



Verification and certification report form for CDM project activities

(Version 01.0)

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

VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION REPORT

Title of the project activity	Amayo 40 MW Wind Power Project – Nicaragua
Reference number of the project activity	UNFCCC ID: 2315 TN P-No.: 8000451339 - 15/109
Version number of the verification and certification report	1.1
Completion date of the verification and certification report	18/09/2015
Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period	7 th Monitoring Period 01/07/2014 – 30/06/2015 (first and last day included)
Version number of monitoring report to which this report applies	2.0
Crediting period of the project activity corresponding to this monitoring period	7-year renewable crediting period from 12/04/2009 to 11/04/2016
Project participant(s)	Consortio Eolico Amayo S.A. (Private Entity) Shell Trading International Limited (Private Entity)
Host Party	Nicaragua
Sectoral scope(s), selected methodology(ies), and where applicable, selected standardized baseline(s)	Sectoral Scope: 1 Energy industries – Renewable/non renewable sources
Estimated GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals for this monitoring period in the registered PDD	120,811 t CO _{2e}
Certified GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals for this monitoring period	127,332 t CO _{2e}
Name of DOE	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Name, position and signature of the approver of the verification and certification report	Evgeni Sud Final Approver 

SECTION A. Executive summary

Consorcio Eolico Amayo S.A. (hereafter referred as “Amayo”) has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program to carry out the 7th periodic verification of the project:

“Amayo 40 MW Wind Power Project - Nicaragua”

with regard to the relevant requirements for CDM project activities.

This verification covers the period from 01/07/2014 to 30/06/2015 (first and last day included).

The project reduces GHG emissions due to the use of wind power to generate renewable electricity to be delivered to the national grid of Nicaragua. The project consists of 19 Wind Turbine Generator (WTG) of 2.1 MW each, accumulating to 39.9 MW of installed capacity.

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

Table A-1: Project Location

No.	Project Location
Host Country	Nicaragua
Region:	Rivas
Project location address:	129 km south of Managua, south west coast of Lake Nicaragua
Latitude:	11° 19' 32" N
Longitude:	85° 43' 05" W

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

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

Parameter	Unit	Value
Total Power	MW	39.9 MW
No. of turbines	-	19
Rated Power per wind-generator	MW	2.1
Number of blades		3
Rotor conus angle	°	5.0
Swept area	m ²	6,082
Tip speed (at rated power)	m/s	72.0
Rotor diameter	m	88
Rotational speed	rpm	15.0-17.6

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, i.e., ACM0002 ver.07;
- the installed equipment being essential for measuring parameters required for calculating emission reductions are calibrated appropriately;
- the monitoring system is in place and functional. And that the project has generated GHG emission reductions.

As a result of the 7th periodic verification, the verifier confirms that the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements in a conservative and appropriate manner. TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP herewith confirms that the project has achieved emission reductions in the above mentioned reporting period as follows:

Emission reductions: 127,332 t CO₂e

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	IR	Quireza	Oliver	TN México	x	x	x	x
2.	Verifier	IR	González Mitre	Raúl	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	Stöhr	Christina	TN CERT GmbH
2.	Approver	IR	Sud	Evgeni	TN CERT GmbH

SECTION C. Application of materiality

C.1. Consideration of materiality in planning the verification

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
☐	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 ¹ ;
☐	1 %	Emission reductions or removals for registered CDM project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal of between 300,000

¹ A year refers to a period of 12 consecutive months.

	Threshold	Related to
		and 500,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per year;
☒	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;
☐	5 %	Emission reductions or removals for registered small-scale CDM project activities other than registered CDM project activities covered under next category below;
☐	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).

Justification

As per registered PDD, the estimated amount of GHG emission reductions per year is 120,811_{2e}.

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.

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.	Omissions and misstatements in data transfer from hand written notes into digital Excel ER spreadsheet	Medium	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 the procedure is actually conducted, but not adequately described.
2.	Missing data due to failure of measurement equipment	Low	The monitoring plan defines emergency procedures in case a meter fails. Besides, a back-up meter is installed.	Check, if related meters are installed as per monitoring plan. Check, if emergency procedure is known across related personnel via interviews. Check the back-up meter with regard to correct calibration.

On the basis of the risk analysis the verification has been planned and a detailed audit/verification plan has been prepared and submitted to the project participant(s) in due time before the site visit.

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* detected	Corrected	Remaining verification risk
EG _y	CDC	☒	☒	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, due to the insignificance no major revision of the overall plan was required. Some minor mistakes, errors, misstatements or omissions were found. The reported ER in the published MR (127,332 t CO_{2e}) has not changed as, thus the materiality threshold was not exceeded. Please refer to Appendix 5 sections C and D for further details on the complete data check.

SECTION D. Means of verification

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

Other supporting documents, such as publicly available information on the UNFCCC website and background information were also reviewed. Please refer to Appendix 3 for further details.

D.2. On-site inspection

Duration of on-site inspection: 13/08/2015 to 14/08/2015				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	Kick off meeting	Amayo main offices	13/08/2015	Oliver Quireza Raul Gonzalez Mitre
2.	Viewing of relevant site points	WTG, metering equipment room, substation, control room.	13/08/2015	Oliver Quireza Raul Gonzalez Mitre

Duration of on-site inspection: 13/08/2015 to 14/08/2015				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
3.	Evidence assessment	Amayo main offices	13/08/2015	Oliver Quireza Raul Gonzalez Mitre
4.	Preparation of the DVR	Amayo main offices	13/08/2015	Oliver Quireza Raul Gonzalez Mitre
6.	Findings summary to the client	Amayo main offices	13/08/2015	Oliver Quireza Raul Gonzalez Mitre
7.	Working day auditor-client to close findings	ICE Power Nicaragua S.A.	14/08/2015	Oliver Quireza Raul Gonzalez Mitre
8.	Closing meeting	ICE Power Nicaragua S.A.	14/08/2015	Oliver Quireza Raul Gonzalez Mitre

D.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Mariana	Barrios	Amayo	13/08/2015	Environmental and CDM Coordinator	Oliver Quireza Raul Gonzalez Mitre
2.	Montealegre	Eleazar	Amayo	13/08/2015	Plant Manager	Oliver Quireza Raul Gonzalez Mitre
3.	Saldaña	Felix	Amayo	13/08/2015	Plant Operator	Oliver Quireza Raul Gonzalez Mitre
4.	Bismarck	José	Amayo	13/08/2015	Plant Operator	Oliver Quireza Raul Gonzalez Mitre
5.	Hernandez	Martha	Rivas County	13/08/2015	Planning Director	Oliver Quireza Raul Gonzalez Mitre

D.4. Sampling approach

D.4.1 Sampling during monitoring

☒	No sampling approach has been used by the PP to determine the monitored parameters						
☐	A sampling approach has been taken for the following monitored parameter(s):						
	Parameter	Sampling approach ¹⁾	Sampling Type ²⁾	Population	Sample Size	PDD compliant	Conf. / prec.

D.4.2 Sampling approaches during verification

☒	No sampling approach has been used by the VT to verify the monitored parameters					
☐	A sampling approach has been applied by the VT for the following monitored parameter(s):					
	Parameter	Sampling approach ¹⁾	Sampling Type ²⁾	Population	Confid./ precision	Sample Size

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

Areas of verification findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form	1	0	0
Compliance of the project implementation with the registered PDD	0	0	0
Post-registration changes	0	0	0
Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool and standardized baseline	0	0	0
Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan	0	0	0
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	1	0	0
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals	0	1	0
Others: Minor issues regarding inconsistencies in PLF, hub height, monitoring period, log event, name of monitoring parameter and calibration report	0	1	0
Other: Minor issue regarding inconsistency in official dates	0	0	0
Other: Internal manuals and procedures	0	0	0
Total	2	2	0

SECTION E. Verification findings

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

Means of verification	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. By means of the UNFCCC website it has been checked whether the latest applicable MR template CDM-MR-FORM has been used. 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. Please refer to following checklist items in Appendix 5 Table A-2: A.1 to A.7
Findings	CL 02: The table with the PP contact information of Shell Trading International Limited is missing in Appendix 1.
Conclusion	The table with the PP information was included in the MR. 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. It can be confirmed that the Monitoring report is complete and transparent and in accordance with the registered PDD, other relevant requirements as well as with the applicable monitoring report form.

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

There were no open issues addressed in the previous verification report.

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

Means of verification	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. 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. Interviews with operational personnel have been carried out, QMS records, maintenance records, instrument specifications were checked in this context. Special focus has further been laid to determine whether a potential phase wise implementation has occurred within the crediting period or any delays with respect to the starting dates have occurred. Further it has been checked whether any observed deviations from the registered project design have been correctly addressed as PRCs. Please refer to following checklist items in Appendix 5 Table A-2: B.1, B.1.1 to B.1.5
Findings	No findings were identified.
Conclusion	During the verification a site visit was carried out. On the basis of this site visit and the reviewed project documentation it can be confirmed that w.r.t. the realized technology, the project equipments, as well as the monitoring and metering equipment, the project has been implemented and operated as described in the registered PDD.

E.4. Post-registration changes

- ☒ By means of site visit, document check and interview it could be verified that the project is implemented and operated in line with the latest PDD and the applied methodology.
- ☐ Post registration changes have been identified and are assessed in detail in the subsequent steps E.4.1 to E.4.7.

E.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline

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.

☒	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.		
☐	The following TDfrMP or TDfMM have been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC		
1	Title		
	Status	☐ under approval; ☐ approved (approval No.:)	
	Appr.date		
	Ref. No.		
2	Title		

	Status	☐ under approval; ☐ approved (approval No.:)	
	Appr.date		
	Ref.No.		
☒	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		
☐	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:	
☐	The following TDfrMP or TDfMM for which appendix 1 of the PS is applicable have been applied:		
	1	Issue:	
	2	Issue:	

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.

☒	During the verification of the current MP no need for corrections has been identified.		
☐	The following corrections have been applied:		
	1	Issue:	
	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.		
	☐ A related post registration change has been submitted prior to the issuance request. The approval has been received on DD/MM/YYYY via approval number PRC-XXXX-00Z. ☐ 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

☒	N/A - as this is not the first verification within the crediting period
☐	The PPs do not intend to change the start date of the crediting period.
☐	As the change in the start date was below the related time period as indicated in PS § 277 and

	§ 278 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.
☐	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 § 279 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.
☐	The approval to change the start date of the crediting period has been received on DD/MM/YYYY via approval number PRC-XXXX-00Z

E.4.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan to a registered project activity

☐	N/A - as this monitoring plan was part of the registered PDD
☐	In line with PS § 281 or § 282 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 § 282 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..
☒	In line with § 282 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 approved on 08/09/2011.

E.4.5. Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline

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.

☒	No PCfrMP, PCfMM or PCfSB have been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period		
☐	The following PCfrMP, PCfMM or PCfSB have been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC		
	1	Title	
		Status	☐ under approval; ☐ approved
		Appr.date	
		Ref. No.	
	2	Title	
		Status	☐ under approval; ☐ approved
		Appr.date	
Ref.No.			
☒	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		
☐	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:	
☐	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 of a registered project activity

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.

☒	No CoPD has been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period		
☐	The following CoPD have been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC		
	1	Title	
		Status	☐ under approval; ☐ approved
		Appr.date	
		Ref. No.	
	2	Title	
		Status	☐ under approval; ☐ approved
		Appr.date	
Ref.No.			
☒	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		
☐	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:	
	2	Issue:	
☐	The following CoPD for which appendix 1 of the PS is applicable have been applied:		
	1	Issue:	
	2	Issue:	

E.4.7. Types of changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities

Not applicable.

E.5. Compliance of monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool and standardized baseline

Means of verification	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. Please refer to following checklist items in Appendix 5 Table A-2: C.1 to C.7
Findings	No findings were identified.
Conclusion	The monitoring system and all applied procedures are completely in compliance to the registered monitoring plan. The monitoring system is in compliance with the applied monitoring methodology (ACM0002 version 07).

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

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

Means of verification	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 or at renewal of the crediting period have been applied correctly. Further it has been checked whether the GWP for the respective period have been correctly applied. Please refer to following checklist items in Appendix 5 Table A-2
Findings	No findings were raised on this matter.
Conclusion	Based on the assessment as provided in related checklist items and by other sections of this report the monitoring activities comply with the registered monitoring plan and are in accordance with applicable verification requirements related to the compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan in the VVS.

E.6.2. Data and parameters monitored

Means of verification	During the verification all relevant monitoring parameters (as listed in chapter B.7.1 of the PDD) have been verified with regard to the (i) appropriateness of the applied measurement / determination method, (ii) the correctness of the values applied for ER calculation, (iii) the accuracy, and applied QA/QC measures. The results as well as the verification procedure are described parameter-wise in the project specific verification checklist (Appendix 5).
Findings	CAR 01: Raw data from May and June of the received energy ($EC^{230kV}_{AMAYO,y}$) from the main meters ION is incorrect.
Conclusion	During the verification all relevant monitoring parameters (as listed in chapter B.7.1 of the PDD) have been verified with regard to the appropriateness of the applied measurement / determination method, the correctness of the values applied for ER calculation, the accuracy, and applied QA/QC measures. The results as well as the verification procedure are described parameter-wise in the project specific verification checklist. After appropriate corrections were carried out by the project participant, it can be confirmed that the monitoring parameter has been measured without material misstatements and in line with all applicable standards and relevant requirements.

E.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan

Means of verification	The verification team has been checked whether the PPs have applied a sampling approach to determine the monitored values. No sampling is applied. Please refer to section D.4 of this report.
Findings	No findings were raised on this matter.
Conclusion	No sampling was required to determine the monitored parameters.

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

Means of	During the verification the relevant monitoring equipment has been checked whether the calibration requirements have been met; especially if the
-----------------	--

verification	calibration frequency is in line with the requirements of the validated PDD and/or the applicable calibration standards. The results as well as the verification procedure are described equipment-wise in the project specific verification checklist (Appendix 6).
Findings	CL 01: Dates of calibration included in section D.2 are not clear enough to be easy understand.
Conclusion	The calibrations of all monitoring equipments installed have been verified as listed in table given in Appendix 6 to this report. All calibration certificates were provided and assessed. A delayed calibration was identified by the PP from the beginning of the verification process. Hence the PP has performed the necessary corrections in terms of application of the maximum error. Based on that the verification team can confirm that all installed monitoring equipments are now duly calibrated.

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

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

Means of verification	During the verification the calculation of baseline GHG emissions has been checked. In detail the following has been verified: • <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. • <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. • <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. • <i>Completeness</i>: It has been checked whether all calculations are complete and without omissions. Further the baseline emissions are calculated as following: $BE_y = EG_y \cdot EF_{grid,CM,y}$
Findings	No findings were raised on this matter.
Conclusion	No mistakes, errors, misstatements or omissions were found. The reported ER in the published MR (127,332 t CO_{2e}) will remain the same, thus the materiality threshold was not exceeded. Please refer to Appendix 5 sections C and D for further details on the complete data check. Thus it is confirmed that the ER calculation is overall correct. A complete set of data for the specified monitoring period was available. The calculations of baseline GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan, and the applied methodology. Any assumptions used in emission or removal calculations have been justified. The appropriate emission factor has been correctly applied.

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

Means of verification	During the verification the calculation of project GHG emissions has been checked. In detail the following has been verified: • <i>Transparency</i>: It has been checked whether the calculation of project emissions is fully traceable and, where used, the Excel calculation provides all calculation formulae. • <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. • Correctness: It has been checked whether the applied formulae and methods for calculating project emissions are in accordance with the monitoring plan and the approved methodology. • Completeness: It has been checked whether all calculations are complete and without omissions. Project emissions are zero PE = 0. This is in line with the registered PDD as indicated in the related methodology. The verification team has checked the reg. PDD as well as the methodology to confirm the same.
Findings	No findings were raised on this matter
Conclusion	No project emissions in this regard have to be considered as checked with related methodology and registered PDD.

E.8.3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions

Means of verification	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. Leakage emission are zero LE = 0. This is in line with the registered PDD as indicated in the related methodology. The verification team has checked the reg. PDD as well as the methodology to confirm the same.
Findings	No findings were raised on this matter.
Conclusion	No leakage has to be considered as checked with related methodology and the registered PDD.

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

Means of verification	☒ The MR includes in section E.4 a summary table of the emission reductions calculation. ☒ The summary table specified the total baseline, project and leakage emissions as well as the total emission reductions separately. ☒ 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. ☐ During the verification issues with impact on the ER calculation have been identified. Thus subject to the closure of above listed findings the summary table in E.4 needs to be revised.
Findings	No findings were raised on this matter.
Conclusion	The summary table in the MR has been filled correctly and the values are in line with the related emissions reduction spreadsheet.

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

Means of verification	The 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. Please refer to following checklist items in Appendix 5 Table A-2: E.4
Findings	CAR 02: Estimated ex-ante value according to the registered PDD included in section E.5 differs is incorrect
Conclusion	The MR includes a comparison of the calculated actual emission reductions with the ex-ante calculated values in the registered PDD. An editorial mistake was identified when the value was copied.

	The ex-post determined value was found to be slightly higher than the ex-ante estimated value. This was justified by the PP using historical data of wind speed. The wind speed of year 2015 was found to be higher than in previous 2 years. Hence more electricity was generated due to external conditions not in control of the PP. Wind projects depends on wind availability. Therefore the slightly higher achieved ER was considered plausible and accepted by the audit team.
--	--

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

Means of verification	On the basis of the above comparison of actual values of the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered PDD (E.8.5) the verification team has checked whether (in case 3) an appropriate explanation is included in the MR. Please refer to following checklist items in Appendix 5 Table A-2: E.4
Findings	No findings were raised on this matter.
Conclusion	The ex-post determined value was found to be slightly higher than the ex-ante estimated value, thus proper justification was provided in the checklist.

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

Means of verification	☒ The MR in section E.4 includes a summary table of the ER breakdown a) <i>ER up to 2012-12-31 and</i> b) <i>ER from 2013-01-01 onwards</i>							
	☐ The breakdown of the ERs during the first commitment period and from 2013-01-01 onwards is as follows: ☐ The ER have completely been generated during the first commitment period ☒ The ERs have completely been generated from 2013-01-01 onwards, ☐ The ERs have partly been generated during the first commitment period and partly from 2013-01-01 onwards.							
	☒ The breakdown of the ERs is correct, considering the applicable guidance.							
	<table><tr><th></th><th>until 2012-12-31 ¹⁾</th><th>from 2013-01-01 ¹⁾</th><th>Sum</th></tr><tr><td>Emission reductions [tCO_{2e}]</td><td>0</td><td>127,332</td><td>127,332</td></tr></table> ¹⁾ Both days included		until 2012-12-31 ¹⁾	from 2013-01-01 ¹⁾	Sum	Emission reductions [tCO _{2e}]	0	127,332
	until 2012-12-31 ¹⁾	from 2013-01-01 ¹⁾	Sum					
Emission reductions [tCO _{2e}]	0	127,332	127,332					
Findings	No findings were raised on this matter							
Conclusion	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 before 31 December 2012 and ends anytime thereafter.							

SECTION F. Internal quality control

Before submission of the final verification report a technical review of the whole verification procedure was carried out. The technical reviewer is a competent GHG auditor being appointed for the scope this project falls under. The technical reviewer is 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 has been conducted.

SECTION G. Verification opinion

Consorcio Eólico Amayo S.A. has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program to carry out the 7th periodic verification of the project: "Amayo 40MW Wind Power Project - Nicaragua", with regard to the relevant requirements for CDM project activities.

The project reduces GHG emissions due to the use of wind power to generate renewable electricity to be delivered to the national grid of Nicaragua. The project consists of 19 Wind Turbine Generator (WTG) of 2.1 MW each, accumulating to 39.9 MW of installed capacity. This verification covers the period from 01/07/2014 to 30/06/2015 (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, i.e., ACM0002 ver.07;
- 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 the 7th periodic verification, the verifier confirms that the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements in a conservative and appropriate manner. TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP herewith confirms that the project has achieved emission reductions in the above mentioned reporting period as follows:

Emission reductions: 127,332 t CO₂e

SECTION H. Certification statement

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

"Amayo 40MW Wind Power Project - Nicaragua"

registered under UNFCCC-No. : 2315

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

MP-No.: 7th

from: 01/07/2014

to: 30/06/2015 (including both days) as follows:

Emission reductions: 127,332 t CO₂e.

Sao Paulo, 2015-19-18



Oliver Quireza
Team leader

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
Amayo	Amawo Wind Project
CA	Corrective Action / Clarification Action
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CEA	Consorcio Eólico Amayo
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO _{2eq}	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CL	Clarification Request
CNDC	National Center of Dispatch of Charge <i>“Centro Nacional de Despacho de Carga”</i>
DVerR	Draft Verification Report
ER	Emission Reduction
ENATREL	National Company of Transmission of Electricity <i>“Empresa Nacional de Transmisión eléctrica”</i>
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
IM	Interview Memo
MARENA	Ministry for the Environmental <i>“Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales”</i> (DNA)
MP	Monitoring Plan
MR	Monitoring Report
N/A	Not Applicable
PA	Project Activity
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
QA/QC	Quality Assurance / Quality Control

Abbreviations	Full texts
SETENA	Secretaría Técnica Nacional del Ambiente (Environmental Ministry)
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard
WEC	Wind Energy Converter
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 TÜV NORD JICDM Certification Program

Mr. Oliver Quireza Campos

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Auditor	07-07-2017
VCS / ISO 14064-2	Auditor	07-07-2017

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA
1.2	Renewable Energies
13.1	Waste Handling and Disposal
13.2	Animal Waste Management

337 - Rev. 2, Date: 2014-07-08

337_001-VA050-F20_2014-07-08_rv2 - Kopie.doc

001-VA050-F20 rw3 / 2012-10-25



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

Mr. Raul Gonzalez Mitre

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification) Technical Reviewer	2016-06-27
VCS / ISO 14064-2		2016-06-27

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA
1.2	Renewables
13.1	Solid waste and wastewater

062 - Rev. 7, Date: 2015-07-10



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

Ms. Christina Stöhr

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

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

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

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

200_001-VA050-F20_2014-12-12_rv4.doc

001-VA050-F20 rw3 / 2012-10-25

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
1	UNFCCC	/ACM0002/	ACM0002 ver.07, "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources"	http://cdm.unfccc.int/filestorage/C/D/M/CDMWFA_M_323M30IDF1IH6AG3GRCJ4PKR9CKM7P/ACM0002_ver07.pdf?t=REp8bnN6dHE4fDC1r1ZHBw_9zu_XNSBCezp	Other
2	DOE	/CPM/	TÜV NORD JI / CDM CP Manual (incl. CP procedures and forms)		Other
3	IPCC	/IPCC/	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book	www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp	Other
4	UNFCCC	/KPI/	Kyoto Protocol (1997)	http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/items/2830.php	Other
5	UNFCCC	/MA/	Decision 3/CMP. 1 (Marrakesh – Accords)	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/COPMOP/index.html	Other
6	UNFCCC	/MRT/	Monitoring Report Form (CDM-MR-FORM), Version 5.1	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/PDDs_Forms/index.html	Other
7	UNFCCC	/PDD/	Project Design Document for CDM project: "Amayo 40 MW Wind Power Project - Nicaragua" version 03, dated 2008-10-31	http://cdm.unfccc.int/filestorage/0/H/W/0HWUDQ8FMYNI21R7PKXTSO569J4L3A/PDD%20Version%203.pdf?t=Vmp8bnN6dXo3fDARIOKPBZIIIRGwZYQnpXpmr	Other
8	UNFCCC	/PSI/	CDM Project Standard (Version 9.0)	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	Other
9	PP	/VAL/	Validation Report for CDM project "Amayo 40 MW Wind Power Project - Nicaragua" version 2, dated 2008-11-21.		Other
10	PP / DOE	/VER/	Documents of previous verifications (Monitoring report, verification report, ER calculation sheet)		Other

No.	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
11	UNFCCC	/VVS/	CDM Validation and Verification Standard (Version 09.0)	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	Other
14	UNFCCC	/GOT/	Glossary "CDM terms" (version 08.0)	https://cdm.unfccc.int/filestorage/e/x/t/extfile-20150226124447549-glos_CDM.pdf/glos_CDM.pdf?t=UmZ8bnFjODI3fDCW9A3vJwR03kQQh4sbLiYu	Other
15	ENATREL	/ICA/	Connection Agreement (transmission line) between ENATREL and CEA - " <i>Convenio de conexión entre ENATREL y Consorcio Eólico Amayo S.A</i> " - number 46397, issued 2007/08/17 (without validity date).	N/A	PP
16	General Stores	/ICC_IO N/	Main meter: Schneider Electric, Power Logic, ION 8600, s/n: PT-0901A531-01: • Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 0779, 2012/10/14 by ENATREL (valid till 2014/10/13). • Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 1020, 2014/10/23 by ENATREL (valid till 2016/10/22). Back up meter: Schneider Electric, Power Logic, ION 8600, s/n: PT-0901A532-01 • Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 0780, 2012/10/14 by ENATREL (valid till 2014/10/13) • Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 1021, 2014/10/23 by ENATREL (valid till 2016/10/22).	N/A	PP
17	General Stores	/ICC_nexus/	AMAYO PHASE I • Measurement point AMY-U3010 (Cell 3): ○ <u>Main meter</u> E.I.G., type Nexus 1262, class 0.2, serial No. 35415827 - Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 1004, 2014/01/28 by ENATREL (valid till 2016/01/27) - Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 1012,	N/A	PP

No.	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
			2014/10/23 by ENATREL (<u>valid till 2016/10/22</u>) ○ <u>Back-up meter</u> E.I.G., type Nexus 1262, class 0.2, serial No. 102-0053298431: - Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 0767, 2012/10/13 by ENATREL (<u>valid till 2014/10/12</u>) - Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 1013, 2014/10/23 by ENATREL (<u>valid till 2016/10/22</u>) • Measurement point AMY-U3040 (Cell 6): ○ <u>Main meter</u> E.I.G., type Nexus 1262, class 0.2, serial No. 102-0053298936: - Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 0772, 2012/10/13 by ENATREL (<u>valid till 2014/10/12</u>) - Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 1014, 2014/10/23 by ENATREL (<u>valid till 2016/10/22</u>) ○ <u>Back-up meter</u> E.I.G., type Nexus 1262, class 0.2, serial No. 102-0053299028: - Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 0771, 2012/10/13 by ENATREL (<u>valid till 2014/10/12</u>) - Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 1015, 2014/10/23 by ENATREL (<u>valid till 2016/10/22</u>) <u>AMAYO PHASE II</u> • Measurement point AMY-U3120 (Cell 4) ○ <u>Main meter</u> E.I.G., type Nexus 1262, class 0.2, serial No. 102-0053298532: - Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 0773, 2012/10/15 by ENATREL - (<u>valid till 2014/10/14</u>).		

No.	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
			- Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 1018, 2014/10/23 by ENATREL (<u>valid till 2016/10/22</u>) - o <u>Back-up meter</u> E.I.G., type Nexus 1262, class 0.2, serial No. 102-0053298633: - Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 0774, 2012/10/15 by ENATREL - (<u>valid till 2014/10/14</u>). - Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 1019, 2014/10/23 by ENATREL (<u>valid till 2016/10/22</u>) • Measurement point AMY-U3110 (Cell 5) - o <u>Main meter</u> E.I.G., type Nexus 1262, class 0.2, serial No. 102-0053298734: - Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 0775, 2012/10/14 by ENATREL - (<u>valid till 2014/10/13</u>). - Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 1016, 2014/10/23 by ENATREL (<u>valid till 2016/10/22</u>) - o <u>Back-up meter</u> E.I.G., type Nexus 1262, class 0.2, serial No. 102-0053298835: - Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 0776, 2012/10/14 by ENATREL. - (<u>valid till 2014/10/13</u>). - Conformity and Verification Certificate Num. 1017, 2014/10/23 by ENATREL (<u>valid till 2016/10/22</u>)		
18	PP	/downtime/	Downtimes excel spread sheet (evidence of all down times extracted by the SCADA system)	N/A	PP
19	PP	/DRI/	Daily generation calculation spread sheet " <i>Amayo Daily Report</i> " (Evidence of daily energy generation).	N/A	PP
20	CNDC	/DTE/	Economic Transaction Documents covering the monitoring period. Document issued monthly by the CNDC with information of the total energy generated by every plant in the	N/A	PP

No.	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
			national system (extracted directly from the CNDC web site (access route: Transacciones Economicas/DTE Oficiales/Transacciones Resumen/year)		
21	CNDC	/DWS/	Dispatch Information Center web site: <i>"Sistema de Información del Centro Nacional de Despecho de Carga"</i> www.cndc.org.ni Usuarios autorizados/nombre de usuario/contraseña/INICIO/Subida de archivos Agentes/Comercial/SIMEC/AMAYO/YEAR (Evidence of the energy data delivered and up loaded to the energy authority).	N/A	PP
22	PP	/EDI/	Electricity data extracted from the main and back up meters corresponding the monitoring period.	N/A	PP
23	CNDC, PP, Energy Buyers	/IEEG/	Evidence of Energy Generation from Amayo Phase I covering the monitoring period: • Energy meter readings downloaded directly from CDNC; • Sales invoices issued; • Monthly letters from the energy buyers confirming the acceptance of the invoices.	N/A	PP
24	CNDC, PP, Energy Buyers	/IEEG_A 2/	Evidence of Energy Generation from Amayo Phase II covering the monitoring period: • Energy meter readings downloaded directly from CDNC; • Sales invoices issued; • Monthly letters from the energy buyers confirming the acceptance of the invoices.	N/A	PP
25	ENATREL	/EGL/	Energy Generation License – <i>"Contrato de Licencia de Generación de energía eléctrica"</i> – number 29498, issued 2008/08/05 (valid for 30 years).	N/A	PP
26	PP	/EIA/	Environmental Impact Study, issued November 2006.	N/A	PP
27	MARENA	/EL/	• Environmental License – "Permiso ambiental" – number 01-2007, issued 2007/01/08 (without expiration date). • Document part of the Environmental License – <i>"Resolución Administrativa"</i> – number 08-99, issued 1999/05/18. • Letter stamped and signed by MARENA 2008/10/21 (Evidence that the Environmental License is still valid).	N/A	PP

No.	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
			Environmental License – “Resolución Administrativa DT Rivas” – number 014-09N, issued 2009/11/02.		
28	PP	/log_book/	Logbook of Operations Amayo (covering the monitoring period).	N/A	PP
29	Suzlon	/IMI/	Installation Manual – S88-2.1 MW – Suzlon Windkraft GmbH, Doberaner Str. 115, 18057 Rostock Germany.	N/A	PP
30	INE	/INE/	Official letter signed and stamped by INE, Ref. DGE-MCV-0230-0302010, dated 2010/03/23 (evidence of the approval by the energy authority regarding the new method to calculate the energy supplied to the grid).	N/A	PP
31	NACE	/ISO/	ISO 9001:2008 NMX-0207/2012CRE00086 and ISO 14001:2004 NMX-0207/2012CRE00083 issued on 2012/12/21, both valid until 2015/12/21	N/A	PP
32	PP	/MEP/	Monitoring Environmental Plan May-2016 and 2015 “ <i>Reporte de Monitoreo Ambiental</i> ” for Amayo I and Amayo II and its prove of receipt by MARENA on 2015/07/14 (bird impact monitoring, water quality monitoring, residual domestic water quality monitoring, sludge quality monitoring of the water treatment system, air quality monitoring, noise and hearing monitoring).	N/A	PP
33	PP	/MEPR/	Monthly Energy Production calculation spread sheet & Monthly Energy Production Report corresponding to the monitoring period (evidence of monthly energy generation).	N/A	PP
34	PP	/MoRe/	Monthly Report Amayo (Evidence of the operation data such as energy generation, operation statistics, incidents, etc.)	N/A	PP
35	PP	/MR/	- Monitoring Report 7th “Amayo 40 MW Wind Power Project – Nicaragua”, version 01, 2015/07/08. - Monitoring Report 7th “Amayo 40 MW Wind Power Project – Nicaragua”, version 02, 2015/08/14.	N/A	PP
36	Suzlon	/MS/	Turbines main specification S88, 60 Hz – Standard Temperature Version 80m, Tubular Tower.	N/A	PP
37	Suzlon	/O&M/	Technical documentation - Maintenance Manual - S88-2.1 MW, number WD00114, issued 2008/04/07.	N/A	PP
38	PP	/OP/	AMAYO Operational Procedures (relevant for the project activity): - Procedure for discharge the SCADA files of turbine generation (AMY1-OPE-P14). - Procedure to up load data to the	N/A	PP

No.	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
			CNDC web page (AMY1-OPE-P06). • ION meter readings (AMY1-OPE-P02) • NEXUS meter file data generation (AMY1-OPE-P19)		
39	PP	/OPL/	Operational Procedures List by AMAYO.	N/A	PP
40	INE	/OR/	Operational Regulation # 26-2000 “ <i>Normativa de Operación</i> ”, issued November 2000 by INE.	N/A	PP
41	PP	/PCC/	Procedures for carbon credits, January 2013 (procedures for monitoring parameters, troubleshooting procedures, and data management).	N/A	PP
42	Dissur	/PPA1/	Power Purchase Agreement of Amayo Phase I – between (Empresa Distribuidora de electricidad del Sur (Dissur) and Consorcio Eólico Amayo, S.A. issued 2007/02/12 (valid for 15 years).	N/A	PP
43	Disnorte	/PPA2/	Power Purchase Agreement Amayo Phase I – between (Empresa Distribuidora de electricidad del Norte (Disnorte) and Consorcio Eólico Amayo, S.A. issued 2007/09/03 (valid for 15 years).	N/A	PP
44	Disnorte	/PPA_A 1/	Power Purchase Agreement of Amayo Phase II – between (Empresa Distribuidora de Electricidad del Sur (Disnorte) and Consorcio Eólico Amayo (Fase II), S.A. issued 2009/07/22 (valid for 15 years).	N/A	PP
45	Dissur	/PPA_A 2/	Power Purchase Agreement of Amayo Phase II – between (Empresa Distribuidora de Electricidad del Sur (Dissur) and Consorcio Eólico Amayo (Fase II), S.A. issued 2009/07/22 (valid for 15 years).	N/A	PP
46	Suzlon	/SCI/	SC-Comander User Manual, date 2008/06/19	N/A	PP
47	Suzlon	/SCS/	Functional description SC-SCADA Reporting – Suzlon Energy A/S - issued 2009/04/01 Revision 00.	N/A	PP
48	Suzlon	/TSP/	Alarm Description & Trouble Shooting S88 CSM88L28021, Version 01, issued 2008/09/30 by Suzlon.	N/A	PP
49	PP	/XLS/	Emission reduction calculation spreadsheet	N/A	PP
50	Fiallos y Asociados	/45-94/	Environmental Impact Assessment Regulation number 45-94 “ <i>Reglamento de Permiso y Evaluación de Impacto Ambiental</i> ”, issued 1994/10/31. (Regulation that requires an EIA for any project implemented in Nicaragua)	N/A	PP

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

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

FAR ID	Section no.	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR		
<i>There were no open issues addressed in the previous verification report</i>		
Project participant response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by project participant		
DOE assessment		Date: DD/MM/YYYY

Table 4. CL from this verification

CL ID	01	Section no.	D.2	Date: 13/08/2015
Description of CL				
Dates of calibration included in section D.2 are not clear enough to be easy understand.				
Project participant response				Date:
Details of the calibration date and its delay has been included in section D2 of the monitoring report:				
<i>The calibration of metering system was supposed to be carried out before October 13th 2014, but it was not possible because the company contracted did not have availability to carry out the audit before October 13th and for instance the calibration was delayed for ten days.. For this reason and in accordance to UNFCCC guidelines the maximum precision error of 0.2% has been applied in the measurements both for delivery and received energy of every meter in order to obtain the net energy produced on October. The maximum error was applied for the whole month in order to obtain the most conservative energy production value of this period. Please refer to spreadsheet calculation.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<i>Calibration certificates and Monitoring report.</i>				
DOE assessment				Date: 20/08/2015
The calibrations of all monitoring equipments installed have been verified as listed in table given in Appendix 6 to this report. All calibration certificates were provided and assessed. A delayed calibration was identified by the PP from the beginning of the verification process. Hence the PP has performed the necessary corrections in terms of application of the maximum error. Based on that the verification team can confirm that all installed monitoring equipments are now duly calibrated.				

CL ID	02	Section no.	Appendix 1	Date: 13/08/2015
Description of CL				
The table with the PP contact information of Shell Trading International Limited is missing in Appendix 1.				
Project participant response				Date:
The table with the PP contact information of project participant Shell Trading International Limited has been included in appendix 1.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Monitoring report.				
DOE assessment				Date: 20/08/2015
The table with the PP information was included in the MR.				

Table 5. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	01	Section no.	D.2	Date: 13/08/2015
Description of CAR				
Raw data from May and June of the received energy ($EC^{230kV}_{AMAYO,y}$) from the main meters ION is incorrect.				
Project participant response				Date:
The raw data for May and June has been corrected for parameter $EC^{230kV}_{AMAYO,y}$.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Monitoring report and spreadsheet calculation.				
DOE assessment				Date: 20/08/2015
During the verification all relevant monitoring parameters (as listed in chapter B.7.1 of the PDD) have been verified with regard to the appropriateness of the applied measurement / determination method, the correctness of the values applied for ER calculation, the accuracy, and applied QA/QC measures. The results as well as the verification procedure are described parameter-wise in the project specific verification checklist. After appropriate corrections were carried out by the project participant, it can be confirmed that the monitoring parameter has been measured without material misstatements and in line with all applicable standards and relevant requirements.				

CAR ID	02	Section no.	E.5	Date: 13/08/2015
Description of CAR				
Estimated ex-ante value according to the registered PDD included in section E.5 differs is incorrect.				
Project participant response				Date:
The estimated ex-ante value according to the PDD has been corrected.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Monitoring report.				
DOE assessment				Date: 20/08/2015
The MR includes a comparison of the calculated actual emission reductions with the ex-ante calculated values in the registered PDD. An editorial mistake was identified when the value was copied. The ex-post determined value was found to be slightly higher than the ex-ante estimated value. This was justified by the PP using historical data of wind speed. The wind speed of year 2015 was found to be higher than in previous 2 years. Hence more electricity was generated due to external conditions not in control of the PP. Wind projects depends on wind availability. Therefore the slightly higher achieved ER was considered plausible and accepted by the audit team.				

Appendix 5. Verification Protocol

Table A-1: GHG calculation procedures and management control testing / detailed audit testing of residual risk areas and random testing

Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including <i>Forward Action Requests</i>)
Raw data generation				
• Installation of measuring equipment • Dysfunction of installed equipment • Maloperation by operational personnel • Downtimes of equipment • Exchange of equipment • Change of measurement equipment characteristic • Insufficient accuracy • Change of technology	• Installation of modern and state of the art equipment • Process control automation • Internal data review • Regular visual inspections of installed equipment • Only skilled and trained personnel operates the relevant equipment • Daily raw data checks • Immediate exchange of dysfunctional equipment • Stand-by duty is organized	• Inadequate installation / operation of the monitoring equipment • Inadequate exchange of equipment • Change of personnel • Undetected measurement errors • Inappropriateness of Management system procedures w.r.t. monitoring plan requirements (e.g. substitute value strategies) • Non-application of management system procedures • Insufficient accuracy • Inappropriate QA/QC	• Site – visit • Check of equipment • Check of technical data sheets • Check of suppliers information / guarantees • Check of calibration records, if applicable • Check of maintenance records • Counter-check of raw data and commercial data • Check of CDM management system • Check of CDM related procedures	• See Table A-2

Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including <i>Forward Action Requests</i>)
Accuracy of values supplied by Third Parties	- Training - Internal audit procedures - Internal check of QA/QC measures of involved Third Parties	measures of Third Parties	- Application of CDM management system procedures - Check of trainings - Check of responsibilities - Check of QA/QC documentation / evidences of involved Third Parties	
Raw data collection and data aggregation				
- Wrong data transfer from raw data to daily and monthly aggregated reporting forms - IT Systems - Spread sheet programming - Manual data transmission - Data protection - Responsibilities	- Cross-check of data - Plausibility checks of various parameters. - Appropriate archiving system - Clear allocation of responsibilities - Application of CDM Management system procedures - Usage of standard software solutions (Spreadsheets) - Limited access to IT systems	- Unintended usage of old data that has been revised - Incomplete documentation - Ex-post corrections of records - Ambiguous sources of information - Non-application of management system procedures - Manual data transfer mistakes - Unintended change of spread sheet programming or data base entries	- Check of data aggregation steps - Counter-calculation - Data integrity checks by means of graphical data analysis and calculation of specific performance figures - Check of management system certification - Check of data archiving system - Check of application of Management system procedures	See Table A-2

Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including <i>Forward Action Requests</i>)
	Data protection procedures	Problems caused by updating/upgrading or change of applied software		
Other calculation parameters				
Emission factors, oxidation factors, coefficients	The values and data sources applied are defined in the PDD and monitoring plan	- Unintended or intended Modification of calculation parameters - Wrong application of values - Misinterpretations of the applied methodology and/ or the PDD - Missing update of applicable regulatory framework (e.g. IPCC values)	- Update-check of regulatory framework - Countercheck of the applied MP in the MR against the methodology and the PDD	See Table A-2
Calculation Methods				
- Applied formulae - Miscalculation - Mistakes in spread-sheet calculation	- Advanced calculation and reporting tools - A CDM coordinator is in charge of the CDM related calculations - Usage of tested / counterchecked Excel spreadsheets - Involvement of external	The danger of miscalculation can only be minimized.	- Countercheck on the basis of own calculation. - Spread sheet walk-through. - Plausibility checks - Check of plots	See Table A-2

Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including <i>Forward Action Requests</i>)
	consultants			
Monitoring reporting				
• Data transfer to the author of the monitoring report • Data transfer to the monitoring report • Unintended use of outdated versions	• An experienced CDM consultant is responsible for monitoring reporting. • CDM QMS procedures are defined	• The danger of data transfer mistakes can only be minimized • Inappropriate application of QMS procedures	• Counter check with evidences provided. • Audit of procedure application	• See Table A-2

Table A-2: (Project specific) Periodic Verification Checklist

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
A. Description of the project activity				
A.1. Purpose and general description of the project activity (F-CDM-FORM, Attachment, A.1) <i>Check if section A.1 of the MR includes the following:</i> - Purpose of the PA and the measures taken to reduce GHG emissions - Brief description of the installed technology and equipment - Relevant dates for the project activity (e.g. construction, commissioning, continued operation periods etc.) - Total emission reductions achieved in this monitoring period	/MR/	The verification team has checked section A.1 of the MR and confirms that the information provided is complete and correct with regards to the following: ☒ Purpose of the PA and the measures taken to reduce GHG emissions ☒ Brief description of the installed technology and equipments ☒ Relevant dates for the project activity (e.g. construction, commissioning, continued operation periods etc) ☒ Total emission reductions achieved in this monitoring period	OK	OK
A.2. Location of project activity (F-CDM-FORM, Attachment , A.2) <i>Check if section A.2 of the MR reflects correctly the following:</i> - Host Party(ies) - Region / State / Province etc. - City / Town / Community etc. - Physical / geographical location (e.g. Latitude and Longitude)	/MR/ /PDD/	The verification team has checked section A.2 of the MR and confirms by means of comparison with the information given in the PDD and information gathered during the site visit that the information provided is complete and correct with regards to the following: ☒ Host Party(ies) ☒ Region / State / Province ☒ City / Town / Community ☒ Physical / Geographical location	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
A.3. Parties and Project Participants (F-CDM-FORM, Attachment, A.3) Check if section A.3 of the MR includes the following: - All PPs as displayed on the UNFCCC website - A correctly filled table as per the MR template	/MR/ /unfccc/	The verification team has checked section A.3 of the MR as well as the UNFCCC website and confirms that: ☒ all PPs as displayed on the project related UNFCCC website are correctly listed ☒ the table as per the template MR has been correctly filled	OK	OK
A.4. Reference of applied methodology (F-CDM-FORM, Attachment, A.4) Check if section A.4 of the MR correctly describes / includes the following: - Reference to the applicable version of the methodology - Reference to the applicable version(s) of relevant methodological tools - Relevant EB decisions, if applicable	/MR/ /PDD/ /unfccc/	The verification team has checked section A.4 of the MR and confirms by means of comparison with the information given in the PDD and displayed on the UNFCCC website that the information provided is complete and correct with regards to the following: ☒ Number, title and version of the applicable CDM Methodology ☒ Name and version of applicable CDM methodological tools ☐ Relevant EB decisions	OK	OK
A.5. Crediting period of project activity (F-CDM-FORM, Attachment, A.5) Check if section A.5 of the MR correctly includes the following: - Start date of the crediting period. In this context please check, if applicable, whether post registration changes to the start date have been accepted by the EB. Length and type of the crediting period	/MR/ /unfccc/	The verification team has checked section A.5 of the MR and confirms by means of comparison with the information displayed on the UNFCCC website that the information provided is complete and correct with regards to the following: ☒ Start date of the crediting period. ☒ Type and length of the crediting period	OK	OK
A.6. Publication of the Monitoring Report (VVS, § 348)	/unfccc/	The verification team has ensured and confirms by means of checking the respective project information on the UNFCCC website that:	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>Check if the monitoring report has been made publicly available on the UNFCCC website before the verification commenced.</i> <i>Check if comments have been received and if yes, how they have been addressed.</i>		☒ The draft monitoring report, as received from the project participants, has been made publicly available prior to the start of the verification activities. Publication was made on 22/07/2015 and the audit was held on 13-14/08/2015 ☒ No comments have been received.		
A.7. Compliance with standardized format of the Monitoring Report (VVS, § 381, 382) <i>Check (only) if the latest applicable MR template has been used. For compliance assessment with the MR guideline pl. refer to the respective MR sections.</i>	/F-CDM-FORM/	The verification team has checked all sections of the MR and confirms by means of comparison with the MR template that: ☒ the standardized MR template has been used In this context the following findings have been identified: CL 02 was raised.	CL-02	OK
B. Implementation of project activity				
B.1. Description of implemented registered project activity (F-CDM-FORM, Attachment, B.1) <i>Check if section B.1 of the MR correctly describes / includes the following:</i> - Implementation status of the PA - Detailed description of installed technology(ies) / technical processes and equipment applied - Diagrams (where appropriate)	/MR/ /PDD/ /PS/ /IM/ /log_book/	The verification team has checked section B.1 of the MR and confirms by means of comparison with the information given in the PDD, the project standard and information gathered during the site visit that: ☒ the description of the implementation status of the PA is in line with the applicable provisions of the project standard ☒ an appropriate description of the installed technology(ies), technical process and equipment incl. diagrams, where applicable, has been included	OK	OK
B.1.1. Initial project implementation (VVS; §§ 383, 384, 385) <i>Assess whether the project has been implemented and operated as per the registered PDD and are all physical features of the project in place?</i> <i>Further focus on the potential phase wise</i>	/IM01/ /PDD/ /MS/ /log_book/	<i>Description:</i> at the registered PDD it is stated the technical features and equipment to be employed by the project activity, and what was verified by the verification team is that the project is indeed implemented with them. 19 Suzlon wind turbine generators of 2.1 MW model S88 were	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>implementation and check the reporting on the corresponding status and starting dates accordingly. Check if the project is still in compliance with the applicability conditions of the methodology. Also, discuss – if applicable – the necessity of PRC notifications / approvals.</i>		installed resulting in a wind farm of 39.9 MW generation capacity. The project is operated as described in the PDD^{/PDD/}. All required procedures are available and implemented in an appropriate manner. <i>Verifier's action:</i> Interviews were performed during on site visit. A logbook^{/Log_book/} to record observations deviating from normal operating conditions was available and checked by the verification team. <i>Conclusion:</i> The project has been implemented and operated as per registered PDD		
B.1.2. Technical equipment changes (VVS; §§ 383, 384, 385) <i>Check if relevant technical equipment of the project activity has been exchanged or modified during the monitoring period. Further ensure that consistent notations of key equipment (meters etc.) in PDD, MR and calculation spreadsheet are applied</i> <i>Consider e.g. interviews with operational personnel, QMS records, maintenance records, instrument specifications.</i> <i>In case of changes, check whether the project is still in line with the registered PDD and assure that these changes have been considered in the monitoring report and the emission reduction calculation.</i> <i>In case of post registration changes pl. refer to chapter B.2.</i>	/IM01/ /PDD/ /log_book/ /downtime/	<i>Description:</i> No relevant technical equipment of the project activity has been exchanged or modified during the monitoring period. The Operational Logbooks^{/logbook/} were reviewed, these Logbooks includes the daily operational records, this are prepared manually by the project operators and then all this data is recorded in the Amayo Daily Reports. In addition the raw data from the SCADA system were checked^{/downtime/}. <i>Verifier's action:</i> Interviews with the project operators were performed. The operational logbooks^{/logbook/} were reviewed so as the information extracted from the SCADA^{/downtime/}. <i>Conclusion:</i> It is confirmed that the project is still in line with the registered PDD. The change has been considered in the MR and in the power generation registers.	OK	OK
B.1.3. Operation of the project activity (VVS; §§ 383, 384, 385) <i>Check if relevant operation modes of the project</i>	/IM01/ /PDD/	<i>Description:</i> Amayo has complete control of the operation of the wind farm. SUZLON is responsible for the operation and maintenances of the wind park.	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>activity have been exchanged or modified during the monitoring period.</i> <i>Consider e.g. interviews with operational personnel, operation log sheets, data management system records.</i> <i>In case of changes, check whether the project is still in line with the registered PDD and assure that these changes have been considered in the monitoring report and the emission reduction calculation.</i> <i>In case of post registration changes pl. refer to chapter B.2.</i>		A SCADA system (SC-Commander system) is implemented to control, collect, store, analyze and distribute all available data. The SC-SCADA Reporting server is a central Suzlon database where wind power project plant data is hosted for reporting. The SC-SCADA Reporting server is located in a central location and is operated and maintained by Suzlon. The verification team has identified that the mode of operation for the project activity have not been changed or modified during this 7th monitoring period. <i>Verifier's action:</i> By means of interviews with the operational personnel and revision of technical informatio it was evidenced, that the operation modes were not changed since 1st verification and they are in line with the approved PDD and the revised monitoring plan. <i>Conclusion:</i> No operation modes were changed. The PP has performed interviews and reviewed documents. No discrepancies were identified.		
B.1.4. Incidents (VVS; §§ 383, 384, 385) <i>Identify if there have been any significant incidents, deviant operation modes and / or downtimes of the equipment?</i> <i>Consider e.g. interviews with operational personnel, operational log sheets, analysis of performance data.</i>	/IM01/	<i>Description:</i> Some downtimes were observed mainly due to maintenance activities. Furthermore a delayed calibration was observed. This is addressed in the related monitored parameter. <i>Verifier's action:</i> An Interview with the project operator from the wind park was performed to confirm the maintenance activities occurred during the 7th monitoring period. The operational logbooks were reviewed so as the SUZLON repair documentation^{/downtime/}. <i>Conclusion:</i> all shutdowns occurred during the monitoring period have been properly recorded and have been considered in the MR and emission reduction calculation.	OK	OK
B.1.5. Legislation Find out – esp. in the context of methodological	/IM01/ /EIA/	<i>Description:</i> no legislation has been changed during the current monitoring period. The Power Purchase Agreement is still valid.	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
requirements - whether relevant legislation with effect on the project activity in the host country has been changed. Assess, in case of changes, whether consequences for the PA with regard to relevant CDM requirements have been accounted for. In case of changes data sources shall be referenced.	/MEP/ /EGL/ /EL/ /45-94/	Commercial operating certificates are still valid and are necessary to operate the plant. Environmental license is still valid. The annual environmental report corresponding to 2014 and 2105 has been provided. <i>Verifier's action:</i> the verification team checked the licenses which are still valid. The PP has provided the periodic reports to the environmental authority. Proof of receipt by the environmental body was reviewed and accepted. <i>Conclusion:</i> Relevant legislation was considered. No changes were detected. The PP complies with local regulation.		
B.1.6. Open issues from validation (VVS; § 353, 354) <i>Check (esp. in case of 1st periodic verification) whether there are any open issues indicated in the validation report (e.g. FAR)?</i>	/VAL/	☒ There were no open issues addressed in the validation report ☐ All open issues from the validation have been appropriately addressed. ☐ The following issues related to the validation have not yet been appropriately addressed:	OK	OK
B.1.7. Open issues from previous verification (VVS; §§ 353, 354) <i>Check in case of further periodic verifications whether there are any open issues indicated in previous verification reports (FAR) and take into consideration the guidance as specified in VVS.</i>	/VER/	☒ There were no open issues addressed in the previous verification report ☐ All open issues from the previous verification have been appropriately addressed. ☐ The following issues related to the previous verification have not yet been appropriately addressed:	OK	OK
C. Description of monitoring system				
C.1. Monitoring Plan – PDD Compliance	/MR/	By means of comparison of the MR with the registered PDD (or	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.														
(VVS, §§ 383-385) <i>Check if the monitoring plan is in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD (or any accepted revised MP).</i> <i>Please check esp. if</i> - <i>all parameters stated in the MP of the registered PDD have been monitored and updated as applicable</i> - <i>the monitoring equipment has been controlled and calibrated as per the MP</i> - <i>the monitoring results are consistently recorded as per the approved frequency</i> - <i>QA/QC procedures have been applied in accordance with the MP</i>	/PDD/	any revisions thereof) the verification team has checked whether the MP is in compliance with the registered PDD. The outcome is as follows: <table><tr><td>☒</td><td colspan="3">The MP is completely in accordance with the last registered/approved version of the PDD / MP.</td></tr></table>	☒	The MP is completely in accordance with the last registered/approved version of the PDD / MP.														
☒	The MP is completely in accordance with the last registered/approved version of the PDD / MP.																	
C.2. Monitoring Plan – Meth Compliance (VVS, §§ 386-388) <i>Check if the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.</i> <i>In case the methodology references applicable tools it has to be ensured that the MP is also compliant with those tools.</i> <i>Also please specify if monitoring aspects have been identified that are not specified in the methodology but may enhance the level of accuracy and completeness of the monitoring plan – this esp. applies for SSC PAs.</i>	/MR/ /PDD/ /ACM000 2/	By means of comparison of the MR with the applied CDM methodology and related tools the verification team has checked whether the MP is in compliance with the MP related requirements of the applied methodology. The outcome is as follows: <table><tr><td>☒</td><td colspan="3">The MP is completely in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the CDM project (last registered/approved version of the PDD)</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="3">☐</td><td colspan="3">The MP is completely in accordance with the applied tools which the methodology references. A breakdown of the referenced tools is as follows:</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Title (of the tool)</td><td>Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Version</td><td>01</td></tr></table>	☒	The MP is completely in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the CDM project (last registered/approved version of the PDD)			☐	The MP is completely in accordance with the applied tools which the methodology references. A breakdown of the referenced tools is as follows:			1	Title (of the tool)	Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system		Version	01	OK	OK
☒	The MP is completely in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the CDM project (last registered/approved version of the PDD)																	
☐	The MP is completely in accordance with the applied tools which the methodology references. A breakdown of the referenced tools is as follows:																	
	1	Title (of the tool)	Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system															
		Version	01															

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.																		
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>MP compliance</td><td> ☐ full compliance ☐ findings have been raised ☒ N/A (for MP) </td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Title (of the tool)</td><td>Tool to demonstration and assessment of additionality</td></tr> <tr> <td>Version</td><td>05</td></tr> <tr> <td>MP compliance</td><td> ☐ full compliance ☐ findings have been raised ☒ N/A (for MP) </td></tr> </table> </td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Title (of the tool)</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Version</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>MP compliance</td><td> ☐ full compliance ☐ findings have been raised ☐ N/A (for MP) </td></tr> </table> </td></tr> </table>	MP compliance	☐ full compliance ☐ findings have been raised ☒ N/A (for MP)	2	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Title (of the tool)</td><td>Tool to demonstration and assessment of additionality</td></tr> <tr> <td>Version</td><td>05</td></tr> <tr> <td>MP compliance</td><td> ☐ full compliance ☐ findings have been raised ☒ N/A (for MP) </td></tr> </table>	Title (of the tool)	Tool to demonstration and assessment of additionality	Version	05	MP compliance	☐ full compliance ☐ findings have been raised ☒ N/A (for MP)	3	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Title (of the tool)</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Version</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>MP compliance</td><td> ☐ full compliance ☐ findings have been raised ☐ N/A (for MP) </td></tr> </table>	Title (of the tool)		Version		MP compliance	☐ full compliance ☐ findings have been raised ☐ N/A (for MP)		
MP compliance	☐ full compliance ☐ findings have been raised ☒ N/A (for MP)																						
2	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Title (of the tool)</td><td>Tool to demonstration and assessment of additionality</td></tr> <tr> <td>Version</td><td>05</td></tr> <tr> <td>MP compliance</td><td> ☐ full compliance ☐ findings have been raised ☒ N/A (for MP) </td></tr> </table>	Title (of the tool)	Tool to demonstration and assessment of additionality	Version	05	MP compliance	☐ full compliance ☐ findings have been raised ☒ N/A (for MP)																
Title (of the tool)	Tool to demonstration and assessment of additionality																						
Version	05																						
MP compliance	☐ full compliance ☐ findings have been raised ☒ N/A (for MP)																						
3	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Title (of the tool)</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Version</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>MP compliance</td><td> ☐ full compliance ☐ findings have been raised ☐ N/A (for MP) </td></tr> </table>	Title (of the tool)		Version		MP compliance	☐ full compliance ☐ findings have been raised ☐ N/A (for MP)																
Title (of the tool)																							
Version																							
MP compliance	☐ full compliance ☐ findings have been raised ☐ N/A (for MP)																						
C.3. Management System (VVS, § 373 (a) (iii)) <i>Check if the GHG data monitoring system can be assessed as appropriate.</i> <i>In case reference is made to a (certified) company quality management system, check if all CDM related monitoring procedures have been fully integrated in the project participant's quality management system.</i> <i>In case of a stand-alone system, check how the GHG management system has been implemented and effectiveness is ensured.</i>	/ MR/ / IM01/ / IM02/ / PCC/ / ISO/	<i>Description:</i> Amayo Wind Farm project is certified in ISO 9001:2008 and ISO 14001:2004. All CDM related monitoring procedures have been fully integrated in the project participant's quality management system. Amayo has developed and implemented operational procedures including procedures for extract data from the meters. There are procedures for operation and maintenance issued by Suzlon, which is the supplier of the wind turbines. There are also procedures for carbon credits developed by the PP and the consultancy firm which describe the responsibilities and procedures for data collection, calculation, reporting, and		OK	OK																		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		archiving. The procedures for carbon credits^{/PCC/} were revised on January 2013. This procedure includes the data management, QA/QC procedures, trouble shooting procedures (according to the applicable legislation) and calibration frequency. <i>Verifier's action:</i> Last versions of the Operational Procedures and the carbon credits procedure were checked. Also, the ISO certificates have been checked by the verification team. <i>Conclusion:</i> All GHG monitoring system is included and integrated in the management system of the wind farm and it could be evidenced and confirmed during site visit that GHG management system is completely implemented in the wind farm.		
C.4. Metering diagram (F-CDM-FORM, Attachment, C; PS §246) <i>Check first if the MR includes a metering diagram showing all relevant monitoring points.</i> <i>Check further if this diagram reflects the actual situation and is in line with the registered PDD and with the requirements of the applied methodology.</i>	/MR/ /ACM000 2/	<i>Description:</i> Yes, the MR includes a metering diagram showing all relevant monitoring points. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The MR was checked compared with the information in the PDD. <i>Conclusion:</i> The diagram reflects the actual situation and is in line with the registered PDD and with the requirements of the applied methodology.	OK	OK
C.5. Roles and Responsibilities (F-CDM-FORM, Attachment, C; PS §246) <i>Check if all roles and positions of each person in the GHG data management process are clearly defined and implemented as stated in the monitoring plan. Please consider the complete data trail from raw data generation to submission of the final data.</i> <i>Identify, if relevant personnel w.r.t. monitoring has been exchanged?</i> <i>If so, have appropriate training measures been carried out.</i>	/MR/ /EL/ /IM01/ /IM02/	<i>Description:</i> The roles and positions were evidenced on the List of Employees. Responsibilities for measurements, collection and compilation of data, data storage and archiving are clearly stated. All responsibilities and roles are clearly defined in the Procedures for carbon credits. <i>Verifier's action:</i> the validation team has checked the MR against the registered PDD and the applicable methodology ACM0002 version 07. Also interviews were performed during on site visit. <i>Conclusion:</i> It was verify by the verification team that only duly	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>In case of changes, assure that the implemented monitoring procedures have not been affected.</i>		qualified personnel is involved in the monitoring procedures. Training evidence of all personnel involved in the project was checked		
C.6. Emergency procedures for the monitoring system (F-CDM-FORM, Attachment, C; PS §246) <i>Check, as appropriate, whether relevant emergency procedures for the monitoring system have been included in the MR and assess whether these procedures have been implemented, when required</i>	/TSP/	<i>Description:</i> Troubleshooting procedures are described in the Alarm Description & Trouble Shooting Manual property of Suzlon. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The Alarm Description & Trouble Shooting Manual was checked accordingly. <i>Conclusion:</i> Troubleshooting procedures are included in the operation manuals. No discrepancies were identified.	OK	OK
C.7. Data archive and data protection (PS §65 b)) Check whether all records of monitoring parameters are archived according to the monitoring plan. Assess further whether appropriate measures have been taken in order to avoid unintended or intended manipulation or loss of the measured data.	/IM01/ /PDD/ /SC/ /SCS/ /CC_ION/ /CC_nexus/ us/	<i>Description:</i> The turbines are interconnected with optical fiber to an Optical Fiber Center (central PLC) located in the wind farm. The Optical Fiber Center (central PLC) transmits to a VPN (Virtual Private Network) the information in real time (without any interval of time). A SCADA system (SC-Commander system)^{/SC/ & /SCS/} is implemented to control, collect, store, analyze and distribute all available data. The SC-SCADA Reporting server is a central Suzlon database where wind power project plant data is hosted for reporting. The SC-SCADA Reporting server is located in a central location (Houston, USA) and is operated and maintained by Suzlon. Both ION meters^{/CC_ION/} and all the Nexus power meters^{/CC_nexus/} are sealed. CNDC is connected to the ION main meter (via modem) with 1 dedicated channel which transmit the information in real time (without any interval of time). Currently CNDC has access to the low voltage power meters via internet through the IP address of each power meter. Amayo downloads daily the data from the ION and Nexus main and back-up meters. Every day (after 00:00 hrs.) Amayo uploads the data extracted	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		directly from the ION and Nexus main and back up meter, to the dispatch web site^{/DWS/}. Furthermore, the PP backs up monthly the data from the meters. There is a server in the wind farm which storages all the data of the wind farm operation, this server has a back-up which is performed automatically every day. There is also measurement equipment for each wind-generator on-line in the SCADA system. The data is archived in electronic way. Archived data is kept during the crediting period and two years later. <i>Verifier's action:</i> It was checked during site visit that the ION meters located in the Protection, Control and Monitoring (PCYM) room of Amayo Substation so as the power meters located at the Medium Voltage room are in sealed cabinets. Interviews were performed to confirm data protection methods. Furthermore, the SCADA system manuals and procedures^{/SC/ & /SCS/} were also reviewed. <i>Conclusion:</i> All records of monitoring parameters are archived according to the monitoring plan. No discrepancies were identified. Energy data are protected and information could be obtained from different sources to avoid manipulation. Data protection methods are accepted by the verification team.		
D. Data and parameters				
D.1. Data and Parameters fixed ex ante				

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
a) Compliance with registered PDD (F-CDM-FORM, Attachment; D1, VVS § 352) Check whether the value applied is in compliance with the registered PDD.	/PDD/ /ACM 0002/ /MR/	<i>Description:</i> The values of the data and parameters fixed ex-ante by the PP have been checked against the revised PDD and the applicable methodology. All fixed ex-ante values were found correct. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The revised monitoring plan, the registered PDD and the applicable methodologies were checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> the value applied for all data and parameter fixed ex ante are in compliance with the registered PDD	OK	OK
b) Compliance with the applied methodology (F-CDM-FORM, Attachment; D1) Check whether the value applied is in compliance with the applied methodology or any other tool.	/PDD/ /ACM 0002/ /MR/	<i>Description:</i> The values of the data and parameters fixed ex-ante by the PP have been checked against the revised PDD and the applicable methodology. All fixed ex-ante values were found correct. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The revised monitoring plan, the registered PDD and the applicable methodologies were checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> the value applied for all data and parameter fixed ex ante are in compliance with the applied methodologies and tools.	OK	OK
D.2. Data and Parameters monitored				
D.2.1. EG_y		Description: Electricity supplied to the grid by the project		
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 389-393) 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	/IM01/ /PDD/ /ACM 0002/ /MR/ /OR/	<i>Description:</i> According to the registered MP this parameter is calculated by subtracting the project power consumption from the project gross electricity generation: $EG_y = EG_{PhaseI,y}^{230kV} - EC_{PhaseI,y}^{230kV}$ As Amayo Phase I shares the substation and the commercial power meters at the 230 kV side with Amayo Phase II, the project power consumption ($EC_{PhaseI,y}^{230kV}$) and power gross electricity generation ($EG_{PhaseI,y}^{230kV}$) are calculated by the PP	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>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.</i>		based on the total electricity from both wind farms measured at the 230 kV and the independent power generation and consumption measurements performed for each wind farm at the 13.8 kV. The formulas used for these calculations are: $EC_{PhaseI,y}^{230kV} = \frac{EC_{PhaseI,y}^{13.8kV}}{EC_{PhaseI,y}^{13.8kV} + EC_{PhaseII,y}^{13.8kV}} \cdot EC_{AMAYO,y}^{230kV}$ $EG_{PhaseI,y}^{230kV} = \frac{EG_{PhaseI,y}^{13.8kV}}{EG_{PhaseI,y}^{13.8kV} + EG_{PhaseII,y}^{13.8kV}} \cdot EG_{AMAYO,y}^{230kV}$ The detail measurement/determination method for each parameter considered in the formulas is explained in Section C. of the verification checklist. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The registered MP has been checked by the verification team. Interviews were also performed with personnel from CEA to confirm the measure method. Also, the Operational Regulation^{ORI} requirements were checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> the monitoring of this parameter is in line with the revised MP and with the applied methodology.		
b) Accuracy and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 394-400) <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. 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>	/IM01/ /CC_ION/ /INE/ /CC_next/ us/	<i>Description:</i> No measurement equipment is required for this parameter as it is calculated. <i>Verifier's action:</i> No action was required. <i>Conclusion:</i> the calculation was performed based on the required documents and procedures.	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i>				
c) Correctness (VVS, §§ 389-393) <i>Determine whether the value given in the monitoring report is correct or determined in a conservative manner. In case of conservative approaches used in lieu of the monitoring as per registered MP detailed assessment of the conservativeness of the approach used should be given. In case of mistakes / deviations pl. provide details and descriptions of the CARs raised.</i>	MR/ /XLS/ /EEG/ /ED/ /DWS/ /MEPR/ /cndc/ /DTE/	☒ Correct ☐ Not correct <i>Description:</i> The values given in the monitoring report are correct. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The monitoring plan was assessed. The values were crosschecked against the raw data, sales records and acceptance letters from DISNORTE-DISSUR. <i>Conclusion:</i> The values are correct.	OK	OK
D.2.2. EG^{230kV}_{AMAYO,y}		Description: Quantity of electricity delivered to the grid (230 kV transmission line) by the entire wind farm (Phase I + Phase II)		
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 389-393) <i>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.</i>	/CC_ION/ /DR/ /DWS/ /MEPR/ /OR/	<i>Description:</i> The quantity of electricity delivered to the grid (230 kV transmission line) by the entire wind farm (Phase I + Phase II) is measured and recorded by one main meter ^{/CC_ION/} (ION 8600 s/n: PT-0901A531-01) and one back up ^{/CC_ION/} (ION 8600 s/n: PT-0901A532-01) located in the Protection, Control and Monitoring (PCYM) room of the wind farm at the high side voltage (230 kV Delivery Point) of the AMAYO Substation. Both meters are bi-directional and also calibrated ^{/CC_ION/} , sealed, and belong to Amayo. When a failure is detected in the main meter, the date will be taken from the back up meter (^{/OR/} section X/10). Extraordinary audits (including calibration) are possible if CNDC or Amayo detect any failure in the measurement (^{/OR/} Annex III, section 7.1(d)). The audit shall be performed by an auditor certified by CNDC. INE defines the local standards and parameters to be followed in	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		the electricity generation sector. Amayo download daily the data from the main and back up meters and monitors the total electricity generation^{/DR/}. Also, a monthly report^{/MEPR/} of total generation is elaborated. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The registered MP has been checked by the verification team. Interviews were also performed with personnel from CEA to confirm the measure method. Also, the Operational Regulation^{/OR/} requirements were checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> The measurement of the parameter is in line with the registered monitoring plan and the applied methodology.		
b) Accuracy and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 394-400) <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_ION/	<i>Description:</i> Both ION meters are state of the art. The calibration of the meters is done by a certified auditor and registered by CND. The verification team had checked the calibration certificates. Calibration of the meters shall be done once every 2 years in agreement of the Operational Regulation^{/OR/} (Annex III, section 7.3). The calibration records^{/CC_ION/} of the power meters located at the delivery point were checked by the verification team. A delayed calibration was identified by the PP from the beginning of the verification process. Hence the PP has performed the necessary corrections in terms of application of the maximum error. Justification was provided by the PP. There are only a few entities in Nicaragua which provide calibration services. Hence the demand on this is high and availability is limited. The PP required the services on time but this was not provided in the required date. <i>Verifier's action:</i> During site visit, the meters were checked. The ION power meters are sealed and protected. <i>Conclusion:</i> Calibration of meters was delayed but after corrections it can be confirmed that all installed monitoring equipments are now duly calibrated. No finding was raised due	CL-01	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		to delayed calibration as the PP corrected the calculation itself applying the maximum error of the meter. Nevertheless a CL was raised related to calibration: CL 01 was raised.		
c) Correctness (VVS, §§ 389-393) <i>Determine whether the value given in the monitoring report is correct or determined in a conservative manner.</i> <i>In case of conservative approaches used in lieu of the monitoring as per registered MP detailed assessment of the conservativeness of the approach used should be given.</i> <i>In case of mistakes / deviations pl. provide details and descriptions of the CARs raised.</i>	/ED/ /CC_ION/	☒ Correct ☐ Not correct <i>Description:</i> The verification team has checked power generation values for Amayo Phase I and Amayo Phase II based on the power meters measurements at the high voltage side. The gross generation values from both wind farms were found correct. As a cross-check measurement the verification team has checked the power generation invoices ^{/EEG/ & /EEG_A2/} and the DTE reports ^{/DTE/} . <i>Verifier's action:</i> The electricity invoices ^{/EEG/ & /EEG_A2/} so as the power generation records ^{/MEPR/ & /ED/} were reviewed and crosschecked. Also the data uploaded to the energy authority was reviewed ^{/DWS/} . <i>Conclusion:</i> the values given in the monitoring report are correct and determined in a conservative manner. For the hole month when the delayed calibration occurred (just a few days), the PP applied the maximum error of the meters as a conservative assumption.	OK	OK
D.2.3. EG^{13.8kV}_{PhaseI,y}		Description: Gross electricity generation in year y by Phase I, as measured in the 13.8 kV meter		
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 389-393) <i>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)).</i> <i>Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard</i>	/DR/ /DWS/ /MEPR/ /PCC/ /CC_nexus/ /OR/	<i>Description:</i> according to the registered MP this parameter is measured by power meters and data shall be automatically and monitored on an hourly basis. The data is recorded and aggregated monthly. Two sets of main and back-up power meters (Cells 3 & 6) are installed at the low voltage side (13.8 kV) collector of each project activity (Amayo Phase I and Amayo Phase II) located in the Substation Medium Voltage room. These collectors send the	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements.</i> <i>Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</i>		power generation from each phase to a common bus bar at the entrance of the low voltage side of the Amayo I Substation main transformer. All power meters are bi-directional. Calibration of the meters shall be done once every 2 years in agreement of the Operational Regulation^{/OR/} (Annex III, section 7.3). When a failure is detected in the main meter, the official measure will be taken from the back up meter (^{/OR/} section X/10). Extraordinary audits (including calibration) are possible if CNDC or Amayo detect any failure in the measurement (^{/OR/} Annex III, section 7.1/d). The audit shall be performed by an auditor certified by CNDC. INE defines the local standards and parameters to be followed in the electricity generation sector. Amayo download daily the data from the main and back up meter and monitors the total electricity generation^{/DR/}. Also, a monthly report^{/MEPR/} of total generation is elaborated. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The registered MP has been checked by the verification team. Interviews were also performed with personnel from CEA to confirm the measure method. Also, the Operational Regulation^{/OR/} requirements were checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> the monitoring of this parameter is in line with the registered MP of the PDD and with the applied methodology.		
b) Accuracy and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 394-400) <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>	/MR/ /CC_nexus/ us/	<i>Description:</i> Both sets of Nexus power meters, including the new meter are state of the art. The calibration of the meters is done by a certified auditor and registered by CNDC. The verification team had checked the calibration certificates. The calibration records of the power meters located at the delivery point were checked by the verification team. Both set of Nexus meters^{/CC_Nexus/} were calibrated. A delayed calibration was identified by the PP from the beginning	~~CL-01~~	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<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>		of the verification process. Hence the PP has performed the necessary corrections in terms of application of the maximum error. Justification was provided by the PP. There are only a few entities in Nicaragua which provide calibration services. Hence the demand on this is high and availability is limited. The PP required the services on time but this was not provided in the required date. <i>Verifier's action:</i> During site visit, the meters were checked. The Nexus power meters are sealed and protected. <i>Conclusion:</i> Calibration of meters was delayed but after corrections it can be confirmed that all installed monitoring equipments are now duly calibrated. No finding was raised due to delayed calibration as the PP corrected the calculation itself applying the maximum error of the meter. Nevertheless CL 01 was raised related to calibration issues.		
c) Correctness (VVS, §§ 389-393) <i>Determine whether the value given in the monitoring report is correct or determined in a conservative manner.</i> <i>In case of conservative approaches used in lieu of the monitoring as per registered MP detailed assessment of the conservativeness of the approach used should be given.</i> <i>In case of mistakes / deviations pl. provide details and descriptions of the CARs raised.</i>	/MR/ /CC_nexus/	☒ Correct ☐ Not correct <i>Description:</i> the value given in the MR is in line with the data from the raw data file. <i>Verifier's action.</i> The MR and excel spreadsheet were checked in detail against the data from the raw data file of the Nexus main and back-up meters. Also, the power meters calibration certificates have been checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> the values given in the monitoring report are correct and determined in a conservative manner. For the hole month when the delayed calibration occurred (just a few days), the PP applied the maximum error of the meters as a conservative assumption.	OK	OK
D.2.4. EG^{13.8kV}_{PhaseII,y}		Description: Gross electricity generation in year y by Phase II, as measured in the 13.8 kV meter		
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 389-393) <i>Describe how the monitoring parameter was</i>	/DR/ /DWS/	<i>Description:</i> according to the registered MP this parameter is measured by power meters and data shall be automatically and monitored on an hourly basis. The data is recorded and	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>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)).</i> <i>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.</i> <i>Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</i>	/MEPR/ /PCC/ /CC_nex us/ /OR/	aggregated monthly. Two sets of main and back-up power meters (Cells 4 & 5) are installed at the low voltage side (13.8 kV) collector of each project activity (Amayo Phase I and Amayo Phase II) located in the Substation Medium Voltage room. These collectors send the power generation from each phase to a common bus bar at the entrance of the low voltage side of the Amayo I Substation main transformer. All power meters are bi-directional. Calibration of the meters shall be done once every 2 years in agreement of the Operational Regulation^{/OR/} (Annex III, section 7.3). When a failure is detected in the main meter, the official measure will be taken from the back up meter (^{/OR/} section X/10). Extraordinary audits (including calibration) are possible if CNDC or Amayo detect any failure in the measurement (^{/OR/} Annex III, section 7.1/d). The audit shall be performed by an auditor certified by CNDC. INE defines the local standards and parameters to be followed in the electricity generation sector. Amayo download daily the data from the main and back up meter and monitors the total electricity generation^{/DR/}. Also, a monthly report^{/MEPR/} of total generation is elaborated. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The registered MP has been checked by the verification team. Interviews were also performed with personnel from CEA to confirm the measure method. Also, the Operational Regulation^{/OR/} requirements were checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> the monitoring of this parameter is in line with the registered MP of the PDD and with the applied methodology.		
b) Accuracy and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 394-400) <i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check</i>	/MR/ /CC_nex us/	<i>Description:</i> Both sets of Nexus power meters are state of the art. The calibration of the meters is done by a certified auditor and registered by CNDC. The verification team had checked the	CL-01	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>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>		calibration certificates including the new meter. The calibration records of the power meters located at the delivery point were checked by the verification team. Both set of Nexus meters^{/CC_Nexus/} were calibrated. A delayed calibration was identified by the PP from the beginning of the verification process. Hence the PP has performed the necessary corrections in terms of application of the maximum error. Justification was provided by the PP. There are only a few entities in Nicaragua which provide calibration services. Hence the demand on this is high and availability is limited. The PP required the services on time but this was not provided in the required date. <i>Verifier's action:</i> During site visit, the meters were checked. The Nexus power meters are sealed and protected. <i>Conclusion:</i> Calibration of meters was delayed but after corrections it can be confirmed that all installed monitoring equipments are now duly calibrated. No finding was raised due to delayed calibration as the PP corrected the calculation itself applying the maximum error of the meter. Nevertheless CL 01 was raised related to calibration issues.		
c) Correctness (VVS, §§ 389-393) <i>Determine whether the value given in the monitoring report is correct or determined in a conservative manner.</i> <i>In case of conservative approaches used in lieu of the monitoring as per registered MP detailed assessment of the conservativeness of the approach used should be given.</i> <i>In case of mistakes / deviations pl. provide details and descriptions of the CARs raised.</i>	/MR/ /ED/ /XLS/	☒ Correct ☐ Not correct <i>Description:</i> the value given at the MR and the corresponding Excel sheet is correct. The verification team has checked the measured data from the Nexus main and back-up meters. No discrepancies were identified. Also, the power meters calibration certificates have been checked. <i>Verifier's action:</i> the MR and excel spreadsheet were intensively checked. No deviations from registered PDD and MP have been detected. Power generation data from the power meters^{/ED/} has	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		been reviewed. <i>Conclusion:</i> the values given in the MR and the excel spreadsheet are consistent and justified. For the hole month when the delayed calibration occurred (just a few days), the PP applied the maximum error of the meters as a conservative assumption.		
D.2.5. EC^{230kV} AMAYO,y		Description: Quantity of electricity consumed from the grid at the 230 kV transmission line by the entire wind farm (Phase I + Phase II)		
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 389-393) 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.	/CC_ION/ /DR/ /DWS/ /MEPR/ /OR/	<i>Description:</i> The quantity of electricity consumed from the grid (230 kV transmission line) by the entire wind farm (Phase I + Phase II) is measured and recorded by one main meter^{/CC_ION/} (ION 8600 s/n: PT-0901A531-01) and one back up^{/CC_ION/} (ION 8600 s/n: PT-0901A532-01) located in the Protection, Control and Monitoring (PCYM) room of the wind farm at the high side voltage (230 kV Delivery Point) of the AMAYO Substation. Both meters are bi-directional and also calibrated^{/CC_ION/}, sealed, and belong to Amayo. When a failure is detected in the main meter, the official measure will be taken from the back up meter (^{/OR/} section X/10). Extraordinary audits (including calibration) are possible if CNDC or Amayo detect any failure in the measurement (^{/OR/} Annex III, section 7.1/d). The audit shall be performed by an auditor certified by CNDC. INE defines the local standards and parameters to be followed in the electricity generation sector. Amayo download daily the data from the main and back up meters and monitors the total electricity consumption^{/DR/}. Also, a monthly report^{/MEPR/} of total power consumption is elaborated. According to the registered MP this data is also crosschecked against the Economic Transaction Document (DTE) and the	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		highest value is used as a conservative assumption. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The parameter has been measured accordingly the registered MP and the applied monitoring methodology.		
b) Accuracy and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 394-400) <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_ION/	<i>Description:</i> Both ION meters are state of the art. The calibration of the meters is done by a certified auditor and registered by CND. The verification team had checked the calibration certificates. Calibration of the meters shall be done once every 2 years in agreement of the Operational Regulation^{OR/} (Annex III, section 7.3). The calibration records^{/CC_ION/} of the power meters were checked by the verification team. Both meters were calibrated. A delayed calibration was identified by the PP from the beginning of the verification process. Hence the PP has performed the necessary corrections in terms of application of the maximum error. Justification was provided by the PP. There are only a few entities in Nicaragua which provide calibration services. Hence the demand on this is high and availability is limited. The PP required the services on time but this was not provided in the required date. According to the registered MP this data is also crosschecked against the Economic Transaction Document (DTE) and the highest value is used as a conservative assumption. <i>Verifier's action:</i> During site visit, the meters were checked. The ION power meters are sealed and protected. New calibration certificates are not required yet because the measurement equipment should be calibrated at least every two years^{/CC_ION/}. <i>Conclusion:</i> Calibration of meters was delayed but after corrections it can be confirmed that all installed monitoring equipments are now duly calibrated. No finding was raised due to delayed calibration as the PP corrected the calculation itself	CL-01	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		applying the maximum error of the meter. Nevertheless CL 01 was raised related to calibration issues.		
c) Correctness (VVS, §§ 389-393) Determine whether the value given in the monitoring report is correct or determined in a conservative manner. In case of conservative approaches used in lieu of the monitoring as per registered MP detailed assessment of the conservativeness of the approach used should be given. In case of mistakes / deviations pl. provide details and descriptions of the CARs raised.	/ MR / / DWS / / ED / / XLS /	☐ Correct ☒ Not correct Description: The verification team has checked power consumption values for Amayo Phase I and Amayo Phase II based on the power meters measurements at the high voltage side. As a cross-check measurement the verification team has checked the power consumption data from the DTE reports ^{/DTE/} . Verifier's action: the power consumption records ^{/DTE/} , /MEPR/& /ED/ were reviewed and crosschecked. Also the data uploaded to the energy authority was reviewed ^{/DWS/} . Conclusion: For the hole month when the delayed calibration occurred (just a few days), the PP applied the maximum error of the meters as a conservative assumption. Nevertheless some values given in the MR are not correct. (CAR D1) Raw data from May and June of the received energy (EC ^{230kV} _{AMAYO,y}) from the main meters ION is incorrect.	CAR D1	OK
D.2.6. EC^{13.8kV}_{PhaseI,y}		Description: Electricity consumption in year y by Phase I, as measured in the 13.8 kV meter		
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 389-393) 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	/ DR / / DWS / / MEPR / / PCC / / CC_nexus / / OR /	Description: according to the registered MP this parameter is measured by power meters and data shall be automatically and monitored on an hourly basis. The data is recorded and aggregated monthly. Two sets of main and back-up power meters (Cells 3 & 6) are installed at the low voltage side (13.8 kV) collector of each project activity (Amayo Phase I and Amayo Phase II) located in the Substation Medium Voltage room. All power meters are bi-directional.	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements.</i> <i>Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</i>		When a failure is detected in the main meter, the official measure will be taken from the back up meter (^{/OR/} section X/10). Extraordinary audits (including calibration) are possible if CNDC or Amayo detect any failure in the measurement (^{/OR/} Annex III, section 7.1/d). The audit shall be performed by an auditor certified by CNDC. INE defines the local standards and parameters to be followed in the electricity generation sector. Amayo download daily the data from the main and back up meter and monitors the total electricity consumption^{/DR/}. Also, a monthly report^{/MEPR/} of total power consumption is elaborated. According to the registered MP this data is also crosschecked against the Economic Transaction Document (DTE) and the highest value is used as a conservative assumption. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The calibration records of the power meters and the registered MP were checked by the verification team. Interviews were also performed with personnel from CEA to confirm the measure method. Also, the Operational Regulation^{/OR/} requirements were checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> the monitoring of this parameter is in line with the registered MP of the PDD and with the applied methodology.		
b) Accuracy and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 394-400) <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</i>	/MR/ /CC_nex us/	<i>Description:</i> The calibration of both sets of Nexus power meters the meters is done by a certified auditor and registered by CNDC. The verification team had checked the calibration certificates. The main meter was calibrated on time but the backup meter had a delayed calibration. During the whole period just the main meter was used. Nevertheless and following the conservativeness of calculation, the PP decided to apply the maximum error on the measurements of all parameters including this in the same way she did it for other parameters where delayed calibration actually occurred.	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>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>		<i>Verifier's action:</i> During site visit, the meters were checked. The Nexus power meters are sealed and protected. <i>Conclusion:</i> Calibration of meters was done on time and according with the registered MP.		
c) Correctness (VVS, §§ 389-393) <i>Determine whether the value given in the monitoring report is correct or determined in a conservative manner.</i> <i>In case of conservative approaches used in lieu of the monitoring as per registered MP detailed assessment of the conservativeness of the approach used should be given.</i> <i>In case of mistakes / deviations pl. provide details and descriptions of the CARs raised.</i>	/ED/ /DTE/ /XLS/	☒ Correct ☐ Not correct <i>Description:</i> The verification team has checked the calculated values of power consumption for Amayo Phase I and Amayo Phase II based on the power meters measurements at the low voltage and high voltage side and the power consumption values determined by the DTE Reports. The value reported in the MR is in line with the value registered in the raw data files. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The power consumption measurements^{/ED/} so as the DTE reports have been checked by the verification team. <i>Conclusion:</i> the values given in the monitoring report are correct. and determined in a conservative manner.	OK	OK
D.2.7. EC^{13.8kV} PhaseII,y		Description: Electricity consumption in year y by Phase II, as measured in the 13.8 kV meter		
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 389-393) <i>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)).</i> <i>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.</i>	/DR/ /DWS/ /MEPR/ /PCC/ /CC_nexus/ /OR/	<i>Description:</i> according to the registered MP this parameter is measured by power meters and data shall be automatically and monitored on an hourly basis. The data is recorded and aggregated monthly. Two sets of main and back-up power meters (Cells 4 & 5) are installed at the low voltage side (13.8 kV) collector of each project activity (Amayo Phase I and Amayo Phase II) located in the Substation Medium Voltage room. All power meters are bi-directional. Calibration of the meters shall be done once every 2 years in agreement of the Operational Regulation^{/OR/} (Annex III, section	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</i>		7.3). When a failure is detected in the main meter, the official measure will be taken from the back up meter (^{/OR/} section X/10). Extraordinary audits (including calibration) are possible if CNDC or Amayo detect any failure in the measurement (^{/OR/} Annex III, section 7.1/d). The audit shall be performed by an auditor certified by CNDC. INE defines the local standards and parameters to be followed in the electricity generation sector. Amayo download daily the data from the main and back up meter and monitors the total electricity consumption^{/DR/}. Also, a monthly report^{/MEPR/} of total energy consumption is elaborated. According to the registered MP this data is also crosschecked against the Economic Transaction Document (DTE) and the highest value is used as a conservative assumption. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The registered MP has been checked by the verification team. Interviews were also performed with personnel from CEA to confirm the measure method. Also, the Operational Regulation^{/OR/} requirements were checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> the monitoring of this parameter is in line with the registered MP of the PDD and with the applied methodology.		
b) Accuracy and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 394-400) <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</i>	/MR/ /CC_nex us/	<i>Description:</i> The calibration of both sets of Nexus power meters is done by a certified auditor and registered by CNDC. The verification team had checked the calibration certificates. The Nexus power meters were calibrated. A delayed calibration was identified by the PP from the beginning of the verification process. Hence the PP has performed the necessary corrections in terms of application of the maximum error. Justification was provided by the PP. There are only a few entities in Nicaragua which provide calibration services. Hence the demand on this is high and availability is limited. The PP	CL-01	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance. Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.		required the services on time but this was not provided in the required date. <i>Verifier's action:</i> During site visit, the meters were checked. The Nexus power meters are sealed and protected. <i>Conclusion:</i> Calibration of meters was delayed but after corrections it can be confirmed that all installed monitoring equipments are now duly calibrated. No finding was raised due to delayed calibration as the PP corrected the calculation itself applying the maximum error of the meter. Nevertheless CL 01 was raised related to calibration issues.		
c) Correctness (VVS, §§ 389-393) Determine whether the value given in the monitoring report is correct or determined in a conservative manner. In case of conservative approaches used in lieu of the monitoring as per registered MP detailed assessment of the conservativeness of the approach used should be given. In case of mistakes / deviations pl. provide details and descriptions of the CARs raised.	/MR/ /ED/	☒ Correct ☐ Not correct <i>Description:</i> the value given in the MR is in line with the data from the raw data file. <i>Verifier's action.</i> The MR and excel spreadsheet were checked in detail against the data from the raw data file of the Nexus main and back-up meters. Also, the power meters calibration certificates have been checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> the values given in the monitoring report are correct and determined in a conservative manner. For the hole month when the delayed calibration occurred (just a few days), the PP applied the maximum error of the meters as a conservative assumption.	OK	OK
E. Calculation of Emission reductions				
E.1. Traceability (VVS, §§ 353, 356) Assess if the calculation is fully traceable. In case of complex calculations an Excel calculation spreadsheet shall be used. All applied formulae must be visible.	/XLS/ /MP/ /PDD/	<i>Description:</i> The PP had used an Excel calculation sheet to provide evidence of the measured parameters and the ER to be generated. <i>Verifier's action:</i> The emission reduction calculation spreadsheet^{/XLS/} was reviewed by the verification team. <i>Conclusion:</i> The calculation is overall correct and traceable.	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
E.2. Parameter consistency (VVS, § 356) Assess whether all internal and external parameters and data used for calculation are applied consistently in the monitoring report and the calculation spreadsheet? Consider only the correct data exchange between the monitoring report and the calculation spreadsheet (if any). Further ensure the consistency of notations for all parameters in the PDD, MR and calculation spreadsheet.	/XLS/ /MP/ /PDD/	<i>Description:</i> Electricity generation data has been applied consistently between the monitoring report and the Excel calculation spread sheet. <i>Verifier's action:</i> Monitoring report and Excel calculation spread sheet were checked accordingly. <i>Conclusion:</i> No discrepancies were identified.	OK	OK
E.3. Correctness of calculation (VVS, §§ 401-402) Check if the applied formulae and methods for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage are in accordance with the monitoring plan and / or the approved methodology. Assess whether the provided calculations are complete and reflect all requirements of the monitoring plan. Check especially that no standard or old values have been used for calculation where calculations based on up-to-date data is required.	/XLS/ /MP/ /PDD/ /ACM0002/ /	<i>Description:</i> All applied formulae and methods for calculating baseline emissions are in accordance with the monitoring plan and the approved methodology. Neither project emissions nor leakage are considered for this project. Furthermore the calculations are complete and reflect all requirements stated in the Monitoring Plan. <i>Verifier's action:</i> Monitoring report and Excel calculation spread sheet were checked accordingly and crosschecked with the monitoring plan and the approved methodology. <i>Conclusion:</i> All applied formulae are in accordance with the monitoring plan and the approved methodology.	OK	OK
E.4. Comparison with ex-ante determined emission reductions (F-CDM-FORM, Attachment, E.5; E.6) Check if the MR includes a comparison of actual values of the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered PDD. Check further whether in case of an increase an appropriate explanation is included in the MR. Assess in case of a significant increase whether this	/XLS/ /MR/ /PDD/	<i>Description:</i> The emission reductions of this verification period are slightly higher than the estimation based on the PDD. <i>Verifier's action:</i> Interviews with operation personnel were also performed. <i>Conclusion:</i> The MR includes a comparison of the calculated actual emission reductions with the ex-ante calculated values in the registered PDD. An editorial mistake was identified when the value was copied:	CAR 02	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>is due to technical or organisational changes within or outside the control of the PP and – if this is case – whether the PRC have been considered appropriately.</i>		CAR 02 was raised. The ex-post determined value was found to be slightly higher than the ex-ante estimated value. This was justified by the PP using historical data of wind speed. The wind speed of year 2015 was found to be higher than in previous 2 years. Hence more electricity was generated due to external conditions not in control of the PP. Wind projects depends on wind availability. Therefore the slightly higher achieved ER was considered plausible and accepted by the audit team.		

Appendix 6. Calibration dates and validity of installed monitoring equipment

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 Meter Schneider Electric, Power Logic	EG ^{230KV} AMAYO,y EC ^{230KV} AMAYO,y	PT-0901A531-01	ION 8600	0.2	2012/10/14 <u>valid till</u> <u>2014/10/13</u>	2014/10/23 <u>valid till</u> <u>2016/10/22</u>	2 years	☐ No ☒ Yes	From: 2014/10/13 To: 2014/10/23
Backup meter Schneider Electric, Power Logic	EG ^{230KV} AMAYO,y EC ^{230KV} AMAYO,y	PT-0901A532-01	ION 8600	0.2	2012/10/14 <u>valid till</u> <u>2014/10/13</u>	2014/10/23 <u>valid till</u> <u>2016/10/22</u>	2 years	☐ No ☒ Yes	From: 2014/10/13 To: 2014/10/23
Main Meter EIG Measurement point: AMY-U3010 (cell 3)	EG ^{13.8KV} PHASE I EC ^{13.8KV} PHASE I	35415827	Nexus 1262	0.2	2014/01/28 <u>valid till</u> <u>2016/01/27</u>	2014/10/23 <u>valid till</u> <u>2016/10/22</u>	2 years	☒ No ☐ Yes	From: To:
Backup meter EIG Measurement point: AMY-U3010 (cell 3)	EG ^{13.8KV} PHASE I EC ^{13.8KV} PHASE I	102-0053298431	Nexus 1262	0.2	2012/10/13 <u>valid till</u> <u>2014/10/12</u>	2014/10/23 <u>valid till</u> <u>2016/10/22</u>	2 years	☐ No ☒ Yes	From: 2014/10/12 To: 2014/10/23
Main meter EIG Measureme nt point	EG ^{13.8KV} PHASE I EC ^{13.8KV} PHASE I	102-0053298936	Nexus 1262	0.2	2012/10/13 <u>valid till</u> <u>2014/10/12</u>	2014/10/23 <u>valid till</u> <u>2016/10/22</u>	2 years	☐ No ☒ Yes	From: 2014/10/12 To: 2014/10/23

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
AMY-U3040 (Cell 6)									
Backup meter EIG Measurement point AMY-U3040 (Cell 6)	EG ^{13.8kV} PHASE I EC ^{13.8kV} PHASE I	102-0053299028	Nexus 1262	0.2	2012/10/13 <u>valid till</u> <u>2014/10/12</u>	2014/10/23 <u>valid till</u> <u>2016/10/22</u>	2 years	☐ No ☒ Yes	From: 2014/10/12 To: 2014/10/23
Main Meter EIG Measurement point AMY-U3120 (Cell 4)	EG ^{13.8kV} PHASE II EC ^{13.8kV} PHASE II	102-0053298532	Nexus 1262	0.2	2012/10/15 <u>valid till</u> <u>2014/10/14</u>	2014/10/23 <u>valid till</u> <u>2016/10/22</u>	2 years	☐ No ☒ Yes	From: 2014/10/14 To: 2014/10/23
Backup meter EIG Measurement point AMY-U3120 (Cell 4)	EG ^{13.8kV} PHASE II EC ^{13.8kV} PHASE II	102-0053298633	Nexus12 62	0.2	2012/10/15 <u>valid till</u> <u>2014/10/14</u>	2014/10/23 <u>valid till</u> <u>2016/10/22</u>	2 years	☐ No ☒ Yes	From: 2014/10/14 To: 2014/10/23
Main Meter - EIG Measurement point AMY-U3110 (Cell 5)	EG ^{13.8kV} PHASE II EC ^{13.8kV} PHASE II	102-0053298734	Nexus12 62	0.2	2012/10/14 <u>valid till</u> <u>2014/10/13</u>	2014/10/23 <u>valid till</u> <u>2016/10/22</u>	2 years	☐ No ☒ Yes	From: 2014/10/13 To: 2014/10/23
Backup meter EIG Measurement point AMY-U3110 (Cell 5)	EG ^{13.8kV} PHASE II EC ^{13.8kV} PHASE II	102-0053298835	Nexus12 62	0.2	2012/10/14 <u>valid till</u> <u>2014/10/13</u>	2014/10/23 <u>valid till</u> <u>2016/10/22</u>	2 years	☐ No ☒ Yes	From: 2014/10/13 To: 2014/10/23