




**Validation report form for renewal of crediting period for
CDM project activities
(Version 03.0)**

Complete this form in accordance with the instructions attached at the end of this form.

BASIC INFORMATION

Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity	Bundled wind power project Cape Verde UNFCCC ID: 9570 TN P-No. : 20/020
Number and duration of the next crediting period	2 nd CP, from 01/04/2020 to 31/03/2027
Version number of the validation report	1.2
Completion date of the validation report	30/04/2021
Version number of PDD to which this report applies	8
Project participants	Cabeolica S.A. Swedish Energy Agency
Host Party	Cape Verde
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	ACM0002 - Large-scale Consolidated Methodology: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources Version 20.0 standardized baselines: N/A
Mandatory sectoral scopes	Scope: 01 Energy Industries (renewable-/nonrenewable sources) Technical Area 1.2
Conditional sectoral scopes, if applicable	N/A
Estimated amount of annual average GHG emission reductions or GHG removals by sinks in the next crediting period	64,312 TCO ₂
Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH (TÜV NORD) Ref No.: E-0022
Name, position and signature of the approver of the validation report	 Final Approver Kunal Rami

SECTION A. Executive summary

>>

Cabeolica S.A. has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program to carry out validation of the request for renewal of crediting period (RCP) for the project:

“Bundled wind power project Cape Verde”

with regard to the relevant requirements for CDM project activities.

The project has been registered on 31-01-2013 under the UNFCCC registration No. 9570. The PPs have chosen a 7 year crediting period which is now due for renewal. The PPs have thus notified the UNFCCC about their intention to request the renewal of the crediting period.

The objective of this RCP validation is the review by an independent entity whether the project is still compliant with the applicable sections of:

- the CDM project standard,
- the CDM cycle procedure
- the updated applied UNFCCC Methodology ACM0002 ver. 20 and
- the methodological tool “Assessment of the validity of the original / current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period”.

As per the requirements of the CDM Validation and Verification Standard^{/VVS/} (section 11) the validation is based on

- the registered and/or latest updated version of the PDD (including revisions of the monitoring plan)^{/PDD/},
- the updated emission reduction calculation spread sheet ^{/XLS/},
- further supporting documents made available to the validator as well as
- information collected through performing interviews and during the on-site assessment.

Furthermore publicly available information, such as the host country legislation, was considered as far as available and required.

The project reduces GHG emissions due to the use of wind power to generate renewable electricity to be delivered 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	Cape Verde
Region:	Santiago, Sal, São Vicente and Boa Vista islands
Project location address:	Santiago Wind Farm: Santiago Island, 8 km from the city of Praia
	Sal Wind Farm: Selada do Flamengo – Sal island, 6 km southeast of the city of Espargos
	São Vicente Wind Farm: São Vicente island, 6 km southwest of the city of Mindelo
	Boa Vista Wind Farm: northwest of Boa Vista island, 5 km from the city of Sal Rei
Latitude:	Santiago Wind Farm: 14°58.2 N
	Sal Wind Farm: 16°42.1 N
	São Vicente Wind Farm: 16°50.3 N
	Boa Vista Wind Farm: 16°13.2 N
Longitude:	Santiago Wind Farm: 23°30.7 W
	Sal Wind Farm: 22°54.1 W
	São Vicente Wind Farm: 25°01.4 W
	Boa Vista Wind Farm: 22°54.7 W

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

Table - A-2: Technical data of the project activity

Santiago Wind Farm

Parameter	Unit	Value
Installed Capacity	MW	9.35
Plant Load Factor	%	40.3
Net Energy	MWh _{avg}	3.77
Expected Generated Energy	MWh/y	33,008.12
Wind Turbines	-	11
Model	-	Vestas – V52-850
Nominal capacity	kW	850
Hub height	m	55

Sal Wind Farm

Parameter	Unit	Value
Installed Capacity	MW	7.65
Plant Load Factor	%	43.2
Net Energy	MWh _{avg}	3.3
Expected Generated Energy	MWh/y	28,950.05
Wind Turbines	-	09
Model	-	Vestas – V52-850
Nominal capacity	kW	850
Hub height	m	55

São Vicente Wind Farm

Parameter	Unit	Value
Installed Capacity	MW	5.95
Plant Load Factor	%	51.5
Net Energy	MWh _{avg}	3.06
Expected Generated Energy	MWh/y	26,842.83
Wind Turbines	-	07
Model	-	Vestas – V52-850
Nominal capacity	kW	850
Hub height	m	55

Boa Vista Wind Farm

Parameter	Unit	Value
Installed Capacity	MW	2.55
Plant Load Factor	%	42.5
Net Energy	MWh _{avg}	1.083
Expected Generated Energy	MWh/y	9,493.65
Wind Turbines	-	03
Model	-	Vestas – V52-850
Nominal capacity	kW	850
Hub height	m	55

SECTION B. Validation team, technical reviewer and approver**B.1.** Validation team member

No.	Role	Signature	Last name	First name	Affiliation	Involvement in
-----	------	-----------	-----------	------------	-------------	----------------

					(e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)	Desk review	On-site inspection	Interview(s)	Validation findings
1	Team member	EI	Quireza	Oliver	TN México	x		x	x

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

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/ Approver	IR	Rami	Kunal	TN CERT GmbH

SECTION C. Means of validation

C.1. Desk/document 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 last revision of the PDD including the monitoring plan^{/PDD/},
- the last revision of the validation report^{/VAL/},
- documentation of previous verifications^{/VER/}
- the monitoring report, including the claimed emission reductions for the project^{/MR/},
- the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet^{/XLS/}.

Other supporting documents, such as publicly available information on the UNFCCC website and background information were also reviewed.

C.2. On-site inspection

In accordance with EB108 §28 the DOE may apply alternative measures of validation/verification to mandatory on-site inspections until 30/06/2021. The DOE performed interviews via internet have with PP personnel representatives in order to confirm the relevant information provided in the PDD such as national regulation, local stakeholders consultation, technology information and project location.

The following 2 remote inspections were done:

Duration of remote inspection: 19/05/2020 to 19/05/2020				
No.	Activity performed remotely	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	Kick off meeting	Remote	19/05/2020	Oliver Quireza
2.	Discussion on the calculation the EF calculation, and project description	Remote	19/05/2020	Oliver Quireza
3.	Closing meeting	Remote	19/05/2020	Oliver Quireza

Duration of remote inspection: 08/01/2021 to 08/01/2021				
No.	Activity performed remotely	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	Kick off meeting	Remote	08/01/2021	Oliver Quireza
2.	Discussion and review of calculation (baseline/project/leakage emissions and emission reductions)	Remote	08/01/2021	Oliver Quireza
3.	Review of completeness of ex ante and	Remote	08/01/2021	Oliver Quireza

	ex post parameters and such validation			
4.	Monitoring plan (feasibility, QA/QC procedures, responsibility and recording of monitoring results and sampling methods, if applied)	Remote	08/01/2021	Oliver Quireza
5.	Feedback and interactions with local stakeholders	Remote	08/01/2021	Oliver Quireza
6.	Closing meeting			

C.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Monteiro	Ana	Cabeoilica	19/05/2020	EF	Oliver Quireza
2.	Veiga	Telma	Cabeoilica	19/05/2020	Project Description	Oliver Quireza
3.	Zanardi	Paulo	GSS	08/01/2021	PDD, ER, Monitoring, data	Oliver Quireza

C.4. Sampling approach

>>

<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
 AS: Acceptance Sampling

²⁾ Sampling Types:

PS: Parameter Sampling

D.4.2 Sampling approaches during verification/validation

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No sampling approach has been used by the VT to verify the monitored parameters				
<input type="checkbox"/>	A sampling approach has been applied by the VT 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:

AS: Acceptance Sampling
 PS: Parameter Sampling
 COM: Full data check at higher data aggregation levels and sampling at original data levels

C.5. Clarification requests (CLs), corrective action requests (CARs) and forward action requests (FARs) raised

Area of validation findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance with PDD form	-	1	-
Application and selection of methodologies and standardized baselines	-	1	-
Validity of original baseline or its update	-	2	-
Estimated emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals	-	1	-
Validity of monitoring plan	-	2	-
Crediting period	-	1	-
Project participants	-	1	-
Post-registration changes	-	-	-
Others (please specify)	-	-	-
Total	-	9	-

SECTION D. Validation findings

D.1. Compliance with PDD form

Means of validation	<p>A draft revised PDD was submitted to the validation team by the project participants. 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/ • /unfccc/ 		
Findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	The latest reporting template CDM-PDD-FORM as listed on the UNFCCC website has been used for the PDD.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The latest instructions for filling out the PDD have been followed. No adverse finding has been identified in the course of this validation.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with; however; the following issues needed to be addressed in this context:	
		CAR 01	
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>After corrections the latest applicable PDD template CDM-PDD-FORM has been used.</p> <p>(i) The updated PDD has been completed using the valid version of the applicable PDD form, following the instructions therein; (ii) The information transferred to the later valid version of the PDD form is materially the same as that in the registered PDD, where applicable;</p>	

D.2. Application and selection of methodologies and standardized baselines

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 verification team has checked whether the updated PDD is in compliance with the 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/ • /METH/ • /TOOL/ • /unfccc/
----------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Methodology conditions</p> <p>The conditions for the application of the methodology ACM0002, version 20 were identified by the PP in section B.2 o the updated PDD.</p> <p>The VT confirm that the methodology ACM0002, version 20 is applicable to wind farm projects as per numerals 3 (a) and 4 (a).</p>			
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The updated PDD is completely in accordance with the approved methodology applicable for the CDM project		
		The breakdown of PDD accordance of the referenced tools is as follows:		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Title (of the tool)	Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system
			Version	7.0
			MP compliance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> full compliance <input type="checkbox"/> findings have been raised <input type="checkbox"/> N/A (for MP)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Title (of the tool)	Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline und update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period
			Version	03.0.1
			MP compliance	<input type="checkbox"/> full compliance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> findings have been raised <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The breakdown of PDD accordance of the applicable SB is as follows:		
		1	Title (of the tool)	Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality
		Version	7.0.0	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:</p> <p>CAR 03, CAR 09</p>			
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"/>	<p>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> <p>After corrections the updated PDD fully complies with the latest version of the approved methodology and applicable tools. All applicable references in the updated PDD are correct and all applicable tools have been correctly identified.</p> <p>The VT concluded that the applicable conditions selected by the PP are in line with the real situation of the project which was validated in the technical documentation of the PA.</p> <p>The methodologies and, where applicable, the standardized baselines and the other methodological regulatory documents were applied in accordance with the applicable requirements in the "CDM project standard for project activities"</p>		

D.3. Validity of original baseline or its update

Means of validation	In order to check the validity of the original baseline or its updates the validation team has applied the following stepwise approach:
	<p>The baseline scenario of the project as per the registered project can be described as follows:</p> <p><i>The electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity would have otherwise been generated by the operation of the grid-connected power plants and by the addition of</i></p>

	<p><i>new generation sources into the grid.</i></p> <p>As per the project standard this scenario is not subject to re-assessment and is thus deemed to be applicable for the next crediting period.</p> <p>However the baseline itself i.e. the calculation of baseline emissions has been checked regarding the continued validity of underlying assumptions and parameter values. The assessment steps are described in the following subsections:</p> <p>As per tool "Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period" the PP has to assess the validity of the baseline. The following steps were reviewed:</p>
Findings	<p>Step 1.1 Assess compliance of the current baseline with relevant mandatory national and/or sectoral policies:</p> <p>The baseline of the registered PDD has been assessed to be compliant with the national legislation and policies applicable for the project activity at the time of validation. During the first crediting period the PP has reviewed the legal requirements and policies relevant for the baseline of the project. On the basis of this the PP has arrived at the conclusion that the baseline is still in line with all applicable legislations and policies.</p> <p>The validation team has independently reviewed the host country legislation as well as current policies, such as:</p> <p>Legislation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Resolution 7/2012 dated February 2012, on Strategic Plan for the Renewable Energy Sector (PESER) and the Renewable Energy Development Zones (ZDER),. -Resolution 100/2015 dated October 2015, on National Action Plan for Renewable Energy (PNAER) and the National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency for the term 2015-2020/2030. -Resolution 39/2019 dated April 2019 on the Electricity Sector Master Plan for the term 2018-2040 <p>Country policies described in the following sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ELEKTRA National Energy Agency 2. Cape's Verde General Directorate of the Environment 3. Sustainable Development goals partnerships platform 4. Cabo Verde Case study, General Direction of Energy, Ministry Tourism, Investment and business development 5. Cape Verde sheet, EU, update 2016 6. Master Plan for the Electric Sector 2018-2040, Resolution no. 39/2019 of 8 April <p>On the basis of this analysis the validation team confirms that the baseline is still in compliance with the currently applicable national legislation and other national and/or sectoral policies. Therefore the baseline did not need to be adjusted due to changes in this respect.</p> <p><u>Step 1.2 Assess the impact of circumstances:</u></p> <p>As the baseline scenario might be affected by changed circumstances, e.g. market conditions, market prices etc. the PP has checked the baseline against such changes that have occurred since validation. This is of special importance if the baseline scenario is the continuation of the pre-project scenario.</p> <p>The most relevant change in the electricity market that could impact the project baseline is the the reduction in the electricity price. such situation doesn't change the baseline of the project. On the contrary as the competition and global situation is reducing the electricity prices that makes even more difficult the development of wind energy project.</p> <p>The argumentation provided by the PP is in line with the market situation observed in the project and the actual contractual situation.</p> <p>The changes in the electricity market doesn't affect the original baseline of the project</p>

as the incentives and actual prices aren't enough to make the investment in renewable energy attractive.

The validation team has independently checked whether there are changes in circumstances which have an impact on the baseline. No such changes have been identified and thus it is deemed appropriate not to revise the baseline due to changes in circumstances.

Step 1.3 Assess whether the continuation of use of current baseline equipment(s) or an investment is the most likely scenario for the crediting period for which renewal is requested:

If the baseline scenario has been identified as the continuation of the pre-project scenario it is necessary to assess whether an investment and/or exchange of the baseline equipment (e.g. due to expiry of the equipment's lifetime) during the upcoming crediting period is to be deemed the most likely scenario. If so the baseline needs to be updated.

As the project activity consist of a greenfield project no baseline equipment is considered.

Furthermore no other reasons for a possible investment – other than possible legal requirements – have been identified.

Thus the validation team confirms the conclusion that no changes to the baseline are required due to the likeliness of investments in equipment which impacts the baseline.

Step 1.4: Validity of ex-ante determined parameters:

In the registered PDD the $EF_{CM,y}$ was determined based on the TOOL 07 version 2.2.1.

The PP originally planned for the RCP to apply the Standardized Baseline Cape Verde Standardized Baseline for the power sector version 1, nevertheless such SB was valid only from 11/03/2016 to 10/03/2019 and has not been approved by UNFCCC for additional periods. So that the PP used the TOOL07 version 7.0 to calculate the $EF_{CM,y}$.

In the updated PDD the EF is calculated ex-ante which is in line with the methodology, so that the following parameters are fixed ex ante according to the TOOL07.

	Parameter	Previous value	Updated value	Reference																																																																									
1.	$EF_{OM,y}$	<table><tr><th>System</th><th>$EF_{grid,OMsimple}$</th></tr><tr><td>São Vicente</td><td>0.7496</td></tr><tr><td>Sal</td><td>0.6742</td></tr><tr><td>Santiago</td><td>0.6665</td></tr><tr><td>Boa Vista</td><td>0.6505</td></tr></table>	System	$EF_{grid,OMsimple}$	São Vicente	0.7496	Sal	0.6742	Santiago	0.6665	Boa Vista	0.6505	Santiago: 0.6517 Sal: 0.7295 São Vicente: 0.6863 Boa Vista: 0.7609	according to the TOOL07																																																															
System	$EF_{grid,OMsimple}$																																																																												
São Vicente	0.7496																																																																												
Sal	0.6742																																																																												
Santiago	0.6665																																																																												
Boa Vista	0.6505																																																																												
2.	$EF_{BM,y}$	<table><tr><th>System</th><th>$EF_{grid,BM}(tCO_2/MWh)$</th></tr><tr><td>São Vicente</td><td>0.7036</td></tr><tr><td>Sal</td><td>0.6755</td></tr><tr><td>Santiago</td><td>0.6622</td></tr><tr><td>Boa Vista</td><td>0.6340</td></tr></table>	System	$EF_{grid,BM}(tCO_2/MWh)$	São Vicente	0.7036	Sal	0.6755	Santiago	0.6622	Boa Vista	0.6340	Santiago: 0.6504 Sal: 0.4312 São Vicente: 0.6878 Boavista: 0.0000	according to the TOOL07																																																															
System	$EF_{grid,BM}(tCO_2/MWh)$																																																																												
São Vicente	0.7036																																																																												
Sal	0.6755																																																																												
Santiago	0.6622																																																																												
Boa Vista	0.6340																																																																												
3.	$EF_{CM,y}$	<table><tr><th>System</th><th>$EF_{grid,CM}(tCO_2/MWh)$</th></tr><tr><td>São Vicente</td><td>0.7381</td></tr><tr><td>Sal</td><td>0.6746</td></tr><tr><td>Santiago</td><td>0.6655</td></tr><tr><td>Boa Vista</td><td>0.6464</td></tr></table>	System	$EF_{grid,CM}(tCO_2/MWh)$	São Vicente	0.7381	Sal	0.6746	Santiago	0.6655	Boa Vista	0.6464	<table><tr><th>System</th><th>$EF_{grid,CM}(tCO_2/MWh)$</th></tr><tr><td>São Vicente</td><td>0.6867</td></tr><tr><td>Sal</td><td>0.6549</td></tr><tr><td>Santiago</td><td>0.6514</td></tr><tr><td>Boa Vista</td><td>0.5707</td></tr></table>	System	$EF_{grid,CM}(tCO_2/MWh)$	São Vicente	0.6867	Sal	0.6549	Santiago	0.6514	Boa Vista	0.5707	according to the TOOL07																																																					
System	$EF_{grid,CM}(tCO_2/MWh)$																																																																												
São Vicente	0.7381																																																																												
Sal	0.6746																																																																												
Santiago	0.6655																																																																												
Boa Vista	0.6464																																																																												
System	$EF_{grid,CM}(tCO_2/MWh)$																																																																												
São Vicente	0.6867																																																																												
Sal	0.6549																																																																												
Santiago	0.6514																																																																												
Boa Vista	0.5707																																																																												
4.	$FC_{i,y}$	<table><tr><th></th><th colspan="2">2008</th><th colspan="2">2009</th><th colspan="2">2010</th></tr><tr><th></th><th colspan="2">$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)</th><th colspan="2">$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)</th><th colspan="2">$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)</th></tr><tr><td>S.VICENTE</td><td>Diesel</td><td>Fuel Oil</td><td>Diesel</td><td>Fuel Oil</td><td>Diesel</td><td>Fuel Oil</td></tr><tr><td>TE</td><td>888,688</td><td>12,302,082</td><td>996,033</td><td>12,784,248</td><td>1,507,881</td><td>13,639,34</td></tr><tr><td>SAL</td><td>272,654</td><td>8,548,010</td><td>421,047</td><td>7,976,353</td><td>472,292</td><td>7,762,07</td></tr><tr><td>SANTIAGO</td><td>4,665,294</td><td>25,862,633</td><td>1,445,548</td><td>29,357,880</td><td>5,568,602</td><td>28,972,20</td></tr><tr><td>Boa Vista</td><td>1,829,403</td><td>0</td><td>1,666,734</td><td>0</td><td>1,651,230.48</td><td>0</td></tr></table>		2008		2009		2010			$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)		$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)		$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)		S.VICENTE	Diesel	Fuel Oil	Diesel	Fuel Oil	Diesel	Fuel Oil	TE	888,688	12,302,082	996,033	12,784,248	1,507,881	13,639,34	SAL	272,654	8,548,010	421,047	7,976,353	472,292	7,762,07	SANTIAGO	4,665,294	25,862,633	1,445,548	29,357,880	5,568,602	28,972,20	Boa Vista	1,829,403	0	1,666,734	0	1,651,230.48	0	<table><tr><th></th><th>2015</th><th>2016</th><th>2017</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)</th><th>$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)</th><th>$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)</th></tr><tr><td>S.VICENTE</td><td>11,431</td><td>11,781</td><td>12,741</td></tr><tr><td>SAL</td><td>10,224</td><td>12,323</td><td>15,921</td></tr><tr><td>SANTIAGO</td><td>37,667</td><td>39,391</td><td>43,220</td></tr><tr><td>BOA VISTA</td><td>6,041</td><td>6,198</td><td>7,777</td></tr></table>		2015	2016	2017		$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)	$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)	$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)	S.VICENTE	11,431	11,781	12,741	SAL	10,224	12,323	15,921	SANTIAGO	37,667	39,391	43,220	BOA VISTA	6,041	6,198	7,777	As per official information
	2008		2009		2010																																																																								
	$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)		$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)		$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)																																																																								
S.VICENTE	Diesel	Fuel Oil	Diesel	Fuel Oil	Diesel	Fuel Oil																																																																							
TE	888,688	12,302,082	996,033	12,784,248	1,507,881	13,639,34																																																																							
SAL	272,654	8,548,010	421,047	7,976,353	472,292	7,762,07																																																																							
SANTIAGO	4,665,294	25,862,633	1,445,548	29,357,880	5,568,602	28,972,20																																																																							
Boa Vista	1,829,403	0	1,666,734	0	1,651,230.48	0																																																																							
	2015	2016	2017																																																																										
	$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)	$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)	$FC_{i,y}$ (Liters)																																																																										
S.VICENTE	11,431	11,781	12,741																																																																										
SAL	10,224	12,323	15,921																																																																										
SANTIAGO	37,667	39,391	43,220																																																																										
BOA VISTA	6,041	6,198	7,777																																																																										
5.	$NCV_{i,y}$	Diesel oil: 41.4 TJ/Gg Fuel oil: 39.8 TJ/Gg	Diesel oil: no change Fuel oil: N/A	IPCC, 2006. OECD/IEA, 2004																																																																									
6.	$EF_{CO_2,i,y}$	Diesel oil: 72.6 TCo2/TJ Fuel oil: 75.5 TCo2/TJ	Diesel oil: no change Fuel oil: N/A	IPCC, 2006. OECD/IEA, 2004																																																																									

The $EF_{CM,y}$ determination is assessed in section D.4 of this report.

The ex-ante EF_{grid} calculation is done based on the latest available information of the ELEKTRA which includes years 2015-2017.

Weight	
W_{OM}	0.75
W_{BM}	0.25

These changes have been appropriately considered in the updated PDD.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with; however; the following issues needed to be addressed in this context: CAR 03, CAR 04, CAR 10
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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.
A relevant change in the project is that the emission factor $EF_{grid,y}$ changed from calculated ex-post to fixed ex-ante for the next crediting period. After the correction		

	requested during the validation it is concluded that the PDD has been updated correctly in line with the respective requirements to the validity original baseline
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

D.4. Estimated emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals

Means of validation	<p>For validation of the estimated GHG emission reductions the client has provided the validation team with the following documentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated PDD^{/PDD/} - XLS spreadsheet^{/XLS/} - Electricity data from the AMM <p>Further, the validation team has downloaded from the UNFCCC website the applicable version of the CDM methodology and all referenced methodological tools ^{/unfccc/}.</p> <p>The XLS ER calculation has been duly checked. Further it has been checked whether the results have been correctly transferred to the updated PDD for determination of ex-ante ER. The validation team has further checked the updated PDD against the latest version of the applicable methodology incl. the referenced methodological tools for consistency. Special focus was laid on the changes against the previous crediting period.</p> <p>1) Baseline emissions BE_y:</p> <p>As per applied methodology the ER is calculated as follow:</p> $BE_y = EG_{PJ,y} \times EF_{grid,y} \quad \text{Equation (1)}$ <p>Where:</p> <p>BE_y = Baseline emissions in year y (t CO₂)</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)</p> <p>EF_{grid,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" (t CO₂/MWh)</p> <p>The PP calculated the EF_{grid,CM,y} as per TOOL07 Tool to Calculate the Emission Factor for an Electricity System, ver. 7.</p> <p>For the EF_{grid,CM,y} the PP applied the step approach which is assessed in section B of this report.</p> <p><u>Step 1. Identification of the relevant electricity systems</u></p> <p>The bundle project consist of 4 wind farms which are located in the four islands (Santiago, Sal, São Vicente and Boa Vista) where each island has its own and independent electricity system. For the the delineation of the project electricity systems the PP chose Option 1 because the DNA in Cape Verde has defined the electricity systems. The VT checked the official information to confirm the delineation of the electricity systems. It can be confirmed that the option 1 chose by the PP is correct because it the official information clearly states that the islands have their own, independent electricity system. The PP chose is correct.</p> <p><u>Step 2. Inclusion off-grid power plants in the project electricity system</u></p> <p>In line with the tool the PP decided to not to include off-grid power plants.</p> <p><u>Step 3. Selection of a method to determine the operating margin</u></p> <p>As per latest publicly available 2015-2017 electricity system information, the following statements of the PP are correct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ There is no publicly available dispatch data, therefore method c) is not applicable ✓ The simple adjusted OM method, needs the annual load duration curve of the grid. Based on reason stated above, the data is no publicly available. ✓ So the simple OM method is correctly chosen. The calculation of the operating margin emission factor (EF_{grid,OM,y}) is based on the Simple OM method which can be only used if low-cost/must run resources constitute less than 50% of grid generation, averaged over the five most recent years.
----------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Step 4. Calculation of Operating Margin emission factor according to the selected method

The ex-ante option was chosen based on the most recent official data of the electricity systems available, without requirements to monitor and recalculate the emission factors during the crediting period.

As per TOOL07 the simple OM may be calculated by one of the following two options:

Option A: Based on the net electricity generation and a CO₂ emission factor of each power unit; or

Option B: Based on the total net electricity generation of all power plants serving the system and the fuel types and total fuel consumption of the project electricity system.

Option B can only be used if:

(a) The necessary data for Option A is not available; and

(b) Only nuclear and renewable power generation are considered as low-cost/must-run power sources and the quantity of electricity supplied to the grid by these sources is known; and

(c) Off-grid power plants are not included in the calculation (i.e. if Option I has been chosen in Step 2).

Option B was correctly selected.

In line with the TOOL07 the following equation is used:

$$EF_{grid,OMsimple,y} = \frac{\sum_m EG_{m,y} \times EF_{EL,m,y}}{\sum_m EG_{m,y}} \quad \text{Equation (3)}$$

Where:

$EF_{grid,OMsimple,y}$ = Simple operating margin CO₂ emission factor in year y (t CO₂/MWh)

$EG_{m,y}$ = Net quantity of electricity generated and delivered to the grid by power unit m in year y (MWh)

$EF_{EL,m,y}$ = CO₂ emission factor of power unit m in year y (t CO₂/MWh)

m = All power units serving the grid in year y except low-cost/must-run power units

y = The relevant year as per the data vintage chosen in Step 3

Where the $EF_{EL,m,y}$ is calculated as:

$$EF_{EL,m,y} = \frac{\sum_i FC_{i,m,y} \times NCV_{i,y} \times EF_{CO2,i,y}}{EG_{m,y}} \quad \text{Equation (4)}$$

Where:

$EF_{EL,m,y}$ = CO₂ emission factor of power unit m in year y (t CO₂/MWh)

$FC_{i,m,y}$ = Amount of fuel type i consumed by power unit m in year y (Mass or volume unit)

$NCV_{i,y}$ = Net calorific value (energy content) of fuel type i in year y (GJ/mass or volume unit)

$EF_{CO2,i,y}$ = CO₂ emission factor of fuel type i in year y (t CO₂/GJ)

$EG_{m,y}$ = Net quantity of electricity generated and delivered to the grid by power unit m in year y (MWh)

m = All power units serving the grid in year y except low-cost/must-run power units

i = All fuel types combusted in power unit m in year y

Step 5. Calculation of Build Margin emission factor

For the BM calculation the PP chose option 1 where the BM is calculated using the most recent available information.

Worth to notice is that the 4 electricity systems of the project have less than 5 interconnected plants, furthermore in 2 islands (Boa Vista and Sal) there are plants which started operation more than 10 years ago. So the PP selected the sample group according the applicable approach as follows:

Sal: SETsample-CDM

Boavista: SETsample-CDM

Santiago: SETsample-5Units or also $SET \geq 20\%$ (for this case SETsample-5Units and $SET \geq 20\%$ are the same)

São Vicente: SETsample-5Units or also $SET \geq 20\%$ (for this case SETsample-5Units and $SET \geq 20\%$ are the same)

The selected sample power plants for each system is presented in the following table:

Island	Unit_Name	Commissioning date	Energy that comprises up to 20% of the system generation - Egm,y		Amount of fossil fuel type consumed by grid power units comprises up to 20% of the system generation
			Total [MWh]	[%]	Diesel/Fuel Oil [Ton]
Sal	P. Eólico Cabeolica Sal	16/11/2011	16,541.06	39.35%	0.00
	APP	01/01/2014	25,496.42	60.65%	6,032.23
São Vicente	São Vicente	01/05/2015	55,659.28	73.90%	12,740.46
Boavista	P. Eólico Cabeolica Boavista	01/03/2012	7,959.42	20.27%	0.00
Santiago	Palmarejo	2015	199,690.30	84.91%	43,219.58

The BM is calculated as follow:

$$EF_{grid,BM,y} = \frac{\sum_m EG_{m,y} \times EF_{EL,m,y}}{\sum_m EG_{m,y}}$$

Where:

- $EF_{grid,BM,y}$ = BM CO₂ emission factor in year y (tCO₂/MWh)
- $EG_{m,y}$ = Net quantity of electricity generated and delivered to the grid by power unit m in year y (MWh)
- $EF_{EL,m,y}$ = CO₂ emission factor of power unit m in year y (tCO₂/MWh)
- m = Power units included in the BM
- y = Most recent historical year for which electricity generation data is available

Where $EF_{EL,m,y}$ is calculated as per equation 4 above.

For the OM and BM the VT cross checked the information applied in the $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ calculation versus the official information, where the official information included the annual report from the electricity utility Elektra and Reports from the plant APP. The information of diesel consumption for year 2015 for the power generation plants were received directly by email from the Power generators because that information is not included in Elektra reports. The following plants are under that situation:

- ✓ Boavista -Chavez
- ✓ Santiago - Palamarejo
- ✓ Sal - Palmeira
- ✓ Sao Vicente - Sao Vicente

Such information is confirmed to be official because is provided directly by the power generation companies but also they are confirmed to be correct by the DSE (Direction of Services of Energy) dependent from the Ministry of industry Commerce and Energy by the Declaration issued on 15/02/2021 and the informative letter issued on 30/06/2021.

Step 6. Calculation of the combined margin emission factor

CM calculation

As per the Tool, the weights applied for the 2nd CP are as follow:

$$W_{OM} = 0.75$$

$$W_{BM} = 0.25$$

The calculation is done as follow:

$$EF_{grid,CM,y} = EF_{grid,OM,y} \times w_{OM} + EF_{grid,BM,y} \times w_{BM}$$

Equation (16)

Where:

$EF_{grid,BM,y}$	=	Build margin CO ₂ emission factor in year y (t CO ₂ /MWh)
$EF_{grid,OM,y}$	=	Operating margin CO ₂ emission factor in year y (t CO ₂ /MWh)
w_{OM}	=	Weighting of operating margin emissions factor (per cent)
w_{BM}	=	Weighting of build margin emissions factor (per cent)

2) Project emissions PE_y:

As per registered PDD the PE_y from wind sources are considered 0.

3) Leakage emissions LE_y:

For the case of leakage emissions, in line with methodology ACM0002. as the power equipment was not transferred from another activity the LE_y= 0.

4) Emission reductions ER_y:

$$\begin{aligned} ER_y &= BE_y - PE_y \\ &= BE_y - 0 \\ &= BE_y \end{aligned}$$

Where:

ER_y	=	Emission reductions in year y (tCO ₂)
BE_y	=	Baseline emissions in year y (tCO ₂)
PE_y	=	Project emissions in year y (tCO ₂)
LE_y	=	Leakage emissions in year y (tCO ₂)

the provided ER calculation spreadsheet was validated and it is correct. The following tables

The estimated amount of GHG emission reductions of the project is 450,184 tCO₂e during the second crediting period (7 years) from 01/04/2020 to 31/03/2027, resulting in estimated average annual emission reductions of 64,312 tCO₂e.

The ER calculation sheet has been duly checked. Further it has been checked whether the results have been correctly transferred to the updated PDD for determination of ex-ante ER. The validation team has further checked the updated PDD against the latest version of the applicable methodology incl. the referenced methodological tools for consistency. Special focus was laid on the changes against the previous crediting period.

Findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	The calculation of ERs is done as per the applied methodology (ACM0002). The calculation in the Excel spreadsheet and the corresponding calculation tables in the PDD have been checked and no mistakes have been identified. The estimation of emission reductions for the 3 rd crediting period is deemed plausible 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 03, CAR 10
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.
All changes due to the upgraded methodology and the re-assessment of the baseline have been considered appropriately and in line with the CDM PS. The ERs calculation is done as per the applied methodology (ACM0002). The calculation in the Excel spreadsheet and the corresponding calculation tables in the PDD are consistent and traceable. The estimation of emission reductions for the 2 nd crediting period is deemed plausible and conservative.		

D.5. Validity of monitoring plan

Means of validation	<p>The validation team has checked the monitoring plan of the updated PDD against the required changes due to the update of the baseline and other methodological changes. Further, changes due to editorial updates of the applicable templates have been checked.</p> <p>In detail all parameters, ex-ante values and applicable formulae have been checked to determine the required changes for the next crediting period.</p> <p>Monitoring</p> <p>The PDD describes the responsibilities and procedures for monitoring, records keeping, quality check and details on parameters monitoring and calibration of measurement equipment. No major change against the registered PDD has been done because no changes are expected in the monitoring procedure. The VV reviewed the parameters against the new version of the applied methodology (ACM0002 version 20).</p> <p>In line with the methodology and registered PDD the following parameters are to be monitored:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. $EG_{\text{facility},y}$ = Quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project plant/unit to the grid in year y The only change in this parameter is the abbreviation (before: EG_y) <p>The following changes are applicable to the MP:</p> <p>The ex-ante parameters update is assessed in section D.3 of this report.</p>				
Findings	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="410 927 475 1352"><input type="checkbox"/></td><td data-bbox="475 927 1461 1352"> <p>Although the monitoring plan in the PDD has been revised to comply with the latest applicable version of the monitoring methodology (ACM0002 version 20). No changes have occurred.</p> <p>The validation team has duly assessed all the required changes due to the upgraded methodological requirements and the re-assessment of the baseline. The validation team has concluded that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all necessary changes have been appropriately reflected in the updated PDD, • the monitoring plan in the updated PDD is in compliance with the applied monitoring methodology, • the monitoring arrangements described in the updated PDD can be implemented and are feasible within the project design. </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="410 1352 475 1442"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td data-bbox="475 1352 1461 1442"> <p>The respective requirements have widely been complied with; however; the following issues needed to be addressed in this context:</p> <p>CAR 07</p> </td></tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Although the monitoring plan in the PDD has been revised to comply with the latest applicable version of the monitoring methodology (ACM0002 version 20). No changes have occurred.</p> <p>The validation team has duly assessed all the required changes due to the upgraded methodological requirements and the re-assessment of the baseline. The validation team has concluded that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all necessary changes have been appropriately reflected in the updated PDD, • the monitoring plan in the updated PDD is in compliance with the applied monitoring methodology, • the monitoring arrangements described in the updated PDD can be implemented and are feasible within the project design. 	<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 07</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Although the monitoring plan in the PDD has been revised to comply with the latest applicable version of the monitoring methodology (ACM0002 version 20). No changes have occurred.</p> <p>The validation team has duly assessed all the required changes due to the upgraded methodological requirements and the re-assessment of the baseline. The validation team has concluded that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all necessary changes have been appropriately reflected in the updated PDD, • the monitoring plan in the updated PDD is in compliance with the applied monitoring methodology, • the monitoring arrangements described in the updated PDD can be implemented and are feasible within the project design. 				
<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 07</p>				
Conclusion	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="410 1442 475 1509"><input type="checkbox"/></td><td data-bbox="475 1442 1461 1509"> <p>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.</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="410 1509 475 1599"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td data-bbox="475 1509 1461 1599"> <p>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> </td></tr> </table> <p>After correction it is concluded that the monitoring plan of the updated PDD is fully in line with the applied methodology including the applicable methodological tools. The monitoring arrangements described in the updated PDD can be implemented and are feasible within the project design.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>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>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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.</p>				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>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>				

D.6. Crediting period

Means of validation	<p>The validation team has checked that the validation process of the RCP takes place in the specified timeframe from 270 days before the expiry of the CP up to one year after the CP expiry. So, as the 1st CP ends on 31/03/2020 the request can be done from 06/07/2019 up to 31/03/2021.</p>
----------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	As the respective requirements are met, the project's 3 rd crediting period may start immediately after the expiration of the 2 nd one, given that all other applicable criteria are met. It is further confirmed that the start date (01/01/2021) and the length of the crediting period (7 years) are in compliance with the project standard.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with; however; the following issues needed to be addressed in this context: CAR 08
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.
As per UNFCCC Project Cycle Procedure the time period to request the renewal of the crediting period starts 270 days before the expiry of the CP, So, as the 2nd CP ends on 31/03/2020 the request can be done from 06/07/2019 up to 31/03/2021.		

D.7. Project participants

Means of validation	The validation team has checked the revised PDD ^{/PDD/} and the UNFCCC website ^{/unfccc/} esp. the latest version of the Modalities of Communication ^{/MOC/} to check whether the listed project participants have duly been authorized and if communication requirements are met.	
Findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	The names of the project participants as listed in the revised PDD (sections A.4. and appendix 1) are consistent with those listed on the dedicated UNFCCC project website as well as in the last version of the modalities of communication ^{/MOC/} .
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with; however; the following issues needed to be addressed in this context: CAR 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.
The names of the project participants as listed in the revised PDD (sections A.4. and appendix 1) are consistent with those listed on the dedicated UNFCCC project website as well as in the last version of the modalities of communication ^{/MOC/}		

D.8. Post-registration changes

Type of post-registration changes (PRCs)	Confirmation (Y/N)	Validation report for PRCs	
		Version	Completion date
Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents ¹	N		
Corrections	N		
Change to the start date of the crediting period	N		
Inclusion of a monitoring plan	N		
Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines, or other methodological regulatory documents	N		

¹ Other standards, methodologies, methodological tools and guidelines (to be) applied in accordance with the applied(selected) methodologies are collectively referred to as the other (applied) methodological regulatory documents).

Changes to the project design	N		
Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities	N		

SECTION E. Internal quality control

>>

Before the submission of the final VAL RCP 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 validation 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.

After this step the submission for requesting the renewal of crediting period is conducted.

SECTION F. Validation opinion

>>

Cabeolica S.A. has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program to re-validate the project "Bundled Wind "Power Project Cape Verde" for the purpose of renewal of the crediting period. The validation is based on the relevant UNFCCC requirements.

The review of the updated project design documentation and additional documents related to baseline and monitoring methodology; the subsequent background investigation, follow-up interviews have provided TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program with sufficient evidence to validate the fulfilment of the stated criteria applicable for RCP.

In detail the conclusions can be summarized as follows:

The current baseline of the project is in line with the national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances at the time of requesting renewal of crediting period.

The monitoring plan is transparent and adequate and in line with the applicable monitoring methodology (ACM0002 ver. 20).

The calculation of the project emission reductions is carried out in a transparent and conservative manner, so that the calculated emission reductions of 450,184 tCO_{2e} are most likely to be achieved within the second renewable crediting period of 7 years.

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 renewal of the crediting period.

Queretaro, 30/04/2021



Oliver Quireza
Team leader

Abbreviations

BAU	Business as usual
BCV	Bank of Cape Verde
CA	Corrective Action / Clarification Action
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CL	Clarification Request
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO _{2e}	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CP	Certification Program // Crediting Period
DSE	Sectorial Direction of Energy
DNA	Designated National Authority
EB	CDM Executive Board
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ELECTRA	ELECTRA – Empresa de Eletricidade e Água, SARL (Company of Electricity and Water of Cape Verde – State owned)
ER	Emission Reductions
ETS	Emission Trading Scheme
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LOA	Letter of Approval
MIOTH	Ministry of Infrastructure, Territorial Planning, and Housing
MOC	Modalities of Communication
PCP	CDM Project Cycle Procedure
PDD	Project Design Document
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
PPP	Private-Public Partnership
PP	Project Participant
PS	CDM Project Standard
QC/QA	Quality control/Quality assurance
RCP	Renewal of Crediting Period
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VT	Validation Team
VVS	CDM Validation and Verification Standard

Appendix 1. Competence of team members and technical reviewers



Statement of Competence

Appointment and authorization according to the procedures of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program

Mr. Oliver Quireza Campos

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Lead Assessor (Validation, Verification)	2021-05-28
VCS / ISO 14064-2	Lead Assessor	2021-05-28

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
13.2	Manure

337 - Rev. 5, Date: 2018-08-17



Statement of Competence

Appointment and authorization according to the procedures of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program

Mr. Kunal Rami

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification) Technical Reviewer	2023-03-26
VCS / ISO 14064-2	Senior Assessor Technical Reviewer	2023-03-26

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA
1.2	Renewables
2.1	Energy distribution
3.1	Energy demand
6.1	Construction
7.1	Transport
13.1	Solid waste and wastewater

224 - Rev. 9, Date: 2020-12-03

337_501-VA060-F20_2018-08-17_rev5.doc

501-VA060-F20 rev3 / 2012-10-25

224_501-VA060-F20_2020-12-03_rev9

501-VA060-F20 rev3 / 2012-10-25

Appendix 2. Documents reviewed or referenced

No	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
1.	TUV NORD	/CPM/	TUV NORD JI / CDM Certification Program Manual (incl. procedures and forms)	N/A	TUV NORD
2.	IPCC	/IPCC/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPCC Good Practice Guidance & Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2000 Revised 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Reference Manual 	https://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gp/english/	IPCC
3.	UNFCCC	/KP/	Kyoto Protocol (1997)	https://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol	UNFCCC
4.	UNFCCC	/MA/	Decision 3/CMP. 1 (Marrakesh – Accords & Annex to decision (17/CP.7))	https://unfccc.int/decisions?search2=marrakesh	UNFCCC
5.	UNFCCC	/VVS/	CDM Validation and Verification Standard, Version 2.0	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	UNFCCC
6.	UNFCCC	/METH-1/	ACM0002: Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources – version 13.0.0	https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/XP2LKUSA61DKUQC0PIWPGWDN8ED5PG	UNFCCC

No	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
7.	UNFCCC	/METH-2/	ACM0002: Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources – version 20.0	https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/XP2LKUSA61DKUQC0PIWPGWDN8ED5PG	UNFCCC
8.	UNFCCC	/PCP/	CDM project cycle, version 2.0	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	UNFCCC
9.	UNFCCC	/PS/	CDM project standard, version 2.0	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	UNFCCC
10.	UNFCCC	/PDD-T/	Project Design Document Form (CDM-PDD-FORM) - Version 11.0 including Attachment: Instructions for filling out the project design document form for CDM project activities	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	UNFCCC
11.	MIOth	/LOA/	Letter of Approval from DNA, 15/04/2012 to Cabeolica S.A	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV/1359635253.96/view	Other
12.	PP	/MOC/	Modalities of Communication	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV/1359635253.96/view	UNFCCC
13.	TÜV NORD	/VAL/	Validation Report for CDM project “Bundled wind power project Cape Verde” version 2, dated 31/01/2013, by TÜV NORD	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV/1359635253.96/view	TÜV NORD
14.	PP	/PDD/	RCP Project Design Document “Bundled wind power project Cape Verde”: -version 1., 30/03/2020 -version 8, 29/01/2021	N/A	UNFCCC
15.	PP	/PDD-Reg/	Registered Project Design Document “Bundled wind power project Cape Verde” version 7.0, 16/06/2015	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV/1359635253.96/view	UNFCCC
16.	Elektra PP Ministry of Industry, commerce and energy	/EF/	-Elektra SA Annual reports 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017. -AEB xls files Dados Electricidade 2013, 2014 2015, 2016, 2017 -APP indicadores 2015, 2016, 2017 -Grid Emission Factor 2015-2017, Sal, Sao Vicente, Boa Vista, Santiago - Informative letter, Ministry of Industry, commerce and energy, 30/06/2020, confirming the xls files APP_Indicadores 2015_2016_2017 and AEB-Datos Electricidade 2015, 2016 e 2017 as official reported to the DNICE and ARME. -Declaration, from Ministry of Industry, commerce and energy, 15/02/2021	N/A	PP
17.	PP	/XLS/	-Emission reduction calculation spreadsheet - version 1, 30/03/2020 - version 2, 10/02/2021 - version 3.1, 15/02/2021	N/A	PP
18.	Cape Verde Governm ent	/LEG/	<u>Legislation:</u> - Official Bulletin #10 – Resolution 29, Rules about the environmental impact assessment – 2006-03-06 - Law 34-VII-2008 – 2009 Corporate Tax Rate in Cape Verde – 2008-12-28	N/A	Other

No	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Official Bulletin #48 – Accounting Rules – 2008-12-29 - Official Bulletin #1 – Rules about the independent production of electric energy – 2010-01-03 - Resolution 86, June 1993, Environmental Policy 		
19.	Cape Verde Government	/BL/	<p>-Resolution 7/2012 dated February 2012, on Strategic Plan for the Renewable Energy Sector (PESER) and the Renewable Energy Development Zones (ZDER),.</p> <p>-Resolution 100/2015 dated October 2015, on National Action Plan for Renewable Energy (PNAER) and the National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency for the term 2015-2020/2030.</p> <p>-Resolution 39/2019 dated April 2019 on the Electricity Sector Master Plan for the term 2018-2040.</p>	http://www.electra.cv/ http://www.fao.org/faolex/results/details/en/c/LEX-FAOC185115	other
20.	PP	/EIA/	<p>Environmental Impact Assessment – Cape Verde Wind Farm Extension Project – Gabinete de Advocacia, Consultoria e Procuradoria Jurídica – February 2009</p> <p>Environmental and Social management Plan – Cabeólica Wind Farm Project – April 2010</p>	N/A	PP
21.	PP	/FIN/	<p>Financial Data – General:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PPA – Non-Binding Term Sheet for Power Purchase Agreement for Cape Verde Wind PPA among InfraCo and Electra Cape Verde – 2008-07-11 (<i>proposal</i>) 2. Quote provided by Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) personnel – e-mail message – 2009-04-09 3. EPC Contract – Turnkey Engineering, Procurement and Construction Agreement between Cabeólica S.A and Vestas Portugal Serviços de Tecnologia Eólica, Lda – 2009-12-22 4. Service and Availability Agreement (SAA) between Cabeólica S.A and Vestas Portugal Serviços de Tecnologia Eólica Lda – 2009-12-22 5. Contract of Guarantee for Equity Investments (Model) – Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) 6. Power Purchase Agreement between Empresa de Eletricidade e Água - Electra and Cabeólica S.A – 2010-03-26 – (<i>signed contract – used just to</i> 	N/A	PP

No	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
			<i>cross check the data)</i> 7. Service and Availability Agreement (final) between Cabeólica S.A and Vestas Portugal Serviços de Tecnologia Eólica Lda – 2010-10-08 (<i>used just to cross check the data</i>) 8. AFDB Facility Agreement between Cabeólica S.A and African Development Bank – 2010-12-14 (<i>used just to cross check the data</i>) 9. Finance Contract between Cabeólica S.A and European Investment Bank – 2010-12-14 (<i>used just to cross check the data</i>)		
22.	PP	/LIC/	Licenses: <i>Environmental:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EIA Approval – Santiago Wind Farm – National Direction of Environment – Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources – 2009-04-13 - EIA Approval – Sal Wind Farm – National Direction of Environment – Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources – 2009-04-13 - EIA Approval – Boa Vista Wind Farm – National Direction of Environment – Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources – 2009-04-13 - EIA Approval – São Vicente Wind Farm – National Direction of Environment – Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources – 2009-04-13 - EIA Declaration Approval – National Direction of Environment – Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources – 2011-05-04 <i>Implementation:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Santiago Wind Farm – National Direction of Energy – Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources – 2010-03-04 - Sal Wind Farm – National Direction of Energy – Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources – 2010-03-04 - Boa Vista Wind Farm – National Direction of Energy – Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and 	N/A	PP

No	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
			Marine Resources – 2010-03-04 - São Vicente Wind Farm – National Direction of Energy – Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources – 2010-03-04		
23.	PP	/PLF/	<u>Plant Load Factor:</u> - Wind Study – SKM – 2009-12-02 - Wind Resource and Energy Yield – Rev.4 – Final Report – SKM – 2010-05-12	N/A	PP
24.	PP	/START/	Evidences of <u>early consideration</u> and <u>project starting date</u> : - PPP signature between Cape Verdean government, Electra and InfraCo Management Services Ltd. – Official Bulletin #7 2008-02-18 - Commercial Registry of Cabeólica S.A # 3039/2009/09/29 – Commercial Registry Section – 2009-09-29 - Publication of Company Statutes – Official Bulletin #2 – 2011-01-14	N/A	PP
25.	PP	/ORG/	- Company Organizational Chart - Operational Roles and Responsibilities Chart	N/A	PP
26.	VESTAS	/TECH/	<u>Technical Description:</u> - General Specification – Vestas V52-850 kW – 50/60 Hz – 2008-10-08 - Type Certificate TC-WT01-007A-2007 Rev.3 – Vestas V52-850 kW – 50 Hz – Germanischer Lloyd Industrial Services GmbH – 2009-06-30 - Electricity Connection Diagram - Verification at Origin of Meters – Landys+Gyr - High Precision Metering – Landys+Gyr Qualigrid – ZMQ202 / ZFQ202 – User Manual	N/A	PP

Appendix 3. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests

Table 3. CL from this validation

CL ID	xx	Section no.		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of CL				
Project participant response				Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by project participant				
DOE assessment				Date: DD/MM/YYYY

Table 4. CAR from this validation

CAR ID	CAR 01	Section no.	From	Date: 31/03/2020
Description of CAR (1st round)				
1. The latest version of the PDD form was not used 2. The version of the updated PDD cannot be 1 if the registered PDD is version 7.0.				
Project participant response				Date: 03/04/2020
<i>The PDD form has been updated to version 11.</i> <i>The PDD was updated to version 8.0.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
PDD v.8				
DOE assessment				Date: 01/02/2021
1. The last version of the PDD form (11) has been used 2. The PDD version is consistent with the consecutive version Finding is closed				

CAR ID	CAR 02	Section no.	Front	Date: 31/03/2020
Description of CAR (1st round)				
The PP Swedish Energy Agency which appears in the UNFCCC interface was not included in the front page of the PDD				
Project participant response				Date: 03/04/2020
The PP Swedish Energy Agency has been included.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
PDD v.8				
DOE assessment				Date: 01/02/2021
The PPs in the PP are in line with the PPs in the UNFCCC website. Finding is closed				

CAR ID	CAR 03	Section no.	B	Date: 01/04/2020
Description of CAR (1st round)				

Sections B.1, B.4 (step 2), B.6.1	
The mentioned standardized baseline Cape Verde standardized baseline for the power sector Version 1.0 is not valid any longer (validity up to 10/03/2019). Furthermore, the EFgrid has not been calculated as per TOOL 07 Tool to Calculate the Emission Factor for an Electricity System.	
Project participant response	Date: 03/04/2020
The PDD has been updated and the the EFgrid calculated as per TOOL 07 Tool to Calculate the Emission Factor for an Electricity System v7.0.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
PDD v.8	
DOE assessment 1st Round	Date: 01/02/2021
The updated standardized baseline has not been updated up to date (01/02/2021) so the PP decided to calculated the $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ as per TOOL 07 Tool to Calculate the Emission Factor for an Electricity System, ver. 7. Nonetheless following issues have to corrected: In line with PDD instructions:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Document how each equation is applied to enable the reader to reproduce de calculation. 2. Provide sample calculation for each equation. 3. The step approach provided in §75 for the determination of the BM has to be documented in the PDD. 	
Project participant response 2nd Round	Date: 10/02/2021
The PDD has been updated including the issues raised by the DOE	
Documentation provided by project participant 2nd Round	
PDD v	
DOE assessment 2nd Round	Date: 11/02/2021
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The application of the equation is properly documented in the PDD 2. Sample calculations taken from from the ER spreadsheet are provided 3. Step approach to determine the BM is included in the PDD, nevertheless the selected sample group of power units m not been described. Issue remains open. 	
Project participant response 3rd Round	Date: 10/02/2021
The PDD has been updated and the selected sample group described.	
Documentation provided by project participant 3rd Round	
PDD v.8	
DOE assessment 3rd Round	Date: 11/02/2021
The approach followed to determine the SET sample to calculated the BM is in line with the TOOL 07 Tool to Calculate the Emission Factor for an Electricity System, ver. 7. The calculation is traceable and correct. Finding is closed	

CAR ID	CAR 04	Section no.	B4	Date: 01/04/2020
Description of CAR (1st round)				
The assessment of the validity of the current baseline for the next crediting period doesn't elaborate on the actual situation of the country as follow: Step 1.1: Assess compliance of the current baseline with relevant mandatory national and/or sectoral policies				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The description provided doesn't assess any new regulation, i.e. the Master Plan for the Electric Sector 2018-2040, Resolution no. 39/2019 of 8 April, that could impact the project. 				
Step 1.2: Assess the impact of circumstances				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The description provided doesn't mention the relevant situation of the project, such as the electricity price or possible additional incentives for wind energy generation, that could change the actual baseline. 				
Project participant response				Date: 29/01/2021
Section B.4 has been updated with a description of the policies issued by Cape Verde government and a explanation of the impacts in the Cabeolica's operations.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
PDD v.8				
DOE assessment				Date: 02/02/2021
The assessment of the validity of the current baseline has been provided, nonetheless additional data has to be provided on 1) the price reduction, 2) the escalation factor and 3) the energy sells in the 2 nd tier, in order to confirm the impact due to the changes.				
Project participant response 2nd Round				Date: 10/02/2021
<i>The additional data required has been included.</i>				

Documentation provided by project participant 2nd Round	
PDD v 8	
DOE assessment 2nd Round	Date: 11/02/2021
<p>According to the new contractual situation of the project the electricity price was reduced; such situation doesn't change the baseline of the project. On the contrary as the competition and global situation is reducing the electricity prices that makes even more difficult the development of wind energy project.</p> <p>The argumentation provided by the PP is in line with the market situation observed in the project and the actual contractual situation.</p> <p>Finding is closed.</p>	

CAR ID	CAR 05	Section no.	B5	Date: 01/04/2020
Description of CAR (1st round)				
The additionality analysis included in registered PDD has to be included in the updated PDD. Although no changes have been done in the additionality section, this has to be copied to the updated PDD.				
Project participant response				Date: 03/04/2020
Section B.5 has been updated and the additionality analysis from the registered PDD included.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
PDD v. 8				
DOE assessment				Date: 02/02/2021
No changes in additionality are necessary, so this section remains as the registered PDD.				
Finding is closed				

CAR ID	CAR 06	Section no.	B.6.2	Date: 01/04/2020
Description of CAR (1st round)				
The data and parameters fixed ex-ante are not in line with the TOOL 07 Tool to Calculate the Emission Factor for an Electricity System.				
Project participant response				Date: 03/04/2020
The PDD has been updated and the the EFgrid calculated as per TOOL 07 Tool to Calculate the Emission Factor for an Electricity System v7.0.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
PDD v. 8				
DOE assessment				Date: 02/02/2021
The data and parameters included in section B.6.2 have been revised and updated in line with the TOOL 07 Tool to Calculate the Emission Factor for an Electricity System.				
Finding is closed				

CAR ID	CAR 07	Section no.	B.7.3	Date: 01/04/2020
Description of CAR (1st round)				
Other elements of the monitoring plan				
1. The technical team is missing in Figure 16 (organization Chart)				
Appendix 5				
2. the position CFO in Appendix 5 differs from the one in the registered PDD				
Project participant response				Date: 03/04/2020
The technical team is now included in the organization chart. The CFO's position, in the appendix 5, is now in line with the registered PDD.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
PDD v.8				
DOE assessment				Date: 02/02/2021
1. The organization chart is correct and has not been updated in the revised PDD.				
2. The positions in Appendix 5 are correct.				
Finding is closed				

CAR ID	CAR 08	Section no.	C.3.1	Date: 01/04/2020
---------------	--------	--------------------	-------	-------------------------

Description of CAR (1st round)	
The crediting period stated in section C.3.1 is incorrect	
Project participant response	Date: 03/04/2020
The section C.3.1 has been updated to the correct date 01/04/2020 to 31/03/2027	
Documentation provided by project participant	
PDD v.8	
DOE assessment	Date: 02/02/2021
The corrected crediting period is in line with the an consistent with the years of the 1 st CP	
Finding is closed	

CAR ID	CAR 09	Section no.	B.2	Date: 03/04/2020
Description of CAR (1st round)				
TOOL 32 – Positive List of technologies was not mentioned in section B.2				
Project participant response				Date: 29/02/2021
A mention of the TOOL 32 has been included.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
PDD v.8				
DOE assessment				Date: 02/02/2021
TOOL 32 has properly referenced in section B.2.				
Finding is closed				

CAR ID	CAR 10	Section no.	EF calculation	Date: 02/02/2021
Description of CAR (1st round)				
EF calculation sheet for the 4 wind farms				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In line with the TOOL07 the WOM and WBM for the 2nd crediting period is 0.75 and 0.25 for wind projects. Table 5 of all EF sheet, it is not necessary to perform any calculation of EFOM if the calculation was done in Table 4 Cross check vs oficial data was not possible due to missing references In Table 5 the EFOM weighted averages (2015-2017) have not been calculated correctly. The actual electricity generation has to be considered. 				
Project participant response				Date: 10/02/2021
The calculation spreadsheet has been updated for all values included there is a comment presenting the evidence document to make possible the cross check. Table has been excluded from the calculations and EFOM weighted averages corrected.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
PDD v8				
DOE assessment				Date: 11/02/2021
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> WOM and WBM weight are properly been corrected Tables have been corrected References from official sources were provided so that it could be confirmed the correctness in the EF calculation Weighted average for OM calculation is incorrect for the 4 systems. Issue remains open The communications to confirm the information of Diesel consumption fo year 2015 from plants Chavez, Palmeira, Palmarejo and Sao Vicente have to be provided to confirm the traceability. Issue remains open 				
Project participant response				Date: 10/02/2021
The weighted average for OM calculation has been update for all 4 systems. Regarding the evidence to confirm the traceability of fuel consumption at the power plants, we formally asked Electra and/or ARME to send to us.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
PDD v.8				
DOE assessment				Date: 11/02/2021
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The weighted average to estimate the OM has been properly calculated in line with the TOOL07 ver7. A declaration from the Ministry of Industry , commerce and Energy has been provided to confirm the diesel values are official. 				
Finding is closed				

CAR ID	CAR 11	Section no.	B.6.1	Date: 01/03/2021
Description of CAR (1st round)				
B.6.1 - Step 1				
it is not clear which option of Tool under §17 is used, Option 1,2 or 3. In case option 3 is chosen then § 18- 27 of the TOOL07 have to be assessed				
Project participant response				Date: 01/03/2021
As the delineation has been published by the DNA, option I is applied to this project.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
PDD v.8				
DOE assessment				Date: 01/03/2021
The chosen option 1, is correct as the DNA has published the delineation of the country connected electricity systems of Cape Verde. Finding is closed				

Table 5. FAR from this validation

FAR ID	01	Section no.	General	Date: 19/02/2021
Description of FAR				
Guidance from CMP is not available on the issues below for calculation and processing of CERs post 2020. At verification stage it has to be ensured that corresponding CMP guidance and related EB decisions are available and duly considered by the PP as follows:				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PP has to apply any GWP values that may be adopted by the CMP for the period from 1 January 2021 in the its monitoring reports for any emission reductions achieved by the project activity in that period; and 2. The PP has to update its project design document in accordance with any requirements of the CMP guidance. 3. The PP has to consider the technical modalities of CER issuance (e.g. serial numbers). 				
Project participant response				Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by project participant				
DOE assessment				Date: DD/MM/YYYY

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
03.0	31 May 2019	Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure consistency with version 02.0 of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (CDM-EB93-A05-STAN) and version 02.0 of the “CDM project cycle procedure for project activities” (CDM-EB93-A06-PROC); • Make editorial improvements.
02.0	31 October 2017	Revision to align with the requirements of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (version 01.0).
01.0	23 March 2015	Initial publication.
Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Form Business Function: Renewal of crediting period Keywords: crediting period, project activities, validation report		