




Validation report form for CDM project activities

(Version 02.0)

Complete this form in accordance with the "Attachment: Instructions for filling out the validation report form for CDM project activities" at the end of this form.

VALIDATION REPORT

Title of the project activity	Grid-connected Solar PV Project in Bokhol
Version number of the validation report	2.0 TN P-No. : 8000457721 – 16/032
Completion date of the validation report	02/12/2016
Version number of PDD to which this report applies	1.4
Date when PDD was uploaded for global stakeholder consultation	01/03/2016
Project participant(s)	Senergy 2 SAS
Host Party	Republic of Senegal
Estimated annual average GHG emission reductions or net removals in the crediting period (tCO₂e)	23,022
Sectoral scope(s) and selected methodology(ies)	Scope: 1 / Technical Area: 1.2 CDM Methodology: ACM0002,; <i>Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources</i> , version 16.0
Name of DOE	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Name, position and signature of the approver of the validation report	 Evgeni Sud Final Approver

SECTION A. Executive summary

Senenergy 2 SAS has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program to carry out the validation of the project:

“Grid-connected Solar PV Project in Bokhol”

with regard to the relevant requirements for CDM project activities.

The proposed project activity is a Greenfield project consisting of a Photovoltaic solar plant (Solar PV modules) of capacity 20.03 MW. The average net annual power generation of the project for the next 7 years is estimated to be 33,868 MWh of renewable electricity which is to be exported to the national grid.

Details of the project location are given in table A-1 below:

Table A-1: Project Location

No.	Project Location
Host Country	Republic of Senegal
Region	Saint Louis
Project location address:	Village of Bokhol, Department of Dagana
Point A	
Latitude:	16°31'02.09"N
Longitude:	15°27'40.60"W
Point B	
Latitude:	16°31'17.14"N
Longitude:	15°27'50.37"W
Point C	
Latitude:	16°31'06.17"N
Longitude:	15°31'06.17"W
Point D	
Latitude:	16°31'03.65"N
Longitude:	15°28'15.06"W
Point E	
Latitude:	16°30'57.75"N
Longitude:	15°28'14.31"W
Point F	
Latitude:	16°30'44.80"N
Longitude:	15°28'05.56"W

Basic technical details of the project are summarized in table A-2.

Table - A-2: Technical data of the solar cell modules

Parameter	Unit	Description
Type	-	Polycrystalline
Number of PV Modules	-	77,040
Model	-	HSL60S
Nominal Power per PV Module	Wp	260
Total Installed Capacity	kW	20,030.04
Rated voltage (Vmpp) STC	V	30.9
Rated current (Impp) STC	A	8.42
Yield	%	15.6
Cell Dimensions	mm	1,670 x 1000 x 32
Average annual power output degradation	%	0.5
Estimated Load Factor	%	19.30
Average Lifetime	Years	20
Manufacturer	-	Hanwha solar

Table - A-3: Technical data of the inverter

Parameter	Unit	Description
Model	-	ASP 2000
Rated AC Power	kW	1,950 kW
Maximum Input Current	A	3 × 1,204
Rated AC power	kW	1,950
Operating frequency range	Hz	50/60 Hz
Maximum efficiency	%	98.4
Manufacturer	-	WSTECH

Table - A-4: Technical data of the transformer

Parameter	Unit	Description
Model		TDQ-203F03S5A-99
Rated capacity	kVA	2,000
Rated voltage H/L	V	33,000/330
Rated frequency	Hz	50
Manufacturer	-	Siemens

In detail the conclusions can be summarised as follows:

- The project is in line with all relevant host country criteria Senegal and all relevant UNFCCC requirements for CDM. Project activity approval has been obtained from DNA of Mali vide the Letter of Approval (HCA) dated July 15 2016 (Code: 1572).
- The project's additionality is sufficiently justified and referenced in the PDD.

- The monitoring plan is transparent and adequate.
- The sustainable development is sufficiently justified and referenced.
- The calculation of the project emission removals is carried out in a transparent and conservative manner, so that the calculated emission removals of 161,159 tCO₂e are most likely to be achieved within the 7 years of the renewable crediting period.
- The conclusions of this report show, that the project, as it was described in the project documentation, is in line with all criteria applicable for the validation.

SECTION B. Validation team, technical reviewer and approver

B.1. Validation team member

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)	Involvement in			
						Desk review	On-site inspection	Interview(s)	Validation findings
1.	Team Leader/Validator	EI	Kochaniewicz	Grzegorz		x	x	x	x
2.	Team Member	EI	Lubanga	David		x	-	-	-

B.2. Technical reviewer and approver of the validation report

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)
1.	Technical Reviewer	IR	Stöhr	Christina	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
2.	Approver	IR	Sud	Evgeni	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH

SECTION C. Means of validation

C.1. Desk review

During the desk review all documents initially provided by the client and publicly available documents relevant for the validation were reviewed. The main documents are listed below:

- the draft PDD including the monitoring plan^{/PDD/},
- regulations and approval of project activity^{/ESIA/}
- the Local Stakeholder Consultation Report^{/LSCR/},
- the Grid Emission Factor calculation spreadsheet and data Sources^{/ER/}.
- the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet^{/ER/}.
- technical details of the project^{/TEC/}
- the Summary of the ESIA
- the Environmental Certificate
- the Plant approval by the Republic of Senegal

- National legislation^{/ADC/},

Other supporting documents, such as publicly available information on the UNFCCC website and background information were also reviewed. The published PDD and supporting background documents related to the project design and baseline were reviewed.

Furthermore, the validation team used additional documentation by third parties like host party legislation, technical reports referring to the project design or to the basic conditions and technical data.

C.2. On-site inspection

Duration of on-site inspection: 13/04/2016				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1	Opening meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Round of introductions ○ Attendance list ○ Procedure of the audit ○ <u>Introduction of company and local facilities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ History, size, future development ○ Personal organisation and responsibilities ○ Legal status of PV plant ○ Plant permissions ○ EIA requirements ○ Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) ○ Landownership ○ <u>Project Technology:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Capacity ○ Supplier ○ EPC ○ Installation design ○ Metering points ○ Metering requirements (national/ international standards) ○ GEF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review of existing power plants in Senegal 	Dagana, Senegal	13/04/2016	G. Kochaniewicz
2	Site inspection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Location of the Power plant ○ Grid connection ○ Substation 	Village of Bokhol	13/04/2016	G. Kochaniewicz
3	Local stakeholder consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Meeting with local authorities ○ Meeting with stakeholders attending the LSC ○ Meeting with (surrounding) landowners 	Village of Bokhol	13/04/2016	G. Kochaniewicz

C.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			

No .	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Mayr	Sebastian	Ecosur Afrique	13/04/2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Introduction of company and local facilities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ History, size, future development, ○ Personal organisation and responsibilities, ○ Legal status of PV plant, ○ Plant permissions, ○ EIA requirements, ○ Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), ○ Landownership, ○ <u>Project Technology:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Capacity, ○ Supplier, ○ EPC, ○ Installation design, ○ Metering points, ○ Metering requirements, (national/ international standards), ○ Location of the Power plant ○ Grid connection 	Grzegorz Kochaniewicz
2.	Guichere	Pierre-Jean	OMEXO M	13/04/2016		
3.	Gatta	Ba	Senergy	13/04/2016		
4.	Diallo	Mamadou	Senergy	13/04/2016		
5.	SOW	Mamadou	Senergy	13/04/2016		
6.	Singale	Camara	Semaf	13/04/2016		
7.	Hady	Maude	Commune Bokhol	13/04/2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>LSC</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landownership, ○ Land tenure, ○ Number of families affected, ○ Project impact on the local population, ○ Consultation time, ○ Consultation process, 	
8-29.	Village represents		Commune Bokhol	13/04/2016		

C.4. Sampling approach

D.4.1 Sampling during validation

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No sampling approach has been used by the PP to determine the monitored parameters				
<input type="checkbox"/>	A sampling approach has been taken for the following monitored parameter(s):				
	Parameter	Sampling approach ¹⁾	Sampling Type ²⁾	Population	Sample Size

¹⁾ Sampling Approaches:

SiRS: Simple Random Sampling
 StRS: Stratified Random Sampling
 SS: Systematic Sampling
 CS: Cluster Sampling
 MSS: Multi-stage Sampling

²⁾ Sampling Types:

PS: Parameter Sampling

C.5. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests raised

Areas of validation findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Global stakeholder consultation	0	0	0
Approval	0	1	0
Authorization	0	1	0
Contribution to sustainable development	0	0	0
Modalities of communication	0	1	0
Project design document	0	0	0
Description of project activity	0	1	0
Application of selected baseline and monitoring methodology and selected standardized baseline			
- Applicability of methodology and standardized baseline	0	0	0
- Deviation from methodology	0	0	0
- Clarification on applicability of methodology, tool and/or standardized baseline	0	0	0
- Project boundary	0	0	0
- Establishment and description of baseline scenario	0	0	0
- Demonstration of additionality	0	0	1
- Emission reductions	0	1	0
- Monitoring plan	0	0	0
Duration and crediting period	0	1	0
Environmental impacts	0	0	0
Local stakeholder consultation	0	1	0
Others (please specify)	0	0	1
Total	0	7	2

SECTION D. Validation findings**D.1. Global stakeholder consultation**

Means of validation	By means of the draft PDD submitted to the validation team by the project participants, the DOE has made the PDD publicly available prior to the start of the validation activities through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website in accordance with applicable validation requirements related to the global stakeholder consultation in the VVS. The following sources of information have been used in this context: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• /PDD/• /unfccc/		
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The PDD was made publicly available through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website for global stakeholder consultation.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No comments were received during the global stakeholder consultation period.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comments were received during the global stakeholder consultation period. The comments (in unedited form) and the consideration/response of the validation team are presented below:	
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.	
		The validation team has checked for the stakeholder's comments and found no adverse comments during the period for comments.	

D.2. Approval

Means of validation	By means of the LoA issued by the DNA of Sengal, the validation team was able to assess the approval from the DNA in accordance with related applicable validation requirements in the VVS. The following sources of information have been used in this context: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /PDD/ • /HCA/ • /dna/ • /unfccc/ 	
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All DNAs from each party involved in the PA issued a LoA.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The LoA(s) confirms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that the party is a party to the Kyoto Protocol; - that participation is voluntary; - that the project contributes to sustainable development (only host party LoA); the precise project activity title in the PDD intended for submission for registration.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The LoA is authentic.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with. However, the following issues needed to be addressed in this context: CAR D.1
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.

D.3. Authorization

Means of validation	By means of the LoA issued by the DNA of Senegal, the validation team is able to assess the authorization from the DNA in accordance with related applicable validation requirements in the VVS. The following sources of information have been used in this context: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /PDD/ • /HCA/ • /dna/ • /unfccc/ 	
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The host Party has authorized the project activity in accordance with applicable validation requirements related to the authorization in the VVS.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with. However, the following issues needed to be addressed in this context: CAR D.1
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.

D.4. Contribution to sustainable development

Means of validation	<p>By means of the PDD submitted by the project participants, site visit to project location and interviews with project participant representatives, the validation team has assessed the contribution of the project activity to the sustainable development of the host Country in accordance with applicable related validation requirements in the VVS.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /PDD/ • /LoA/ • /unfccc/ • /IM01/ 	
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The PDD clearly states that the project contributes to sustainable development of the host country and evidence were presented to the validation team to confirm this information.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The LoA confirms that the project contributes to sustainable development of the host country.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The respective requirements have widely been complied with. However, the following issues needed to be addressed in this context:</p> <p>CAR D.1</p>
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
		<p>The Project contributes to sustainable development through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in Senegal's energy security and contribute to its self-sufficiency; • Financial support of local community; • Reduction of emissions of greenhouse gas; • Development of renewable energy; • Production of electricity without noise, without waste and without water consumption; • Enhance the country's attractiveness for companies in the photovoltaic sector; • Employment opportunity; • Strengthen the knowledge and experience of the country on the development of solar projects; • Trough supply of electricity improvement of health conditions;

D.5. Modalities of communication

Means of validation	<p>By means of comparison of the Modalities of Communication (MoC) submitted by the project participants and the contract among the PP and TÜV Nord, the validation team has assessed the MoC in accordance with applicable related validation requirements in the VVS.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /PDD/ • /MoC/ • /VVS/ • /unfccc/ • /IM01/ 	
Findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	A valid Modalities of Communication (MoC) was provided to the validation team from a project participant with whom the DOE has a contractual relationship.

	<input type="checkbox"/>	The MoC was signed by a duly authorized person on behalf of the respective project participant.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The MoC statement was correctly completed.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with. However, the following issues needed to be addressed in this context: CAR D.1
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
	The project participant and focal point is included in the presented Modalities of Communication statement, as well as the personal identities, including specimen signatures and employment status. The representatives who submitted the MoC statement to the DOE are duly authorized to do so, on behalf of the respective project participant.	

D.6. Project design document

Means of validation	<p>The project participants submitted a draft PDD to the validation team. By means of the UNFCCC website it has been checked whether the latest applicable PDD template CDM-PDD-FORM has been used.</p> <p>Further it has been checked whether the latest instructions for filling out the PDD template have been followed. Every section has been checked against the respective guidance.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /PDD/ • /PDD-T/ • /unfccc/ 	
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The latest reporting template CDM-PDD-FORM as listed on the UNFCCC website has been used for the Project Design Document to be uploaded.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The latest instructions for filling out the PDD have been followed. All raised findings have been correctly solved.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with. However, the following issues needed to be addressed in this context: CAR D.2
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
	The latest applicable PDD template (CDM-PDD-FORM – version 08.0) has been used and correctly filled out.	

D.7. Description of project activity

Means of validation	<p>By means of comparison of the PDD submitted by the project participants, site visit to project location and interviews with project participant representatives, the validation team has assessed the description of the proposed CDM project activity in accordance with applicable related validation requirements.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /PDD/ • /unfccc/ • /Tec/ 	
----------------------------	---	--

Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The PDD contains a clear, accurate and complete project description.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The information regarding the project participant is listed at the PDD and it is consistent with Appendix 1 that contains the contact information.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This description is in accordance with the real situation or (in case of greenfield projects) is it most likely that the project will be implemented according to the project description.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project involves an alteration of the existing installation or process and there is a clear description available regarding the differences between the project and the pre-project situation.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project qualifies as a small scale CDM project activity as defined in decision 4 / CMP.1 annex II.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project qualifies as an afforestation and reforestation (A/R) CDM project activity.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with. However, the following issues needed to be addressed in this context:
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.

D.8. Application of selected baseline and monitoring methodology and selected standardized baseline

D.8.1. Applicability of methodology and standardized baseline

Means of validation	<p>By means of comparison of the PDD with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the applied CDM methodology, (ii) all applicable CDM Meth tools, and (iii) if applicable, a standardized baseline <p>the validation team has checked whether the project activity is in compliance with the related requirements of the applied methodology/tools/SB.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /PDD/ • /ACM2/ • /unfccc/ 	
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project applies a valid version of a CDM Methodology.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All applied methodological tools are valid and approved.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The applied methodology and methodological tools are derived from UNFCCC CDM website.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All methodology applicability conditions are met.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project is in line with all requirements and stipulations mentioned in all sections of the applied methodology.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project activity is expected to result in significant emissions, related both to project and leakage, other than those listed in the methodology.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with. However, the following issues needed to be addressed in this context:
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.

	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
		<p>The project activity applies approved methodology ACM0002 version 16.0, Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources which is valid at the moment of the validation process.</p> <p>All applicability conditions of the applied methodology are met (refer to Appendix 7 for details).</p> <p>The project activity also applies the following methodological tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system</i> ^{/TL/} <p>which are the last ones available.</p> <p>Methodology and tools are derived from UNFCCC CDM website.</p> <p>Hence, the PA is in line with all requirements and stipulations mentioned in all sections of the applied methodology.</p>

D.8.2. Deviation from methodology

Means of validation		<p>By means of comparison of the PDD with the applied CDM methodology and methodological tools, it has been checked whether any deviation from applied methodologies, including standardized baselines have been verified.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /PDD/ • /ACM2/ • /unfccc/
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No deviation from or revision of the methodology is necessary.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	A deviation from or revision of the methodology is to be requested and approved.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The respective requirements have widely been complied with. However, the following issues needed to be addressed in this context:</p> <p>-</p>
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
		<p>The project activity applies approved methodology ACM0002 ver. version 16.0 which is valid at the moment of the validation process.</p> <p>No deviation or revision of the methodology was requested during the validation period.</p>

D.8.3. Clarification on applicability of methodology, tool and/or standardized baseline

Means of validation		<p>By means of verification of the proposed CDM project activity with</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the applied CDM methodology, all applicable CDM Meth tools, and if applicable, a standardized baseline <p>the validation team has checked whether if any clarification on applicability of methodology, tool and/or standardized baseline to the proposed CDM project activity has been issued.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /PDD/ • /ACM2/ • /unfccc/
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No clarification on applicability of methodology, tool and/or standardized baseline to the proposed CDM project activity has been issued.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	A clarification on applicability of methodology, tool and/or standardized baseline to the proposed CDM project activity has been issued.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with. However, the following issues needed to be addressed in this context:

		-
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
		The project activity applies approved methodology ACM0002 ver. version 16.0 which is valid at the moment of the validation process. There is no clarification on applicability of methodology, tool and/or standardized baseline to the proposed CDM project activity.

D.8.4. Project boundary

Means of validation		By means of comparison of the PDD with the applied CDM methodology, the validation team has assessed the project boundary in accordance with applicable related validation requirements in the VVS. The following sources of information have been used in this context: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /PDD/ • /ACM2/ • /unfccc/ • /goog/ • /TL/
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The spatial (geographical) boundaries of the project are clearly defined at the PDD.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All sources and GHGs are included in the project boundary as required in the applied methodology.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The methodology allows choosing whether a source and/or gas is to be included. The choice is sufficiently explained and justified.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Emission sources that are expected to contribute more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emissions reductions and which are not addressed by the selected approved methodology have been identified
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with. However, the following issues needed to be addressed in this context:
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
		The project boundary is validated as correct and compliant with the applied large-scale consolidated methodology and applied tools.

D.8.5. Establishment and description of baseline scenario

Means of validation		By means of comparison of the PDD with the applied CDM methodology, the validation team has assessed the baseline scenario in accordance with applicable related validation requirements in the VVS. The following sources of information have been used in this context: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /PDD/ • /ACM2/ • /TL/ • /unfccc/ • /ER/
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The baseline scenario is given by the applied methodology: <i>'Electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity would have otherwise been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources, as reflected in the combined margin (CM)</i>

		<i>calculations described in the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system".</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	All possible baseline scenarios have been considered.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with. However, the following issues needed to be addressed in this context:
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
	For a detailed assessment of the baseline identification refer to Appendix 5.	

D.8.6. Demonstration of additionality

Means of validation	<p>By means of comparison of the PDD with the applied CDM methodology, the validation team has assessed the additionality of the project activity in accordance with applicable related validation requirements in the VVS.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /PDD/ • /ACM2/ • /unfccc/ • /TEC/ • /senelec data/ 	
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The PDD describes how the project is additional in accordance with the requirements of the applied methodology
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The simplified procedure to demonstrate additionality as per applied methodology is applicable
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with; however; the following issues needed to be addressed in this context: CAR D.3, FAR 02
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
<p>As per the applied methodology, ACM0002 Version 16, the simplified procedure to demonstrate additionality is applicable to five grid connected electricity generation technologies (positive list), including solar photovoltaic technologies.</p> <p>The Solar PV technology is automatically additional if at the time of PDD submission any of the following conditions is met: -</p> <p>(a) The percentage share of total installed capacity of the specific technology in the total installed grid connected power generation capacity in the host country is equal to or less than two per cent;</p> <p>or</p> <p>(b) The total installed capacity of the technology in the host country is less than or equal to 50 MW.</p> <p>The project activity is a PV project and meets condition b), as data from the state utility Senelec, confirms that the total installed capacity of the PV technology in the host country is less than 50 MW at the time of PDD submission for registration. Furthermore the DNA of Senegal confirmed the information on PV plants in Senegal.</p> <p>The project activity is therefore additional.</p>		

D.8.7. Emission reductions

Means of verification	<p>During the validation the calculations of GHG emissions reductions and the grid emission factor for Senegal have been checked. In detail the following has been verified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transparency: It has been checked whether the calculation of $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ and baseline emissions is fully traceable and, where used, the Excel calculation provides all calculation formulae. • Parameter consistency: It has been checked whether all internal and external parameters and data used for the calculation are applied consistently in the PDD and the calculation spreadsheet. • Correctness: It has been checked whether the applied formulae and methods for calculating baseline emissions and the grid emission factor are in accordance with the Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, version 05.0, monitoring plan and the approved methodology. • Completeness: It has been checked whether all calculations are complete and without omissions. <p>The equation applied for the determination of baseline GHG emissions is consistent with the methodology:</p> $BE_{,y} = EG_{PJ,y} * EF_{grid,CM,y}$ <p>Where:</p> <p>$BE_{,y}$: Baseline emission in year y; (tCO₂/year).</p> <p>$EG_{PJ,y}$: Quantity of net electricity generation that is produced and fed into the grid as a result of the implementation of the CDM project activity in year y (MWh/yr)</p> <p>$EF_{grid,CM,y}$: Combined margin CO₂ emission factor for grid connected power generation in year y calculated using the latest version of the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" (tCO₂/MWh)</p> <p>According to the methodology, $EG_{PJ,y} = EG_{facility,y}$</p> <p>In line with applied methodology the following parameters are fixed throughout the 1st crediting period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combined margin CO₂ emission factor for grid connected power generation in year y ($EF_{grid,CM,y}$) • Operating Margin CO₂ emission factor for grid connected power generation in year y ($EF_{grid,OM,y}$) • Build Margin CO₂ emission factor for grid connected power generation in year y ($EF_{grid,BM,y}$) • The percentage share of total installed capacity of solar PV • The total installed capacity of solar PV <p>All data and parameters not monitored throughout the monitoring period of the project activity were correctly sourced in line with the applied methodology and tools. Correct assumptions were applied.</p> <p>Only Quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project plant/unit to the grid in year y ($EG_{facility,y}$) will be monitored in line with applied methodology.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /ACM2/ • /ER1/ • /PDD/
-----------------------	--

	• /TL/											
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The equations applied for calculation are correctly applied according to the approved methodology.										
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Conservative assumptions were used when calculating the project emissions.										
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All values of data to be applied for the purpose of calculating expected emissions reductions are considered to be reasonable, applicable and conservative.										
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with. However, the following issues needed to be addressed in this context: CAR D.4										
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs has been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.										
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs has been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.										
<p>During the validation the calculations of GHG emissions reductions and the grid emission factor for the project electricity system (national grid of Senegal) have been checked. In the ER calculation is as follows:</p> $ER_y = BE_{,y} - PE_{,y}$ $BE_{,y} = EG_{PJ,y} * EF_{grid,CM,y}$ <p>Where:</p> <table> <tr> <td>ER_y</td> <td>Emission reductions</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PE</td> <td>Project emissions</td> </tr> <tr> <td>$BE_{,y}$</td> <td>: Baseline emission in year y; (tCO₂/year).</td> </tr> <tr> <td>$EG_{PJ,y}$</td> <td>Quantity of net electricity generation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>$EF_{grid,CM,y}$</td> <td>CO2 emission factor for grid connected power generation</td> </tr> </table> <p>According to the methodology,</p> $PE_y = 0 \text{ t CO}_{2e}$ <p>and $EG_{PJ,y} = EG_{facility,y}$</p> <p>The calculations of the grid emission factor has been carried out in accordance with the options, equations and methods described in the <i>Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system</i>^{TL/}. The emission factor applied is an ex-ante value valid for the fixed crediting period.</p> <p>Asper §60 of the applied baselined and monitoring methodology ACM0002, version 16.0, no leakage emissions are considered for this project activity.</p> <p>It can therefore be confirmed that the emission reduction calculation is correct and in line with the applicable methodology and tool.</p>			ER_y	Emission reductions	PE	Project emissions	$BE_{,y}$: Baseline emission in year y; (tCO ₂ /year).	$EG_{PJ,y}$	Quantity of net electricity generation	$EF_{grid,CM,y}$	CO2 emission factor for grid connected power generation
ER_y	Emission reductions											
PE	Project emissions											
$BE_{,y}$: Baseline emission in year y; (tCO ₂ /year).											
$EG_{PJ,y}$	Quantity of net electricity generation											
$EF_{grid,CM,y}$	CO2 emission factor for grid connected power generation											

D.8.8. Monitoring plan

Means of validation	<p>During the validation all monitoring parameters (as listed in chapter B.7.1 of the PDD) have been checked with regard to the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) description, (ii) source of data, (iii) appropriateness of the applied measurement / determination method, (iv) monitoring frequency, (v) applied QA/QC measures, (vi) purpose of data
----------------------------	---

	(vii) formats. The following sources of information have been used in this context:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /PDD/ • /ACM2/ • /unfccc/ • /VVS/ • /PS/
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All monitoring parameters required by the applied methodology are contained in the monitoring plan.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The means of monitoring of all parameters contained in the monitoring plan are feasible.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All equations necessary to ex-post emission reduction calculation are clearly defined.
	<input type="checkbox"/> The respective requirements have widely been complied with. However, the following issues needed to be addressed in this context:
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/> The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
	It can be confirmed that all monitoring parameters required by the applied methodology are contained in the monitoring plan and the means of their monitoring is feasible. The validation procedure is described parameter-wise in the project specific validation checklist (Appendix 6).

D.9. Duration and crediting period

Means of validation	By means of comparison of the PDD and evidence presented, the validation team has checked the compliance of the duration and crediting period with validation requirements related to the starting date, duration and crediting period in the VVS. The following sources of information have been used in this context:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /PDD/ • /PDD-T/ • /PPA/ • /TEC/
Findings	<input type="checkbox"/> The starting date of the project activity is clearly defined and evidenced.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The type, duration and start date of the crediting period are clearly defined.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The operational lifetime of the project activity is clearly defined and evidenced.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The respective requirements have widely been complied with. However, the following issues needed to be addressed in this context:
Conclusion	CAR D.5
	<input type="checkbox"/> No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
	The project start date is 02/02/2016, the date of signing of the concession contract between the Project Participant and the representatives of the Republic of Senegal, and therefore, real action as per CDM Glossary of Terms The start of the (<i>renewable</i>) crediting period is appropriately given as 01/11/2016.

D.10. Environmental impacts

Means of validation	<p>By means of provided evidence and by the assessment of host party regulations regarding the environment, the validation team has checked the compliance of the analysis of the environmental impacts with applicable validation requirements related to the environmental impacts in the VVS.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /EIA/ • /PDD/ • /IM01/ • /ESIA/ • /EL/ 	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project complies with host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with. However, the following issues needed to be addressed in this context:
		-
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
	<p>An Environment & Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) is required for the project activity. It has been assessed that the environmental impacts associated with the installation and operation of the proposed PV solar plants will be minimal, and the mitigation measures proposed are sufficient. The environmental approval^{/ESIA/} was issued on 20/10/2015.</p>	

D.11. Local stakeholder consultation

Means of validation	<p>By means of provided evidence and by the assessment of host party regulations, the validation team has checked the compliance of the local stakeholder consultation process with applicable validation requirements related to the local stakeholder consultation in the VVS.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /LSC/ • /PDD/ • /IM01/ 	
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The relevant local stakeholders were invited to consultation prior to the publication of the PDD.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The local stakeholder consultation process can be assessed as adequate and in accordance with host Country requirements.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with; however; the following issues needed to be addressed in this context:
		CAR D.6
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
	<p>A local stakeholder consultation was conducted; Following on-going meetings were held:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early meetings with local authorities and local population on 17/01/2013, • Meeting with local population, on 03/08/ 2015, <p>A summary of comments and how they have been considered is included in Sections E.2 and E.3 of the PDD. A list of participants as well as how their comments have been addressed has sufficiently been included in the PDD.</p>	

SECTION E. Internal quality control

Before the submission of the final validation report a technical review of the whole validation procedure was carried out. The technical reviewers are competent GHG auditors where at least one is being appointed for the scope this project falls under. The technical reviewers are not considered to be part of the verification team and thus not involved in the decision making process up to the technical review.

As a result of the technical review process the validation opinion and the topic specific assessments as prepared by the validation team leader may have been confirmed or revised. Furthermore reporting improvements might have been achieved.

After the successful technical review, an overall (esp. procedural) assessment of the complete validation has been carried out by a senior assessor located in the accredited premises of TÜV NORD CERT GmbH.

After this step the submission for requesting for registration is conducted.

SECTION F. Validation opinion

Senergy 2 SAS has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program to validate the CDM project "Grid-connected Solar PV Project in Bokhol", with regard to the relevant requirements of the UNFCCC for CDM project activities, as well as criteria for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria include article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the modalities and procedures for CDM (Marrakech Accords) and the relevant decisions by COP/MOP and CDM Executive Board.

In detail the conclusions can be summarized as follows:

- The project is in line with all relevant host country criteria (Senegal) and all relevant UNFCCC requirements for CDM. Project activity approval has been obtained from DNA of Host Country vide the Letter of Approval (HCA) dated 15/07/2016
- The baseline has been appropriately identified as per the applied methodology.
- The framework for determination project additionality is sufficiently justified in the PDD in line with the applied methodology.
- All applicability conditions of the applied methodology have been fulfilled.
- the monitoring plan is transparent and adequate;
- The calculation of the project emission reductions is carried out in a transparent and conservative manner, so that the calculated emission reductions of **161,159 tCO₂e** are most likely to be achieved within the (1st renewable) crediting period.
- Information on the environmental impact assessment and local stakeholders' consultation by the project participant is sufficiently provided.

Kigali, 02/12/2016




Dr Grzegorz Kochaniewicz
TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP
Validation Team Leader

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
CA	Corrective Action / Clarification Action
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO _{2eq}	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CL	Clarification Request
DOE	Designated Operating Entity
DNA	Designated National Authority
DValR	Draft Validation Report
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ESIA	Environmental & Social Impact Assessment
ER	Emission Reduction
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
IM	Interview Memo
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MP	Monitoring Plan
MR	Monitoring Report
PA	Project Activity
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
PRC	Post Registration Changes
PS	CDM Project Standard
QA/QC	Quality Assurance / Quality Control
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers



Statement of Competence
Appointment and authorization according to the procedures
of the TUV NORD JICDM Certification Program

Mr. Grzegorz Kochaniewicz


SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification) Technical Reviewer	2019-02-08
VCS / ISO 14064-2	Senior Assessor	2019-02-08

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA
1.2	Renewables
3.1	Energy Demand
14.1	Afforestation and Reforestation

173 - Rev. 7, Date: 2016-02-09

173_011-VA060-F20_2016-02-09_e7.doc 801-VA060-F20-rev3 / 2012-10-28



Statement of Competence
Appointment and authorization according to the procedures
of the TUV NORD JICDM Certification Program

Mr. David Lubanga


SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Lead Assessor (Validation, Verification)	2018-10-20
VCS / ISO 14064-2	Lead Assessor	2018-10-20

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA
1.2	Renewables
3.1	Energy demand

251 - Rev. 4, Date: 2015-10-21

251_201-VA060-F20_2015-10-21_rev4.doc 801-VA060-F20-rev3 / 2012-10-28



Statement of Competence
Appointment and authorization according to the procedures
of the TUV NORD JICDM Certification Program

Ms. Christina Stöhr

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Assessor (Validation, Verification) Technical Reviewer	2017-12-12
VCS / ISO 14064-2	Assessor/ Technical Reviewer	

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA
1.1	Thermal energy generation
1.2	Renewables
13.1	Solid waste and wastewater

200 - Rev. 4 Date: 2015-06-09

200_001-VA060-F20_2014-12-13_rev4.doc 801-VA060-F20-rev3 / 2012-10-28

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
1	UNFCCC	/ACM2/	ACM0002: Large-scale Consolidated methodology - <i>Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources</i> , version 16.0	https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/EY2CL7RTEHRC9V6YQHLAR6MJ6VEU83	Other
2	DOE	/CPM/	TÜV NORD JI / CDM CP Manual (incl. CP procedures and forms)		Other
3	IPCC	/IPCC/	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book 	www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp	Other
4	UNFCCC	/KPI/	Kyoto Protocol (1997)	http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/items/2830.php	Other
5	UNFCCC	/MA/	Decision 3/CMP. 1 (Marrakesh – Accords)	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/COPMOP/index.html	Other
6	UNFCCC	/PDD/	Project Design Document for CDM project: “Grid-connected Solar PV project in Bokhol” version 01.0, dated 25/02/2016		Other
7	UNFCCC	/PDD-T/	Project Design Document Form (CDM-PDD-FORM) - Version 8.0	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/PDDs_Forms/index.html	Other
8	UNFCCC	/PS/	CDM Project Standard (Version 9.0)	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	Other
9	UNFCCC	/VVS/	CDM Validation and Verification Standard (Version 09.0)	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	Other
10	UNFCCC	/PCP/	CDM Project Cycle Procedure (Version 09.0)	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Procedures/index.html	Other
11	UNFCCC	/PS/	CDM Project Standard (Version 09.0)	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	Other
12	UNFCCC	/TL/	Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system Version 05.0	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/tools/index.html	Other
13	UNFCCC	/GT/	Glossary “CDM terms” (version 08.0)	https://cdm.unfccc.int/filestorage/extra/t/extfile-20150226124447549-glos_CDM.pdf/glos_CDM.pdf?t=UmZ8bnFjODI3fDCW9A3vJwR03kQ	Other

No.	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
				Qh4sbLiYu	
14	PP	/PDD/	“Grid-connected Solar PV project in Bokhol” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Version 1.0, dated 25/02/2016 Version 1.1, dated 24/04/2016 Version 1.2, dated 08/07/2016 Version 1.3, dated 22/09/2016 Version 1.4, dated 01/12/2016 		PP
ER spreadsheets					
1	PP	/ER1/	ER Ex-Ante Calc-BHOKO version 01.0 ER Ex-Ante Calc-BHOKO version 02.0 ER Ex-Ante Calc-BHOKO version 1.3 ER Ex-ante Calc-BHOKO version 1.4		PP
Equipment & Instrument					
1	PP	/CON/	PV connection lines		PP
2	Senegy 2PV Plant	/TEC/	Technical Due Diligence Report		PP
3	Siemens	/TEH/	Technical Data Sheet		PP
Regulatory & Approvals					
1	Senegal DNA	/LoA/	Host Country Letter of Approval, dated 15/07/2016	Senegal DNA	PP
2	Ministry of Environment	/EL/	Environmental License, dated 20/10/2015	Ministry of Environment	PP
3	Africa Development Bank	/ESIA/	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Resume de L'Etude D'Impact Environnemental et Social), dated October 2015		PP
4	Ministre de L'Environnement et du Developpement Durable	/ESIA/	ESIA approval (Attestation), dated 20/10/2015		PP
5	Ministre de Energy et des Mines	/PAP/	Plant approval (Agrement de projets IPP d'energie renouvelable pour injection au reseau SENELEC)		PP
6	Ministre de L'Environnement et du Developpement Durable	/PAPR/	Production Licence (Arrete protant attribution d'une licence de production et de vente d'enerie electrique a la societe Senegy 2 SAS).		PP
7	Senegy	/PCO/	Prior consideration of the CDM, dated		PP
8	Senegy	/PIN/	Project Information Note		PP
9	Senegy	/PPA/	Contrat d'Achat d'Energie Contrale Soaire de Bohol,		PP
10	Global Environmental Facility	/LON/	Loan Agreement from Global Environmental Facility, dated 02/02/2016		PP
11	Senegy	/GCA/	Grid Connention Agreement (Convention de Raccordement au Reseau), dated 15/03/2015		PP
12	Ministre de L'Economie et des Finances	/LAND/	Land lease agreement, dated 13/03/2016		PP

No.	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
13	Senergy	/MoC/	Modality of Communication		PP
14	Ministre de L'Economie des Finances et du Plan	/PLA/	Plant Location Approval, dated 06/10/2015		PP
15	Alban Pelletier	/MTP/	Private power production and integration opportunities. A case study for decentralized energy production in Senegal.		Others
Websites					
1	Senegal DNA	/dna-HP/	http://www.denv.gouv.sn	Direction de l'Environnement et des Etablissements Classés 106, Rue Carnot Dakar BP 6557 Dakar Etoile (DNA)	Other
2	Hanwha Q Cells	/hgc/	www.hanwha-qcells.com	Hanwha Q Cells	Other
3	Ecosur Afrique	/dna-SP/	http://ecosurafrique.com/	Ecosur Afrique	Other
4	Senelec Senegal	/SEN/	http://www.senelec.sn	Senelec Senegal	Other
5	GreenWish	/GRW/	http://www.greenwishpartners.com/en/portfolio-our-portfolio/	GreenWish	Other
6	UNFCCC	/unfccc/	http://cdm.unfccc.int	UNFCCC	Other
7	IPCC	/ipcc/	www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp	IPCC publications	Other
8	Google	/goog/	https://earth.google.com/	Google Earth	Other

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

Table 3. CL from this validation

CL ID	N/A	Section no.		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of CL				
n/a				
Project participant response (1st round)				Date:
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:			
DOE assessment (1st round)				Date:
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed		

Table 2. CAR from this validation

CAR ID	D.1	Section No.	F	Date: 03/03/2016
Description of CAR				
1. A host country letter of approval from the host country DNA is pending validation 2. Modalities of communication (MoC) between the project proponent and the UNFCCC EB is required for validation				
Project participant response				Date: 24/04/2016
1. A request for a LoA has been submitted to the DNA on 5 April 2016 and is still pending validation. A hard copy of the request has been provided to the DOE. 2. Modalities of Communication (MoC) between the project proponent and the UNFCCC EB is provided to DOE.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the MR	Section(s):	New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:			
DOE assessment				Date: 10/05/2016
1. Finding remains open.				
Project participant response				
1. LoA dated 15/07/2016 were provided. 2. MoC were provided.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s): F	New version No.: 1.3	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:			
DOE assessment				Date: 30/07/2016
1. The LoA from DNA of Senegal, dated 15/07/2016 was provided by PP. The LoA was issued by Ministère de l'Environnement Et Des Développement Durable, Direction De L'Environnement Et Des Etablissements Classes. The Direction De L'Environnement Et Des Etablissements Classes is the DNA of Senegal listed on the UNFCCC homepage. The LoA confirms that The Republic of Senegal has ratified the Kyoto Protocol, participates voluntary in the CDM and that the project will contribute to the sustainable development of Senegal. The LoA refers to the precise project title in the PDD submitted for registration. The LoA approval and authorisation of Senergy 2 SAS is unconditional.				

<p>2. Valid MoC was provided from Senergy 2 SAS the party that has contractual relationship with DOE. The MoC statement was completed correctly. Mr. Sow Mamadou and Mr. Gilles Parmentier, signed the MoC. Mr. Sow Mamadou is a Asset Manger by Greenwish Partners^{/GRW/} a company who specialized in development of green energy projects. Senergy 2 SAS is owned by GreenWish Partners. Senergy 2 SAS is also the signatory of service contract with the DOE. DOE conducted onsite interviews with Mr. Sow Mamadou confirming his position and organization.</p>	
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed

CAR ID	D.2	Section No.	Page 1 & A.1.	Date: 03/03/2016
Description of CAR				
<p>1. The ER units are not correct</p> <p>2. Section A.1 has not been completed as per template requirements (see point 2 a&b, and point 4)</p>				
Project participant response				Date: 24/04/2016
<p>1. The ER units have been corrected from tCO₂eq per year to tons CO₂eq per year.</p> <p>2. Section A.1 has been completed as per PDD version 6.0 template requirements (point 2 a&b) and point 4).</p>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s): 1&A.11	New version No.: 1.1	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:			
DOE assessment				Date: 10/05/2016
<p>1. The ER reduction units were corrected. Standards abbreviation "tCO₂e" was used.</p> <p>2. The description of baseline scenario was included in the section A.1.1.</p>				
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed			

CAR ID	D.3	Section No.	B.5.	Date: 03/03/2016
Description of CAR				
<p>The start date of the proposed PA (15/12/2015) is before GSCP (01/03/2016). Prior consideration is required in this section as well, and evidenced, in accordance with §115 of the CDM VVS, version 09.0.</p>				
Project participant response				Date: 24/04/2016
<p>The following paragraphs have been added in the PDD: "The start date of the proposed project activity is defined as 02/02/2016 i.e. the approval of an African Development Bank's request (on behalf of the project participant) to the Global Environment Facility of a proposed investment to support the Bokhol Solar Power Project in Senegal. This triggered the project start including construction works. The Prior Consideration Form has been sent to the DNA of Senegal on November 2nd 2015¹ and published on the UNFCCC website on December 11th 2015.</p> <p>Requirements of Project Standard Version 09.0 §27 are fulfilled as the project participant has informed the host Party's DNA and the secretariat of the UNFCCC of their intention to seek CDM status in accordance with the Project Cycle Procedure."</p> <p>The evidence of project start date is the approval letter from the global environment facility to the African Development Bank.</p>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s): B.5.	New version No.: 1.1	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other: approval letter from the global environment facility to the African Development Bank			
DOE assessment				Date: 10/05/2016

¹ Evidence: email has been submitted to the DOE.

The start date originally stated as the 15/12/2016 was revised. The project starting date was defined as the day when the loan from Green Investment Facility of Africa Development Bank was approved. This information was evidenced by provided loan confirmation dated 02/02/2016 and via interviews onsite as well as onsite inspection. The prior notification was published on UNFCCC homepage and the DNA was notified of the intention to develop the project activity before the project starting date in 2015. The project complies with the requirements.

Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed
---	--

CAR ID	D.4	Section No.	B.6.1	Date: 03/03/2016
Description of CAR				
Calculation of the GEF <ol style="list-style-type: none"> STEP 2: Option II is not justified as per §28 of the GEF Tool version 05.0 STEP 3: Please clarify why off-grid generation (10%) has been included in the calculation of low cost/must run which appears to violate §37 a) of the GEF tool (Table 9) STEP 3: Please clarify the statement. '...As the table below shows, fossil fuels exceed 50% between 2011 and 2015....' STEP 3: State which option as per §39 & §42 of tool Please exclude all comments in the excel sheets 				
Project participant response				Date: 24/04/2016
<p>Step 2: Option II has been justified as per §28 of the GEF Tool version 05.0. the following paragraphs have been added in the PDD:</p> <p>„Option II aims to reflect that in some countries off-grid power generation is significant and can partially be displaced by CDM project activities that are if off-grid power plants are operated due to an unreliable and unstable electricity grid.</p> <p>As demand for electricity grows a lot faster than its supply, Senegal is facing serious problems. SENELEC lacks an efficient organisational structure and lacks (access to funds for) investments in power plants and transmission-lines in order to cope with the increasing demand. Reserve capacity presently is insufficient, causing frequent (scheduled or unscheduled) outages of whole districts.² Therefore option II is selected for the calculation of both the operating and build margin emission factors.“</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Step 3: Off –grid generation (10%) has been excluded of the calculation of the share of low cost/must run in accordance with §37 a) of the GEF tool in ER spreadsheet and PDD (table 9) has been amended accordingly. Step 3: The statement “ as the table below shows, fossil fuels exceed 50% between 2011 and 2015” has been clarified in the PDD. Step 3: Options selected as per §39 & §42 of tool has been defined in the PDD (before step 4 in accordance with the Tool). The following paragraphs have been added: <p>“For the simple OM, the emissions factor can be calculated using either of the two following data vintages:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ex ante option Ex post option <p>For the purpose of this project, option a) ex ante option is selected. Thus, the emission factor is determined once at the validation stage, and no monitoring and recalculation of the emissions factor during the crediting period is required. For grid power plants, a 3-year generation-weighted average has been used, based on the most recent data available at the time of submission of the CDM-PDD to the DOE for validation.</p>				

² Energypedia website: https://energypedia.info/wiki/Senegal_Energy_Situation

Power plants registered as CDM project activities should be included in the sample group that is used to calculate the operating margin if the criteria for including the power source in the sample group apply. In Senegal and at the time of request for registration, there are 5 projects activities and 4 programmes of activities registered under the CDM. The only CDM project implying a grid-connected power plant that is already commissioned is Félou Regional Hydropower Project (Ref 3090). This hydro power plant is a low-cost/must-run power plant therefore, it is not included in the sample group."

5. All comments in the excel sheets have been deleted.

Documentation provided by project participant			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s): B.6.1.	New version No.: 1.1
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s): ER Ex-ante	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:		
DOE assessment			Date: 10/05/2016
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> STEP 2: Option II, of grid power plants are included in the calculation of operating and build margin emission factor. The justification of the selected option was provided and found in line with power supply situation in Senegal. STEP 3: The off-grid generation (10%) has been excluded in the calculation of low cost/must run in line with §37 a) of the GEF tool (Table 9). STEP 3: The statement.'...As the table below shows, fossil fuels exceed 50% between 2011 and 2015...' was revised providing values of low-cost must run generation in the respective period. STEP 3: Ex-ante option for build and operating margin factor were selected and justified in line with §39 & §42 of tool. The comments in the excel sheets were removed. 			
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed	

CAR ID	D.5	Section No.	C.1.1.	Date:	03/03/2016	
Description of CAR						
The starting date of the proposed PA has not been evidenced, in accordance with the CDM glossary of terms (VVS §120). This section is therefore not completed as per PDD version 6.0 template instructions						
Project participant response					Date:	24/04/2016
The starting date has been explained in accordance with PDD version 6.0 template instructions. Evidence of the starting date is provided to the DOE as requested.						
Documentation provided by project participant						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s): C.1.1.	New version No.: 1.1			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:					
DOE assessment					Date:	10/05/2016
The starting date was corrected and evidenced. The project starting date is 02/02/2016 the day of loan approval from Global Environment Facility. The loan agreement confirmation was provided and checked during onsite visit.						
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed				

CAR ID	D.6	Section No.	E.1	Date:	03/03/2016	
Description of CAR						
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> It is unclear when and where the first LSC meeting was conducted The means of identification and informing the relevant stakeholders about the two LSC meetings to ensure representativeness is neither included nor evidenced. Please clarify what Municipality of Senergy 2 means 						
Project participant response					Date:	24/04/2016
1. As the ESIA summary states (p. 26) the participatory approach has been applied from the very						

beginning of the project. As such, several meetings with the local stakeholders took place from 2013 until beginning of the ESIA.			
2. As many local stakeholders can't read, they were informed via megaphones on cars in public spaces of each community and then word-of-mouth. This has been confirmed by the mayor of Bokhol during on-site visit.			
A respective phrase has been added into the PDD.			
3. The reference to the "Municipality of Senery 2" in section E.2 has been corrected to the "Municipality of Bokhol and Senery 2".			
Documentation provided by project participant			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s): E.1.	New version No.: 1.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:		
DOE assessment			Date: 10/05/2016
1. The first LSC meeting were conducted in 2013. The process was on-going until 2015. The information was provided in the PDD and confirmed during meeting with local stakeholders during onsite visit.			
2. The LSC were identified among the local population and the authorities. The invitation was conducted via direct contacts. The information provided in the PDD was confirmed during meeting with local stakeholders during onsite visit.			
3. The agreement to contribute to local electrification was signed between the Municipality of Bokhol and Senery 2. The PDD was revised.			
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed	

Table 3. FAR from this validation

FAR ID	01	Section No.	N/A	Date: 03/03/2016
Description of FAR				
A construction of low voltage (400 V) power supply line for the time of construction of PV plant was discussed during onsite visit. The power line shall be disconnected after the power plant was permanent connected to the national grid and started generate electricity. The time of disconnection of the construction low voltage supply power line and the time connection of line(s) evacuating electricity shall be checked and evidenced during first periodic verification.				
Project participant response				Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by project participant				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:			
DOE assessment				Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification				

FAR ID	02	Section No.	B.5	Date: 02/12/2016
Description of FAR				
In line with §31 of the applied methodology ACM0002, version 16.0, the project proponent has applied the simplified procedure to demonstrate additionality and shall therefore provide information on actual capital cost of the project activity at the time of the first verification.				
Project participant response				Date: 02/12/2016
Noted				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:			

DOE assessment		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification	

Appendix 5. Assessment of Baseline Identification

Table A-5: Assessment of Baseline Identification (VVS §§ 88 – 95)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Baseline is pre-defined by the methodology
<input type="checkbox"/>	Assessment of baseline alternatives see below

Appendix 6. Monitored Parameters

Table A-6: Validation Checklist – Monitored Parameters

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Refer- ence	Validation Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)				Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
1. $EG_{facility,y}$	<u>Parameter:</u>	Quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project plant/unit to the grid in year y					
<p>Indicate whether the provided information for the monitoring parameter complies with the approved methodology including applicable tool(s) in the aspects listed.</p> <p>For checking the use of international standards in the nomenclature, consider: Standard format (e.g. 1,000 representing one thousand and 1.0 representing one).</p> <p>Values shall be directly given in SI units – or additionally to original units transferred to SI.</p> <p>Short scale naming system: (Only) million = 10^6 and billion 10^9 shall be used.</p>	/PDD/ /ACM2/	Requirement	OK	Not OK	N/A	OK	OK
		Label	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Data Unit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Description	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Source of data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Measurement equipment / measure method	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Monitoring frequency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		QA/QC procedures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Purpose of data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Standard format	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		SI units	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Short scale naming	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		In the context of this parameter the following finding was raised: N/A					

Appendix 7. Assessment of Applicability Criteria of Methodology

Table A-7: Assessment of Applicability Criteria

Applicability Criteria	Evidence used	Met	N/A	Assessment of validation team
This methodology is applicable to grid-connected renewable power generation project activities that (a) install a new power plant at a site where no renewable power plant was operated prior to the implementation of the project activity (greenfield plant).	Onsite inspection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	During the site visit no installation existing on the project site were detected. The construction did not commence. The project is a green field project.
The project activity is the installation, capacity addition, retrofit or replacement of a power plant/unit of one of the following types: hydro power plant/unit (either with a run-of-river reservoir or an accumulation reservoir), wind power plant/unit, geothermal power plant/unit, solar power plant/unit, wave power plant/unit or tidal power plant/unit	/PDD/ /TEC/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project will install solar power plant. This has been checked against the technical due diligence report and on site investigation.
In the case of capacity additions, retrofits or replacements (except for wind, solar, wave or tidal power capacity addition projects which use Option 2: on page 11 to calculate the parameter EGPJ,y): the existing plant started commercial operation prior to the start of a minimum historical reference period of five years, used for the calculation of baseline emissions and defined in the baseline emission section, and no capacity expansion or retrofit of the plant has been undertaken between the start of this minimum historical reference period and the implementation of the project activity;	/PDD/ onsite inspection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project will install solar power plant on a site where no power generation power plant existed prior to project implementation. During the site visit no installation existing on the project site were detected. The construction did not commence. The project is a green field project.
In case of hydro power plants, one of the following conditions must apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project activity is implemented in an existing reservoir, with no change in the volume of reservoir; or • The project activity is implemented in an existing reservoir, where the volume of reservoir • is increased and the power density of the project activity, as per definitions given in the • Project Emissions section, is greater than 4 W/m²; or 	/PDD/ onsite inspection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project is not a hydropower project. The project will install solar power plant. This has been checked against the technical due diligence report and during on site investigation.

Applicability Criteria	Evidence used	Met	N/A	Assessment of validation team
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project activity results in new reservoirs and the power density of the power plant, as per definitions given in the Project Emissions section, is greater than 4 W/m². 				
<p>The methodology is not applicable to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project activities that involve switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources at the site of the project activity, since in this case the baseline may be the continued use of fossil fuels at the site; Biomass fired power plants; Hydro power plants¹ that result in new reservoirs or in the increase in existing reservoirs where the power density of the power plant is less than 4 W/m². 	/PDD/ onsite inspection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project will install solar power plant on a site where no power generation power plant existed prior to project implementation. During the site visit no installation existing on the project site were detected. The construction did not commence. The project is a green field project.
In the case of retrofits, replacements, or capacity additions, this methodology is only applicable if the most plausible baseline scenario, as a result of the identification of baseline scenario, is .the continuation of the current situation, i.e. to use the power generation equipment that was already in use prior to the implementation of the project activity and undertaking business as usual maintenance.	/PDD/ onsite inspection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project will install solar power plant on a site where no power generation power plant existed prior to project implementation. During the site visit no installation existing on the project site were detected. The construction did not commence. The project is a green field project.
This tool ("Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system".) may be applied to estimate the OM, BM and/or CM when calculating baseline emissions for a project activity that substitutes grid electricity that is where a project activity supplies electricity to a grid or a project activity that results in savings of electricity that would have been provided by the grid (e.g. demand-side energy efficiency projects).	/PDD/ /EXCEL/ onsite inspection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project will be connected and national grid of Senegal and substitutes grid electricity. This has been checked during on site investigation.
Under this tool, the emission factor for the project electricity system can be calculated either for grid power plants only or, as an option, can include off - grid power plants. In the latter case, two sub-options under the step 2 of the tool are available to the project participants, i.e. option IIa and option IIb. If option IIa is chosen, the conditions specified in "Appendix 2: Procedures related to off-grid power generation" should be met. Namely, the total capacity of off-grid power plants (in MW) should be at least 10 per cent of the total capacity of grid power plants in the electricity system; or the total electricity generation by off-grid power plants (in MWh) should be at least 10 per cent of the total electricity generation by grid power plants in the electricity system; and that factors	/PDD/ /EXCEL/ /MTP/ onsite inspection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Both grid and of-grid power plants were included in the calculation of GEF. All respective steps in the calculation were followed. All conditions to include the of-grid power generation were met. The PDD and the xls calculation have been checked against the applied tool.

Applicability Criteria	Evidence used	Met	N/A	Assessment of validation team
which negatively affect the reliability and stability of the grid are primarily due to constraints in generation and not to other aspects such as transmission capacity.				
In case of CDM projects the tool is not applicable if the project electricity system is located partially or totally in an Annex I country.	PDD/ /EXCEL/ /MTP/ onsite inspection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project is completely located in Senegal which is not Annex 1 country. This has been checked during on site investigation and by local expertise.
Under this tool, the value applied to the CO2 emission factor of biofuels is zero.	PDD/ /EXCEL/ /MTP/ onsite inspection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project will install solar power plant on a site where no power generation power plant existed prior to project implementation. During the site visit no installation existing on the project site were detected. The construction did not commence. No biofuel will be used.

Appendix 8. Assessment of Financial Parameters

Table A-8: Assessment of Financial Parameters

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No financial parameters are used for additionality justification
<input type="checkbox"/>	Assessment of all financial parameters see below