainability in the region. The project serves as a model for similar industrial areas, showcasing the benefits of treating wastewater in enhancing in safeguarding the water quality of local water reserves.

PCN+Monitoring Report

| Means of Project Verification | Conducting off-site audit to verify the implementation and operation of the CETP. Examining all relevant documents, such as permits, ownership papers, and maintenance records of the CETP. Talking to the project proponent about the operation of the unit. Checking the accuracy of reported data, such as the flow details, flow meter details, treated water details and by evaluating the design and technical aspects of the CETP to ensure it aligns with the UWR RoU Standard principles. |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Findings | CL 01, CL 05 were raised and closed successfully. More information presented appendix below. |
| Conclusion | The verification team is convinced of compliance of the monitoring plan. During the remote audit assessment, the verification team interviewed the PP that the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the project design. |
| | The monitoring parameter reported in PCNMR adequately represents the parameters relevant to RoU calculation. The calibration report ensures the accuracy of the data reported. The number of RoU's generation is calculated based on this accurately reported data. The calculation was done using an excel sheet where all the parameters were reported. In the PCNMR RoU calculations are correctly calculated and reported. The PCNMR meets the requirements of UWR project verification requirements. |

National Water Security Index

| Means of Project Verification | As per UWR RoU standard version 7.0 all projects RoU methodology are ideally below the NWS score of 60 and NWSI equal or lower than 2 (NWSI ≤ 2). India's NWS score is below 60. This index is considered in establishing and implementing policies for sustainable water and groundwater development. As mentioned in the PCNMR, commissioning certificate and DPR this project is not a groundwater restoration project. It is an effluent treatment unit. |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Findings | No findings raised |
| Conclusion | The verification team on assessment concluded that the project is an industrial wastewater recycle and reuse project and not a groundwater restoration project. Hence, national water security index is not applicable in this project. |

Start date, crediting period and duration

| Means of Project Verification | The start date and crediting period of project activity was checked based on the commissioning certificate, PCNMR and other documents provided. |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Findings | No findings raised. |
| Conclusion | The project has chosen crediting period start date as 01/01/2014. The crediting period is chosen as 01/01/2014 to 31/12/2023. |

Positive Environmental impacts

| Means of Project Verification | PP has not claimed any separate positive environmental impact. The project being industrial wastewater treatment unit will reduce the further contamination of the local water reserves. |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Findings | No findings raised |
| Conclusion | The project is a wastewater recycle/reuse project and reduces the |
| | further contamination of groundwater and local water reserves. |

Project Owner- Identification and communication

| Means of Project Verification | PCNMR, communication agreement, commissioning certificate. | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Findings | No findings raised | | | |
| Conclusion | The project owner was identified through a communication agreement signed between project owner and project aggregator. Commissioning certificate was also verified and they clearly establish the project ownership. The identification and communication correctly meet the requirement of project verification and UWR project standard. | | | |
| | Project owner: Kunnankalpalayam Common Effluent Treatment Plant Pvt Ltd | | | |

Positive Social Impact/Ecological Aspects/Recharge Aspects

| Means of Project Verification | Project has provided temporary employment to local people during its installation and commissioning. Also post commissioning some of people have employed permanently and local people were engaged leading to social financial benefit to surrounding. Overall social impact of project implementation is positive on the surrounding area. Also, The PP has showcased the successful wastewater treatment of industrial effluent, thus saving millions of liters of wastewater from the textile dyeing member units. The project activity showcases best-in-class wastewater treatment technology that can replace the equivalent freshwater and industrial demand in different sectors for nonportable purposes while reducing the proportion of untreated wastewater and substantially increasing recycling and safe reuse in India. |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Findings Conclusion | No findings raised. Project has overall social positive impact and ecological positive |
| Conclusion | impact |

Sustainable development aspects

| Means of Project Verification | PP has claimed SDG Goals 3, 6, 8, 13 SDG 3 is good health and well-being and it is verified during remote audit. PP showcases how recycling and reusing wastewater can prevent depletion of natural water reserves and prevent water scarcity during droughts. The hazardous impact of industrial wastewater is avoided due to this project. This ensures water availability in water-scarce zones that help promotes healthy lives and well-being in the region. SDG 6 is sustainable development and is verified during remote audit. The project has showcased recycling and safe reuse of 4,950 cubic meter/day (4.95 MLD) which is the operational capacity of the plant and the actual installed capacity is 5,500 cubic meter/day (5.5 MLD) within the industry during this monitoring period and the same was verified by the assessment team. SDG 8 is decent work & economic growth and this was verified by the supporting document of employment details provided. SDG 13 is climate action. This was verified during the remote audit. PP recycles and reuses the industrial wastewater. Recycling and reusing wastewater are an effective solution for climate change adaptation because it helps mitigate the impacts of droughts, floods, and other extreme weather events that are becoming increasingly common due to climate change due to water scarcity. |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Findings | No findings raised. |
| Conclusion | The project has the capability to address SDG 3, 6, 8, 13. |

Internal quality control

The verifier confirms that,

- Due professional care has been taken while reviewing the submitted document.
- There is no conflict of interest as the verifier has no other engagement with either the aggregatoror project owner directly or indirectly.
- Verification team consists of experienced personnel.

Project Verification opinion

Assessment team conducted documentation review the PCNMR against the UWR RoU verification standard version 2.0 and UWR RoU standard version 7.0 and the UWR-PCNMR FORM Version 3.0.

It is confirmed that the project activity is an industrial effluent treatment plant, that is located in Chinnakarai, Tiruppur, Murugampalayam, Tamil Nadu, India.

The geo co-ordinates of the plant have been mentioned in sections above. Assessment team performed an offsite audit and confirmed that the location described in the PCNMR is accurate. The verification was performed on the basis of UWR requirements, and host country criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The verification consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the PCNMR and additional background documents; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and opinion.

The project correctly applies the approved baseline and monitoring methodology.

The monitoring plan provides for the monitoring of the project's Rainwater Offset Unit (RoU) calculations. The monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the project design, and the project participants are able to implement the monitoring plan. Given that the project is implemented and maintained as designed, the project has achieved the RoU's of 40,11,801 RoU during the monitoring period i.e. from 01/01/2014 to 31/12/2023.

The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided assessment team with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all applicable UWR requirements. Assessment team thus requests the registration of the proposed UWR project activity.

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

| Abbreviations | Full texts |
|---------------|--|
| UWR | Universal Water Registry |
| PCNMR | Project Concept Note and Monitoring Report |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organization |
| CAR | Corrective Action Request |
| CL | Clarification Request |
| ETP | Effluent Treatment Plant |
| CETP | Common Effluent Treatment Plant |
| RoU | Rainwater Offset Unit |
| DPR | Detailed Project Report |

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

- Mr. Pankaj Kumar worked as team leader Bihar for South Asia Climate Proofing and Growth Development (CPGD) - Climate Change Innovation Programme (CCIP) supported by DFID that seeks to mainstream climate change resilience into planning and budgeting at the national and sub-national level in India, Pakistan, Nepal, and Afghanistan. Pankaj Kumar has worked previously with IL&FS Infrastructure Development Corporation and BUIDCO (Bihar Urban Infrastructure Development Corporation), Govt. of Bihar as Environmental Specialist for WB & ADB funded projects. Prior to this, he worked with Carbon Check (UNFCCC accredited DoE), Johannesburg, RSA, Applus certification as Team Leader for validation, verification of around 100 GHG projects in Asia, Africa, USA, Asia Pacific & Americas. Pankaj is accredited Lead Auditor, Validator, Verifier and Technical Expert for Sectoral Scope/Technical Area - 1.1, 1.2, 3.1, 4.1, 13.1 by Enviance. He is also member of task force on climate change & human health, Health Department, GoB and on roster of UNICEF's WASH experts. He is an experienced, qualified and result oriented Environment Professional having more than 14 yrs. of relevant experience in Climate Change (Mitigation & Adaptation), Environmental Due Diligence, Disaster Risk Reduction, Validation and Verification of GHG project under CDM, Verified Carbon Standard, Gold Standard & Social Carbon Standard, Brazil. He provides technical support for environmental investigative, consultative and remedial projects involving air, water and soil, Waste management, EIA, Environmental Compliance, ISO 14001, OHSAS 18001, GHG accounting (ISO 14064) and Carbon foot printing. Pankaj Kumar is Masters in Environment Management from Forest Research Institute (University), I.C.F.R.E, Dehradun, which is Centre of Excellence in South East Asia for Forestry education & research and PGDEL from National Law School of India University, Bangalore (India).
- ❖ Mr. Vipul Jain holds Bachelor of Technology from VIT University Vellore in 2020. He has gained valuable work experience as a site engineer at Light House Energy Developers, where he

was employed from May 2020 to August 2022. Vipul holds an IRCA certification as an ISO 9001 Lead Auditor, demonstrating his expertise in quality management systems. He is well-versed in ISO 14064-1, ISO 14064-2, and ISO 14064-3, which are standards for greenhouse gas accounting and reporting. Furthermore, Vipul has received training in ISO 17029 and ISO 14065, highlighting his proficiency in environmental auditing and conformity assessment. He has also completed Clean Fuel Regulation training from Environment and Climate Change Canada, demonstrating his expertise in environmental management and sustainability.

- Ms. Swati Mahajan is graduate in Environmental Engineering from Shivaji University, India and previously worked as an Environment Engineer at Eco Designs India Private Ltd., Pune. She is adept in designing of landfill sites for solid waste management. She also has hands on experience in cost benefit analysis and preparation of DPRs for SWM projects. She also has done a certified course in carbon capture and storage from Edinburg University. Currently working as GHG assessor for projects under various GHG mechanisms like GCC, ICR, UCR and VERRA.
- ❖ Mr. Vijayanand is an experienced professional, a strategic HSE expert with 16 years of leadership in environmental consulting, audit, and regulatory compliance. He has successfully implemented HSE/ESG rules across Asia and Europe, managing corporate and site-level HSE functions. His roles have involved EIA, waste management, and policy development. He is leading HSE and ESG efforts at Hero Future Energies, demonstrating budgeting, due diligence, and international standard implementation skills. He has contributed to impactful projects like ESIA, renewable energy initiatives, and audits. He is also having accreditation as a Lead Auditor in CDM and Verra by various DOEs/VVBs, he is qualified by Enviance as a TL, TR and Technical expert in Section 1.2, 3.1, 14.1.

Appendix 3. Document reviewed or referenced

| No. | Author | | References to the document | Provider |
|-----|--------|---|----------------------------|---------------|
| 1 | NA | Communication agreement | | Project Owner |
| 2 | NA | Project Concept Note and Monitoring Report | | Aggregator |
| 3 | NA | RoU Calculation sheet | | Aggregator |
| 4 | NA | Declaration on avoidance of double counting | | Aggregator |
| 5 | NA | Commissioning Certificates for the ETP | | Aggregator |
| 6 | NA | Water flow details/log book details for thecomplete monitoring period | | Aggregator |
| 7 | NA | Calibration certificates for water meters | | Aggregator |

| 8 | UWR | UWR RoU Program manual | Universal Water |
|---|-----|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| | | version 2.0 | Registry |
| | | UWR RoU standard version 7.0 | |
| | | UWR RoU Verification standard | |
| | | version 2 | |
| | | UWR terms and conditions | |

Clarification request, corrective action request and forward action request

Table 1. CLs from this Project Verification

| Classification | ☐ CAR ☐ CL/CR ☐ FAR | Number: | 01 | |
|--|---|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Raised by: | Mr. Pankaj Kumar | Document | PCNMR | |
| | | Reference | | |
| Finding Descrip | otion | Date: | 27/12/2024 | |
| | the section A.2 and A.2.1 of PCNMR by adding | information of project ov | vner, company | |
| details and detailed description of purpose of project activity. Client/Responsible Party/Project Proponent Response Date: 24/01/2 | | | | |
| PP has updated | the information in section A.2 and A2.1 as per the | version 3 of the PCNMR | . Also. PP has | |
| - | ist in PCNMR Section A.8. | | , | |
| Validation/Verif | ication Team Assessment | Date: | 04/02/2025 | |
| PP has updated | the section A.2 and A.2.1 and the same has bee | n verified in PCNMR ver | sion 2. Hence, | |
| this part of CL is | closed. | | | |
| | | | | |
| Classification | ☐ CAR ☐ CL/CR ☐ FAR | Number: | 02 | |
| Raised by: | Mr. Pankaj Kumar | Document | PCNMR | |
| | | Reference | | |
| Finding Descrip | otion | Date: | 27/12/2024 | |
| for current monit | U verification standard version 2.0, PP shall submi oring period and for project activity has neither bed water registry or sustainable development progran | en registered nor seeking | | |
| | ible Party/Project Proponent Response | Date: | 24/01/2025 | |
| <u>-</u> | d the undertaking for no double counting for the cu | urrent Monitoring Period. | | |
| | | | | |
| Validation/Verif | ication Team Assessment | Date: | 04/02/2025 | |
| PP has submitted part of CL is close | ed the undertaking for no double counting and the | e same has been verifie | ed. Hence, this | |
| | | | | |
| Classification | ☐ CAR ☐ CL/CR ☐ FAR | Number: | 03 | |
| Raised by: | Mr. Pankaj Kumar | Document | PCNMR | |
| | | Reference | | |
| Finding Description Date: 27/12/2 | | | 27/12/2024 | |
| PP shall submit the commissioning certificate of the project activity. | | | | |
| 2. As discussed during remote audit PP shall submit the DPR and EIA report of the project activity. Client/Responsible Party/Project Proponent Response Date: 24/01/2025 | | | | |
| Ollellureapolla | ible i dity/i ioject r iopolient itespolise | Date. | 24/01/2025 | |

| 1. PP has | submitted a declaration for the cor | mmissioning of the | e project activity. | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| 2. PP has | submitted the DPR and EIA report | of the project act | tivity. | |
| Validation/Ver | ification Team Assessment | | Date: | 04/02/2025 |
| 2. PP has | submitted the commissioning certi submitted the DPR and EIA report this part of CL is closed. | | | |
| Classification | ☐ CAR ☐ CL/CR | FAR | Number: | 04 |
| Raised by: | Mr. Pankaj Kumar | | Document Reference | PCNMR |
| Finding Descr | iption | | Date: | 27/12/2024 |
| installe | Il submit the clear pictures of the m d at inlet and outlet of water flow. Il submit the single line diagram of R. | | | |
| Client/Respon | sible Party/Project Proponent Re | sponse | Date: | 24/01/2025 |
| meters | submitted the clear pictures of the installed at inlet and outlet of wate submitted the single line diagram R. | r flow. | | |
| Validation/Ver | ification Team Assessment | | Date: | 04/02/2025 |
| docume 2. PP has been ve | submitted the single line diagram | | | |
| Classification | ☐ CAR ⊠ CL/CR | ☐ FAR | Number: | 05 |
| Raised by: | Mr. Pankaj Kumar | | Document Reference | PCNMR |
| Finding Descr | iption | | Date: | |
| | Il aubmit the aupporting document | | | 27/12/2024 |
| 2. PP sha in PCN 3. PP sha | and the same shall be added in PC Il submit the list of chemicals used MR. Il submit the technical specification | NMR. in the treatment p | | of each unit of |
| 2. PP sha in PCN 3. PP sha added | and the same shall be added in PC Il submit the list of chemicals used MR. | NMR. in the treatment p s of RO and it's n | process and the same sh | of each unit of |
| 2. PP sha in PCN 3. PP sha added Client/Respon 1. PP has of CET 2. PP has added 3. PP has | and the same shall be added in PC II submit the list of chemicals used MR. II submit the technical specification in PCNMR. sible Party/Project Proponent Resubmitted the supporting document P and the same has been added in submitted the list of chemicals use in PCNMR. submitted the supporting document PCNMR. | NMR. in the treatment p s of RO and it's m sponse nt of design basics PCNMR. ed in the treatmen | process and the same shapembranes and the same Date: s and detailed description t process and the same | of each unit of hall be added e shall be 24/01/2025 on of each unit has been |
| 2. PP sha in PCN 3. PP sha added Client/Respon 1. PP has of CET 2. PP has added 3. PP has PCNMI | and the same shall be added in PC II submit the list of chemicals used MR. II submit the technical specification in PCNMR. sible Party/Project Proponent Resubmitted the supporting document P and the same has been added in submitted the list of chemicals use in PCNMR. | NMR. in the treatment p s of RO and it's m sponse nt of design basics PCNMR. ed in the treatmen | process and the same shapembranes and the same Date: s and detailed description t process and the same | of each unit of hall be added e shall be 24/01/2025 on of each unit has been |

the documents.

- 2. PP has submitted the list of chemicals used in the treatment process and the same has been added in PCNMR version 2. Assessment team has verified all the documents.
- 3. PP has submitted the supporting documents of technical specifications of RO and also added in PCNMR version 2. Assessment team has verified all the documents.

 Hence, this part of CL is closed.

| Classification | ☐ CAR ☐ CL/CR ☐ FAR | Number: | 06 | |
|---|---|---------------------------|----------------|--|
| Raised by: | Mr. Pankaj Kumar | Document Reference | PCNMR | |
| Finding Descri | ption | Date: | 27/12/2024 | |
| | the details of local stakeholder meetings. Supporting a stakeholders and also the list of names of local stake | | ping | |
| | sible Party/Project Proponent Response | Date: | 24/01/2025 | |
| PP has submitte | ed the supporting document of local stakeholders | | | |
| Validation/Veri | fication Team Assessment | Date: | 04/02/2025 | |
| PP has submitted is closed. | ed the details of local stakeholders and the same has | s been verified. Hence, t | his part of CL | |
| Classification | ☐ CAR ☐ CL/CR ☐ FAR | Number: | 07 | |
| Raised by: | Mr. Pankaj Kumar | Document Reference | PCNMR | |
| Finding Descri | ption | Date: | 27/12/2024 | |
| PP shall add the | e treated water quality report in PCNMR. | | | |
| Client/Responsible Party/Project Proponent Response Date: 24/01/2025 | | | | |
| PP has added the | ne treated water quality report in PCNMR. | | | |
| Validation/Veri | fication Team Assessment | Date: | 04/02/2025 | |
| | ed the treated water quality report and the same ha of CL is closed. | s been added in PCNN | MR version 2. | |
| | | | | |
| Classification | ☐ CAR ☐ CL/CR ☐ FAR | Number: | 08 | |
| Raised by: | Mr. Pankaj Kumar | Document Reference | PCNMR | |
| Finding Descri | ption | Date: | 27/12/2024 | |
| As discussed during the remote audit, the operational capacity of the plant is less than the actual capacity. PP shall clarify and submit the supporting document for both. | | | | |
| | | | 24/01/2025 | |
| PP wants to clarify that operational capacity, and the actual capacity is clearly mentioned in the DPR (1 and 2). | | | | |
| Validation/Verification Team Assessment Date: 04/02/202 | | | | |
| PP has submitted the documents clarifying the capacity of the plant. Hence, this part of CL is closed. | | | | |

| Classification | ⊠ CAR ☐ CL/CR ☐ FAR | Number: | 01 | | |
|---|--|--------------------|------------|--|--|
| Raised by: | Mr. Pankaj Kumar | Document Reference | PCNMR | | |
| Finding Description | | Date: | 04/02/2025 | | |
| certificate and operation | In PCNMR PP has mentioned current operational capacity as 3.3 MLD but as per the commissioning certificate and operational capacity declaration of the plant, the current operational capacity is 4.95 MLD while in section 2.7 of EIA report the current operational capacity is 3.65 MLD. Correction sought. | | | | |
| Client/Responsible Party/Project Proponent Response Date: 04/02/2025 | | | | | |
| PP has made the current operational capacity consistent in the PCNMR to 4.95 MLD. As mentioned in the section 2.7 of the EIA report dated July 2007, the project activity is designed for 5.5 MLD Capacity considering the future expansion, the operational capacity has increased from 3.65 MLD to 4.95 MLD. This can be verified by the recent consent to operate letter dated 02/04/2024.To attest the same, PP has provided a declaration confirming the operational Capacity. | | | | | |
| Validation/Verification | Team Assessment | Date: | 05/02/2025 | | |
| PP has done the suggested corrections in PCNMR and has provided the justification for the same. Assessment team has verified this in PCNMR version 2 and provided supporting documents. Hence, this part of CAR is closed | | | | | |

Table 3. FARs from this Project Verification

| FAR ID | XX | Section no. | | Date: DD/MM/YYYY | |
|--|-----------------|-------------|--|------------------|--|
| Description | on of FAR | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Project O | wner's response | | | Date: DD/MM/YYYY | |
| | | | | | |
| Documentation provided by Project Owner | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| UWR Project Verifier assessment Date: DD/MM/YYYY | | | | | |
| | | | | | |