




**Verification and certification report form for
CDM project activities
(Version 04.0)**

BASIC INFORMATION

Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity	San Antonio El Sitio Wind Power Project UNFCCC reference number: 6973		
Scale of the project activity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Large-scale <input type="checkbox"/> Small-scale		
Version number of the verification and certification report	1.2		
Completion date of the verification and certification report	17/10/2021		
Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period	2 nd Monitoring Period Monitoring period duration: 01/08/2018 to 31/12/2020 (including both days)		
Version number of the monitoring report to which this report applies	03.1		
Crediting period of the project activity corresponding to this monitoring period	Fix crediting period, 10 years 19/04/2015 - 18/04/2025, (including both days).		
Project participants	Eólico San Antonio El Sitio, S.A (Private Entity)		
Host Party	Guatemala		
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	ACM0002: "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" (Version 12.3.0) Standardized Baseline: N.A.		
Mandatory sectoral scopes	Sectoral scope – 01 Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)		
Conditional sectoral scopes, if applicable	N/A		
Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring duration in the registered PDD	197,125 tCO ₂ e		
Certified amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring period	Amount before 1 January 2013	Amount from 1 January 2013 until 31 December 2020	Amount from 1 January 2021
	0 tCO ₂ e	202,633 tCO ₂ e	0 tCO ₂ e
Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE	KBS Certification Services Private Limited UNFCCC Ref. No. E-0051		
Name, position and signature of the approver of the verification and certification report	 Mr. Kaushal Goyal		

	Managing Director
--	-------------------

SECTION A. Executive summary

KBS Certification Services Private Limited has been commissioned by “Eólico San Antonio El Sitio, S.A.” to perform an independent verification of its registered CDM project, “San Antonio El Sitio Wind Power Project”, UNFCCC ref. no. 6973 for the reported GHG emission reductions for the given monitoring period from 01/08/2018 to 31/12/2020 (both dates included). The CDM projects must undergo independent third-party verification and certification of emission reductions as the basis for issuance of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs).

The objectives of this verification exercise are, by review of objective evidence, to establish that:

- The project activity has been implemented and operated as per the registered and revised PDD and that all physical features (technology, project equipment, and monitoring and metering equipment) of the project are in place;
- Monitoring report and other supporting documents are complete;
- The actual monitoring systems & procedures and monitoring report conforms with the requirements of the approved monitoring plan and the approved monitoring methodology;
- The data is recorded and stored as per the monitoring methodology and approved monitoring plan.

Scope:

The scope of the verification is the independent and objective review and ex post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emission by the project activity. The verification is based on review of monitoring report, supporting information and

- a) The registered and revised PDD, including the monitoring plan and the corresponding validation opinion(s);
- b) Previous verification reports, deviation requests, requests for revision of monitoring plan;
- c) Monitoring report for the monitoring period under verification including CER calculations sheets and all supporting documents;
- d) The applied monitoring methodology;
- e) Relevant decisions, clarifications and guidance from the CMP and the CDM Executive Board;
- f) All information and references relevant to the project activity's resulting in emission reductions
- g) The project is assessed against the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM Modalities and Procedures and related rules and guidance.

KBS has, based on the recommendations in the latest version of CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activity, employed a rule-based approach in the verification, focusing on the identification of significant reporting risks and the reliability of project monitoring.

Description of project:

The project activity consists of a green field wind power plants with a generation capacity of 55.2 MW. The project comprises 16 WTGs of 3.45 MW. The electricity generated is exported to the national electricity transmission grid of Guatemala (NIS). The project displaces power generation using fossil fuels and hence leads to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. The project activity owner and operator is Eólico San Antonio El Sitio, S.A.

Methodology:

KBS follows a rule-based verification approach, wherein, as a first step, the contract review is undertaken as per latest version of CDM Accreditation Standard. Subsequently, after the contract is signed, the monitoring report of the project activity is made publicly available at UNFCCC website as per CDM procedures. A desk review of the project documentation is undertaken, which is followed by a remote audit by the members of verification team in accordance with the latest version of CDM VVS. The verification protocol is filled by the verification team that is based on standard auditing practices and version 02 of CDM VVS for project activities, to capture the assessment of applicable CDM requirements viz., version 02 of CDM Project Standard for project activities, registered and revised PDD, applied methodology, applied standardized baseline and/or tools and recent decisions. The verification protocol provides transparent means to record the observations and compliances by the verification team members and the nonconformities, if any. The verification protocol is an internal document and is available on request. Following are the major milestones for the verification under consideration.

KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd. confirms that the monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements.

Based on the information seen and evaluated we confirm that the implementation of the project has resulted in 202,633 tCO₂e emission reductions during the current monitoring period from 01/08/2018 to 31/12/2020 (both days included)

SECTION B. Verification team, technical reviewer and approver

B.1. Verification 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/document review	On-site inspection	Interviews	Verification findings
1.	Team Leader, Technical Expert (1.2), local expert	EI	Quireza	Oliver	Central Office	x	x	x	x

B.2. Technical reviewer and approver of the verification and certification 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 (TA 1.2)	IR	Sharma	Anjana	Central office
2.	Manager (Technical & Certification)	IR	Chaudhari	Tushar	Central office
3.	Authorizer	IR	Goyal	Mr. Kaushal	Central office

SECTION C. Application of materiality

C.1. Consideration of materiality in planning the verification

No.	Risk that could lead to material errors, omissions or misstatements	Assessment of the risk		Response to the risk in the verification plan and/or sampling plan
		Risk level	Justification	
1.	The data monitoring is done through electronic meters and errors can be perceived during the information transfer from the source to the emission reduction sheet.	High	<p>There is one parameter to measure - the quantity of net electricity supplied to the grid by the project activity: EG_{facility,y} and the same is monitored through energy meters. Errors can be perceived during the information transfer from the source to the emission reduction sheet.</p> <p>There is no project and leakage emission during this monitoring period</p>	The complete dataset for the monitoring parameters was checked on monthly basis and it can be confirmed that the values are consistent with their sources. Other necessary cross-checks have also been considered to ensure plausibility of the data provided in the ER Sheet.

C.2. Consideration of materiality in conducting the verification

The prescribed thresholds for materiality, as per VVS PA, Version 02.

Prescribed range of ERs/annum	500,000+	300,000+ to 500,000	300,000	SSC Pas	MSC PAs
Prescribed Threshold	0.5%	1.0%	2.0%	5.0%	10.0%

The identified/selected materiality threshold for the project activity under current monitoring period is 2.0% as the project activity is a large-scale project activity.

	MR Version (Draft)	MR Version (Final)
Emission reductions	202,597 tCO ₂ e	202,633 tCO ₂ e
Identified Threshold	2.0%	2.0%

The impact of errors observed during verification for each monitoring parameter on the emission reduction calculation is provided below:

Parameter	Population size	Sample size	Type of error identified	Impact on ERs	
				Population size (Qty and %)	Within Threshold
EG _{facility,y}	58	58	See: CAR 02 CAR 03	Not applicable. The whole data was checked.	Yes

The complete dataset (electricity export and import values) for the project activity was checked and it can be confirmed that the values are consistent with their sources. The assessment team confirms that the reported emission reductions are free from material errors, omissions or misstatements.

SECTION D. Means of verification**D.1. Desk/document review**

A desk review is undertaken, involving but not limited to,

- A review of the data and information presented to verify their completeness;
- A review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures;
- An evaluation of data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions.

The list of documents reviewed is included in the section 'Appendix 3' of this report.

D.2. On-site inspection

For the current monitoring period of this project activity, on-site inspection could neither be postponed nor conducted. A detailed justification and compliance against EB guidance and announcements for on-site assessment during Covid-19 times is as presented below:

As per EB announcement, "As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, taking into account the CDM Executive Board announcement to relax mandatory site visits till 31 December 2021, rules of relevant national and local authorities (local to the DOE offices as well as to locality of the site visits), World Health Organization (WHO) recommendations, policies of the DOE and other relevant travel restrictions and guidance (for example, a

requirement to self-isolate upon return from specific countries), **a DOE may postpone site visits for onsite inspections** required by the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities (version 02.0)”.

However, based on discussion with PP, KBS verification team found that on-site inspections for the current monitoring period (2nd monitoring period) could not be postponed due to following reasons:

- ERPA had already been signed by PP on 08/07/2021 with a CERs buyer;
- As per signed ERPA, CER delivery date is stated to be 31/12/2021.

KBS verification team reviewed the above ERPA contract and confirmed that if PP fails to meet the CER delivery deadline as stated above, that would result in breach of ERPA contract and PP has to bear the burden of penalty payments. Based on the documents verified, KBS verification team concluded that on-site inspection for the current monitoring period cannot be postponed.

This is in line with EB guidance for cases where on-site assessments cannot be postponed – *“If the site visits cannot be postponed, a proper justification should be provided by the DOE why the site visits cannot be postponed, including the demonstration of a significant impact of delaying the site visits on the DOE, or project participants or coordinating/ managing entity (e.g. commitment/ timeline as per the validation or verification contract, CER delivery commitment by project participants) reliance on applicable force major provisions in the validation or verification contracts, if needed”*

Since the on-site inspection could not be postponed and have not been conducted due to above stated reasons, KBS, still used alternative measures of verification. This is in line with EB announcement for such cases - *“Where the DOE relies on this temporary measure, it shall describe in the validation/ verification report the alternative means used and justify that they are credible and sufficient for the purpose of validation or verification. In EB 110th meeting, the EB agreed to further extend the period in which DOEs may apply alternative measures of validation/verification to mandatory on-site inspections until 31 December 2021.”*

Alternative measures used by KBS included:

- virtual interviews via internet with PP personnel representatives. Through these virtual interviews, KBS verification team confirmed the relevant information provided in the PDD and monitoring report such as technology information, project implementation, monitoring systems, meter location & calibration details and project location.
- In addition to above, KBS verification team also used standard auditing techniques as referred in section 9.1.3. of VVS-PA, ver 02 to assess project information:
 - Complete desk review of the monitoring report, emission reduction excel sheet and supporting documents was carried out.
 - Information provided in monitoring report and ER excel sheet was cross checked against other sources like electricity sales records etc, to confirm the completeness, correctness and conservativeness of the emission reductions for current monitoring period.
 - As stated above, the project information and its implementation, information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters, QA/QC etc were further cross checked with project representatives during remote interviews carried out virtually.

Given the above, KBS verification team followed all relevant EB guidance and announcements on mandatory on-site inspections for verification and temporary measures announced for such cases during Covid-19 period which are valid till 31/12/2021.

•

Duration of remote inspection: 29/06/2021- 29/06/2021				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	A complete desk review of the MR, registered and revised PDD, Invoices, Power Purchase Agreement, calibration certificates etc. as well as all applicable country legal requirement and supportive evidences have been checked by the verification team	Project site	29/06/2021	Oliver Quireza
2.	Verification team has performed interviews with PP in order to check implementation, project boundary, current situation, evaluation of data management, QA/QC system, monitoring and metering equipment, monitoring procedures, calibration etc. Interview questions were filled as per Verification team interview checklist and also videos were captured.	Project site	29/06/2021	Oliver Quireza
3.	Cross checks between information provided by interviewed personnel (i.e. by checking sources) to ensure that no relevant information has been omitted.	Project site	29/06/2021	Oliver Quireza
4.	Cross-check evaluation, for information received from interviews, under the scope of all information and references provided in MR and supporting documents	Project site	29/06/2021	Oliver Quireza

D.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Espinoza	Selvin	San Antonio	29/06/2021	Energy generation	Oliver Quireza
2.	Aguirre	Edwin	San Antonio	29/06/2021	Substations	Oliver Quireza
3.	Aguirre	Isabel	San Antonio	29/06/2021	MR/CERs	Oliver Quireza
4.	Rubio	Juan Manuel	San Antonio	29/06/2021	Energy Generation	Oliver Quireza
5.	Wagner	Paul	San Antonio	29/06/2021	O&M	Oliver Quireza
6.	Malin	Alexander	Vestas	29/06/2021	O&M	Oliver Quireza

D.4. Sampling approach

No Sampling Approach is used during verification.

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

Areas of verification findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form	--	--	--
Compliance of the project implementation and operation with the registered PDD	--	--	--
Post-registration changes	--	--	--
Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with the methodologies including applicable tools and standardized baselines	--	--	--
Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan	--	CAR 01 CAR 02	--

Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	--	CAR 03	--
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals	CL 01	CAR 04	--
Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits	--	--	--
Global stakeholder consultation	--	--	--
Others (please specify)	--	--	--
Total	1	4	--

SECTION E. Verification findings

E.1. Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form

Means of verification	Verification team checked the monitoring report with "Instructions for filling out the monitoring report form" mentioned as attachment to Monitoring report form (version 08.0).
Findings	No findings raised.
Conclusion	In accordance with §352 of CDM validation and verification standard for project activities, Version 02.0, verification team confirms that final monitoring report is completed using the latest valid version of the applicable monitoring report form.

E.2. Remaining forward action requests from validation and/or previous verifications

Not applicable

E.3. Compliance of the project implementation and operation with the registered project design document

Means of verification	<p>By means of an in-depth review of the PDD in its latest form – as downloaded from the UNFCCC project site - and the checks carried out during the on-site visit an assessment has been carried out whether the project has been implemented and operated in line with the latest approved version of the PDD and whether all physical features of the project are in place. The following has been checked: implemented technology, project equipment as well as monitoring and metering equipment.</p> <p>The following topics were checked:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implemented technology ▪ Project equipment ▪ Monitoring practices ▪ Metering equipment. <p>Further it has been checked if relevant technical equipment of the project activity has been exchanged or modified during the monitoring period and consistent notations of key equipment (meters etc.) in PDD, MR and calculation spreadsheet are applied.</p> <p>Interviews with operational personnel have been carried out, QMS records, maintenance records, instrument specifications were checked in this context. Special focus has further been laid to determine whether a potential phase wise implementation has occurred within the crediting period or any delays with respect to the starting dates have occurred.</p> <p>Further it has been checked whether any observed deviations from the registered project design have been happened.</p> <p>The O&M is contracted with Vestas for 20 years which has 8 person on site to perform the O&M activities.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Project Design Document for CDM project: "San Antonio El Sitio Wind Power Project" version 4.3, dated 04/07/2018 ✓ Monitoring Report 2nd "San Antonio El Sitio Wind Power Project"
------------------------------	---

	✓ VVS ✓ XLS ✓ O&M ✓ unfccc
Findings	--
Conclusion	<p>According to paragraph 354-356 of CDM VVS for project activities (version 02.0), the verification team confirms that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The project activity is implemented as per the revised PDD, the project activity was fully commissioned at the time of remote site visit. b) The actual operation of the proposed CDM project activity is in line to the registered PDD, the power generated from the project activity is supplied to national grid. c) No permanent change in the registered Monitoring Plan from the project activity as described in the revised PDD is requested in the current monitoring period. d) The actual emission reductions are slightly higher than the expected emission reductions for the current monitoring period; such difference has been properly justified by the PP. <p>It has reviewed the revised PDD, including the monitoring plan and the corresponding validation report, the applied monitoring methodology, relevant decisions from the CMP and the CDM EB and previous verifications documents and found that the revised MR for this monitoring period is in line with all the above-mentioned documents.</p>

E.4. Post-registration changes

E.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents¹

No temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan have occurred during this monitoring period. Therefore, this section is not applicable

E.4.2. Corrections

No corrections have occurred during this monitoring period. Therefore, this section is not applicable.

E.4.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

No changes to the start date of the crediting period has occurred during this monitoring period.
 A change to the start date of the CP "from 01/11/2013 to 19/04/2015" was approved on 06/09/2018 with approval PRC-6973-001.

E.4.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan

No Post Registration Changes have occurred during this monitoring period. Therefore, this section is not applicable.

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).

E.4.5. Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents

Before the actual MP a change in the emission factor was approved on 06/09/2018 with approval PRC-6973-001.

E.4.6. Changes to the project design

No Post Registration Changes have occurred during this monitoring period.

Before the actual MP a change in the effective output capacity took place, which was approved on 06/09/2018 with approval PRC-6973-001.

E.4.7. Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities

This section is not applicable.

E.5. Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with applied methodologies, applied standardized baselines, and other applied methodological regulatory documents

Means of verification	The verification team was able to confirm that the monitoring plan contained in registered PDD and MR is almost in accordance with the approved methodology applied for the project activity i.e. ACM0002 Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, version 12.3.
Findings	--
Conclusion	As per para 357 and 358 of CDM VVS for project activity version 02.0, In the opinion of the verification team the monitoring plan of the registered PDD complies with the monitoring requirement of the applied approved methodology ACM0002 Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, version 12.3 in the context of the project activity.

E.6. Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan

E.6.1. Data and parameters fixed ex ante or at renewal of crediting period

Means of verification	As per the revised PDD, the following parameters is listed as fixed ex-ante in the revised PDD:				
		Parameter abbreviation	Description	Value as per initial MR	Unit
	1.	EF _{CO₂,i,y}	CO2 emission factor	Fuel Oil: 75.5 Diesel: 72.6 Coal: 87.3	tCO ₂ /TJ
	2.	EG _{m,y}	Annual Electricity generation of each power plant	Values as per Table 8 of revised PDD	MWh
	Although the EG _{grid,CM,y} - Combined margin CO ₂ emission factor of the national connected grid is not explicitly included in the ex ante parameter section D.1 of the PDD, it is a relevant parameter for the calculation of the ER. The parameter EG _{grid,CM,y} - is assessed by the verification team throughout the MR and specially the correct application for the ER calculation. EG _{grid,CM,y} - 0.6 tCO ₂ e/MWh				
Findings	CAR 01 was raised and successfully closed.				
Conclusion	As per para 360 to 361 of CDM VVS for project activity version 02.0, the assessment team concludes that the ex-ante parameter of the project activity is				

	<p>in accordance with the revised monitoring plan and meets the requirements of the applied monitoring methodology.</p> <p>The verification team confirms that the value used for grid emission factor (Fixed ex-ante for the 1st crediting period) for calculation of emission reduction is consistent with PDD and correctly applied in MR and emission reduction spread sheet and justified.</p>
--	--

E.6.2. Data and parameters monitored

Means of verification	<p>As per registered PDD the only monitoring parameter is the $EG_{\text{facility}, y}$ - Quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project plant/unit to the grid in period y.</p> <p>The verification team confirms through remote on-site verification and from the document review, the actual monitoring system complies with the monitoring plan mentioned in the registered PDD.</p> <p>During the verification, the monitoring parameter of the monitoring plan have been verified with regard to the appropriateness of the verification method; the correctness of the values applied for ER calculation, the accuracy and applied QA/QC measures. The monitoring parameters have been measured / determined without material misstatements and is in line with all applicable standards and relevant requirements.</p> <p>The assessment for the monitoring parameter is given below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Discussion and verification assessment</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Purpose of data</td><td>Baseline Emissions</td></tr> <tr> <td>Calculation of baseline emissions</td><td>According to the registered MP this parameter is calculated by subtracting the project power consumption from the project gross electricity generation.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Measuring/Reading / Recording frequency</td><td> <p>The parameter is measured by electricity meter (main and backup). The bidirectional meters record the electricity.</p> <p>The measuring and recording frequency is in compliance with the revised PDD and the applied methodology.</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td>Data collection (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting)</td><td>The details of roles and responsibilities for the monitoring is provided in the MR. The plant personnel were interviewed during remote auditing and the assessment team confirms that the details as provided are followed at site and are effective reliable for the accounting of emission reductions.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Verified value</td><td>337,722.055 MWh</td></tr> <tr> <td>Cross checks</td><td>The verification team has cross checked the reported values in the ER calculation sheet against the data downloaded from the official source AMM (www.amm.org.gt) and the sales receipts.</td></tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures applied</td><td>The electricity meters have to be calibrated yearly as per PDD. Calibration gaps were identified by the Verification Team.</td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Discussion and verification assessment	Purpose of data	Baseline Emissions	Calculation of baseline emissions	According to the registered MP this parameter is calculated by subtracting the project power consumption from the project gross electricity generation.	Measuring/Reading / Recording frequency	<p>The parameter is measured by electricity meter (main and backup). The bidirectional meters record the electricity.</p> <p>The measuring and recording frequency is in compliance with the revised PDD and the applied methodology.</p>	Data collection (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting)	The details of roles and responsibilities for the monitoring is provided in the MR. The plant personnel were interviewed during remote auditing and the assessment team confirms that the details as provided are followed at site and are effective reliable for the accounting of emission reductions.	Verified value	337,722.055 MWh	Cross checks	The verification team has cross checked the reported values in the ER calculation sheet against the data downloaded from the official source AMM (www.amm.org.gt) and the sales receipts.	QA/QC procedures applied	The electricity meters have to be calibrated yearly as per PDD. Calibration gaps were identified by the Verification Team.
	Discussion and verification assessment																
Purpose of data	Baseline Emissions																
Calculation of baseline emissions	According to the registered MP this parameter is calculated by subtracting the project power consumption from the project gross electricity generation.																
Measuring/Reading / Recording frequency	<p>The parameter is measured by electricity meter (main and backup). The bidirectional meters record the electricity.</p> <p>The measuring and recording frequency is in compliance with the revised PDD and the applied methodology.</p>																
Data collection (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting)	The details of roles and responsibilities for the monitoring is provided in the MR. The plant personnel were interviewed during remote auditing and the assessment team confirms that the details as provided are followed at site and are effective reliable for the accounting of emission reductions.																
Verified value	337,722.055 MWh																
Cross checks	The verification team has cross checked the reported values in the ER calculation sheet against the data downloaded from the official source AMM (www.amm.org.gt) and the sales receipts.																
QA/QC procedures applied	The electricity meters have to be calibrated yearly as per PDD. Calibration gaps were identified by the Verification Team.																
Findings	CAR 02, CAR 03 and CAR 04 were raised and successfully closed																
Conclusion	As per para 360 to 361 of CDM VVS for project activity version 02.0, The assessment team concludes that the monitoring of the project activity is being carried out in accordance with the revised monitoring plan and meets the requirements of the applied monitoring methodology. The adequacy and compliance of the revised monitoring plan in the MR can be concluded to be																

	conforming. The flow of the information from the point of generation up to reporting has been reviewed and found to be correct and appropriate meeting the requirements of the applied methodology.
--	---

E.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan

Means of verification	No sampling plan applied for the project activity. Therefore, this section is not applicable.
Findings	-
Conclusion	Not applicable.

E.7. Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments

Means of verification	Verification team has checked whether the calibration of the measuring equipment that has an impact on the claimed GHG emission reductions is conducted by the PP at a frequency specified in the monitoring plan.		
	The calibration details of the monitoring equipment corresponding to monitoring parameter is given in the below table:		
	EG _{facility, y}		
	Meter	Main Meter	Back up Meter
	Manufacturer	Schneider Electric	Schneider Electric
	Model	ION 8650	ION 8650
	Accuracy class	0.2	0.2
	Serial No.	MW-1505A646-02	MW-1505A652-02
	Calibration Frequency	Yearly	Yearly
	Calibration Dates	27/03/2018 04/02/2019 05/02/2020	27/03/2018 04/02/2019 05/02/2020
Calibration Gap	From: 04/02/2020 To: 05/02/2020	From: 04/02/2020 To: 05/02/2020	
	Calibration frequency: Calibration of the meters shall be done once a year in agreement the Norm 14 (14.12, page 9) of the Wholesale Market Administrator, which is in line with the registered PDD and accepted to the verification team.		
	The Calibration performance was checked from the calibration certificates and found that the meters were within the respective accuracy level as verified from the calibration results.		
	The calibration validity of the energy meters during this monitoring period were verified from the corresponding calibration certificates. Some delays occurred in the calibration of the meters were observed. This was mentioned below in each set of calibration table.		
Findings	CAR 03 was raised and successfully closed.		
Conclusion	As per para 365 to 370 of CDM VVS for project activity version 02.0, the Verification team confirms that the calibration frequency is in line with the monitoring plan mentioned in the revised PDD.		

E.8. Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals

E.8.1. Calculation of baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	The calculation applied formulae and the method for calculation of baseline emissions are in accordance with the revised PDD and are in line with the requirements of the applied methodology. The formulae and the methods referred
------------------------------	--

	<p>in the MR and the emission reduction calculation spread sheet for estimation of emission reduction complies with the corresponding formulae and methods in the revised PDD.</p> <p>The ex-ante and validated fixed values are taken into account for the calculation of baseline emissions.</p> <p>The verification team has checked all the monthly invoices applicable for the monitoring period and found the monitoring parameters are monitored and recorded as per the monitoring plan in the revised PDD. The verification team has crosschecked the CER sheet and monitoring report data with the monthly invoices and found all the input values are matching.</p> <p>As per revised PDD the net electricity supplied to the grid is calculates as:</p> $EG_{facility,y} = EG_{230kV,y} - EC_{230kV,y}$ <p>Where:</p> <p>$EG_{230kV,y}$ = Gross electricity delivered to the grid (as measured by the 230 kV meter) in period y</p> <p>$EC_{230kV,y}$ = Electricity consumption from the grid (as measured by the 230 kV meter) in period y.</p> <p>And:</p> $BE_y = EG_{PJ,y} * EF_{grid,CM,y}$ <p>Where:</p> <p>BE_y = Baseline emission reductions in period y (tCO₂e/yr)</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 period y (MWh/yr)</p> <p>$EF_{grid,CM,y}$ = Combined margin CO₂ emission factor for grid connected power generation in period y calculated using the latest version of the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system (version 06.0)" (tCO₂/MWh)</p> <p>As per registered PDD, the baseline emissions (BE_y) by the project activity during the monitoring period is:</p> <p>$BE_y = EG_{PJ,y} \times EF_{grid, CM,y}$</p> <p>$EG_{PJ,y} = 337,722.055 \text{ MWh}$</p> <p>Here,</p> <p>$EF_{grid,y} = 0.6 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/MWh}$</p> <p>$BE_y = 202,633 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/year (rounded down)}$</p> <p>Hence, baseline emission for this monitoring period is 202,633 tCO₂e (Rounded down)</p>
Findings	CAR 04 was raised and successfully closed.
Conclusion	<p>As per para 372 and 373 of CDM VVS for project activity version 02.0, Verification team concludes that the calculation provided in the monitoring report, and emission reduction spread sheet are complete and reflect all the requirements of the monitoring plan and:</p> <p>a) All the monitored data pertaining to baseline calculation as required by the revised monitoring plan was available to PP, the same has been verified by the verification team.</p> <p>b) All the formula used for the baseline, was in line to the revised monitored plan.</p>

E.8.2. Calculation of project GHG emissions or actual net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	No project emissions are associated with project activity.
Findings	--
Conclusion	Not Applicable

E.8.3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions

Means of verification	Not applicable in accordance with applied methodology and revised PDD.
Findings	--
Conclusion	Not Applicable

E.8.4. Summary calculation of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	<p>As per revised PDD, the emission reductions ER_y by the project activity during the monitoring period are calculated as :</p> $ER = BE_y - PE_y - LE_y$ <p>Where:</p> <p>ER = Emission reductions in period y (tCO₂e/yr)</p> <p>BE_y = Baseline emission reductions in period y (tCO₂e/yr)</p> <p>PE_y = Project emission reductions in period y (tCO₂e/yr)</p> <p>LE_y = Leakage emission reductions in period y (tCO₂e/yr)</p> <p>As PE_y and LE_y are considered 0 as per revised PDD then:</p> <p>$ER_y = BE_y$</p> <p>$ER_y = 202,633$ tCO₂e</p> <p>The calculation provided in the ER sheet and MR was assessed appropriate by the verification team.</p> <p>The verification team confirms that a complete set of data for this monitoring period is available to verify the emission reduction calculation, and the same was found in accordance with the revised PDD.</p> <p>No lack of evidence and missing data were detected during this monitoring period. The verification team confirms that the emission reductions are real and measurable.</p> <p>No reporting risks have been identified for the data reported.</p> <p>All the monitored data are archived in electronic form. The data will be kept for the whole crediting period and 2 years after the last crediting period thereby meeting the requirement of the PDD. The verification team has checked and confirms that all the meters are calibrated. Thus, concludes no material risks in the claimed emission reduction for the applied period.</p>
Findings	No finding has been raised
Conclusion	<p>As per para 372 and 373 of CDM VVS for project activity version 02.0, Verification team concludes that the calculation provided in the monitoring report, and emission reduction spread sheet are complete and reflect all the requirements of the monitoring plan and:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All the formula used for the baseline, leakage and project emissions were in line to the revised monitored plan. The ex-ante emission factors correctly sourced from the revised PDD and was found to be appropriate and justified.

E.8.5. Comparison of actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks with estimates in registered PDD

Means of verification	The MR includes a comparison of the calculated actual emission reductions with the ex-ante calculated values in the revised PDD.				
	<table> <tr> <td>Estimated Reduction as per Registered/Approved/revised PDD:</td><td>Emission as per</td><td>197,125 tCO₂e</td></tr> </table>	Estimated Reduction as per Registered/Approved/revised PDD:	Emission as per	197,125 tCO ₂ e	
Estimated Reduction as per Registered/Approved/revised PDD:	Emission as per	197,125 tCO ₂ e			

	Actual Reduction for the Monitoring Period	Emission for the	202,633 tCO ₂ e
	In summary, verification team confirms that the actual emission reduction is lower than the estimate of the revised PDD for the current monitoring period.		
Findings	No finding has been raised.		
Conclusion	Verification team confirms that the comparison for the estimated and actual emission reduction for the monitoring period is correctly calculated and reported.		

E.8.6. Remarks on difference from estimated value in registered PDD

Means of verification	The Verification team reviewed the study Forecasted P50 Net Capacity Factor which was used to determine the electricity generation at validation stage; furthermore the VT reviewed the Vestas monthly reports to confirm that the project was operated and maintained as expected and to confirm that the reason of the electricity production above the expectations as per PDD. The VT confirms that the explanation provided by the PP in section E.6 of the MR is correct and properly supported by actual evidence.
Findings	CL 01 was raised and successfully closed
Conclusion	The actual ERs are 2.79% higher than the ex ante estimation.

E.8.7. Actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks during the first commitment period and the period from 1 January 2013 onwards

Means of verification	The actual ER achieved during the current monitoring period are 202,633 tCO ₂ e CERs verified during current monitoring period.
Findings	No finding has been raised
Conclusion	The actual ER achieved during the current monitoring period are correct and have been calculated as per foreseen in the revised PDD.

E.9. Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits

Means of verification	Not reported by PP.
Findings	Refer above.
Conclusion	Refer above.

E.10. Global stakeholder consultation

Means of verification	The current monitoring period is second monitoring period and the not first monitoring period of the crediting period. Thus, this is not applicable for the project activity. .
Findings	No finding has been raised.
Conclusion	As per para 187 of CDM VVS for project activity version 02.0, verification team concludes that since the current monitoring period is second monitoring period of the crediting period thus, global stakeholder consultation is not applicable for the same.

SECTION F. Internal quality control

The draft verification report prepared by team leader is reviewed by an independent technical reviewer (having competence of relevant technical area himself/herself or through an independent technical area expert) to confirm the internal procedures established by KBS are duly followed and the verification report/opinion is reached in an objective manner and complies with the applicable CDM requirements.

The independent technical reviewer may approve or reject the draft verification report. The findings may be identified even at this stage, which needs to be satisfactorily resolved, before the request for issuance is submitted to UNFCCC. The final decision is taken by the Manager Technical and Certification. The technical reviewer and Manager T&C can be same person.

The final decision is authorized by Managing Director, KBS once the report is approved by the Manager T&C.

SECTION G. Verification opinion

The verification team confirms that the the evidence is of sufficient quantity, appropriate quality and reliable. The reported values, notation, units and sources in the monitoring report for all the monitoring parameters have been cross checked with the emission reduction sheet and monitoring report. During the course of verification and remote audit, the data submitted by PP was cross verified with the values mentioned in the emission reduction sheet and monitoring report. The procedure for data monitoring, recording, transfer and compilation was also verified and found in compliance with the monitoring plan as mentioned in the revised PDD.

Evidences (Documents/interview/remote audit) referred for verification of individual monitoring parameter and fixed parameters are defined in section E.6 above. It is confirmed by the assessment team that the reported emission reductions have been conservatively calculated. A list of referred documents for verification is also included in Appendix 3 of this report.

Based on the information seen and evaluated we confirm that the implementation of the project has resulted in 202,633 tCO₂e emission reductions during period from 01/08/2018 – 31/12/2020

SECTION H. Certification statement

KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd. has been contracted by San Antonio Eólico San Antonio El Sitio, S.A. to undertake independent verification and certification for the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions reported from the project activity San Antonio El Sitio Wind Power Project, UNFCCC Ref. No. 6973 for the 2nd monitoring period in the Monitoring Report Version 1 (first submission) dated 02/06/2021.

The verification is based on the validated and revised PDD and the monitoring report for this project. Our verification approach was based on the requirements as defined under the Kyoto Protocol, Marrakech accord, as well as those defined by the CDM Executive Board.

The management of the San Antonio Eólico San Antonio El Sitio, S.A. is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions on the basis set out within the project Final Monitoring Report, version 3.1 dated 09/08/2021. The calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project is the responsibility of the management of San Antonio Eólico San Antonio El Sitio, S.A. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures are in accordance with the last version of the Monitoring Report.

It is our responsibility to express an independent GHG verification opinion on the GHG emissions and on the calculation of GHG emission reductions from the project for the verified monitoring period based on the reported emission reductions in the Final Monitoring Report for the same period.

Based on an understanding of the risks associated with reporting GHG emissions data and the controls in place to mitigate these, KBS planned and performed our work to obtain the information and explanations that we considered necessary to provide sufficient evidence for us to give reasonable assurance that this reported amount of GHG emission reductions for the period is fairly stated.

KBS confirms the following;

Reporting period: From 01/08/2018 – 31/12/2020

Verified emission in the above reporting period:

	Amount	Unit
Baseline emissions (BE)	202,633	tCO ₂ e
Project emissions (PE)	0	tCO ₂ e
Leakage emissions (LE)	0	tCO ₂ e
Total ERs (01/08/2018 – 31/12/2020)	202,633	tCO ₂ e

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
AC	Alternating Current
AMM	Wholesale Market Administrator
CL	Clarification Request
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO _{2eq}	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CL	Clarification Request
DC	Direct Current
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
DVerR/DVR	Draft Verification Report
ER	Emission Reduction
ERPA	Emission Reduction Purchase Agreement
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
IM	Interview Memo
MP	Monitoring Plan
MR	Monitoring Report
PA	Project Activity
PCP	Project Cycle Procedure
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
PRC	Post Registration Change
PS	Project Standard
QA/QC	Quality Assurance / Quality Control
SCADA	Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard
VT	Verification Team
XLS	Emission Reduction Calculation Spread Sheet

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

Personnel Name:		Oliver Quireza Campos	
Qualified to work as:			
Team Leader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Technical Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Validator/Verifier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial Expert	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Reviewer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Expert (Mexico)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Area(s) of Technical Expertise			
Sectoral Scope	Technical Area		
SS: 01: Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	TA 1.1		
	TA 1.2		
SS 3: Energy demand	TA 3.1		
SS 5: Chemical industry	TA 5.1.		
SS 7: Transport	TA 7.1.		
SS 12: Solvents use	TA 12.1.		
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1		
	TA 13.2		
SS 14: Afforestation and reforestation	TA 14.1.		
Approved by (Manager C & T)	Sanjay Kandari		
Approval date:	04/02/2021		

Personnel Name:		Anjana Sharma	
Qualified to work as:			
Team Leader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Technical Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Validator/Verifier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial Expert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Technical Reviewer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Expert (India)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Area(s) of Technical Expertise			
Sectoral Scope	Technical Area		
SS: 01: Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation from fossil fuels and biomass including thermal electricity from solar		
	TA 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energysources		
SS 3: Energy demand	TA 3.1. Energy Demand		
SS 5: Chemical industry	TA 5.1 Chemical industry		
SS 12: Solvents use	TA 12.1 Chemical industry		
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1 Waste Handling and Disposal		
	TA 13.2 Manure		
Approved by (Manager C & T)	Shikha Sharma		
Approval date:	05/08/2021		

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1.	UNFCCC	ACM0002 ver. 12.3, "Consolidated baseline methodology: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources"	https://cdm.unfccc.int/met/hodologies/DB/XP2LKUS/A61DKUQC0PIWPGWDN/8ED5PG	Other
2.	IPCC	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book	www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp	Other
3.	UNFCCC	Kyoto Protocol (1997)	http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/items/2830.php	Other
4.	UNFCCC	Decision 3/CMP. 1 (Marrakesh – Accords)	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/COPMOP/index.html	Other
5.	UNFCCC	Monitoring Report Form (CDM-MR-FORM), Version 08.0	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/PDDs_Forms/index.html	Other
6.	UNFCCC	Revised Project Design Document (PDD) for CDM project: "San Antonio El Sitio Wind Power Project" version 4.3, dated 04/07/2018	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1344719367.74/view	Other
7.	UNFCCC	CDM Project Standard version 2.0	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	Other
8.	PP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Validation Report for San Antonio El Sitio Wind Power Project, TUV NORD CERT, 06/08/2012 ✓ Validation report for PRC for "San Antonio El Sitio Wind Power Project", IGAI Technology Center SA, version 03, dated 17/07/2018 	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1344719367.74/view	Other
9.	Several	Documents of previous verifications (Monitoring report, verification report, ER calculation sheet)	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1344719367.74/view	Other
10.	UNFCCC	CDM Validation and Verification Standard (Version 2.0)	https://cdm.unfccc.int/filestore/e/x/t/extfile-20170502114945594-reg_stan06.pdf/reg_stan06.pdf?t=cHF8cGk1cmtwfDA7k1b0vxU8LN12rdu1RM-Eh	Other
11.	UNFCCC	Glossary "CDM terms" (version 10.0)	https://cdm.unfccc.int/filestore/e/x/t/extfile-20170831165430180-Glos_CDMv9_1.pdf/Glos_CDMv9_1.pdf?t=THR8cDB1cjhjfDA3nY9J2NxQKB7POsLRQrM-	Other
12.	PP	Monitoring Report - "San Antonio El Sitio Wind Power Project", versions: -version 1.0, 02/06/2021 -version 2.0, 14/07/2021 -version 3.0, 05/08/2021	N/A	PP

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
		-version 3.1, 09/08/2021		
13.	PP	XLS 2021 ER CAM San Antonio v02	N/A	PP
14.	GAUSS	Calibration Certificates covering the monitoring period, issued by Gauss Nacional de Instaladores SA	N/A	PP
15.	PP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Annual Generation Reports XLS, by AMM, 2018, 2019, 2020 ✓ Annual Statistical Reports AMM, 2018, 2019, 2020 ✓ Sales receipts covering the MP 2018, 2019, 2020 	www.amm.org.gt	PP
16.	VESTAS	VESTAS monthly Reports - San Antonio El Sitio Wind Power Project, 2018, 2019, 2020	N/A	PP
17.	VESTAS	General specifications – V112-3.0 MW 50/60 Hz – Code: 0011-9181 V05, 2011/08/16.	N/A	PP
18.	AMM	Approvals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Operation approval 22/04/2015, AMM, San Antonio El Sitio SA ✓ Power uprate contract between Eolica San Antonio el Sitio SA and Wind Turbine Investments SA de CV, 06/12/2016 ✓ EIA - San Antonio El Sitio Wind Power, Grupo NOA, 14/08/2013 ✓ Commissioning, 10/03/2015, Eolico San Antonio El Sitio SA, by Vestas WGT Mexico SA de CV 	N/A	PP
19.	DEOCSA DEORSA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ PPA - Eolica San Antonio El Sitio SA and Distribuidora de electricidad de Occidente SA, 26/02/2013 ✓ PPA - Eolica San Antonio El Sitio SA and Distribuidora de electricidad de Oriente SA, 26/02/2013 	N/A	PP
20.	PP	Single-line diagram of the electric installation of the wind farm.	N/A	PP
21.	AMM	National Norm NCC-14 (Commercial Coordination Norm No.14) approved by Resolution No. 307-02 from the AMM on 2000/10/30.	N/A	PP
22.	PP	ERPA between buyer (Confidential) and Eolica San Antonio El Sitio S.A., 08/07/2021	N/A	PP

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

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

FAR ID	xx	Section no.	E.2	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR				
<i>Not applicable</i>				
Project participant response				Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by project participant				
DOE assessment				Date: DD/MM/YYYY

Table 2. CL from this verification

CL ID	01	Section no.	E.6	Date: 29/06/2021
Description of CL				
It is not clear whether the expected plant availability was 97% and the actual availability was above such 97%. Please indicate in which report that can be evidenced.				
Project participant response				Date: 15/07/2021
97% plant availability is based on operator guarantee for project generation. This can be viewed on the Vestas monthly generation reports in monthly availability with a comparison of performance and guarantee.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Annex: Vestas Reports				
DOE assessment				Date: 29/07/2021
As per Vestas operation reports provided by the PP the reported electricity generation is in line with the actual generation reports in the official site of the AMM. An increase of 2.79% in the CERs generation was achieved. Finding is closed.				

Table 3. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	01	Section no.	D.1	Date: 29/06/2021
Description of CAR				
Parameters fixed ex ante don't match the parameters in PDD. Parameter EGm,y is missing and other 2 parameters are not included in PDD.				
Project participant response				Date: 15/07/2021
Parameters were modified to reflect PDD.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Monitoring report version 2				
DOE assessment				Date: 29/07/2021
The reported parameters are in line with the PDD. Finding is closed.				

CAR ID	02	Section no.	D.2	Date: 29/06/2021
Description of CAR				
Parameter EGfacility, y the provided electricity value is different than the value in the spreadsheets				
Project participant response				Date: 15/07/2021
Parameter has been corrected				

Documentation provided by project participant	
Monitoring report version 2	
DOE assessment	Date: 29/07/2021
The reported EGfacility,y value is in line with the actual monitored data as per Vestas and AMM reports. Finding is closed.	

CAR ID	03	Section no.	D.2	Date: 29/06/2021
Description of CAR				
1. Parameter EGfacility, y - There is a calibration gap from 04/02/2020 to 05/02/2020 that has not been reported.				
2. Furthermore, the electricity values have to be penalized with the error of the meter so that the measured electricity is conservative. The application of the error has to be traceable though out the calculation.				
Project participant response				Date: 15/07/2021
Calibration gap has been noted in Monitoring report and error of the meter has been used to penalize electricity values.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
2021 ER CDM San Antonio v02 & Monitoring report version 2				
DOE assessment				Date: 29/07/2021
The gap has been properly reported in the spreadsheet /monitoring data/ and the maximum permissible error of the meter has been applied to penalize the electricity measurement so that the net electricity generation is conservative. The VT reviewed that the electricity meter actual error identified in the calibration certificate is not higher than the maximum permissible error. Finding is closed.				

CAR ID	04	Section no.	ER sheet	Date: 29/06/2021
Description of CAR				
It is not traceable where the electricity consumption EC230kV,y come from in the ER. Original data has to be provided.				
Project participant response				Date: 15/07/2021
Original data has been provided and linked to ER calculations				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Annex: Generation Reports & 2021 ER CDM San Antonio v02				
DOE assessment				Date: 29/07/2021
The electricity consumption has properly been reported and is traceable through the original data and ER calculation sheets. Finding is closed.				

Table 4. FAR from this verification

FAR ID	xx	Section No.		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR				
<i>Not applicable</i>				
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>
04.0	6 April 2021	Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reflect the “Clarification: Regulatory requirements under temporary measures for post-2020 cases” (CDM-EB109-A01-CLAR).
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);• Make structural and editorial improvements.
02.1	11 January 2018	Editorial revision to correct the numbering of appendices in the instructions.
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: Issuance Keywords: project activities, verifying and certifying		