



**Verification and certification report form for  
CDM project activities  
(Version 03.0)**

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

**BASIC INFORMATION**

<b>Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity</b>	60 MW Solar PV – Monte Plata UNFCCC ID: 8530
<b>Scale of the project activity</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Large-scale <input type="checkbox"/> Small-scale
<b>Version number of the verification and certification report</b>	1.0
<b>Completion date of the verification and certification report</b>	23/08/2019
<b>Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> Monitoring Period 01/01/2017 – 31/12/2018 (including both days)
<b>Version number of the monitoring report to which this report applies</b>	3.0
<b>Crediting period of the project activity corresponding to this monitoring period</b>	10-year fixed crediting period from 31/05/2015 to 30/05/2025 (including both days)
<b>Project participants</b>	Electronic J.R.C., S.R.L. (Private Entity) Foundation myclimate – The Climate Protection Partnership (Private Entity) Uno Wind Service GmbH (Private Entity)
<b>Host Party</b>	Dominican Republic
<b>Applied methodologies and standardized baselines</b>	CDM Methodology: ACM0002 “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” version 13
<b>Mandatory sectoral scopes</b>	Scope: 1 / Technical Area: 1.2
<b>Conditional sectoral scopes, if applicable</b>	N/A
<b>Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring duration in the registered PDD</b>	87,763 t CO <sub>2e</sub>
<b>Certified amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring period</b>	62,485 t CO <sub>2e</sub>
<b>Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE</b>	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH; E-0022
<b>Name, position and signature of the approver of the verification and certification report</b>	

	<p>Kunal Rami Final Approver</p>
--	--------------------------------------

## SECTION A. Executive summary

Electronic J.R.C., S.R.L. (hereafter referred as “Electronic”) has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program to carry out the 2<sup>nd</sup> periodic verification of the project:

“60MW Solar PV - Monte Plata”

with regard to the relevant requirements for CDM project activities.

This verification covers the period as indicated on the title page.

The project reduces GHG emissions due to the use of solar power to generate renewable electricity to be delivered to the national grid of Dominican Republic which is mainly fossil fuel dominated.

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

**Table A-1:** Project Location

No.	Project Location
Host Country	Dominican Republic
Region:	Cruce de Boronga Sector
Project location address:	No. 41, 41 - Sub – 24, 41 – Sub - 44, D.C No 64 – B, all of the part of the Distrito Catastral. No. 64
Latitude:	Monte Plata Original: 18°49'.0919"N Monte Plata Addition: 18°49'.28.10"N
Longitude:	Monte Plata Original: 69 47'22.66"O Monte Plata Addition: 69 47'22.66"O

Basic technical details of the project are summarized in table A-2. So far only phase 1 is fully implemented.

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

Parameter	Unit	Value
Total Power	MW	30 Original 30 Addition 60 Total
PV modules area	m <sup>2</sup>	221,100 Original 231,150 Addition 452,250 Total
Project area	m <sup>2</sup>	472,212.5 Original 608,567.06 Addition 1,080,779.56 Total
Rated Power per PV module	W	245-260
No. of PV modules	-	132,000 Original 138,000 Addition
No. of Inverters	-	2,000

As a result of this verification, the verifier confirms that:

- all operations of the project are implemented and installed as planned and described in the validated project design document.
- the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied approved CDM methodology,
- the installed equipment essential for measuring parameters required for calculating emission reductions are calibrated appropriately.
- the monitoring system is in place and functional. The project has generated GHG emission reductions.

As the result of this periodic verification, the verifier confirms that the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements in a conservative and appropriate manner.

## 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 review	On-site inspection	Interview(s)	Verification findings
1.	Team Leader	EI	Quireza	Oliver	TN México	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	IR	Winter	Stefan	TÜV NORD CERT
2.	Approver*	IR	Rami	Kunal	TÜV NORD CERT

## SECTION C. Application of materiality

In order to ensure a complete, transparent and timely execution of the verification task the team leader has planned the complete sequence of events necessary to arrive at a substantiated final verification opinion.

Various tools have been established in order to ensure an effective verification planning.

### Materiality Threshold

The verification is based on the materiality threshold identified in table C-1 below:

**Table C-1:** Applied Materiality Threshold

	Threshold	Related to
<input type="checkbox"/>	0.5 %	Emission reductions or removals for registered CDM project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal equal to or more than 500,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per year <sup>1</sup> ;
<input type="checkbox"/>	1 %	Emission reductions or removals for registered CDM project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal of between 300,000 and 500,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per year;
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 %	Emission reductions or removals for registered large-scale CDM project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal of 300,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per year or less;

<sup>1</sup> A year refers to a period of 12 consecutive months.

\* Approver as of 15.10.2019

	Threshold	Related to
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 %	Emission reductions or removals for registered small-scale CDM project activities other than registered CDM project activities covered under next category below;
<input type="checkbox"/>	10 %	Emission reductions or removals for the type of registered CDM project activities referred to in decision 3/CMP.6, paragraph 38 (referred to as microscale project activities).

### Strategic Analysis

At the beginning of the verification the verification team leader has assessed the nature, scale and complexity of the verification tasks by carrying out a strategic analysis of all activities relevant to the project activity. The team leader has collected and reviewed the information relevant to assess that the designated verification team is sufficiently competent to carry out the verification and to ensure that it is able to conduct the necessary risk analysis.

### Risk analysis and detailed audit testing planning

For the identification and assessment of potential reporting risks and to determine the necessary detailed audit testing procedures for residual risk areas the following table is used.

#### **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.	Overlook relevant differences when cross checking electricity data from main meter and invoices	Low	Even though there is procedures in place for all metering and cross checking processes the personnel could overlook important differences when performing the electricity reports.	Interview with personnel as well as demonstration of how the cross check is done. Cross check electricity data from both meters directly by the VT.
2.	Omissions and misstatements in data transfer from SCADA into digital Excel ER spreadsheet	Low	Ineffective quality control of data transfer due to unclear QA/QC procedure	Check QM procedure/manual. PP may demonstrate how to transfer data and how this is crosschecked. Conduct interview with related personnel whether procedure is actually conducted but not adequately described.
3.	Missing data due to failure of measurement equipment	Low	The monitoring plan defines emergency procedures in case a meter fails. Besides back-up meters are either installed or available onsite for fast exchange.	Check if related meters are installed as per monitoring plan. Check if emergency procedure is known across related personnel via interviews. Check back-up meters on correct calibration.

#### **C.2. Consideration of materiality in conducting the verification**

Based on the verification planning the verification has been carried out. The concept of materiality has been considered. A breakdown of the chosen approaches is included in the following table.

Parameter	Approach*	Errors*	Corrected	Remaining verification risk
-----------	-----------	---------	-----------	-----------------------------

		<b>detected</b>		
EG <sub>Facility,y</sub>	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material
Aggregate	0%			Materiality threshold not exceeded

\*) incl. omissions and misstatements

+) Verification Approaches:

CDC: Complete data check of data including all data aggregation steps

NDC: Non-complete data check – omissions not material

SPL: Sampling approach (all data available)

ASP: Acceptance Sampling

COM: Data check at higher data aggregation levels and sampling at original data levels

The verification was basically carried out as per the verification plan. However, based on the actual situation on-site and the errors, omissions and misstatements identified during the verification minor deviations from the original plan occurred. However, due to the insignificance no major revision of the overall plan was required. Esp. there was no need for significant modification of the sampling approaches or for additional / less locations to be visited during the on-site.

## SECTION D. Means of verification

### D.1. Desk/document review

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

- the last revision of the PDD including the monitoring plan<sup>/PDD/</sup>,
- the last revision of the validation report<sup>/VAL/</sup>,
- documentation of previous verifications<sup>/VER/</sup>
- the monitoring report, including the claimed emission reductions for the project<sup>/MR/</sup>,
- the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet<sup>/XLS/</sup>.

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

Duration of on-site inspection: 04/06/2019 to 06/06/2019				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	Kick off meeting	Main offices Monte Plata	04/06/2019	Oliver Quireza
2.	Viewing of relevant site points	Metering equipment room, substation, control room	04/06/2019	Oliver Quireza
3.	Evidence assessment	Main offices Santo Domingo	04-05/06/2019	Oliver Quireza
4.	Preparation of the DVR	Main offices Santo Domingo	05/06/2019	Oliver Quireza
5.	Findings summary to the client	Main offices Santo Domingo	06/06/2019	Oliver Quireza
6.	Closing meeting	Main offices Santo Domingo	06/06/2019	Oliver Quireza

### D.2. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1	Juberes	Jorge	MIMARENA	04/06/2019	Local government	Oliver Quireza
2	Ramon	Edison	Soventix	04/06/2019	Operation	Oliver Quireza
3	De la Cruz	Gerson	Soventix	04/06/2019	Operation	Oliver Quireza
4	Del Rosario	Zaida	Soventix	05/06/2019	HR	Oliver Quireza
5	Ibarra	Santo	UPS	04/06/2019	Security	Oliver Quireza
6	Cruz	Luis Alberto	Soventix	04/06/2019	Operation	Oliver Quireza
7	Birbuet	Carlos	Soventix	04-06/06/2019	CDM	Oliver Quireza
8	Feliz	Juan Carlos	Soventix	04-05/06/2019	Operation	Oliver Quireza

**D.3. Sampling approach****D.4.1 Sampling during monitoring**

<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 <sup>1)</sup>	Sampling Type <sup>2)</sup>	Population	Sample Size

<sup>1)</sup> Sampling Approaches:

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

<sup>2)</sup> Sampling Types:

PS: Parameter Sampling

**D.4.2 Sampling approaches during verification**

<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 <sup>1)</sup>	Sampling Type <sup>2)</sup>	Population	Sample Size

<sup>1)</sup> Sampling Approaches:

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

<sup>2)</sup> Sampling Types:

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

**D.4. 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	-	1	-
Post-registration changes	-	1	-
Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with the methodologies including applicable tools and standardized baselines	-	-	-
Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan	-	-	-
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for	-	-	-

measuring instruments			
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals	-	1	-
Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits	-	-	-
Global stakeholder consultation	-	-	-
Others (please specify)	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>3</b>	-

## SECTION E. Verification findings

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>A draft monitoring report was submitted to the verification team by the project participants. The DOE has made this report publicly available prior to the start of the verification activities. No comments were received.</p> <p>By means of the UNFCCC website it has been checked whether the latest applicable MR template CDM-MR-FORM has been used.</p> <p>Further it has been checked whether the latest instructions for filling out the MR 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"> <li>• /MR/</li> <li>• /MRT/</li> <li>• /unfccc/</li> </ul>		
<b>Findings</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The latest reporting template CDM-MR-FORM as listed on the UNFCCC website has been used for the Monitoring Report to be uploaded.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The latest instructions for filling out the MR have been followed. No adverse finding has been identified in the course of this verification.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The respective requirements have widely been complied with; however; the following issues needed to be addressed in this context: CAR 04: the latest version of the MR has not been used.	
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.	
		The latest version of the MR has been used and The latest instructions for filling out the MR have been followed. No adverse finding has been identified in the course of this verification	

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

During the validation the validating DOE might have raised issues that could not be closed or resolved during the validation stage. For this purpose FARs might have been raised. Likewise FARs might have been raised in the course of previous verifications.

In the course of this verification the latest version of the PDD <sup>/PDD/</sup> and the previous verification report <sup>/VER/</sup>, where applicable, have been checked in order to identify any remaining forward action requests. For the current monitoring period the following applies:

#### (i) Open issues from validation:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There were no open issues which have been addressed in the latest version of the validation report.
<input type="checkbox"/>	All open issues from the validation have been appropriately addressed in the context of previous verifications.
<input type="checkbox"/>	All issues related to the validation have been appropriately addressed in the course of the current monitoring period (for details please refer to appendix 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	The following issues related to the validation have <b>not</b> yet been appropriately addressed (for details please refer to appendix 4):
	- N/A



(ii) Open issues from previous verifications:

<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A – as this is the first monitoring period for this CDM project activity.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There were no open issues which have been addressed in the previous verification report
<input type="checkbox"/>	All issues related to the previous verification have been appropriately addressed in the course of the current monitoring period (for details please refer to appendix 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	The following issues related to the previous verification have <b>not</b> yet been appropriately addressed (for details please refer to appendix 4):
	N/A

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	<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>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.</p> <p>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, no deviations from the registered project design occurred.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• /PDD/</li> <li>• /MR/</li> <li>• /VVS/</li> <li>• /XLS/</li> <li>• /PROC/</li> <li>• /unfccc/</li> </ul>	
<b>Findings</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project has been implemented as described in the latest version of the PDD as well as in section B.1 of the monitoring report. No deviations thereof have been identified in the course of this verification.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The following deviations from the registered / approved project design and or the project description in the MR have been identified in the course of this verification (for further details please refer to section E.4): - N/A
	<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs have been raised:
	<i>In case of phased implementation:</i>	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The phased implementation has correctly and in sufficient detail been described in the latest version of the PDD.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The description in section B.1 of the MR differs in content or the level of detail from the latest version of the PDD. However, the description in the MR is correct and reflects the situation during the site inspection.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project description in the MR is not deemed sufficient. The detailed implementation timeline is as follows:

		CAR 01: As per site visit the implementation of phase 2 is delayed by around one year, nonetheless such situation is not described in section B.1 of the MR
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 implementation of the original project (phase 1) has been fully implemented as per registered PDD version 6, but the implementation of phase II of the project is delayed for around one year. Nonetheless, it is out of the PP control as it is due to the late response from the government. The concession request to get approval and proceed with the PPA signing for the 2 <sup>nd</sup> phase was submitted on 17/03/2017, which is in line with the construction start of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> phase expected for end of 2017 per PDD, but no response has been received from the Presidential office. The construction is now scheduled to last quarter of 2019.	

#### E.4. Post-registration changes

##### E.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents<sup>2</sup>

It has been checked whether Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan (TDfrMP) or Temporary deviations from monitoring methodology or standardized baseline (TDfMM) have been applied during this monitoring period. The result is summarized in the table below.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan (TDfrMP) or Temporary deviations from monitoring methodology or standardized baseline (TDfMM) have been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	The following TDfrMP or TDfMM have been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC		
	1	Title	
		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved (approval No.: )
		Appr.date	
		Ref. No.	
	2	Title	
		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved (approval No.: )
		Appr.date	
		Ref.No.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	During the verification of the current MP no need for a TDfrMP or TDfMM has been identified. The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the PA		
<input type="checkbox"/>	An approval of the following TDfrMP or TDfMM is to be requested from the EB for the current MP as appendix 1 of the project standard does not apply. Please refer to the related PRC report submitted along with this issuance request for further details w.r.t. the assessment of the PRC.		
	1	Issue:	
	2	Issue:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	The following TDfrMP or TDfMM for which appendix 1 of the PS is applicable have been applied:		
	1	Issue:	
	2	Issue:	

<sup>2</sup> 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.4.2. Corrections**

It has been checked whether any corrections to project information or parameters fixed at validation have been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report. The result is summarized in the table below.

<input type="checkbox"/>	During the verification of the current MP no need for corrections has been identified.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The following corrections have been applied:	
1	Issue:	Change the project activity name to reflect the proposed change in the installed capacity.  Actual name: 30MW Solar PV – Monte Plata Proposed new name: 60MW Solar PV – Monte Plat
The PDD has been revised accordingly: (New) version No.: version 6 Revision date: 24/07/2018		
2	Issue:	
The PDD has been revised accordingly: (New) version No.: Revision date:		
It is confirmed that the updated / corrected information is an accurate reflection of the actual project information and that the corrected parameters are in accordance with the applied methodology and the monitoring plan.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A related post registration change has been submitted prior to the issuance request. The approval has been received on 29/11/2018 via approval number PRC-8530-001.  <input type="checkbox"/> A related post registration change is submitted along with this issuance request. Please refer to the related PRC report submitted along with this issuance request for further details w.r.t. the assessment of the PRC.		

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A - as this is not the first verification within the crediting period
<input type="checkbox"/>	The PPs do not intend to change the start date of the crediting period.
<input type="checkbox"/>	As the change in the start date was below the related time period as indicated in PS § 234 and § 235 no prior approval was required but only a notification. This notification has been submitted by the PP without involvement of the DOE. The change and new start date has been checked from the related UNFCCC project webpage.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The PPs intend to change the start date of the crediting period. As the intended change in start date beyond the related time period as indicated in PS § 236 and as per §237 prior approval by the Board is required. For detailed assessment of the change please refer to related PRC validation report. As per assessment in this report the DOE confirms that the change to the start date of the crediting period are in line with the related requirements of the VVS and PS.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The PP has changed the start date of the crediting period from 01/06/2013 to 31/05/2015. The approval to change the start date of the crediting period has been received on 29/11/2018 via approval number PRC-8530-001.

**E.4.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A - as this monitoring plan was part of the registered PDD
<input type="checkbox"/>	In line with PS § 238 and §78 the PP has forwarded a monitoring plan to the DOE for validation. No prior approval of the monitoring plan was required as the PP in line with PS § 78 wished to submit the monitoring plan together with the request for issuance for the first monitoring period. Please refer to the related PRC report submitted along with this issuance request for further details w.r.t. the assessment of the PRC.
<input type="checkbox"/>	In line with PS § 238 and §78 the PP submitted a monitoring plan prior to the submission of the request for issuance for validation to the DOE. A DOE has assessed the monitoring plan in line with related VVS requirements and submitted a related PRC report for prior approval. The approval has been received on DD/MM/YYYY via approval number PRC-XXXX-00Z.

**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**

It has been checked whether any permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan (PCfrMP) or applied methodologies (PCfMM) including standardized baselines (PCfSB) have been approved prior or during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report. The result is summarized in the table below.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No PCfrMP, PCfMM or PCfSB have been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period									
<input type="checkbox"/>	The following PCfrMP, PCfMM or PCfSB have been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC									
	1	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Title</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Status</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appr.date</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ref. No.</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Title		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved	Appr.date		Ref. No.	
Title										
Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved									
Appr.date										
Ref. No.										
	2	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Title</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Status</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appr.date</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ref.No.</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Title		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved	Appr.date		Ref.No.	
Title										
Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved									
Appr.date										
Ref.No.										
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	During the verification of the current MP no need for a PCfrMP, PCfMM or PCfSB has been identified. The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the PA									
<input type="checkbox"/>	An approval of the following PCfrMP, PCfMM or PCfSB is to be requested from the EB for the current MP as appendix 1 of the project standard does not apply.									
	1	Issue:								
	2	Issue:								
<input type="checkbox"/>	The following PCfrMP, PCfMM or PCfSB for which appendix 1 of the PS is applicable have been applied:									
	1	Issue:								
	2	Issue:								

**E.4.6. Changes to the project design**

It has been checked whether any changes to the project design (CoPD) have been approved prior or during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report. The result is summarized in the table below.

<input type="checkbox"/>	No CoPD has been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period
--------------------------	---

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The following CoPD have been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC		
1	Title	Proposed change in the installed capacity from 30 MW to 60 MW.	
	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> approved	
	Appr.date	29/11/2018	
	Ref. No.	PRC-8530-001	
2	Title		
	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved	
	Appr.date		
	Ref.No.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	During the verification of the current MP no need for a CoPD has been identified. The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the PA		
<input type="checkbox"/>	An approval of the following CoPD.is to be requested from the EB for the current MP as appendix 1 of the project standard does not apply.		
1	Issue:		
	Issue:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	The following CoPD for which appendix 1 of the PS is applicable have been applied:		
1	Issue:		
	Issue:		

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A - as this is no A/R project activity
-------------------------------------	--

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	By means of comparison of the MR with (i) the applied CDM methodology (ii) all applicable CDM Meth tools and (iii) if applicable, a standardized baseline the verification team has checked whether the MP is in compliance with the MP related requirements of the applied methodology/tools/SB. The following sources of information have been used in this context: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• /MR/</li> <li>• /ACM02/</li> <li>• /TA/</li> <li>• /unfccc/</li> </ul>			
<b>Findings</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The MP is completely in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the CDM project (last registered/approved version of the PDD)		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The breakdown of MP accordance of the referenced tools is as follows:		
		1	Title (of the tool)	Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system
			Version	02.2.1
			MP compliance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> full compliance <input type="checkbox"/> findings have been raised <input type="checkbox"/> N/A (for MP)
2	Title (of the tool)	Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality		
		Version	6.1	

		MP compliance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> full compliance <input type="checkbox"/> findings have been raised <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The breakdown of MP accordance of the applicable SB is as follows:		
		1	Title (of the SB)	-
			Version	-
		MP compliance		
<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:			
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs 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.		
	-			

## 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

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>By means of comparison of the MR and the ER calculation with the latest version of the registered PDD the verification team has checked whether all parameters fixed ex-ante have been applied correctly.</p> <p>Further it has been checked whether the GWP for the respective period have been correctly applied.</p> <p>The following list of ex-ante fixed parameters have been applied for the calculation of the EF:</p>			
	Parameter	Description	Value	Unit
	EG <sub>m,y</sub>	Net energy delivered to the grid by power unit "m" during year "y"	As per Appendix 8 of PDD, <a href="http://www.cne.gov.do">www.cne.gov.do</a>	kWh
	EF <sub>CO2,i,y</sub>	Emission factor of the fossil fuel type "i"	Coal 89.5 Fuel Oil#6 75.5 Fuel Oil#2 72.6 Gas Natural 54.3	kgCO2/TJ
	NCV	The NCV refers to the energy content of these fossil fuels	Coal 25.8000 Fuel Oil #6 / Residual Fuel Oil 40.4000 Fuel Oil #2 / Diesel 43.0000	TJ/Gg
	FC <sub>i,m,y</sub>	Amount of fossil fuel type "i" used in power unit "m" during year "y"	As per Appendix 8 of PDD, <a href="http://www.cne.gov.do">www.cne.gov.do</a>	Volume units
	Density of fuels	The density expresses the concentration of mass in a determined volume	Fuel Oil / Residual Fuel –11 API = 0.993 kg/m <sup>3</sup> Diesel / Distillate fuel – 35.5 API = 0.8473 kg/m <sup>3</sup>	Kg/m <sup>3</sup>
	EF <sub>CM</sub>	Combined Margin Emission Factor of the Dominican Republic National Grid	0.6541	tCO <sub>2</sub> /MWh
	EF <sub>OM</sub>	Operating Margin Emission Factor of the Dominican Republic National Grid	0.7238	tCO <sub>2</sub> /MWh
	EF <sub>BM</sub>	Build Margin Emission Factor of the Dominican Republic National Grid	0.4447	tCO <sub>2</sub> /MWh

		<p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• /MR/</li> <li>• /XLS/</li> <li>• /PDD/</li> <li>• /PS/</li> <li>• /VVS/</li> <li>• /unfccc/</li> </ul>
<b>Findings</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The MR and the ER calculation have considered the parameters fixed ex-ante or at the renewal of the crediting period correctly, no deviations have been observed.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The following deviations from the parameters fixed ex-ante or at renewal of crediting period have been identified in the course of this verification:</p> <p>- N/A</p>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs 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 only fixed parameter which is used for emission reduction calculation during monitoring is the corresponding grid emission factor $EF_{grid} = EF_{CM}$ . The value is consistent with the registered PDD and applied correctly during this monitoring period for the ER calculation.

### E.6.2. Data and parameters monitored

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>During the verification all relevant monitoring parameters (as listed in chapter B.7.1 of the PDD) have been verified with regard to the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) appropriateness of the applied measurement / determination method,</li> <li>(ii) the correctness of the values applied for ER calculation,</li> <li>(iii) the accuracy, and applied QA/QC measures.</li> </ul> <p>The results as well as the verification procedure are described parameter-wise in the project specific verification checklist (Appendix 5).</p>	
<b>Findings</b>	CAR 3	
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs 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>For further details please refer to appendix 5.</p> <p>It can be confirmed that all monitoring parameters have been measured / determined without material misstatements and in line with the registered PDD, all applicable standards and relevant requirements.</p>

### E.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>The verification team has been checked whether the PPs have applied a sampling approach to determine the monitored values.</p> <p>Further it has been checked whether the PPs have correctly applied the implemented sampling plan including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) description of the implemented sampling design</li> <li>(ii) collected data</li> <li>(iii) analysis of collected data</li> <li>(iv) demonstration on whether the required confidence/precision has been met.</li> </ul> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• /MR/</li> <li>• /XLS/</li> <li>• /PDD/.</li> </ul>
------------------------------	--

<b>Findings</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The PPs have not applied sampling approaches for the parameters monitored.		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The PPs have applied sampling approaches for the following parameters monitored.		
		1	Parameter:	
			Name:	
			Description on how the sampling efforts and survey comply with the validated sampling plan:	
2	Parameter:			
	Name:			
	Description on how the sampling efforts and survey comply with the validated sampling plan:			
<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:			
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs 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.		
	-			

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>During the verification the relevant monitoring equipment has been checked whether the calibration requirements have been met; especially if the calibration frequency is in line with the requirements of the validated PDD and/or the applicable calibration standards.</p> <p>The results as well as the verification procedure are described equipment-wise in the project specific verification checklist (Appendix 6).</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• /MR/</li> <li>• /XLS/</li> <li>• /CAL/.</li> </ul>		
<b>Findings</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Based on the details listed in appendix 6 the verification team can confirm that all installed monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Based on the assessment and information as per appendix 6 delay(s) in calibration have been identified. The PP has applied the maximum permissible error of the instrument to the measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.</p> <p>From the related calibration certificates and emission reduction calculation the verification team confirms that the maximum permissible error has been applied in a conservative manner so that the adjusted measured values due to the delayed calibration result in fewer claimed emission reductions.</p> <p>For details please refer to appendix 6</p>	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:	
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs 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 energy data used for the ER calculation is considered correct. Calibration is traceable and in full compliance with the registered monitoring plan.		

### 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

<b>Means of verification</b>	During the verification the calculation of baseline GHG emissions has been
------------------------------	--



	<p>checked. In detail the following has been verified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>Transparency:</i> It has been checked whether the calculation of baseline emissions is fully traceable and, where used, the Excel calculation provides all calculation formulae.</li><li><i>Parameter consistency:</i> It has been checked whether all internal and external parameters and data used for the calculation are applied consistently in the monitoring report and the calculation spreadsheet.</li><li><i>Correctness:</i> It has been checked whether the applied formulae and methods for calculating baseline emissions are in accordance with the monitoring plan and the approved methodology.</li><li><i>Completeness:</i> It has been checked whether all calculations are complete and without omissions.</li></ul> <p>The GHG calculation is bases on the following formula:</p> $BE_y = EG_{PJ,y} * EF_{grid,CM,y}$ <p>Where:</p> <p><math>BE_y</math> = Baseline emissions in year “y” (tCO<sub>2</sub>/year)</p> <p><math>EG_{PJ,y}</math> = 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/year)</p> <p><math>EF_{grid,CM,y}</math> = Combined Margin CO<sub>2</sub> 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” (tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh)</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>/MR/</li><li>/XLS/</li><li>/PDD/</li><li>/DATA/</li></ul>										
Findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The calculation of the baseline emissions was found to be fully compliant with the above stated principles.</p> <p>The calculations of baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline. Any assumptions used in emission or removal calculations have been justified. Appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values, GWPs and other reference values have been correctly applied.</p> <p>No errors, miscalculations, omissions, misstatements or incomplete information has been identified.</p>									
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The verification team has identified mistakes in the baseline emissions calculation or the underlying calculation approaches.</p>									
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:</p>									
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>CAR 03:</p> <p>For the ER calculation, the gross electricity generation from the invoices was used instead of the net electricity. Correction is requested.</p>									
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.</p>									
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The raised CARs/CLs/FARs 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 have been applied the baseline emissions for this entire monitoring period are as following:</p> <p>Net electricity provided to the grid <math>EG_{PJ,y}</math>:</p> <table><tr><th>Month</th><th>kWh</th><th>Source</th></tr><tr><td>Jan-17</td><td>4,350,389</td><td>Measurement report</td></tr><tr><td>Feb-17</td><td>3,819,185</td><td>Electronic JRC</td></tr></table>			Month	kWh	Source	Jan-17	4,350,389	Measurement report	Feb-17	3,819,185
Month	kWh	Source									
Jan-17	4,350,389	Measurement report									
Feb-17	3,819,185	Electronic JRC									

	Mar-17	4,572,732	
	Apr-17	3,913,357	
	May-17	4,331,806	
	Jun-17	4,341,660	
	Jul-17	2,354,588	
	Aug-17	4,517,807	
	Sep-17	4,051,929	
	Oct-17	3,695,532	
	Nov-17	3,159,834	
	Dec-17	3,816,615	
	<b>Total 2017</b>	<b>46,925,435</b>	
	Jan-18	3,478,684	
	Feb-18	3,985,320	
	Mar-18	4,832,519	
	Apr-18	4,303,560	
	May-18	3,977,070	
	Jun-18	3,983,355	
	Jul-18	4,364,401	
	Aug-18	4,048,799	
	Sep-18	4,053,007	
	Oct-18	4,113,131	
	Nov-18	3,622,919	
	Dec-18	3,846,145	
	<b>Total 2018</b>	<b>48,608,910</b>	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>95,534,345</b>	
	$BE_{2017} = 46,925 \text{ MWh} \times 0.6541 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/MWh} = 30,693 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$		
$BE_{2018} = 48,608 \text{ MWh} \times 0.6541 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/MWh} = 31,794 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$			
$BE_v = 95,534 \text{ MWh} \times 0.6541 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/MWh} = 62,487 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$			

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>During the verification the calculation of project GHG emissions has been checked. In detail the following has been verified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Transparency</i>: It has been checked whether the calculation of baseline emissions is fully traceable and, where used, the Excel calculation provides all calculation formulae.</li> <li>• <i>Parameter consistency</i>: It has been checked whether all internal and external parameters and data used for the calculation are applied consistently in the monitoring report and the calculation spreadsheet.</li> <li>• <i>Correctness</i>: It has been checked whether the applied formulae and methods for calculating baseline emissions are in accordance with the monitoring plan and the approved methodology.</li> <li>• <i>Completeness</i>: It has been checked whether all calculations are complete and without omissions.</li> </ul> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• /MR/</li> <li>• /XLS/</li> <li>• /SCADA/</li> <li>• /PDD/</li> </ul>
<b>Findings</b>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> As per revised PDD the project doesn't consider any project emissions. The consideration of project GHG emissions equals zero have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology.</p> <p>No errors, miscalculations, omissions, misstatements or incomplete</p>

		information have been identified.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The verification team has identified mistakes in the project emissions calculation or the underlying calculation approaches.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs 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 registered PDD $PE_y = \text{zero}$ . As this is a solar power project and based on onsite inspection and document check it can be confirmed that no project emissions are applicable to the project activity as per related methodology.

### E.8.3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>During the verification it has been checked whether leakage emissions have to be considered and, in cases where leakage emissions have to be calculated, the respective calculation of leakage GHG emissions has been checked. In such cases the same verification principles have been considered as for the baseline and project emissions calculation. Please refer to E.8.1 and E.8.2.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• /MR/</li> <li>• /XLS/</li> </ul>	
<b>Findings</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No leakage emissions were to be considered ( $LE = 0$ ).
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The calculation of the leakage emissions was found to be fully compliant with the above stated principles (see 8.1 and 8.2).</p> <p>The calculations of leakage GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline. Any assumptions used in leakage emissions calculations have been justified. Where applicable, appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values, GWPs and other reference values have been correctly applied.</p> <p>No errors, miscalculations, omissions, misstatements or incomplete information have been identified.</p>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The verification team has identified mistakes in the project emissions calculation or the underlying calculation approaches.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs 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.
	-	

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>The verification team has checked if the MR includes a summary table of the emission reductions calculation specifying separately</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Total baseline emissions (BE),</li> <li>- Total project emissions (PE),</li> <li>- Total leakage (LE),</li> <li>- Total emission reductions (ER).</li> </ul> <p>It has been assessed whether the values are correct or need to be revised as a consequence of issues identified above.</p>	
<b>Findings</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Section E.4 of the MR includes in a summary table of the emission reductions calculation.

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The summary table specified the total baseline, project and leakage emissions as well as the total emission reductions separately.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The values as specified in the ER summary table are correct; no issues have been identified during the verification which requires changes in the ER calculation.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	During the verification issues with impact on the ER calculation have been identified.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
		It is concluded that the GHG emission reductions are calculated correctly and in line the registered PDD and applicable methodology and tool. The final emission reductions are calculated as following:  $ER_y = BE_y - (PE_y + LE_y) = BE_y = 95,534 \text{ MWh} \times 0.6541 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/MWh} = 62,487 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	The verification team has checked if the MR includes a comparison of actual values of the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered PDD. It has further checked which of the below listed cases is applicable for the calculated ER of the current monitoring period.	
<b>Findings</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Case 1: The ex-ante estimated value was found to be proportionally higher than the ex-post determined value. No further action is deemed required.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Case 2: The ex-ante estimated value fits very good to the actually monitored value. No further justification is deemed required.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Case 3: The ex-ante estimated value was found to be proportionally lower than the ex-post determined value.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs 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.
		-

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	On the basis of the above comparison of actual values of the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered PDD the verification team has checked whether (in case 3) an appropriate explanation is included in the MR.	
<b>Findings</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No further justification or explanation is deemed required as actual emissions of this MP do not exceed significantly the ex-ante calculated emission reductions (applicable for case 1 and 2).
	<input type="checkbox"/>	For case 3: The PP has provided a related justification in the MR. The reasons for the increase are as follows: - N/A
	<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs 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.

**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**

<b>Means of verification</b>	The verification team has checked chapter E.7 of the MR and the emission reduction calculation sheet /XLS/.								
<b>Findings</b>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The MR in section E.7 includes a summary table of the ER breakdown</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a) <i>ER up to 31/12/2012 and</i></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">b) <i>ER from 01/01/2013 onwards</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The breakdown of the ERs during the first commitment period and from 01/01/2013 onwards is as follows:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><input type="checkbox"/> The ER have completely been generated during the first commitment period</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The ERs have completely been generated from 01/01/2013 onwards,</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><input type="checkbox"/> The ERs have partly been generated during the first commitment period and partly from 01/01/2013 onwards.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The breakdown of the ERs is correct, considering the applicable guidance.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>until 31/12/2012<sup>1)</sup></th><th>from 01/01/2013<sup>1)</sup></th><th>Sum</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Emission reductions [tCO<sub>2e</sub>]</td><td>0</td><td>62,485</td><td>62,485</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><sup>1)</sup> Both days included</p>		until 31/12/2012 <sup>1)</sup>	from 01/01/2013 <sup>1)</sup>	Sum	Emission reductions [tCO <sub>2e</sub> ]	0	62,485	62,485
	until 31/12/2012 <sup>1)</sup>	from 01/01/2013 <sup>1)</sup>	Sum						
Emission reductions [tCO <sub>2e</sub> ]	0	62,485	62,485						
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The raised CARs/CLs/FARs 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>The data provided in the MR is correct as well as the related breakdown. The pro-rata approach was correctly applied to the calculations of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals in accordance with the project standard, as the monitoring period starts after 31/12/2012 and ends anytime thereafter.</p>								

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

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A – as the PP has not monitored the sustainable development co-benefits of the registered CDM project activity or not requested the DOE to verify them.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The project participants have monitored the sustainable development co-benefits of the registered CDM project activity, and requested the DOE to verify them.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• /MR/</li> <li>• /PDD/</li> <li>• /DSD/</li> <li>• /unfccc/.</li> </ul>
<b>Findings</b>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A – as the PP has not monitored the sustainable development co-benefits of the registered CDM project activity or not requested the DOE to verify them.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Therefore, the DOE has assessed and confirms that:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">(a) The monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the document for monitoring sustainable development co-benefits, if such document was developed and published on the UNFCCC CDM website in accordance with the “CDM project standard for project activities”;</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">(b) The reported monitoring results correspond to the sustainable development co-benefits of the project activity as observed by the DOE.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.</p>

	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs 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.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A – as the PP has not monitored the sustainable development co-benefits of the registered CDM project activity or not requested the DOE to verify them.
	-	

**E.10. Global stakeholder consultation**

<b>Means of verification</b>	<p>In accordance with the PCP the DOE has submitted the initial version of the monitoring report provided by the PP for this monitoring period to be published on the UNFCCC webpage.</p> <p>The monitoring report has been published from 18/03/2019.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• /MR/</li> <li>• /unfccc/.</li> </ul>		
<b>Findings</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No comments have been received on the published monitoring report for this monitoring period.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comments have been received and the DOE has concluded that comments are related to issues outside the CDM rules and requirements. Please refer to the list provided under Conclusion of this Section below for related information.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Comments have been received.</p> <p>The DOE has</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- requested further information from the submitters of the comments</li> <li>- informed the project participants of the comments received, and requested their feedback within a specified timeframe,</li> <li>- considered the input received and has assessed whether such comments are relevant to the CDM project activity,</li> <li>- acknowledged receipt of all submitted comments on the MR of the proposed CDM project activity,</li> <li>- assessed whether the comments are related to the CDM rules and requirements (if so related findings have been raised as per below),</li> <li>- used all possible means to determine the authenticity of the name and contact details of the individual or organization on whose behalf the comments have been submitted,</li> <li>- contacted the secretariat to make them publicly available (if only addressed to the DOE),</li> <li>- determined whether authentic and relevant comments in the global stakeholder consultation were taken into due account in the PDD of the proposed CDM project activity.</li> </ul>	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised, i.e. as the DOE concludes that the comments are related to the CDM rules and requirements:</p>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs 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 the DOE has concluded that comments are related to issues outside the CDM rules and requirements the comments and information gathered are listed as follows:		
	<b>Nbr.</b>	<b>Original comment received</b>	<b>Feedback by the PP</b>
	1		
	2		
	3		

## **SECTION F. Internal quality control**

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

As a result of the technical review process the verification opinion and the topic specific assessments as prepared by the verification 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 verification has been carried out by a senior assessor located in the accredited premises of TÜV NORD.

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

## **SECTION G. Verification opinion**

Electronic J.R.C., S.R.L. has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program to carry out the 1<sup>st</sup> periodic verification of the project: "60MW Solar PV - Monte Plata", with regard to the relevant requirements for CDM project activities. The project reduces GHG emissions due to the generation of solar energy feed into the national grid which displaces energy from fossil fuels. This verification covers the period from 01/01/2017 to 31/12/2018 (including both days).

As a result of this verification, the verifier confirms that:

- all operations of the project are implemented and installed as planned and described in the validated project design document,
- the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied approved CDM methodology,
- the installed equipment essential for measuring parameters required for calculating emission reductions are calibrated appropriately,
- the monitoring system is in place and functional. The project has generated GHG emission reductions,
- the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements in a conservative and appropriate manner.

TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP further confirms that the project has achieved emission reductions in the above mentioned reporting period as stated on the title page.

**SECTION H. Certification statement**

As a duly accredited DOE, TÜV NORD CERT confirms that the project:

“60MW Solar PV - Monte Plata”

registered under

UNFCCC-No. : 8530

has achieved emission reductions in accordance with all applicable requirements for registered CDM project activities during the current monitoring period

MP-No.: 2<sup>nd</sup>

from: 01/01/2017

to: 31/12/2018

(including both days) as follows: 62,485 tCO<sub>2</sub>e

Queretaro, 23/08/2019



Oliver Quireza



## Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
AC	Alternating Current
CL	Clarification Request
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon dioxide
CO <sub>2eq</sub>	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
GES	General Energy Solutions
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
IM	Interview Memo
MP	Monitoring Plan
MR	Monitoring Report
OC	Coordinating Organism of the National Interconnected Electricity System of the Dominican Republic ("Organismo Coordinador del Sistema Electrico Nacional Interconectado de la Republica Dominicana")
PA	Project Activity
PCP	Project Cycle Procedure
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
PRC	Post Registration Change
PS	Project Standard
PV	Photovoltaic
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



### Statement of Competence

Appointment and authorization according to the procedures of the TUV NORD J/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

337\_001-VA000-F20\_2018-08-17\_wkr.doc

001-VA000-F20 rev3 / 2012-10-25



### Statement of Competence

Appointment and authorization according to the procedures of the TUV NORD J/CDM Certification Program

**Mr. Stefan Winter**

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification) Technical Reviewer	2020-07-27
VCS	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification) Technical Reviewer	2020-07-27

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA
1.1	Thermal energy generation
1.2	Renewables
2.1	Energy distribution
3.1	Energy demand
4.1	Cement and lime production
4.2	Paper
5.2	Caprolactam, nitric and adipic acid
9.1	Aluminium and magnesium production
9.2	Iron, steel and Ferro-alloy production
13.1	Solid waste and wastewater
13.2	Manure

163 - Rev. 5, Date: 2017-07-20

163\_001-VA000-F20\_2017-07-20\_rev5

001-VA000-F20 rev3 / 2012-10-25

## Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
1.	UNFCCC	<b>/ACM0002/</b>	Methodology ACM0002 titled: "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", version 13	<a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/EY2CL7RTEHRC9V6YQH/LAR6MJ6VEU83">http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/EY2CL7RTEHRC9V6YQH/LAR6MJ6VEU83</a>	Other
2.	DOE	<b>/CPM/</b>	TÜV NORD JI / CDM CP Manual (incl. CP procedures and forms)		Other
3.	PP	<b>/DSD/</b>	Documents for monitoring sustainable development co-benefits		Other
4.	UNFCCC	<b>/GOT/</b>	Glossary "CDM terms" (version 09.1)	<a href="https://cdm.unfccc.int/filestorage/ex/t/extfile-20170831165430180-Glos_CDMv9_1.pdf/Glos_CDMv9_1.pdf?t=THR8cDB1cjhfDA3nY9J2NxQKB7POsLROrM-">https://cdm.unfccc.int/filestorage/ex/t/extfile-20170831165430180-Glos_CDMv9_1.pdf/Glos_CDMv9_1.pdf?t=THR8cDB1cjhfDA3nY9J2NxQKB7POsLROrM-</a>	Other
5.	IPCC	<b>/IPCC/</b>	1. 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book 2. 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book	<a href="http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp">www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp</a>	Other
6.	UNFCCC	<b>/KPI/</b>	Kyoto Protocol (1997)	<a href="http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/items/2830.php">http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/items/2830.php</a>	Other
7.	UNFCCC	<b>/MA/</b>	Decision 3/CMP. 1 (Marrakesh – Accords)	<a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/COPMOP/index.html">http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/COPMOP/index.html</a>	Other
8.	PP	<b>/MR/</b>	Monitoring Report – 60MW Solar PV - Monte Plata Project, versions: -version 1.0, 14/03/2016 -version 2.0, 14/07/2019 -version 3.0, 19/08/2019		Other
9.	UNFCCC	<b>/MRT/</b>	Monitoring Report Form (CDM-MR-FORM), Version 7.0	<a href="https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/PDDs_Forms/index.html">https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/PDDs_Forms/index.html</a>	Other
10.	UNFCCC	<b>/PDD/</b>	Revised Project Design Document for CDM project: "60MW Solar PV - Monte Plata" version 6, dated 24/07/2018 (approved)		Other
11.	UNFCCC	<b>/PS/</b>	CDM Project Standard (Version 2.0)	<a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html">http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html</a>	Other
12.	UNFCCC	<b>/SAMPLE/</b>	"Guidelines for Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programme Activities" (Version	<a href="https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Guidclarif/index">https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Guidclarif/index</a>	Other

No	Author	Reference	Title			References to the document	Provider
			04.0) “Standard for Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programme Activities” (version 7.0)			<a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html">http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html</a>	
13.	UNFCCC	<b>/TOOL/</b>	Rel.	Name	Ver.	<a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/tools/index.html">http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/tools/index.html</a>	Other
			<input type="checkbox"/>	Tool to calculate project or leakage CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from fossil fuel combustion	1		
			<input type="checkbox"/>	Emissions from solid waste disposal sites	7		
			<input type="checkbox"/>	Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption	1		
			<input type="checkbox"/>	Project emissions from flaring Version	2.0.0		
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system	2.2.1		
			<input type="checkbox"/>	Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream	2.0.0		
			<input type="checkbox"/>	Tool to determine the baseline efficiency of thermal or electric energy generation systems	1		
			<input type="checkbox"/>	Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment	1		
			<input type="checkbox"/>	Project and leakage emissions from transportation of freight	1.1.0		
			<input type="checkbox"/>	Project and leakage emissions from composting	1		
			<input type="checkbox"/>	Project and leakage emissions from anaerobic digesters	1		
			<input type="checkbox"/>	Upstream leakage emissions associated with fossil fuel use	2.0		
			<input type="checkbox"/>	Project and leakage emissions from biomass	2		
			<input type="checkbox"/>	Leakage in biomass small-scale project activities	4.0		
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	6.1.0		
14.	PP	<b>/VAL/</b>	-Validation Report for CDM project “30MW Solar PV - Monte Plata”, submitted by RINA, version 1.4 dated 26/11/2012 -Validation opinion for project “30MW Solar PV - Monte Plata”, by TNC, 28/07/2018, version 1. -PRC Approval: PRC-8530-001 by UNFCCC, from 29/11/2018				Other
15.	UNFCCC	<b>/VVS/</b>	CDM Validation and Verification Standard (Version 02.0)			<a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html">http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html</a>	Other

No	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
.				<a href="#">ml</a>	
16.	Schneider Electric	<b>/METER/</b>	Technical Data sheet ION 8650 by Schneider, June 2011		PP
17.	OC	<b>/START/</b>	1. Certificate of fulfilment of Connection Code Num. OC-000980 dated on 2016/08/12. 2. Certificate of start of Commercial Operation (expected start date 20/08/2016) Num. OC-000997 dated on 2016/08/15.		PP
18.	GES HUAWEI Janitza	<b>/TECH/</b>	1. Technical Data of the PV Module with Multi cell by GES 2. Technical Data of String Inverter (SUN2000-33KTL) 3. Power Analyser UMG 604 / UMG 605 by Janitza.		PP
19.	PP	<b>/PRO/</b>	1. Procedure to collect data from commercial meters code ADM-001 by Soventix, version 01, 2016/08/23. 2. Procedure to create access to energy meters code ADM-002 by Soventix, version 01, 2016/08/23. 3. O&M Manual by Soventix, Rev. 2017/04/04.		PP
20.	OC	<b>/CC/</b>	Calibration certificates issued by the OC covering the MP		PP
21.	PP / OC	<b>/DATA/</b>	1. Electricity measurements (raw data) downloaded from the solar plant SCADA 2. Monthly Measures Reports per Meter by PP (Monitoring data Control) <i>Electronic JRC Measurement Report</i> 3. Monthly Economic transactions and its Report by OC		PP
22.	PP	<b>/INVO/</b>	Monthly invoices issued by the Electronic JRC covering the monitoring period		PP
23.	MIMARENA	<b>/EL/</b>	1. Environmental License Num. 0187-11 given by MIMARENA to Electronic J.R.C., S.R.L. for the project Monte Plata Energia Solar 30MW dated on 2011/03/29 Valid for 5 years (valid till 2016/03/28) 2. Modified Environmental License Num. 0187-11 given by MIMARENA to Electronic J.R.C., S.R.L. for the project Monte Plata Energia Solar from 30MW to 59.8 MW dated on 2013/07/17 Valid for 3 years (valid till 2016/07/16)Renewed Environmental License Num. 0187-11 given by MIMARENA to Electronic J.R.C., S.R.L. for the project Monte Plata Energia Solar from 60 MW MW dated on 2016/01/20 Valid for 5 years (valid till 2021/01/19)		PP

No	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
24.	PP	<b>/LOG-BOOK/</b>	Monthly Report Monte Plata including the energy generation, planned Vs real, graphs of radiation real Vs estimated, radiation per module real Vs estimated, Performance ratio, regular maintenances and failure reports and monitoring of the sensors for control of soiling losses.		PP
25.	PP	<b>/LAY OUT/</b>	1. Lay out of the project activity issued by Electronic JRC SRL, version 1, 2015/11/20. 2. Localization Lay Out of the project activity by Electronic JRC SRL, version 1, 2015/11/20. 3. Cadastral Lay out showing the project coordinates by Electronic JRC SRL, version 1, 2015/11/20		PP
26.	PP	<b>/XLS/</b>	ER Calculation Spread Sheet versions: Ver 1 from 14/03/2019 Ver 3 from 14/07/2019 Ver 4 from 19/08/2019		PP
27.	Government	<b>/LAW/</b>	General Electricity No. Law 125-01 and its Regulation, 2012. Ley No. 57 – 07 de Incentivo a las Energías Renovables y Regímenes Especiales		PP
28.	OC	<b>/Uni/</b>	1. Single line diagram including cells and metering equipment by OC, version 03, 2017/05/31. 2. Diagram Measurement System, issued by ENNOVA, December 2015	<a href="http://www.oc.org.do/SENI/Seni/DiagramaUnifilar.aspx">http://www.oc.org.do/SENI/Seni/DiagramaUnifilar.aspx</a>	PP
29.	Electronic	<b>/LIC/</b>	Request of definitive Concession for the exploitation of electric power generation for Phase II of project Monte Plata, 17/03/2017 directed to the President of the Dominican Republic		PP

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

Table 3. Remaining FAR from validation and/or previous verifications

N/A

Table 4. CL from this verification

CL ID	Section no.	Date:
<b>Description of CAR (1<sup>st</sup> round)</b>		
<b>Project participant response</b>		<b>Date:</b>

Documentation provided by project participant	
DOE assessment	Date:

Table 5. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	01	Section no.	B.1	Date:	06/04/2019
<b>Description of CAR (1<sup>st</sup> round)</b>					
As per site visit the implementation of the phase 2 is delayed by around one year, nonetheless such situation is not described in section B.1 of the MR					
<b>Project participant response</b>					Date: 14/07/2019
Information about delay in the implementation of phase has been included in section B.1					
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>					
MR ver.2.0					
<b>DOE assessment</b>					Date: 25/07/2019
The delay description provided in section B.1 is in line with the actual implementation status of the PA. Finding is closed.					

CAR ID	02	Section no.	B.2	Date:	06/04/2019
<b>Description of CAR (1<sup>st</sup> round)</b>					
PRC-8530-001 related to the capacity change, change the project activity and change the start date of the crediting period was not mentioned in section B.2 of the MR					
<b>Project participant response</b>					Date: 14/07/2019
The information of PRC-8530-001 is included in section B.2 of the MR.					
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>					
MR ver.2.0					
<b>DOE assessment</b>					Date: 25/07/2019
PRC information has been properly included in section B.2 of the MR. Finding is closed.					

CAR ID	03	Section no.	XLS/E.1	Date:	06/04/2019
<b>Description of CAR (1<sup>st</sup> round)</b>					
For the ER calculation, the gross electricity generation from the invoices was used instead of the net electricity. Correction is requested.					
<b>Project participant response</b>					Date: 14/07/2019
The net electricity generation (injections minus withdrawals) is now used. The ER calculation and MR has been updated accordingly.					
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>					
MR ver.2.0 and ER calculation ver.3.0					
<b>DOE assessment</b>					Date: 25/07/2019
The revised ER calculation has properly considered the net electricity generation, which is in line with the values taken from the original monitoring data. Electricity monitoring is also consistent with the data provided in the MR. Finding is closed.					

CAR ID	04	Section no.	MR form	Date:	07/08/2019
<b>Description of CAR (1<sup>st</sup> round)</b>					
The latest version of the MR was not used. Correction is requested					
<b>Project participant response</b>					Date: 09/08/2019
It is used the latest version - v7.0 of the Monitoring Report.					
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>					
MR ver.3.0					
<b>DOE assessment</b>					Date: 12/08/2019
The latest MR template version has been used and the filling up instructions were followed.					

CAR ID	05	Section no.	A1/A2/A4	Date:	07/08/2019
<b>Description of CAR (1<sup>st</sup> round)</b>					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section A1 doesn't mention how GHG emissions are reduced</li> <li>2. The complete address of the project is not described in section A2</li> <li>3. The exact reference of the applied methodologies, methodological tools is not included in section A4</li> </ol>					

<b>Project participant response</b>			<b>Date:</b> 09/08/2019
1. At the end of section A1 has been mentioned the GHG emission reduced. 2. The complete information of the location of the project is included in section A2 3. The references of the methodologies and tools used has been included			
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>			
MR ver.3.0			
<b>DOE assessment</b>			<b>Date:</b> 12/08/2019
1. GHG emission reduction type is clearly described 2. The provided PA address is described as per MR guideline 3. Provided reference to the applied methodologies, methodological tools is correct			

  

<b>CAR ID</b>	06	<b>Section no.</b>	B1	<b>Date:</b> 07/08/2019
<b>Description of CAR (1<sup>st</sup> round)</b>				
1. The SI units system has not been used in section B1 2. specify if the medium stations are connected to the substation as indicated in PDD with technical details ABB 64 MVA 138/69/20 kVMWn 3. the capacity addition us not mentioned				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date:</b> 09/08/2019
1. The section B1 has been corrected and SI units system is used. 2. It is specify the information requested. 3. The capacity addition has been mentioned in section B1				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
MR ver.3.0				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date:</b> 12/08/2019
1. MR ver. 3.0 considers the SI units system 2. Technical details about the substation interconnection is clearly described 3. The capacity addition us clearly described in section B1				

  

<b>CAR ID</b>	07	<b>Section no.</b>	B1	<b>Date:</b> 07/08/2019
<b>Description of CAR (1<sup>st</sup> round)</b>				
Section B.2.6 related PRC approval number and approval date has to be reported				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date:</b> 09/08/2019
The information about PRC has been included in section B.2.6				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
MR ver.3.0				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date:</b> 12/08/2019
Version 3 of the MR mentions the correct PRC ID number				

  

<b>CAR ID</b>	08	<b>Section no.</b>	E1, E2, E3	<b>Date:</b> 07/08/2019
<b>Description of CAR (1<sup>st</sup> round)</b>				
Descriptions of baseline, project emission and leakage emissions have not been described in the correct section				
<b>Project participant response</b>				<b>Date:</b> 09/08/2019
The section E1, E2 and E3 has been updated according the information requested in each section.				
<b>Documentation provided by project participant</b>				
MR ver.3.0				
<b>DOE assessment</b>				<b>Date:</b> 12/08/2019
Descriptions in sections E1, E2, and E3 have been corrected. Also the round-down of the final ER calculation has been properly done in spreadsheet and MR.				

Table 6. FAR from this verification

N/A



## Appendix 5. Monitored Parameters

**Table A-5:** Periodic Verification Checklist – Monitored Parameters

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<b>A. EG<sub>Facility,y</sub></b>		Quantity of net electricity generation supplied to the grid in year y by the project plant/unit that has been added under the project activity		
<p><b>a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 360-364)</b>  Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</p>	<p>/IM01/  /PDD/  /ACM02/  /METER/  /DATA/  /XLS/  /TECH/  /CC/  /INVO/</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The project uses ION 8650 main and backup electricity meters by Schneider, bi-directional. The meters are installed in the substation located at the project site, which continuously measure the net electricity delivered to the grid and register the electricity data every 15 min.</p> <p>Data from the meters can be seen and recorded by using a software ION setup.</p> <p>According to the registered PDD the meter should be periodically calibrated in order to ensure maximum error of <math>\pm 0.2\%</math> following national requirements or manufacturer specifications. It is important to notice that the calibration is under responsibility of the OC, which is outside of the control of the PP.</p> <p>The monitoring procedure is described in detail in Appendix 9 of the PDD.</p> <p>The verification team has checked the General Electricity No. Law 125-01 on its article 342 where is stated that the authority shall check the meters every 2 years. Furthermore, on the same law on the article 299 is stated the accuracy class of the meters shall be 0.2. The accuracy class of all meters is 0.2 which is in accordance with the PDD and the applied Law. Calibrations were performed for all meters.</p> <p>The electricity data from the meters is gathered internally in a spread sheet (monitoring data control, in MR referred as</p>	CAR-03	OK

		<p>“Electronic JRC Measurement Report”) as per Appendix 9 of the PDD. This data is cross checked against the sales receipts, which, for the invoicing process take the electricity data from the Economic Transactions Report of the OC (Coordinating Organism of the National Interconnected Electrical System of the Dominican Republic). In case differences are identified between the sales information and the monitoring data control they should be reported and clarified. During this Monitoring Period no discrepancies were found. By the check conducted it can be confirmed that the net electricity fed into the grid is applied for the ER calculation.</p> <p><i>Verifier’s action:</i> The verifier followed these steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The verifier physically confirms the existence of both, main and back-up meters, checked the respective serial numbers and the correct functioning of both meters.</li> <li>2) The VT reviewed the manufacturer’s specifications and user’s guide.</li> <li>3) Access was granted to the substation, project site where the PVs are installed and also the SCADA showing the plant functioning and monitored parameters (ION setup). Among others, the verifier could see the following information displayed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Energy meters display, main and back-up.</li> <li>• Raw Data from ION SetUp for every day of the monitored months.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4) The electricity generation data from the meters (taken from the spread sheets “Reporte de Medidias de JRC”) <sup>DATA/</sup> used for the ER calculation was cross checked against the sales receipts as well as the National Grid monthly report (NMR) provided by the OC. The electricity data can be analysed and totalized to check the whole monitoring period or by month.</li> <li>5) Calibration certificates were reviewed.</li> </ol> <table border="1" data-bbox="1025 1241 1841 1404"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 1241 1093 1305"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1093 1241 1841 1305">In this context the following findings have been raised:</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 1305 1093 1404"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1093 1305 1841 1404">CAR 03: For the ER calculation, the gross electricity generation from the invoices was used instead of the net electricity. Correction is requested.</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR 03: For the ER calculation, the gross electricity generation from the invoices was used instead of the net electricity. Correction is requested.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR 03: For the ER calculation, the gross electricity generation from the invoices was used instead of the net electricity. Correction is requested.							

		<input type="checkbox"/>			
<b>b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 365-371)</b> <i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i> <i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i> <i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i>	/CC/ /MR/  /IM01/ /PDD/ /ACM02/  /METER/  /DATA/ /XLS/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	OK	OK
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period:  Start date of delay  End date of delay:  For both meters, the main and backup		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals				
<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of				

				calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A			

## Appendix 6. Calibration dates and validity of installed monitoring equipment

**Table A-6:** Periodic Verification Checklist – Calibration details

Monitoring equipment	Related monitoring parameter as per applicable registered monitoring plan	Serial number	Type	Accuracy or accuracy class	Previous calibration (last calibration before start of this monitoring period)	Calibration date(s) during this monitoring period	Validity of calibration(s)	Delay in calibration: yes/no	Period of delayed calibration
Main electricity meter	EG <sub>Facility,y</sub>	MW-1408A774-01	Schneider Electric ION 8650	0.2	15/06/2016	10/04/2018	14/06/2018 09/04/2020	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	N/A
Back-up electricity meter	EG <sub>Facility,y</sub>	MW-1507A002-02	Schneider Electric ION 8650	0.2	15/06/2016	10/04/2018	14/06/2018 09/04/2020	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	N/A

- - - - -

**Document information**

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
03.0	31 May 2019	Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure consistency with version 02.0 of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (CDM-EB93-A05-STAN);</li> <li>• Make structural and editorial improvements.</li> </ul>
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		