

**INFORMATION NOTE ON THE RESULTS OF THE COMPLETENESS CHECKS****24 October 2010 - 31 January 2011****(Version 01)**

1. The Executive Board at its 54th meeting adopted new procedures for registration of project activities and issuance of CERs. Along with the procedures, the Board issued checklists for each of the two stages (completeness check and information & reporting check) that cover the secretariat's initial assessment of the submission. At its 56th meeting, the Executive Board requested the secretariat to provide a detailed analysis of the reasons for why project submissions are returned for corrections. An Information Note on results of the two stages of completeness checks for request for registration and issuance covering the period from 30 June 2010 to 23 October 2010 was published in November 2010 at the UNFCCC CDM website¹, in which it mentioned that the secretariat will be publishing the results of the completeness and information & reporting checks regularly (e.g. quarterly). This Information Note covers the subsequent period from 24 October 2010 to 31 January 2011, and includes a total of 473 submissions for the two stages of completeness checks for registration and a total of 578 submissions for the two stages of completeness checks for issuance. This total of submissions represents requests returned for corrections during completeness check and information & reporting check stages, and the total of requests published within this reporting period.

2. The tables below provide information on the results of the completeness and information & reporting checks for those projects that did not pass the checks during request for registration and request for issuance. A detailed list containing all submissions and all reasons for returning for corrections are provided in Appendix 1.

Table 1: Reasons for returning project submissions during completeness check stage

Category	Registration Occurrence	Issuance Occurrence
Incomplete submission	8	5
Incomplete information	28	4
Inconsistency	20	34
Other	10	8
Total occurrences	66	51
Number of requests rejected	36	51

Table 1 above shows a summary of the reasons for which requests for registration and requests for issuances were returned for corrections during the completeness check stage.

¹ <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Notes/index.html>.

**Table 2: Reasons for returning project submissions during information & reporting check stage**

Registration		Issuance	
Category	Occurrence	Category	Occurrence
Additionality	54	Inconsistency of information	16
Baseline methodology	34	Implementation status/physical features of project	2
Monitoring methodology	7	Monitored Parameters	22
LoA	1	Monitoring system and procedures	2
Other	10	Calibration	33
		ER calculation	21
		Comparison/increase of CERs	6
		Other verification reporting requirement (Crosschecking, statement of compliance with meth/monitoring plan, etc.)	20
		Other	3
Total	106		125
Number of requests rejected	55		67

Table 2 above shows a summary of the reasons for which requests for registration and requests for issuances were returned for corrections during information & reporting stage. As suggested by the categories listed in Table 2, the reasons for returning project submissions are different between registration and issuance submissions. Separate reasons were therefore identified for registration and issuance.

Table 3: Requests for registration returned to DOE

	Total Requests	Returned During Completeness Check		Returned during I&R check	
		#	%	#	%
AENOR	8	2	25%	1	13%
BVCH	36	4	11%	3	8%
CQC	6	0	0%	2	33%



CDM – Executive Board

CEC	6	0	0%	0	0%
Deloitte-TECO	2	0	0%	0	0%
DNV	109	5	5%	9	8%
ERM CVS	13	2	15%	1	8%
EYG	1	0	0%	0	0%
GLC	7	1	14%	1	14%
ICONTEC	5	1	20%	2	40%
JACO	9	3	33%	1	11%
JCI	9	1	11%	2	22%
JQA	1	0	0%	0	0%
KECO	2	0	0%	1	50%
KEMCO	6	1	17%	1	17%
KFQ	8	0	0%	0	0%
KSA	2	0	0%	0	0%
LRQA	10	2	20%	1	10%
RINA	13	1	8%	5	38%
SGS	52	3	6%	5	10%
SIRIM	5	2	40%	1	20%
SQS	7	2	29%	1	14%
TÜV Rheinland	52	2	4%	7	13%
TÜV Nord	52	2	4%	5	10%
TÜV SÜD	52	2	4%	6	12%
Total	473	36		55	

Table 4: Requests for issuance returned to DOE

	Total Requests	Returned During Completeness Check		Returned during I&R check	
		#	%	#	%
AENOR	6	3	50%	0	0%
BVCH	72	2	3%	3	4%
CEC	12	1	8%	2	17%
CQC	4	0	0%	1	25%
Deloitte-TECO	4	0	0%	0	0%
DNV	130	5	4%	28	22%
ERM CVS	22	1	5%	0	0%



CDM – Executive Board

GLC	3	0	0%	0	0%
ICONTEC	9	3	33%	4	44%
JACO	11	0	0%	5	45%
JCI	5	2	40%	1	20%
JQA	5	1	20%	1	20%
JMA	1	0	0%	0	0%
KEMCO	1	0	0%	0	0%
KFQ	5	1	20%	0	0%
KSA	3	1	33%	0	0%
LRQA	8	0	0%	0	0%
PJR CDM	1	0	0%	0	0%
RINA	3	0	0%	0	0%
SGS	123	7	6%	5	4%
SIRIM	8	4	50%	1	13%
SQS	2	0	0%	1	50%
TÜV Rheinland	9	1	11%	3	33%
TÜV Nord	76	15	20%	6	8%
TÜV SÜD	55	4	7%	6	11%
Total	578	51		67	

Tables 3 and 4 above provide a summary of the number of registration and issuance requests, broken down by DOE. The table shows the percentage of cases for each DOE that were returned for corrections at both stages. The details in terms of which projects, DOE and the reasons can be found in the detailed data that included in Appendix 1.

History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision
01	11 February 2011	Further to EB54 Annex 35 paragraphs 10 & 12 and EB54 Annex 28 paragraphs 14 & 16.
Decision Class: Ruling Document Type: Information Note Business Function: Registration, Issuance		

Appendix 1

List of reasons for rejection on completeness check and information & reporting check stages during request for registration and request for issuance.

Table 1

Registration		Stage 1: Completeness Check		
#	Project #	Project	DOE	Reasons
1	3532	Song Chung Hydropower Project	TÜV Nord	<p>Incomplete information: The PP/DOE are requested to provide a reproducible spreadsheet for the Return on Equity and investment analysis as the cells in the spreadsheets provided are not traceable (they do not contain formulas, only typed numbers). In doing so, please refer to paragraph 8 of the Guidance on the Assessment of Investment Analysis version 3.</p> <p>Inconsistency: In response to the previous incomplete issue number 2, the PP has correctly revised the monitoring plan (Section B.7.1). However, the version of the revised PDD submitted is the same as the previous PDD. Please submit a PDD with a revised version and corresponding date accordingly.</p>
2	3580	Silau-2 small hydro power plant in North Sumatera Province, Indonesia	BVCH	<p>Other: The PP is requested to use a valid methodology, as AMS-I.D version 13 was valid until requests for registration submitted on 31/03/10. And the proposed project has been resubmitted on 04/09/10.</p> <p>Other: The DOE is requested to display the Validation Report in the projects view page, as the Validation Report Rev. 4 has been submitted in "confidential mode"</p>
3	2957	Chongqing Liujiagou 20MW Hydro Power Project	TÜV Nord	<p>Incomplete documentation: You have not responded to point 1 of the initial incomplete message, i.e. the LoAs for United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland are to be merged in one PDF file. As this project has more than one PP authorized by the same Party, we would appreciate if you could combine the LoA files and upload them as one continuous pdf document under the same Party in the relevant section of the registration form (i.e., instead of choosing "Add a Party", please choose "Add a participant" under United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and ensure that all LoAs are combined into one pdf when uploaded. This ensures that statistics involving Parties in the CDM database are</p>



				accurate. Incomplete information: The Modalities of Communication file is damaged.
4	3970	Southern Nicaragua CDM Reforestation Project	BVCH	Inconsistency: Information provided on project participants and Parties involved is not consistent between the MoC, the validation report and other documents submitted, namely information provided in the PDD, the request for registration form and the project view page.
5	3954	Ho Bon Hydropower Project	KEMCO	Incomplete documentation: LoA from Switzerland was not submitted. Inconsistency: Inconsistency in the parties involved. The PDD, VR and MoC indicate involvement of two parties while the Registration form and the project viewpage indicates only one. Inconsistency: Inconsistency in the project participants involved. LoA from Vietnam indicates two project participants while the other documents indicates only one participant. Incomplete information: Please be informed that the logo of UN is missing in some pages of the PDD.
6	3608	Inner Mongolia Tongliao Zhalute Qi Beishala Wind Power Project	DNV	Incomplete documentation: Investment analysis spreadsheet was not submitted. Incomplete information: The PDD contains pages that can not be read, and Annex 1 of the PDD appears to provide information of the project owner, instead of the project participant.
7	3995	El Guacal Landfill Gas Flaring Project	SQS	Inconsistency: The Annex-I entity mentioned in the LoA issued by the UK DNA (i.e. Green Gas Management Services) is not consistent with the Annex-I entity mentioned in the project's view page, validation report, MoC and PDD (i.e. Green Gas International B.V.) Please clarify.
8	3573	Inner Mongolia Chifeng Chaghanhada Wind Power Project	BVCH	Incomplete documentation: As this project has more than one project participant authorized by the same Party, the LoA files need to be uploaded as one continuous pdf document under the same Party in the relevant section of the registration form (i.e., instead of choosing "Add a Party", please choose "Add a participant" under Sweden and and ensure that all LoAs are combined into one pdf when uploaded). This ensures that the statistics involving Parties in the CDM database are accurate. Incomplete information: The Modalities of Communication is not dated.



9	3361	Shaanxi Methane Recovery and Electricity Generation Project in Xi'an Guowei Starch Co., Ltd	LRQA	<p>Inconsistency: The DOE is requested to update the project view page as the versions of the methodologies are not updated and consistent with the ones used in the PDD and the validation report.</p> <p>Inconsistency: The DOE is requested to explain the inconsistency in the benchmark value shown in the validation report page 22 where it is mentioned a values of 8% while the PDD and other parts of the validation report state 16%.</p>
10	4032	Methane Recovery Project of Lianyungang Jinchanglin Alcohol Co., Ltd.	JCI	<p>Incomplete information: The DOE/PP have not provided ER calculation spreadsheet which is reproducible; in the PDD the spreadsheet has been provided.</p> <p>Inconsistency: The DOE is requested to clarify on: (i) the project emission reductions as project view page and the PDD (page 62) show 69,650 tCO₂/year while the investment analysis sheet indicates 77,000 tCO₂/year , and (ii) the amount of coal displaced as the investment analysis spreadsheet shows 8,718 tonnes/year while the PDD (page 59) mentions 6,679 t/year. In doing so please refer to EB 48 Annex 60, paragraph 7b</p> <p>Incomplete information: The DOE is requested to report on how the amount of displaced coal has been validated considering that a clarification (No. 19; VR page 63) has been opened but there is no information on how this has been resolved. In doing so please refer to VVM ver. 1.1 paragraph 113 a.</p> <p>Incomplete information: The DOE is requested to further clarify why the heat utilization component on project emissions (PEcomponent 2, y) has been assumed to be zero while the baseline emissions calculations on the same component (BEcomponent 2, y) indicates that some coal will be consumed in the project activity considering that co-fired coal has been indicated as one of the parameters to be monitored (PDD page 40). In doing so please refer to AMS-I.C. version 16 paragraph 26 (page 9).</p>
11	4002	Gansu Yongjing 24.9MW Fuchuan Hydro...	JACO	<p>Inconsistency: Only one focal point was appointed with the shared role for communication with secretariat and EB on matters related to registration and/or issuance.</p> <p>Other: Please also note that an additional file termed "project design document - CONFIDENTIAL" was uploaded in the public view page</p>
12	3869	BRT Lines 1-5 EDOMEX, Mexico	SQS	<p>Incomplete information: The files in the Appendix 2 are not readable.</p>



CDM – Executive Board

13	3813	Wind Power Project in Porbandar dis...	SIRIM	Other: The PDD uses the following expired methodology: AMS.I-D version 14, as requests for registration could be submitted until 30 June 2010.
14	4061	Organic Waste Composting at CKT Pal...	TUEV RHEINLAND	Incomplete documentation: The DOE is requested to submit the Emission Reduction calculation spreadsheet and any other Financial analysis calculation if applicable. Inconsistency: The DOE is requested to clarify the party of the "Other parties participants" as Annex 1 of the Modalities of Communication (MoC) shows Jersey instead of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland as the project view page shows.
15	3570	Alto Tuluá Minor Hydroelectric Powe...	AENOR	Inconsistency: The project titles in the LoAs of Columbia and Spain are not consistent with the submitted project title. The project title should be consistent amongst all documents. Incomplete information: The Project participant has not signed section 3 of the Modalities of Communication. Incomplete documentation: Please submit a reproducible spreadsheet of Simplified Adjusted CM EF calculation.
16	4091	Jiangxi Shihutang Hydropower Projec...	AENOR	Inconsistency: The PP/DOE are requested to include the Party name in the corresponding section of the Annex 1 of the Modalities of Communication as the party for Jiangxi Gan River Shihutang Water Resource Multipurpose Development Co., Ltd. is not shown while the Party section for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development ("World Bank") is shown as N/A.
17	4108	Swine Farm Methane Capture and Combustion Project IDES20091	SGS	Incomplete information: Sectoral scope and project participants are not clearly mentioned in the Validation Report. Incomplete information: Sectoral scope is not mentioned in the Project Design Document. Inconsistency: There are inconsistencies of emission reduction (Validation Report, Project Design Document and the project view page report emission reductions of 28, 403 and the LoA from Host country reports 27,913) and sectoral scope (view page reports sectoral scope 15: Agriculture, and the LoA from Host country reports sectoral scope 1: Renewable energy and 13: Waste handling and disposal).
18	4134	Swine Farm Methane Capture and Combustion/ Utilization Project IDES20091	SGS	Incomplete information: Sectoral scope and project participants are not clearly mentioned in the Validation Report. Incomplete information: Sectoral scope is not mentioned in the Project Design Document.



				Inconsistency: There are inconsistencies of emission reduction (Validation Report, Project Design Document and the project view page report emission reductions of 51, 363 and the LoA from Host country reports 46,537) and sectoral scope (view page reports sectoral scope 1: Energy industries (renewable-/ non-renewable sources) and 15: Agriculture, and the LoA from Host country reports sectoral scope 1: Renewable energy and 13: Waste handling and disposal).
19	3488	Inner-Mongolian Mengniu Aoya Biogas..	DNV	Inconsistency: The sectoral scope in PDD, registration request form is inconsistent with that in project view page Incomplete information: MOC does not contain the email address for Inner-Mongolia Mengniu Biogas Power Co. Ltd Incomplete information: No party mentioned in the Annex 1 of the MoC.
20	3548	Xiangtang xia 10 MW Hydropower Proj..	DNV	Other: The PP/DOE are requested to update the version of the AMS-I.D methodology used, given that version 13 is no longer valid.
21	4187	Guodian Youyu Laoqianshan Wind Farm	ERM CVS	Incomplete documentation: The DOE is requested to submit a complete Modalities of Communication, as Annex 1 of the submitted Modalities of Communication is missing.
22	4190	Guodian Wuchuan Xiwulanbulang Hong...	ERM CVS	Incomplete information: The Annex 1 of the MoC is missing. Inconsistency: Inconsistency in reported project participant. The Registration Form reports only one PP while the PDD, VR and project view page report two PPs.
23	4201	LA CALERA BIODIGESTERS PROJECT	ICONTEC	Incomplete information: The DOE is requested to further substantiate how the start date of the project activity has been validated in line with CDM Glossary of Terms. Incomplete information: The DOE is requested to put both sectoral scopes as well as methodologies used on the project view page. Please also refer to para 13 & 14 EB 48 Annex 60 "GUIDELINES ON COMPLETENESS CHECK OF REQUESTS FOR REGISTRATION" in order to calculate the validity period of the methodology at the time of re-submission of the request for registration.
24	4212	GHG emissions reductions from impro...	DNV	Inconsistency: Information provided on project participants is not consistent between the project view page, the MoC, the LoA, the Validation Report and the Project Design Document. Other: Please refer to paragraphs 13 & 14 contained in EB 48 Annex 60 ("GUIDELINES ON COMPLETENESS CHECK OF REQUESTS FOR



				REGISTRATION")and upon re-submission please submit the revised relevant documents applying the latest available version of methodology AMS-III.H (i.e. please note that the grace period for AMS-III.H v13 expired on 08/12/10, which is the same date of submission of the request for registration). Please also refer to paragraphs 13 & 14 in EB 48 Annex 60 in order to calculate the validity period of the methodology at the time of re-submission of the request for registration.
25	3553	Grid Connected Wind Electricity Gen..	RINA	Other: The PP/DOE are requested to update the version of the AMS-I.D methodology used, given that version 13 is no longer valid. Inconsistency: The PP/DOE are requested to ensure the consistency of the emission reduction amount between the PDD and the project view page.
26	4043	Perdigão Sustainable Swine Producti...	DNV	Inconsistency: The PP/DOE are requested to ensure the consistency of the sectoral scope of the project among PDD, Validation Report and the Registration Request Form. Incomplete information: The PP/DOE are requested to ensure the PDD does not contain blank pages. Inconsistency: The PP/DOE are requested to ensure the internal and mutual consistency of PDD and Validation Report, i.e methodology and project starting dates etc.
27	3573	Inner-MongoliaChiefeng Chaghanhada W...	BVCH	Incomplete documentation: You have not responded to point 1 of the initial incomplete message, i.e. the LoA for Sweden to be uploaded as one continuous pdf document. As this project has more than one PP authorized by the same Party, we would appreciate if you could combine the LoA files and upload them as one continuous pdf document under the same Party in the relevant section of the registration form (i.e., instead of choosing "Add a Party", please choose "Add a participant" under Sweden and ensure that all LoAs are combined into one pdf when uploaded). This ensures that statistics involving Parties in the CDM database are accurate.
28	4200	Low Temperature Waste Heat Generati...	TÜV SÜD	Incomplete information: The DOE is requested to include all relevant sectoral scopes on the project view page. Please notice that section A.2 of PDD mentions that the scopes of the project activity are scope 1 Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources) and scope 4 Manufacturing industries. Incomplete information: The diagram on page 13 of the PDD is incomplete.



29	4219	Blue Fire Bio wastewater treatment ...	TUEV RHEINLAND	Incomplete information: The DOE is requested to submit the complete MoC including the field of 'party that authorizes participation'. Incomplete information: Please include all relevant scopes and methodologies in the project view page and request for registration form.
30	4224	Fuel Switching from Mazout to Natur...	GLC	Incomplete information: The Annex 1 of the MoC is missing. Section 3 of the MoC should be signed by at least one representative of each Project Participant
31	4002	Gansu Yongjing 24.9MW Fuchuan Hydro...	JACO	Other: The PP/DOE are requested to update the version of the ACM002 methodology used, given that version 10 is no longer valid. Please refer to paragraphs 13 & 14 contained in EB 48 Annex 60 ("GUIDELINES ON COMPLETENESS CHECK OF REQUESTS FOR REGISTRATION")
32	3163	Chongqing Wanzhou Xiangjiazui Hydropower Station	TÜV SÜD	Other: Meth version expired
33	4275	Guizhou Qingshuitang 9MW Hydro Project	SIRIM	Incomplete information: The unprotected IRR spreadsheet was not submitted.
34	4249	Power generation by utilizing Blast...	LRQA	Incomplete information: The DOE is requested to include the name of the entity in section 2 p. 1 (focal point) of the MoC.
35	4258	SDIC Hebei Zhangjiakou Kangbao Past...	SGS	Incomplete information: The PP/DOE is requested to amend the Modalities of Communication Form as the signatory for SDIC Zhangjiakou Wind Power Co., Ltd in Section 3 'Statement of Agreement' does not correspond to those listed in Annex I of the F-CM-MOC Form. Please note that one authorized signatory of each project participant entity listed in Annex 1 of the F-CDM-MOC statement must sign Section 3 'Statement of Agreement'.
36	3730	12.82 MW Bundled Small Hydropower P...	JACO	Other: The project activity uses a version of the methodology that is no longer valid (version 14). Furthermore, the validation report refers to an even older version of the methodology.

Table 2

Registration		Stage 2: Information & Reporting Check		
#	Project #	Project	DOE	Reasons



1	3843	Muong Kim Hydropower Project	TUV Nord	<p>Additionality: The DOE has indicated that the starting date of the proposed project activity is 16 July 2007 when the supplying equipment for the Moug Kim I plant was signed. Nevertheless, it is not clear on which ground the same date has been validated as the starting date for the other two hydropower plants (Moug Kim II and Chau Mang).</p> <p>Additionality: The DOE is requested to clarify why the investment analysis cash flow considers five (5) years construction period for every single hydropower plant when as indicated in the PDD page 19, the preparation and construction period takes only 3 years. The answer shall be in line with the starting date of the crediting period (15 September 2010). The DOE is requested to substantiate how it has validated the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis, in particular: total investment cost and zero residual value at the end of the investment analysis period.</p> <p>Other: All the spreadsheets submitted by the DOE must contain formulas, please resubmit all the spreadsheets including all the formulas used for the calculations.</p>
2	3772	Energy efficiency through heat recovery at Vadodara Manufacturing Complex of IPCL	DNV	<p>Other: Please notice that Validation Report page 21 indicates "The decision to invest in the project activity was taken on 2 February 2005", nevertheless, page 22 indicates "The decision to invest in the project activity was taken on 4 November 2004". The DOE should substantiate which one is the decision investment date and on which ground the investment decision date was validated.</p> <p>Additionality: Further substantiation is required on how the DOE has validated the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis, in particular: (a) suitability of the inclusion of the "opportunity cost" as part of the O&M cost of the project; (b) the suitability of the application of the "regular tax income" (36.59%) when the reduction in fossil fuel consumption is not an income. The PP/DOE have indicated that the WHR boiler technical specification was finalized only in March 2006 (provided by Thermax) and that the investment analysis is done using a study called "IPCL Ethylene Expansion Study" (provided by ABB Lummus in 2003) which considers a smaller boiler capacity. Please indicate the exact date when the Thermax WHR technical specification was given and the main difference between these two boilers in terms of capacity.</p>



				<p>Other: Please provide the sensitivity analysis including the formulas used to calculate these values.</p>
3	3461	Rio Amoyá Run-of-River Hydro Project	ICONTEC	<p>Additionality: Project starting date and prior consideration: The DOE is requested to report the project starting date and how it has validated the chosen date to be the earliest commitment made by the project participant. In doing so, please refer to the latest CDM glossary of terms. Further, the DOE should report the validation of the prior consideration for the redefined starting date if it is redefined. In doing so, please refer to EB49 Annex 22.</p> <p>Additionality: Investment analysis input values: The DOE is requested to ensure that all relevant assumptions made in the investment analysis are listed in the PDD, in particular, major input values such as the total investment costs, the annual power export, the power tariff and the O&M costs. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 109 (a). Further, the DOE is requested to report in the validation report how it has validated above assumptions including the annual power export and the applied power tariff. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraphs 110, 111 and 114.</p> <p>Additionality: Common practice analysis: The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the common practice analysis, in particular to explain how it has validated: the geographical scope, existence of similar projects and the essential distinctions from the similar projects. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 121.</p> <p>Other: Confidential documents: The DOE is requested to provide two versions for the financial analysis spreadsheet submitted as confidential: i) the confidential version (as submitted); and ii) non- confidential version either submitted as PDF or spreadsheet with no equations, hiding the confidential information as required. In doing so, please refer to paragraph 4 of "Guideline for completing the Project Design Document (EB 41 Annex 12 Page 4)".</p>
4	3890	Fuel switch from fossil fuel to bio...	DNV	<p>Additionality: The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the suitability of the input values for the investment comparison analysis, in particular, the total investment costs of the project activity and the baseline scenario, the biomass price, NCV of each type of biomass. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2</p>



				<p>paragraph 113. The DOE is requested to explain how it has considered it reasonable to not assess the sensitivity of the investment comparison analysis to the investment cost for both the project activity and the baseline scenario. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 111 (e).</p> <p>Baseline methodology: Section B.6.3 of the PDD should provide a transparent ex-ante calculation of project emissions, baseline emissions expected during the crediting period, applying all relevant equations provided in the approved methodology, documenting how each equation is applied. In doing so, please refer to page 14 of EB 41 annex 12. The DOE should validate each steps of the calculation as required by VVM version 1.2 paragraphs 90-92.</p>
5	3895	Power generation from renewable sources – Arvoredo and Varginha Small Hydropower Plants	RINA	<p>Additionality: The sources of input values at the time of investment decision have not been reported, in accordance with paragraph 6 of the "Guidance on the Assessment of Investment Analysis" (version 3.1). The DOE has not explained and reported how it has validated the suitability of the input values applied for the investment analysis, in accordance with VVM paragraph 111 (version 1.2).</p> <p>Other: The financial analysis spreadsheet submitted contains links to files that are not accessible, and the results of the IRR calculation can not be reproduced.</p> <p>Other: The rationales for the closing CL6, which is related to the approach of investment analysis (portfolio analysis vs individual IRRs) has not been sufficiently explained and reported in the validation report. According to CAR14, the Financial Barriers has been dropped and removed from the final PDD. However, relevant validation can still be found in the final Validation report.</p>
6	3897	Electric Power Generation from Renewable Sources – Barra da Paciência, Ninho da Água, Corrente Grande, Paiol, São Gonçalo and Várzea Alegre Small Hydropower Plants	RINA	<p>Additionality: The sources of input values at the time of investment decision have not been reported, in accordance with paragraph 6 of the "Guidance on the Assessment of Investment Analysis" (version 3.1). The DOE has not explained and reported how it has validated the suitability of the input values applied for the investment analysis, in accordance with VVM paragraph 111 (version 1.2).</p> <p>Other: The financial analysis spreadsheet submitted contains links to files that are not accessible, and the results of the IRR calculation can not be reproduced.</p>



				<p>Other: The rationales for the closing CAR6, which is related to the approach of investment analysis (portfolio analysis vs individual IRRs) has not been sufficiently explained and reported in the validation report. According to CAR14, the Financial Barriers has been dropped and removed from the final PDD. However, relevant validation can still be found in the final Validation report.</p>
7	3918	Alashan 9MW Hydropower Station	TÜV SÜD	<p>Additionality: The Validation Report page 16 indicates that the start date of the project activity was 28 September 2003 when the Industrial & Commercial Bank of China (ICBC) considered the additional revenues from the CDM as a crucial factor to lend 20 million RMB for the project. Also, the PP/DOE have indicated that the CDM development contract was signed on 29 April 2005, the project was commissioned in August 2005 and that the PIN was prepared and sent out to potential buyers on 24 March 2006. Therefore, the DOE is requested to substantiate how it has validated that the CDM benefits were a decisive factor to get the ICBC bank loan on 28 September 2003. Please notice that the CDM development contract was signed more than 1.5 years after this bank loan, and the PIN was finalized on 24 March 2006 which is 2.5 years after the bank loan and 7 months after the commissioning date. Taking into account issue 1, the DOE is requested to substantiate how it has validated that the CDM benefits were a decisive factor to get the China Development Bank loan on 5 February 2005. Please notice that the CDM development contract was signed 2 months after the bank loan and that the PIN was finalized on 24 March 2006 which is more than 1 year after this bank loan was given.</p> <p>Additionality: Validation Report page 20 indicates that the DOE has validated the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis based on the Finance Audit Report for 2008. The DOE has also indicated that the PDR was finalized in May 2001 and the time of investment decision is September 2003. Therefore further substantiation is required on how the DOE has validated that the input values to the investment analysis are valid and applicable at the time of the investment decision, in particular : total investment and O&M cost. The DOE should substantiate why the electricity production in year 3 is only 30%.</p>
8	2993	China Niaoerchao Hydropower Project	ERM CVS	<p>Other: The information on how the negative validation opinion to the</p>



				project activity from the first DOE (https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Validation/DB/IL94TAA2ISL9GR2L4UJFSVLGBLJG0I/view.html) has been taken care of is missing.
9	3350	15.2 MW wind energy project in Madhya Pradesh by Manganese Ore (India) Limited.	TUV Rheinland	Additionality: The Validation Report lacks information on the source of the input values (the date of the sources is not provided) and the crosschecking of the input values.
10	3503	Hebei Shengyuan Xuandong Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project	TUV SÜD	Other: The DOE is requested: (a) to ensure that all relevant assumptions made in the investment analysis are listed in the PDD, in particular, major input values such as the total investment costs, the annual power export, the power tariff, the O&M costs, amount of heat recovered, heat tariff and any other relevant values; in doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 109 (a); and (b) to report how it has validated the above assumptions including the annual power export and the applied power tariff; in doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraphs 110, 111 and 114. Additionality: The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the common practice analysis, in particular to explain how it has validated: the geographical scope, existence of similar projects and the essential distinctions from the similar projects. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 121. Baseline methodology: The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the baseline determination, in particular to explain how it has validated elimination of each baseline alternative scenario. In doing so please refer to ACM 0008 version 7 page 6 to page 8.
11	3464	Exploitation of the biogas from Controlled Landfill in Solid Waste Management Central – CTRS / BR.040	SGS	LoA: The receipt of LoA is not the only change in the validation report (version 3.2) submit for registration. A new LoA should be re-applied based on the final version of the validation report, in line with VVM (v01.1), para 50. Baseline methodology: The DOE should confirm that all relevant policies and circumstances have been identified and correctly considered in the PDD with its knowledge of the sector and advice from local experts, in line with VVM (v01.1), para. 84. Baseline methodology: The adjustment factor (AF) applied in the PDD is 0.05 (page 52), and 3.8% in the validation report (page 17). The DOE should explain which value has been used in the emission reduction calculation. In doing so, the DOE should also explain how it has validated the suitability of the AF applied,



				<p>considering that some other registered landfill projects in Brazil (e.g. PA 1636, 1133, 1908 and 1626) have applied 20% of AF.</p> <p>Additionality: The DOE should further validate the suitability of the input values applied in the investment analysis, in particular the total investment, the O&M cost and the tariff in line with VVM (v01.1), para.110 (a) - (c) and 113 (a) and (c).</p>
12	3922	Baguari Hydropower Plant CDM Proje...	SGS	<p>Additionality: The validation report page 18 indicated that the DOE verified that there is less than 2 years of a gap between the documented evidence and therefore continuing and real actions were taken to secure CDM status. Nevertheless, the validation report does not indicate which documented evidence the DOE validated in order to do this statement.</p> <p>Additionality: The DOE is requested to clearly indicate (source of information and year) how it has validated the following input parameters used to calculate the benchmark: Risk free rate, levered beta, unlevered beta, market premium, country premium, american inflation, BNDES financial cost, BNDES fee, credit risk rate and expected inflation. Please notice that quoting web addresses is only a way of crosschecking but it can not replace the DOE's validation itself. Also, please notice that the "Document Reference" list of the Validation Report does not always indicate the source of information or the year and some sources are very unclear. The DOE is requested to validate the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis, in particular: Electricity generation from turbine 3 (10 MW) and turbine 4 (0 MW), total investment (equipment, construction, etc), whether the validated tariff is with or without VAT, O&M cost, TUST fee, R&D and CFURH fee.</p>
13	3502	Gansu Sunan 6.3MW Sidalong Stage I Hydropower Project	GLC	<p>Other: The project participant from the Host Country identified in the request for registration does not seem to have a contractual agreement with the DOE as indicated in VR p4. Please refer to EB 50, Annex 48 paragraphs 7-9 (PROCEDURES FOR PROCESSING AND REPORTING ON VALIDATION OF CDM PROJECT ACTIVITIES).</p>
14	3669	Rodeio Bonito Small Hydro Power Project	DNV	<p>Other: The VR and PDD are not consistent with the IRR spreadsheet on the value of electricity supplied to the grid (75,997 MWh/yr against 74,228 MWh/yr).</p> <p>Other: There is no validation of the PLF and the DOE has not justified why</p>



CDM – Executive Board

				<p>it has closed CL6.</p> <p>Other: The CDM registration form should correspond to the latest submission, in line with EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 e). The DOE may opt to resubmit the request for registration with an updated methodology version.</p>
15	3268	Korea Hydro & Nuclear Power Co.(KHNP) Cheongpyeong Hydro Power Plant Unit 4 Project	TÜV SÜD	<p>Additionality: The Validation Report lacks information on the validation of the electricity generation and plant load factor.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: The Validation Report lacks information on how the DOE has validated the remaining lifetime of the existing equipment (parameter DATEBaselineRetrofit).</p>
16	3642	Wind Power based electricity generation project in India by DLF Home Developers Limited	BVCH	<p>Other: Spreadsheet 'DLF - IRR - Rajasthan 67-5' and 'DLF - IRR - Tamilnadu 67-5' contain links to unknown sources.</p>
17	3206	Aberdare Range/ Mt. Kenya Small Scale Reforestation Initiative - Kamae-Kipipiri Small Scale A/R Project	JACO	<p>Baseline methodology: The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the applicability condition of the methodology, in particular, how it has validated: a) the average grazing capacity of the project area; and b) that the number of displaced grazing animals is less than 50% of the average grazing capacity of the project area. In doing so, please refer to paragraph 1 (c) of AR-AMS0001 version 05.</p> <p>Other: The DOE is requested to explain: a) how it has resolved clarification request 9 (2) (validation report page 14) with regard to the stratification in the baseline; and b) how the stratification is conducted for the project activity. In doing so, please refer to paragraph 37 of AR-AMS0001 version 05.</p>
18	3997	Hunan Lixian 15MW Biomass Direct Burning Power Plant Project	TUV Rheinland	<p>Additionality: The DOE should further confirm the evidence used to demonstrate the prior consideration of the CDM given that the validation report (page 22) indicates that the board of the project investor Hunan Li'ang Renewable Energy Power Co., Ltd. issued a resolution on 26 May 2008 to indicate that CDM activities would be applied for all invested biomass projects; while the PDD (page 29) mentions that the project developer hold a Board meeting and decided to develop the proposed project into CDM project on 08 May 2008.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: The DOE should clarify the contradiction that the biomass residues are either dumped or left to decay in the absence of the project activity and at the same time carry a purchase price as applied in the investment analysis.</p>



				<p>Additionality: The validation report mentions on page 34 that a sensitivity analysis, covering a fluctuation range of 10%, is discussed with regards to the static total investment, electricity tariff, heat price, operational hours and biomass residue cost. It remains unclear why the heat price was included in the sensitivity analysis considering that the project activity does not include any heat component and why the results of the electricity tariff variations were not presented in the spreadsheet submitted. In addition, the DOE should provide a validation opinion on the variations in the critical parameters that would make the project IRR reach the benchmark, including, why they are not likely to occur in line with the VVM para. 110 (e).</p> <p>Additionality: The common practice analysis includes similar activities with an installed capacity no less than 15 MW. The DOE explained that a renewable power project not exceeding an installed capacity of 15MW is defined as a small scale CDM project, whereas the project is a large scale project. However, the DOE has not explained why similar activities under 15MW take place in an environment (e.g. regulatory framework, investment climate, access to technology, access to financing, etc) which is not comparable to the proposed project activity in line with the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality”.</p> <p>Monitoring methodology: The DOE should confirm that the monitoring procedure and frequency of the following parameters complies with the requirement of the applicable methodology: quantity of dry biomass type k combusted in the project plant during the year y; quantity of dry biomass type k that has been transported to the project site during the year y where k are the types biomass residues used in the project plant in year y; average truck load of the trucks used for transportation of biomass; average CO2 emission factor for transportation of biomass with trucks; net quantity of electricity delivered to the grid during the year y and Net Calorific Value of type k biomass utilized in power plant.</p>
19	3984	Batavo Cooperativa Agroindustrial: Greenhouse emission reductions on swine production by means the installation of better waste management systems	TUV SUD	<p>Additionality: The project starting date is 10 October 2008, defined as the date of the purchase of the first equipments (boiler and stirring system) for Casa Branca farm. Considering that there are 10 farms included in the project activity, the DOE should confirm that this is the</p>



				<p>earliest date towards the implementation of the project activity for all the farms included in the project boundary in line with the Glossary of CDM terms.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: The DOE should confirm that the grid emission factor applied was available at the time of commencement of validation; given that the data vintage used was not provided in any of the documents submitted and the link shown in the PDD and validation report cannot be opened.</p>
20	4008	Sichuan Liangtan Hydropower Station Second Phase Project	DNV	<p>Additionality: The DOE indicated that the proposed project activity requested registration on 20 February 2009 under the UNFCCC reference number 2410 and that it was rejected on 11 September 2009. The PDD and the corresponding investment analysis spreadsheet indicated a IRR value of 8.43% and it was validated by the DOE.</p> <p>The secretariat noticed that the current PDD submitted for registration (under reference number 4008) and the corresponding investment analysis spreadsheet indicate an IRR value of 7.33%. Therefore the DOE is requested to further substantiate: a) the difference between the input values used for investment analysis between the rejected project Ref number 2410 and the project Ref number 4008 submitted for registration; and b) the impact of these changes on the additionality of the project Ref number 4008.</p>
21	3830	Guayacán Hydroelectric Project	SGS	<p>Additionality: The sources of the input values applied in the investment analysis are not reported in the PDD. The DOE has not provided a validation opinion on whether the input values applied in the investment analysis are suitable and available at the time of investment decision. Some costs items (Intake replacement, Triennial maintenance) are estimated by the PP and validated according the expert knowledge, however, no details has been provided by the DOE on how these values have been cross-checked (p.25 of the VR). The size premium (PT) and the project premium (PP) for the calculation of the benchmark have been validated to be appropriate considering the expert surveys in particular the USA survey (ref 114) (see p.20 of the VR). However, apart from quoting the reference document, no further information has been provided.</p>
22	3629	Factory energy efficiency improvement in ceramic Kiln	LRQA	<p>Other: The PDD does not provide the input values of the investment analysis.</p>



		fuel usage in Indonesia		Inconsistencies are found: (a) Quotation for RTO, dated 23/10/2007 as per VR reference 27, but dated 30/04/2008 as per spreadsheet; and (b) LPG price based on quotation, dated 21/12/2006 as per VR reference 21/12/2006, but dated 21/12/2007 as per spreadsheet.
23	3751	Mimosa Coal Mine Methane Project	DNV	<p>Additionality: The DOE is requested to provide justification on why there is only one financial analysis provided while the project contains three independent project site although all of them belong to the same project owner. In doing so please refer to VVM ver. 1.1 paragraphs 7a and 18. The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the input values to the investment analysis, in particular, how it has validated: a) the power output by the project activity; and b) the life time of 10 years for the power generation units and the flaring system. In doing so, please refer to VVM ver. 1.1 paragraph 110. For the validation of the power output (annual operating hours and/or plant load factor), please refer to "Guidelines for the reporting and validation of plant load factors" (EB48 Annex 11). The DOE is requested to report how it has validated how the increase and the decrease in the power output impact the IRR of the project. In doing so, please refer to VVM ver. 1.1 paragraph 111 e.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the formulation of the baseline scenario alternatives to be complete, in particular, to report how it considers the alternatives validated include all possible scenarios that are technically feasible and comply with all legal and regulatory requirements (Step 3 Identification of the baseline scenario, ACM 0008 ver. 7 page 7). In doing so, please provide validation of elimination of each scenario according to step 4 and 5 of "Identification of the baseline scenario" referred to above. In doing so, please refer to VVM ver. 1.1 paragraph 87.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the amount of methane captured in the pre-project scenario and how it is accounted for in the emission reduction calculation. In doing so, please refer to VVM ver. 1.1 paragraph 87 (a and c).</p>
24	3276	Ventanilla Conversion from Single-cycle to Combined-cycle Power Generation Project	DNV	<p>Additionality: The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the input values for the cost comparison analysis, in particular, to provide information on the total investment cost for the project activity (combined cycle)</p>



				including the value applied, the source, the suitability and other relevant information used to validate the value. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.1 paragraph 110. The DOE is requested to report validation of the net electricity output of both scenarios, the open cycle and the combined cycle. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.1 paragraph 110 and EB 48 Annex 11.
25	4060	Jilin Wangqing 2×25MW Biomass Cogeneration Project	TUV Rheinland	Baseline methodology: Emission from heat generation in the baseline is included in the project boundary, however the information on the baseline of the heat generation is missing (the amount of heat generated, the amount of fuel used, the heat users). The information of the lifetime of the existing boilers generating heat in the baseline scenario is missing.
26	3175	Generation with Blast Furnace Gas of SIDERPITA (JUN1060), Brazil	TUV Nord	Baseline methodology: The methodology (AMS-I.D v. 13) applied by the project activity is not applicable considering the BFG used to generate electricity is recovered waste energy, rather than the primary energy covered by AMS-I.D. The DOE/project participant shall submit a request for clarification to the secretariat regarding the applicability of the methodology before the registration request is submitted again.
27	4058	Kolar Biogas Project	SGS	Monitoring methodology: The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the sampling methodology as appropriate in particular the suitability of the 5 % household sample size (mentioned in the PDD) and how this will be determined. In doing so please refer to the VVM, v1.2, paragraph 124, and the GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR SAMPLING AND SURVEYS FOR SMALL-SCALE CDM PROJECT ACTIVITIES, EB 50, Annex 30.
28	4072	Wind power project by Patnaik Minerals Pvt. Ltd	TUV Nord	Additionality: The DOE is requested to include in the validation report the parameters used to calculate the capital asset pricing model (CAPM) such as the risk-free rate, expected return of the market, risk premium and beta value as well as the references used to crosscheck the values applied and how those values were appropriated when the decision to invest in the project was made. Furthermore the DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency with regards to the beta values in the PDD (pg 14 shows $\beta=0.56$) and validation report (page 29 shows $\beta=0.69$). Please refer to paragraph 110 of VVM, v1.1. The DOE is requested to include the escalation in O&M expenses as the validation report table in page 115 is in



				<p>blank while the IRR spreadsheets shows a 5% escalation costs and the PDD does not mention this.</p> <p>Furthermore it is not clear in the same table the following statement: “the escalation rate is also in accordance with the GERC assumptions in the determination of tariff” as the tariff does not show any escalation in price over the project lifetime. Please refer to paragraph 110 of VVM, v1.1.</p>
29	3793	Pindó Biomass Energy Generation from Forest Biomass	DNV	<p>Additionality: The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how it has confirmed that the project activity will use renewable biomass in line with the requirements of EB 23, Annex 18, paras. 1 and 4.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on: a) the investment cost and O&M costs in line with similar activities and based on the DOE’s sectoral expertise; b) the biomass cost for both the sawdust and the forest residues in line with the market price, including, how the DOE has validated the baseline scenario is appropriate for the project, given that the DOE has not explained the contradiction that the biomass residues are either dumped or left to decay in absence of the project activity and at the same time carry a purchase price as applied in the investment analysis; c) the price of electricity, in particular, how the source used to crosscheck the value applied in the investment analysis (i.e. CAMMESA 2008 Annual Report) is suitable to this specific project activity; d) the electricity savings, in particular, whether the plant’s historical records checked by the DOE (i.e., February 2009) can be considered representative of the plant’s operation; g) the suitability of the insurance expenses and other expenses in the context of the project activity.</p> <p>In doing so, the DOE should refer to the requirements of the VVM (version 01.1) para.110 (a) to (c) and to para. 33.</p>
30	3869	BRT Lines 1-5 EDOMEX, Mexico	SQS	<p>Other: The DOE has not explained how it has closed the CL#1, in particular, how it has confirmed that the Taluca BRT line is not for inter-urban transport.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: Step 2 of identification of the baseline scenario of ACM0016 v1 (page 6) requires to conduct an investment comparison analysis for all alternatives that are remaining after Step 1. However, the DOE has not explained why the PP has not conducted the investment comparison analysis for all the</p>



				<p>alternatives that are remaining after step 1 of the methodology to identify most plausible baseline scenario. Step 2 of identification of the baseline scenario of ACM0016 v1 (page 6) requires that the investment analysis should be undertaken from the perspective of the operator of the public transportation system of the city or urban area, reflecting the costs and revenues from the perspective of the operator. However, the DOE has not explained why the PP has conducted the investment analysis from the perspective of EDOMEX as owner of the system. The DOE has not explained how the identified baseline for the proposed CDM project activity will reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that would occur in the absence of the proposed CDM project activity in line with paragraphs 81 - 88 of VVM v1.2. The DOE has not explained why NPV for each BRT line has not been calculated while identifying the baseline and demonstrating the additionality. Further the DOE has not explained how the identified baseline is suitable for all BRT lines in the project activity.</p> <p>Additionality: The DOE has not explained how cost overruns and reduced revenues of the Insurgentes Extension Sur and Eje 4 have been used to determine the cost overruns and reduced revenue for the project activity in line with page 6 of ACM0016 v1 given that these two project have entered into operation after the starting date of the project activity. The DOE has not explained the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in line with paragraph 111 of VVM v1.2, in particular, fare, payment bus operator, payment fare recovery, average payment trust fund, average payment operational entity per annum, maintenance EDOMEX infrastructure, assumption of zero salvage value, etc. Further the DOE has not described in detail: (i) how the parameters used in any financial calculations have been validated and ; (ii) whether the underlying assumptions are appropriate and the financial calculations are correct, in line with paragraph 114 of VVM v1.2. The DOE has not explained the suitability of the input values to emission reduction calculation in line with paragraph 92 of VVM v1.2.</p>
31	4123	Hebei Chongli County Qingsanying Second Phase 49.3 MW Wind Power Project	TUV Rheinland	Additionality: The VR lacks information on how the investment cost was validated.
32	4104	Liaoning Kangping Dongsheng Wind Power	DNV	Additionality: VR lacks information on the essential distinctions in the



		Project		common practice analysis. Inconsistency in the range of capacity considered in the common practice analysis between the PDD and VR. Other: Reference /41-7/ could not be accessed.
33	4185	Methane Recovery Project of Jilin Province Xintianlong Alcohol Co., Ltd.	RINA	Other: The PP/DOE should revise the inconsistencies related to whether the electricity generated is for captive use or to be exported to the grid, considering that the project description (in both the PDD and VR) mentions that the project activity is a captive power plant for internal use in the facility production; whereas the monitoring plan explains that the: "monitoring shall consist of metering the net electricity supplied by the project activity to the grid and that the measurement results shall be cross-checked with records for sold electricity". Additionality: The DOE is requested to further clarify how it has cross-checked the input values in line with the requirements of the VVM (version 01.2) para. 111; in particular, (a) the self-consumption value of 4% as it has not been validated by the DOE; (b) the suitability of the electricity tariff given that the list of the similar activities used by the DOE to crosscheck the value was not presented in the VR in a transparent manner; and (c) the nature of the sources used to validate the O&M cost, namely, references 40 - 49. Monitoring methodology: The PP/DOE shall ensure that the monitoring plan includes the monitoring of the operation of the flare in line with the "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane," considering that an open flare will be installed and that a flare efficiency of 50% is applied by default.
34	4005	Mafrisur renewable thermal energy	AENOR	Other: The spreadsheet including emission reduction calculation and financial analysis is a .zip document. No spreadsheet can be found when it is unzipped. MS 2003 should be applied when the DOE re-submit the spreadsheet. The GSP PDD can not be found from the GSP webpage. Monitoring methodology: The DOE should confirm that the metering is carried out at the recipient's end, according to the methodology page 11, footnote 12. Other: The DOE/PP shall provide more information regarding the purchase, installation and commission of the co-fired boiler. In doing so, the DOE should further validated how CL 11 is closed considering the information about the certificates of



				<p>installation/commissioning required by the CL has not been found in the PDD, neither in the VR.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: The DOE shall provide validation opinion how the "certified firewood" described in the PDD footnote 1 can be defined as renewable biomass, in line with EB 23, Annex 18, para. 1.</p>
35	3033	24 MW Kut Hydro Power Project	DNV	<p>Additionality: Further substantiation is required on how the DOE has validated the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis, in particular: (a) the transmission losses in CTU (4%) and line losses (2.5%), please also clarify what is the difference between them; (b) Plant outages 7% (Forced outage 3%, Maintenance 4%), and (c) wheeling charges and losses (10%). Further substantiation is required on how the DOE has validated the suitability of the input values used to calculate the benchmark, in particular the "marginal tax rate". Please notice that the data source for marginal tax rate is mentioned as reference /13/ in page 15 of Validation Report, however, the reference 13 is benchmark worksheet itself which does not contain the data source.</p> <p>Other: Please provide the calculation spreadsheets for sensitivity analysis including the formulas used to calculate these values.</p>
36	3281	Siam Cement (Lampang) Waste Heat Power Generation Project (LP Project)	BVCH	<p>Additionality: The DOE has not provided the sufficient information and reporting on the validation of the input values to the investment analysis in line with the paragraph 114 of VVM v1.2, in particular, static investment, unit price of electricity, annual O&M cost, plant load factor of the power plant, Kiln Utilization factor, WHG Utilization factor, Machinery cost, etc. The DOE has not provided sufficient information on the validation of the input values to the benchmark in line with the paragraph 112 of VVM1.2, in particular, expected return of the market, beta coefficient, et.</p> <p>Monitoring methodology: The DOE has not provided sufficient validation opinion whether the monitoring plan is in line with the monitoring requirements of AM0024 v2.1.</p>



CDM – Executive Board

37	3923	Jingyang Shengwei Cement 9MW Waste Heat Recovery as Power Project	TUV SUD	<p>Additionality: Further information is required on suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in line with the paragraph 112 (c) of VVM v1.1., in particular: (i) annual O&M cost (further validation on each element of the annual O&M cost should be provided); (ii) annual electricity generation; and (iii) auxiliary consumption.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: The DOE has not provided the means of validation of QOE,BL in accordance with the AMS IIIQ v2.</p> <p>Monitoring methodology: Further information is required why the monitoring of the quantity of the electricity generated by the power plant and auxiliary electricity consumption of the power plant have not been included in the monitoring plan as required by the AMS IIIQ v2.</p>
38	3969	Inner Mongolia Alashan Helanshan Yinxing Wind Farm Phase I Project	CQC	<p>Additionality: Please explain how receipt, by the DNA, of the notification, in accordance with paragraph 2, Annex 46, EB41, was validated. How was the requirement of paragraph 3, Annex 46, EB41, in particular, corroboration with the Chinese DNA met? In connection to this query, please detail how you have resolved CAR 04. The CAR 04 and the related summary response leaves room for various interpretations.</p>
39	3472	Shanxi Shuangliang Cement Company LTD. 4.5MW Waste Heat for Power Generation Project	CQC	<p>Baseline methodology: The DOE has not provided the information on other power plants that have been connected to Shuangliang internal electricity system in addition to the electricity imported from the NCPG. If there are any other power plants connected to the Shuangliang internal electricity system, the DOE should provide further information on how alternative W2/P6 has been deemed to be the applicable baseline in line with ACM0012 v3. The DOE has not provided information on whether there are any existing clinker production lines operated by the Shuangliang cement, and whether the waste heat generated by these clinker production lines has been used for energy generation. In doing so, the DOE should provide further information of the elimination of alternative 5 (P5).</p> <p>Baseline methodology: Information on the facilities connected to the Shuangliang internal electricity system should be provided. If there are any other facilities connected to the Shuangliang internal electricity system other than the Shuangliang cement, the DOE should provide information how the PP makes sure that the electricity generated by the project activity will displace the electricity demand of the</p>



				<p>Shuangliang cement.</p> <p>Monitoring methodology: The DOE should provide information why the monitoring of the quantity of WECM /Waste Gas used for energy generation (QWCM,y/QWG,y), auxiliary electricity consumption of the power plant and the electricity import from the grid (ECPJ,import i,y) have not been included in the monitoring plan as required by the ACM0012 v3.</p> <p>Other: The DOE is requested to submit all the spreadsheet used to calculate the emission reductions.</p>
40	3400	Gas-Steam Combined Cycle Power Plant (CCPP) Project of Laiwu Iron & Steel Group Corp.	TUV SUD	<p>Baseline methodology: Project description 1.The DOE has not provided a clear description of the project activity that provides the reader with a clear understanding of the precise nature of the project activity and the technical aspects of its implementation in line with paragraphs 58-64 of VVM 1.1, in particular: (i) whether there are any power plants connected to the internal electricity system of Laigang other than electricity imported from the NCPG. Please provide detailed information of the power plants connected to the internal electricity system of Laigang; and (ii) the source of energy used to meet the internal energy demand of the steel plant in addition to the electricity import from the internal electricity system of Laigang (please provide detailed information of each energy source including the quantities); (iii) whether the waste energy to be utilized in the project activity is recovered from and existing facility or new facility; (iv) information on the amount of waste energy available; and (v) annual production of the iron and steel facility.</p> <p>Other: Baseline scenario 2.There is an inconsistency about the identified baseline scenario between the page 13 of the validation report (the identified baseline scenario is electricity obtained from the grid and the heat from a fossil fuel based steam boiler) and the page 16 of the validation report (the project activity will generate only electricity). Please clarify.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: Emission reduction 3.The DOE has not provided detailed information on the calculation of the emission reduction, in particular, the means of validation of the fcap in line with ACM0012 v3. Please provide information on how the fcap has been determined and suitability of input values used to the fcap calculation.</p> <p>Additionality: Additionality 4.The DOE has not provided information on whether the equity IRR calculation</p>



				<p>reflect the period of expected operation of the underlying project activity (technical lifetime) in line with paragraph 3, annex 58 of EB 51. Further the DOE should provide information whether the fair value of the project activity assets at the end of the assessment period has been included if a shorter period is chosen.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: Applicability of the methodology 5. The DOE has not explained whether the waste energy was released to the atmosphere in the absence of the project activity in line with ACM0012 v3 (pages 4-5).</p> <p>Monitoring methodology: Monitoring plan 6. The DOE has not explained why monitoring of quantity of WECM recovered in hour h ($Q_{wcm,h}$), net calorific value for WECM ($NCV_{WCM,y}$), specific heat of WECM (C_{pwcm}), temperature of WECM in hour h ($t_{wcm,h}$ or $t_{i,h}$), average temperature of WECM ($t_{wcm,y}$) have not been included in the monitoring plan in line with ACM0012 v3.</p>
41	3992	Shuangyang Waste Heat Recovery and Power Generation Project in Jilin Yatai Cement Co., Ltd.	JCI	<p>Baseline methodology: The DOE has not provided a clear description of the project activity that provides the reader with a clear understanding of the precise nature of the project activity and the technical aspects of its implementation in line with paragraphs 58-64, in particular, whether there are any power plants connected to the internal grid of Shuangyang Cement other than electricity imported from the NEPG. If any, please provide detailed information of the power plants connected to the internal grid of Shuangyang Cement.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: The DOE has explained that the waste energy was released to the atmosphere in the absence of the project activity using the by the process plant manufacture's original design specification and layout diagrams of the existing cement production line. However, the DOE has not provided the quantity and energy content of the waste energy produced for the rated plant capacity or unit of product produced in line with ACM0012 v3 (pages 4-5).</p> <p>Baseline methodology: Further the DOE has not explained the means of validation of the f_{cap}, in particular, output energy that can be theoretically produced ($Q_{OE,BL}$) in line with ACM0012 v3.</p> <p>Additionality: The DOE has explained that the input values to the investment analysis are suitable compared to the similar projects. However, the DOE has not provided information on how the</p>



				<p>similar projects have been selected in line with paragraph 113 (c) of VVM v1.2, in particular, geographical scope, type of technology, type of industry, scale of the production of the identified industry, etc. In addition, the DOE has not explained suitability of assumed auxiliary consumption.</p> <p>Monitoring methodology: The PP has not included the quantity of WECM used for energy generation, the electricity import from the grid, the quantity of the electricity generated by the power plant and auxiliary electricity consumption of the power plant in accordance with the ACM0012 v3.</p>
42	3994	Waste Heat Recovery and Power Generation Project in Jilin Yatai Group Mingcheng Cement Co., Ltd.	JCI	<p>Baseline methodology: The DOE has not provided a clear description of the project activity that provides the reader with a clear understanding of the precise nature of the project activity and the technical aspects of its implementation in line with paragraphs 58-64, in particular, whether there are any power plants connected to the internal grid of Mingcheng Cement other than electricity imported from the NEPG. Please provide detailed information of the power plants connected to the internal grid of Mingcheng Cement.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: The DOE has explained that the waste energy was released to the atmosphere in the absence of the project activity using the by the process plant manufacture's original design specification and layout diagrams of the existing cement production line. However, the DOE has not provided the quantity and energy content of the waste energy produced for the rated plant capacity or unit of product produced in line with ACM0012 v3 (pages 4-5).</p> <p>Baseline methodology: Further the DOE has not explained the means of validation of the fcap, in particular, output energy that can be theoretically produced (QOE,BL) in line with ACM0012 v3.</p> <p>Additionality: The DOE has explained that the input values to the investment analysis are suitable compared to the similar projects. However, the DOE has not provided information on how the similar projects have been selected in line with paragraph 113 (c) of VVM v1.2, in particular, geographical scope, type of technology, type of industry, scale of the production of the identified industry, etc. In addition, the DOE has not explained suitability of assumed auxiliary consumption.</p> <p>Monitoring methodology: The PP has not included the quantity of WECM</p>



CDM – Executive Board

				used for energy generation, the electricity import from the grid, the quantity of the electricity generated by the power plant and auxiliary electricity consumption of the power plant in accordance with the ACM0012 v3.
43	4048	Gimhae PV(photovoltaic) Power Plant Project	KEMCO	Additionality: The DOE is requested to further report and validate the NPV input values, in particular the investment cost, the O&M costs and the net power generated in line with VVM version 1.1 paragraph 110. In doing so, please (i) provide the O&M and investment cost range reported by the Government as mentioned in the validation report (page A-25), and (ii) report on how the net power generated has been validated considering that a clarification (VR page A-26) has been opened but there is no information on how this has been resolved.
44	3790	Quanzhou Liupu Hydropower Project	TUV Rheinland	Additionality: The DOE indicated that the PDR was finalized in June 2004. Also, the DOE indicated that “the project owner did not get the approval of FSR from Guilin City DRC (GCDRC) before 2008”. Therefore the DOE is further requested to substantiate: (a) what is the difference between the FSR finalized in 2004 and the FSR (or equivalent document) approved on 30 January 2008 in terms of cost and economic returns; and (b) what was the IRR of the project when the project financing agreement was achieved. The DOE is requested to substantiate how it has validated the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis against the PDR (2004) when the financing of the project (therefore the rest of the expenditure) was only achieved on after the Project Financing Agreement (November 2007). Additionality: The DOE shall further substantiate that the CDM real and continuing actions were undertaken by the project participant to secure the CDM status of the project activity in line with VVM version 01 paragraph 100b. in particular how the followings facts have been considered as real and continuing actions to secure CDM: (a) the signature and termination of the CDM agreement with the first CDM consultant (Green Galaxy Environmental); and (b) meetings of the board.
45	3836	Construction of Sumgayit Combined Cycle Power Plant	TUEV Rheinland	Baseline methodology: The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on how the applicability conditions prescribed by the AM0029 ver. 3 methodology have been complied with, in particular, the DOE should provide information on the



46	3826	Grid-connected Electricity Generation from Biomass at Buayai Bio Power.	BVCH	<p>future supply and demand balance in the country to confirm that future natural gas based power capacity additions, comparable in size to the project activity, are not constrained by the use of natural gas in the project activity. In doing so the DOE should also explain how this applicability requirement has been assessed at the time of investment decision (May 2005) considering that the graph on page 8 of the PDD shows that due to a supply constraints during the period 2001-2006 the country had to import natural gas to meet its own demands.</p> <p>Additionality: The DOE should provide further information on the selected benchmark in line with EB 51 Annex 58 para. 6, in particular, the date of the sources used by the DOE to crosscheck its suitability since it was not clearly mentioned in the validation report. The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on how it has validated the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in line with the VVM (version 01.1) para. 110, in particular, a) the suitability of the efficiency used; b) the gas price in line with the market price at the time of investment decision, c) the O&M cost; and d) the electricity tariff. Moreover, the DOE is requested to submit the spreadsheet showing the calculation of the project IRR (14.29%).</p> <p>Additionality: The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how it has validated the suitability of each of the input values to the investment comparison analysis, for all of the baseline alternatives considered, in line with the VVM (version 01.1) para. 110.</p> <p>Monitoring methodology: The DOE should confirm that the project participant is able to implement the monitoring plan as per the requirements of the VVM (version 01.1) para, 123 (c).</p> <p>Other: LoA from Host Party was not uploaded. LoA from Annex 1 country was uploaded under the field for Host Country. The names of the PPs in the Registration Request form are missing.</p> <p>Additionality: The evidences of continuous and real action taken to secure the CDM provided in the PDD have not been completely validated by the DOE. The gap between validated evidences is greater than 3 years (Loan agreement dated 28 July 2003 and CDM consulting contract dated 29 June 2007). The DOE shall provide validate opinion on each evidence listed in the PDD, in line with EB 49, Annex 22.</p> <p>Additionality: Interest rate shall be</p>
----	------	---	------	--



				<p>considered in the calculation of the income tax. The benchmark (15%) was sourced from "IPP Bidding" published in November, 2007 by an independent financial firm in Thailand, while the project starting date is 1 Oct 2003. The DOE shall further explain how the benchmark is considered appropriated at the moment of investment decision making, in line with VVM (v01.1), para. 111. The DOE has not validated the suitability of input values, including ash price, tariff for electricity supplied to the rice mill, O&M cost, insurance, depreciation, tax, salvage value and the PLF. The DOE shall validated the suitability of each input value applied in the investment analysis, in line with VVM (v01.1), para. 110 (a) - (c). The project is a cogeneration plant. The DOE shall validate why the heat revenue has not been considered in the investment analysis. Annual O&M cost and annual power supply (or PLF) have not been considered in the sensitivity analysis.</p> <p>Additionality: The DOE mentioned that the project activity is fueled with wood bark, wood chip, and eucalyptus when demonstrated the prevailing practice barrier, which is conflict with the description (rice husk) in other parts of the validation report and the PDD.</p> <p>Other: In addition, the current methodology (I.C version 15) applied by the project activity has been expired (valid until 17 August 2010). The latest version of the methodology need to be applied when the request for registration is re-submitted.</p>
47	3816	Guañaquitas 9.74 MW Hydroelectric project	ICONTEC	<p>Additionality: A detailed validation opinion regarding financial parameters and barriers in accordance with paragraphs 114, 115, 117, and 118 (b) of version 1.2. of the VVM, has not been provided.</p> <p>Monitoring methodology: The DOE has not described its validation of the monitoring plan in accordance with paragraphs 124 (b), and 124 (c) of version 1.2 of the VVM</p>
48	4096	Zhejiang Jinyuan Cement 9MW Waste Heat Recovery Project	TÜV Nord	<p>Other: The DOE should explain how it has closed B9 (FAR), i.e. the DOE should provide the means of validation applied to close this finding, in line with VVM paragraph 39</p> <p>Other: The DOE shall explain the statement on p. 33 of the VR, "The investment analysis and sensitivity analysis shows the financial unattractiveness of the project and that CDM revenue can help to overcome such barrier" given that investment analysis was not used to demonstrate additionality.</p>



				<p>Additionality: The DOE should further explain the identified barriers in line with the EB50 annex 13 guidance.</p>
49	4103	Cabo Negro Wind Farm Project, Phase...	TÜV Nord	<p>Baseline methodology: The DOE is requested to report how it assessed the emission reduction calculation, in particular, calculation of FCE including equations that are not included in the methodology, verification of data such as natural gas consumption, steam production, electricity generation for the cogeneration plant. In doing so please refer to VVM, v1.2, paragraphs 87, 92, 93.</p> <p>Monitoring methodology: The DOE is requested to report how it assesses that the separate and direct monitoring of C NG BOILER I,y and C NG DIRECT j,y for the same cogeneration plant can be properly implemented as per VVM, v1.2, paragraph 124.</p> <p>Other: Please cross-check the start date of the crediting period as the validation report shows tow dates; 01/01/2011 and 01/11/2010.</p>
50	4069	Fujian Kaisheng Biomass Residues-fi...	TUEV Rheinland	<p>Monitoring methodology: The DOE shall explain how it has validated the monitoring plan in line with the requirements, considering what is mentioned in the Validation Report (p. 34) that "the thermal meter's installation configuration shall be provided to the DOE in case of verification phase". The DOE shall confirm how it has validated that the monitoring of this parameter is in line with the requirements from the methodology.</p> <p>Additionality: The DOE shall confirm (and/or correct) the sections mentioned in Validation Report pages 34 ("i.e., the rice factories or the collection site set up by the project owner") and 26 ("For the use of Biomass residues, eight alternatives are identified for rice husk and straws"). It is not clear how rice husk's and straw's conditions apply to the proposed project activity. Furthermore, those types of biomass residues are not mentioned in the section pertaining to baseline alternatives to biomass residues.</p> <p>Other: In line with EB 48, Annex 60, paragraphs 13 &14, please resubmit the revised documents applying the latest version of the methodology. The submission was done on 25th October 2010, same day when the validity of the methodology (including the grace period) expired.</p>
51	4188	Methane Recovery Project of Tianche...	RINA	<p>Baseline methodology: The PP/DOE should revise the inconsistencies related to whether the electricity generated is for captive use or to be exported to the grid, considering that</p>



				<p>the project description (in both the PDD and VR) mentions that the project activity is a captive power plant for internal use in the facility production; whereas the monitoring plan explains that the: "monitoring shall consist of metering the net electricity supplied by the project activity to the grid and that the measurement results shall be cross-checked with records for sold electricity"</p> <p>Additionality: The DOE shall further clarify how it has cross-checked the input values in line with the requirements of the VVM (version 01.2) para. 111; in particular, a) the self-consumption value of 5% as this has not been validated by the DOE; b) the suitability of the electricity tariff given that the list of the similar activities used by the DOE to crosscheck the value was not presented in the VR in a transparent manner; and c) the nature of the sources used to validate the O&M cost, namely, references 40 - 49 (the website provided in Reference 42 and 47 can not be opened).</p> <p>Monitoring methodology: Flaring - The PP/DOE shall explain how the flare can be demonstrated operational in line with the Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane, considering open flare is installed and 50% of flaring efficiency is applied by default.</p> <p>Other: The methodology mentioned in the PDD/validation report (AMS III.H) is inconsistent with the one (AMS III.F) showed on the project view page.</p>
52	3873	Homet Raya Sibuh Biomass Cogeneratio..	SIRIM	<p>Additionality: The DOE has not provided adequate information on the validation of the input values to the investment analysis in line with paragraph 110 of VVM v1.1, in particular, electricity tariff, annual power generation, and annual operating costs. Further the DOE has not clarified if there is any saving due to heat generation of the project activity compared to the heat generation in the pre-project scenario, and if so, why saving due to avoided cost has not been considered as a revenue in the investment analysis. Further the DOE has not clarified why real value has been applied to salary and wages whereas nominal values have been applied to other parameters in the investment analysis.</p> <p>Other: Please provide the reproducible spreadsheets of the investment analysis.</p>
53	4040	Inner Mongolia Wuhai 30MW Waste Gas...	KECO	<p>Baseline methodology: Project description: The DOE has not provided a clear description of the project activity</p>



			<p>that provides the reader with a clear understanding of the precise nature of the project activity and the technical aspects of its implementation in line with paragraphs 58-64 of VVM 1.1, in particular: (i) the source of energy used to meet the internal energy demand of the carbon black production facility; (ii) how it has validated whether the waste energy utilized in the project activity is recovered from an existing facility or new facility; and (iii) information on the amount of waste energy available.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: Applicability of the methodology: The DOE has not explained how it has validated the applicability of the methodology, in particular, whether the waste energy utilized in the project activity was flared or released into the atmosphere in the absence of the project activity in line with ACM0012 v3 (pages 4-5).</p> <p>Baseline methodology: Baseline identification: The DOE has not provided information on how it has validated that the existence of baseline alternative 6 for power generation (P6: electricity is source from the grid connected power plants). The DOE should provide historical data for electricity imported by carbon black production facility if it is an existing facility.</p> <p>Additionality: Emission reduction: Further the DOE has not provided detailed information on the determination of the fcap and the suitability of input values used in the fcap calculation in line with ACM0012 v3, in particular: (i) why method 3 has been selected to calculate the fcap; (ii) why it is not possible to measure the waste energy, enthalpy and pressure content of WECM; (iii) why there are no historical data; (iv) why case 1 of the method 3 has been selected instead of case 2; (iv) how QOE,BL has been determined (methodology requires to determine the QOE,BL based on manufacture's specifications or technical assessment conducted by independent qualified/certified external process experts such as chartered engineers)</p> <p>Additionality: Additionality: The DOE has explained that the input values to the investment analysis are suitable compared with similar WHR projects (installed capacities between 9 to 24 MW). However, there are no similar WHR projects in Inner Mongolia Autonomous region as per common practice analysis. Please clarify. In addition, the DOE should provide information on why projects with</p>
--	--	--	--



CDM – Executive Board

				installed capacity from 9 to 24 MW have been selected whereas the installed capacity of the project activity is 30 MW.
54	3553	Grid Connected Wind Electricity Gen...	RINA	Additionality: The DOE has not provided sufficient information for the issue raised on the prior consideration of the CDM during the previous kick out of the project activity (further substantiation how it has validated that the CDM benefits were considered necessary in the decision to undertake the project as a proposed CDM project activity in line with paragraphs 97-103 of VVM, in particular, consideration of the CDM benefits for 1.25 MW wind power plant.)
55	3912	Wind power project at Karnataka	SGS	Other: As per the PDD, the grid combined margin emission factor has been calculated using the “Tool to calculate emission factor for an electricity system, version 1”, please note that the used version is no longer valid at the point of PDD submission. The PDD should show all the input values used for the investment analysis (for example: values used to calculate the benchmark). As per the Validation Report, the DOE validated that the other barriers were not found prohibitive enough, however they have not been deleted from the submitted PDD. Please correct. Baseline methodology: It is not clear how the DOE confirmed that the proposed project activity is not a de-bundled component of a larger project activity, given that there are two wind projects from the same PP (one already registered and one under validation) in the same State, as mentioned in page 11 of the Validation Report. Moreover the PDD mentions that the PP has no other registered project, therefore being inconsistent with the information given in the Validation Report. In doing so the DOE should also consider the registered project activity UNFCCC reference number 2950. Monitoring methodology: The PDD mentions a monthly monitoring frequency, summarized annually for the electricity imported and exported. However as per paragraph 17 of AMS-I.D version 15 “Hourly measurement and monthly recording” are required.

Table 3						
Stage 1: Completeness Check						
Issuance	#	PA #	Project	Monitoring	DOE	Reasons



			Period		
1	1253	Baragran Hydro Electric Project, 3.0 MW (being expanded to 4.9 MW)	29/10/08 - 31/12/09	SGS	<p>a) Paragraph 7 (a) of EB48 - Annex 68 requires that all documents submitted with the request for issuance must be mutually consistent. However, the version and the date of the registered PDD (version 06 of 21st August 2008) does not correspond to the version and the date of PDD indicated under Verification and Certification Statement (PDD, version 03 dated 14/12/2006) in your Verification and Certification Report. In addition, we would kindly draw your attention to the submitted additional annexes which cannot be read properly as the words are unreadable, especially the attachment of 16/07/2008. Please ensure that these are provided in a clear readable format. Kindly submit the revised documents. Please keep in mind that if you find appropriate to submit a new version of the verification and certification report, a new signed form must be also submitted with the updated date.</p>
2	0030	Essaouira wind power project	01 /09/07 - 31/08/ 09	AENOR	<p>i) According with the Paragraph 8 (b) from EB48 - Annex 68, the documents which must be submitted with the request for issuance include, inter alia, a spreadsheet containing the emission reductions calculation. However, the spreadsheet submitted only contains the values of the monitored gross and net electricity production, without the calculation of ERs;</p> <p>ii) According with the Paragraph 9 (e) from EB48 - Annex 68, the Secretariat shall ensure, when conducting a completeness check, that cross-referencing and versioning, including number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents is correct and accurate. However, the Verification Report makes reference to a monitoring report version 03 (on pages 2 of 29 and 9 of 29) while the monitoring report submitted does not have a version number;</p> <p>iii) According with the Paragraph 9 (c) from EB48 - Annex 68, the Secretariat shall ensure, when conducting a completeness check, that relevant annexes have been provided and are in an appropriate format. However, the monitoring report makes reference to an Annex where calibration records are provided, in section 6.1, but the report does not contain any annex.</p>



CDM – Executive Board

					Kindly submit the revised updated documents. If the DOE find appropriate, it may also submit an updated request for issuance form.
3	1774	Electricity generation from mustard crop residues: Tonk, India	07/10/08 - 28/02/09	TÜV-SÜD	The previous submission of the request for issuance was rejected as incomplete because a delay in the calibration of the main and backup electricity-meters was identified. The PP/DOE followed the guidance from EB52 - Annex 60, which resulted in a lower amount of ERs monitored (19,223 tCO ₂ e against 19,232 tCO ₂ e from the previous submission). However, the signed form presents the value "Total verified and certified emission reductions" corresponding to the previous submission.
4	0784	Yangyang Renewable Energy Project (3MW Wind Power + 1.4MW Small Hydroelectric Power)	10/02/07 - 10/02/10	KFQ	According to EB 48 Annex 68(c)(8) A spreadsheet containing the emission reductions calculation should be submitted. The date provided in the Certification Report (page 14)(20/07/10) is dated prior to the finalization of the Verification Report (page 2)(26/07/10). Kindly address this inconsistency.
5	0083	Cuyamel Hydroelectric Project	01/02/09 - 31/01/10	DNV	a) Paragraph 7 (a) of EB48 - Annex 68 requires that all documents submitted with the request for issuance must be mutually consistent. The Monitoring Report V2 is dated 27/7/2010. In the Verification/Certification Report (Certification Statement included), the reference is being made to Monitoring Report Version 2, date 7/6/2010. Then under References in the Verification/Certification report, the Monitoring Report V2 is dated 27/7/2010.
6	1433	Hubei Xuan'en Dongping Hydropower Station	28/11/09 - 27/05/10	TÜV-Nord	Incorrect MR version described in the VR/CR Report (pages 19, 28). Monitoring period dates are inconsistent in the Verification Report (page 21). Please address these inconsistencies.
7	2379	Kampot Cement Waste Heat Power Generation Project (KCC-WHG)	01/06/09 - 30/04/10	SIRIM	As per EB48 para 9 (b), the spreadsheet must be supplied in an assessable (unprotected) format. However, the Emission Reductions spreadsheet is protected and therefore is not assessable. Additionally, the signed request for issuance form is dated 13 August 2010 which is prior to the finalization of the verification/certification report. Please update this document.
8	1082	7.85 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Southern India	14/07/07 - 01/07/08	TÜV-Nord	The amount of ERs calculated in the Excel Spreadsheet is inconsistent with the amount of ERs claimed in the Monitoring Report, Verification Report and Certification Report.



CDM – Executive Board

9	0545	Durban Landfill-gas-to-electricity project – Mariannahill and La Mercy Landfills	15/12/06 - 01/11/07	JCI	The verification report indicates that the PDD Version 2007-11-20 was reviewed during the verification. However, the PDD Version 2007-11-20 does not exist on the UNFCCC website. The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency.
10	0337	AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-07, Mato Grosso, Minas Gerais and Goiás, Brazil	01/09/09 - 28/02/10	DNV	Incorrect registration date in the revised MR. No calibration date information in the VR/CR.
11	1190	Pingwu Renjiaba 12.6 MW Small Hydropower Project, P.R.China	21/08 09 - 20/07/10	TÜV-Nord	Incorrect monitoring period in the CR.
12	1390	Power Generation (20MW) by utilizing Coke Oven Gas of China Coal and Coke Jiuxin Limited in Lingshi, Shanxi, P. R. China	25/08/09 - 24/06/10	Bureau Veritas	Verification report states (Page 5 and 15) that there is a Version 2 of the monitoring report dated 16/08/2010 which was not submitted with the request for issuance.
13	1380	Power Generation by Waste Heat Recovery Project in Henglai Building Materials Co. Ltd., Yixing City, Jiangsu Province, P. R. China	01/06/09 - 31/05/10	TÜV-Nord	Paragraph 7 (b) of EB48 - Annex 68 requires that all documents submitted with the request for issuance must be mutually consistent. However, the monitoring period indicated in the verification report on pages 11, 46 (14 Mar 2008 - 31 May 09 and 09-09-01 to 2010-03-01) is not consistent with the monitoring period of the request for issuance (01 Jun 09 - 31 May 10). The crediting period indicated in the verification report on page 45 (2008/03/14 - 2015/03/15) is not consistent with the crediting period shown on the project view page (2008/03/14 - 2015/03/13). The version of the monitoring report described in the verification report on page 32 (version 1 dt. 1 Jun. 2010) is not consistent with the version of the document itself (version 02 16/08/2010). The version of the PDD indicated in the verification report on page 33 (version 06, dated 2008-01-23) is not consistent with the version of the document itself (version 05, dated 09/10/2007). Please address these inconsistencies.
14	0853	Waste heat utilization for power generation at Ind Synergy Ltd, Kotmar, Raigargh in Chattisgarh, India	01/01/09 - 31/12/09	TÜV-Nord	Under References of the Verification Report refers to the /MR2/ Monitoring report version 1.1 dated 31/05/2010 based on which verification opinion is given. The latest MR version is 1.2 and is dated on 14/08/2010



CDM – Executive Board

15	0275	Santa Ana Hydroelectric Plant	01/08/08 - 31/07/09	ICONTEC	Paragraph 8 (a) of EB48 - Annex 68 requires that a monitoring report should be submitted with a request for issuance. According to the Verification and Certification Report, the current verification is based on the Monitoring Report dated 2010-05-31 (version 4). However, this version of the MR is missing in the submission. Kindly provide all necessary documents.
16	2120	Qi'nan Hydro Power Project	30/01/09 - 31/07/10	BVCH	i) the calculation spreadsheet submitted does not provide the formulae in column I (EGy); ii) the spreadsheet provides a non-traceable calculation of EGy in lines 50, 51, 56 and 58; additionally, the calculated value of average annual generation is also not traceable; iii) the monitoring period is from 30/01/09 to 31/07/2010 and the values considered as 0 were not listed in the spreadsheet. The calculated length of the average annual generation must take into account these 2-days. In addition, the amount of ERs reported in the calculation spreadsheet is not consistent with the amount of ERs claimed. Furthermore, the Certification Statement refers to a PDD version 05, whereas the correct version of PDD is version 04.
17	1075	Guangzhou Xingfeng Landfill Gas Recovery and Electricity Generation CDM Project	30/12/08 - 31/03/09	TÜV-SÜD	Spreadsheet for February 09 is not submitted.
18	1634	4MW Biomass Power Plants Using Waste Wood Chips & Sawdust in Central Java Province, Indonesia	07/01/09 - 31/12/09	JQA	Inconsistent dates of MR throughout the Verification Report
19	1477	Liujiaohan 10 MW Small Hydropower Project in Jiangxi Province	10/04/08 - 10/07/09	DNV	The baseline emissions reported in the verification report (page 10) are 22,764 tCO ₂ e while the baseline emissions reported in the monitoring report are 25,079 tCO ₂ e.
20	1317	Paraíso Small Hydropower Plant - PCH Paraíso	11/02/08 - 31/12/08	TÜV-Nord	a) In accordance with EB48 - Annex 68 Paragraph 10 (b), the spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions must contain the values of the monitored parameters; the formulae of calculation are shown in the spreadsheet cells for ease of assessment, whenever possible and any other explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet. However; i) The CER spreadsheet submitted does not provide the formulae for EGy and ERy



					<p>ii) The actual calculation of baseline emissions ($ER_y = 86,000.197 \text{ MWh} * 0.327 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh}$) amounts to a value different from that claimed in the spreadsheet.</p> <p>b) Furthermore, the crediting period on page 6 of Verification Report indicates, 'Renewable'. This is not consistent with the crediting period in the registered PDD.</p> <p>c) The Certification report is dated 25/03/2010 and the revised Monitoring report is dated 13/09/2010. This is inconsistent.</p> <p>The DOE is requested to address these inconsistencies and re-submit all the documents with the correct calculation of Emission Reductions.</p>
21	0431	Puente Gallego Landfill gas recovery project, Gallego, Rosario, Argentina	01/01/09 - 30/06/09	SGS	The signed request for issuance form is dated 8 June 2010 which is prior to the finalisation of the monitoring report and verification/certification report. In addition, the form refers to monitoring report ver.4 dated 11/02/2010 whereas the Monitoring Report submitted is Ver.5 dated 23/09/2010. Please correct the inconsistent documents.
22	0801	Korea Water Resources Corporation (Kwater) small-scale hydroelectric power plants project II	01/06/08 - 31/05/09	KSA	The Verification and Certification Report states that the current verification is based on the draft Monitoring Report (dated 01 July 09), the final Monitoring Report (dated 09 July 2010) (the latest Monitoring Report) is missing in the submission.
23	0950	Bio energy in General Deheza – Electricity generation based on peanut hull and sunflower husk	01/01/08 - 31/12/09	ICONTEC	As per EB 48-Annex 68-para 9 (d), all documents must be in English or must contain translations of relevant sections. The Spreadsheet documents contain many sections in Spanish Language. EB 48, Annex 68-para 7(b), also requires that all documents are internally and mutually consistent. The Verification Report makes reference to AMS I.D. Version 7 under References, whereas the registered methodology is AMS I.D version 9. Further, the Monitoring report states "the conclusions on this scorecard are based on the Monitoring report version dated on 12 07 2010", whereas the submitted Monitoring Report is dated 07/07/2010.
24	1841	Yeong Yang 61.5MW Wind Farm Project	20/02/09 - 31/05/10	AENOR	As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, the date provided in the CR (28/10/10) is prior to the date of the VR (29/10/10). Please address this inconsistency.



25	1428	Monomeros Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project	25/03/09 - 03/05/10	ICONTEC	As per EB 48 Annex 68, Paragraph 9 (e) requires that the number of CERs within and between the documents is correct and accurate. However, the Monitoring report on page 18 indicates the number of CERs as 122,354, but the amount of CERs claimed in VR/CR is 122,092. Crediting period dates are inconsistent in the VR (pages 12, 33, 53). Please address these inconsistencies.
26	1229	Catalytic N2O destruction project in the tail gas of the nitric acid plant PANNA 3 of Enaex S.A.	01/01/10 - 31/03/10	TÜV- SÜD	The certification statement in both certification report and verification report refers to a wrong version of monitoring report
27	1229	Catalytic N2O destruction project in the tail gas of the nitric acid plant PANNA 3 of Enaex S.A.	01/04/10 - 30/06/10	TÜV- SÜD	The certification statement in both certification report and verification report refers to a wrong version of monitoring report
28	254	Lepanto Landfill Gas Management Project	29/11/08 - 31/12/09	SGS	As per EB 48-Annex 68-para 9 (d), all documents must be in English or must contain translations of relevant sections. The Spreadsheet documents contain sections in Spanish Language. Kindly address this issue.
29	1872	Hunan Chenxi Dafutan Hydropower Station..	21/06/09 - 25/07/10	SGS	Page 2 of Verification and Certification Report contains data from the previous request for issuance of the same project: The monitoring period, the Monitoring Report Version and the number of CERs. It is therefore inconsistent.
30	2756	Miyi Wantan Hydroelectric Project	23/11/09 - 25/03/10	CEC	As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, the Request for Issuance form indicates a number of 35,375 CERs while the Monitoring Report, the CERs calculation spreadsheet, the Verification Report and the Certification Report indicates a number of 35,344 CERs.
31	0213	Serra Bagasse Cogeneration Project (SBCP)	01/01/08 - 31/12/08	SGS	The Verification Report states that CAR #3 was addressed in the Monitoring Report dated 26/04/2010. However the Monitoring Report submitted is dated 30 July 2010.
32	2379	Kampot Cement Waste Heat Power Generation Project (KCC-WHG)	01/06/09 - 30/04/10	SIRIM	The verification and certification report (p17) refer to "the revised monitoring plan". However, there is no revised monitoring plan approved by the Board. The verification report (p1) states that the project was registered on 23 April 2006. However, the project was registered on 17 Apr 09
33	0591	Shalivahana Non-Conventional	25/01/09 - 24/01/10	DNV	As per EB 48 Annex 68, Paragraph 9 (e) requires that the number of



CDM – Executive Board

		Renewable Sources Biomass Power Project			CERs within and between the documents is correct and accurate. However, the spreadsheet indicates the number of CERs as 27,376, but the amount of CERs claimed in VR/CR is 26,750. The signed form dated 02/07/2010 is not updated. Please address these inconsistencies.
34	0247	Replacement of Fossil Fuel by Palm Kernel Shell Biomass in the production of Portland Cement	01/01/06 - 31/12/09	SIRIM	Paragraph 9 (e) of EB 48 Annex 68 requires that the number of CERs within and between the documents is correct and accurate. The CER spreadsheet indicates the number of CERs as 206,408 however the amount of CERs claimed in MR, VR is 206,353. Please note that the MR gives different amount of Calculation of total ERs for year 2006 and the Spreadsheet another amount, hence the difference in total CER numbers.
35	2686	Low pressure steam generation by recovering waste heat using Heat Reclaimers at Emirates CMS Power	09/10/09 - 08/07/10	TÜV-Nord	As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, the verification report makes reference to a "Monitoring Report revised for 09 Oct 09 - 08 Jul 2010", without specifying the correct date and version
36	0881	6MW Biomass based Power Plant at Nellore	09/03/07 - 31/12/ 08	TÜV-Nord	As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, in the submitted Verification report, on page 2, the version of the Final Monitoring report is indicated as 02. This is not in consistency with the Monitoring Report submitted. Furthermore, under References, Table 7-1, there is no reference to the Monitoring Report (including date and version) verified by the DOE.
37	0662	1.5 MW Link Canal Mini Hydel Project	01/06/07 - 31/05/09	TÜV-Nord	As per paragraph 7 (b) all documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, the figures of project emissions in the spreadsheet are inconsistent with project emissions in Monitoring Report and Verification Report.
38	1568	1568 6 MW Biomass residue based cogeneration unit by MPML at Village Heti (Surla), District Nagpur in Maharashtra, India	05/04/08 - 31/03/09	TÜV-Nord	As per EB 48 Annex 68, Paragraph 9 (e) requires that the number of CERs within and between the documents is correct and accurate. However, the Monitoring report on page 18 indicates the number of CERs as 33,868, but the amount of CERs claimed in VR/CR is 30,607. Monitoring period dates (2008-04-05 to 2008-10-31) on the front page of the VR are inconsistent. Please address these inconsistencies.
39	0133	Project for the Refurbishment and Upgrading of Macho de Monte	01/12/01 - 30/11/08	AENOR	As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, in the signed form the



		Hydropower Plant (Panama)			dates of the monitoring period are 01 Dec 01 - 30 Jun 08, which are not in consistency with the dates of the monitoring period indicated on the project view page (01 Dec 01 - 30 Nov 08). The registration date indicated in the VR (25 Dec 05) is not consistent. Please address these inconsistencies.
40	2217	2217 Municipal Solid Waste based Composting at Kolhapur, Maharashtra	01/04/09 - 31/03/10	TÜV-Rheinland	As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, the date provided in the CR (9/11/10) is prior to the date of the VR (17/11/10). Please address this inconsistency.
41	1015	25.70 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Udumalpet, Tamilnadu	24/06/05 - 31/12/07	TÜV-Nord	As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, in the request for issuance form the dates of the monitoring period are 24/6/05 - 31/12/07, which is not in consistency with the dates of the monitoring period stated in the final version of the Monitoring Report, the Verification Report and the Certification Report submitted. Additionally, the dates of the final version of the Monitoring Report are not consistent within the document, as the date in the cover is: 30/08/2010, and the date stated on page 2 is 16/07/2010.
42	1019	Qixia Tangshanpeng Windfarm Project	27/10/08 - 30/06/10	SGS	As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, the Verification and Certification Statement is dated on 8/09/10, which is prior to the date of the actual Verification Report (15/10/10). Please address this inconsistency.
43	0673	Darajat Unit III Geothermal Project	01/10/07 - 01/10/08	DNV	As per EB48 para 9 (b), the spreadsheet must be supplied in an assessable (unprotected) format. However, the Emission Reductions spreadsheet is protected and therefore is not assessable. Additionally, the signed request for issuance form is not updated. Please update this document.
44	2444	ADFEC 10 MW Solar Power plants,	08/06/09 - 01/07/10	TÜV-Nord	Paragraph 10 (e) of EB 48, annex 68 requires that the request for issuance form has been signed by the representative of the DOE. This request for issuance form does not contain the signature.
45	2474	25.6 MW grid connected Wind Power based electricity generation project in Karnataka, India.	27/07/09 - 28/02/10	TÜV-Nord	As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, the incorrect MR (Version 2 dated 2010-09-20) is described in the VR Report in the reference list. The incorrect date of the PDD in indicated in the VR Report (09-11-



CDM – Executive Board

					07).
46	1872	1872 Hunan Chenxi Dafutan Hydropower Station	21/06/09 - 25/07/10	SGS	As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, the incorrect Monitoring Report (dated 25/06/10) is described in the VR Report on page 2.
47	2686	2686 Low pressure steam generation by recovering waste heat using Heat Reclaimers at Emirates CMS Power	09/10/09 - 08/07/10	TÜV-Nord	As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, the date provided in the CR (12/11/10) is prior to the date of the VR (14/12/10). Additionally, the signed request for issuance form is not updated. Please update this document. The incorrect crediting period is indicated in the MR (on pages 3, 25, 27). Please address these inconsistencies.
48	0545	0545 Durban Landfill-gas-to-electricity project – Mariannahill and La Mercy Landfills	15/12/06 - 01/11/07	JCI	As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, the date provided in the Certification Report (30/03/10) is prior to the date of the Verification Report (30/11/10). Additionally, the incorrect version of PDD is indicated in the CR. Please address these inconsistencies.
49	1963	Guangdong Nan Ao 26MW Wind Power Project	15/12/08 - 28/10/09	TÜV-Nord	Table 5-3 of Emission Reduction Calculation in the Verification Reports shows confusing dates of the monitoring period (ending date is indicated as 09-10-29 to 09-09-29) whereas the last date of the monitoring report is 28/10/09. In addition the Reference list in the Verification Report lists Monitoring Report version 02 dated on 19/10/2010 whereas the submitted MR version 02 is dated 16/11/2010.
50	0247	Replacement of Fossil Fuel by Palm Kernel Shell Biomass in the production of Portland Cement	01/01/06 - 31/12/09	SIRIM	One of the requirements of EB48 - Annex 68 is that the documents are mutually and internally consistent but also that the certification report clearly indicates the monitoring period under verification with the corresponding number of CERs. The Verification and Certification Statement contains a table, located right above the signature, where the monitoring period goes from 1/1/2006 to 31/1/09, whereas the correct monitoring report is 01/01/2006 to 31/12/09. The same issue noted on pg. 16 of the Verification report in the Emission Reduction Calculation Table 1: ERs for Rawang Works (RW). In the reference list the current monitoring report (ver 1.8) and the previous one (ver 1.7) are dated in 2020. Page 6 of the Verification Report lists registered PDD dated 21/11/2006, whereas the PDD



					version 3 is dated 21/11/2005. Kindly address these inconsistencies.
51	0141	Abanico Hydroelectric Project	01/03/09 - 28/02/10	ERM CVS	<p>As per EB 48-Annex 68-para 9 (d), all documents must be in English or must contain translations of relevant sections. Besides the summary sheets, the spreadsheet document contains sheets in Spanish Language. Please provide those in English language.</p> <p>As per EB48-Annex 68 all documents must be mutually and internally consistent. The Monitoring Report in the both Verification and Certification report is dated as 04/11/2010, whereas the monitoring report itself is dated 1/11/2010. The Certification Statement, pg 23 of the Verification Report, in its conclusion makes reference to Monitoring Report version 4 dated 24 September 2010, which is not the latest version of the Monitoring report.</p>

Table 4

Issuance		Stage 2: Information and Reporting Check			
#	PA #	Project	Monitoring Period	DOE	Reasons
1	0765	Catalytic N2O destruction project in the tail gas of three Nitric Acid Plants at Hu-Chems Fine Chemical Corp.	01/01/10 - 31/03/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain all parameters required to be monitored as per the monitoring plan/applied methodology (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iii)).</p> <p>Annex 68 to EB 48 and "Issuance information and reporting checklist" that the Monitoring Report shall contain all parameters required by the monitoring plan. However, in the submitted Monitoring Report (Version 2, 18/06/2010), under the "Data and parameters monitored" section, the required information for Hu-Chems III and Hu-Chem IV plants have not been reported. Only those data and parameters monitored for Hu-Chems II are presented.</p>
2	0765	Catalytic N2O destruction project in the tail gas of three Nitric Acid Plants at Hu-Chems Fine Chemical Corp.	01/01/10 - 31/03/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).</p> <p>In the monitoring line diagram for Hu-Chems II (page 13 of the</p>



					monitoring report), the tag number for the monitoring equipment of "P_HNO3" is stated as 322-FT-2-513 whereas page 43 of the monitoring report states 322-FT-512 (Page 16 of the Verification Report states the same). Please correct this inconsistency.
3	0765	Catalytic N2O destruction project in the tail gas of three Nitric Acid Plants at Hu-Chems Fine Chemical Corp.	01/01/10 - 31/03/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the formulae of calculation (whenever possible) (EB48/Annex 68 para 10 (b) (ii)).</p> <p>Kindly include the formulae of calculation in the spreadsheet cells as per the requirement of Annex 68 to EB 48 and "Issuance information and reporting checklist". For instance, the calculated results in column "H" or "K"(baseline emissions), based on the volume flow times the N2O concentration, should be linked to the monitored data results through appropriate calculation formulae. The formulae of calculations should be included in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible.</p>
4	1158	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-21, Goias	01/02/08 - 31/08/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The verification report does not have a statement on whether the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 203).</p> <p>VVM (paragraph 220d) and the "Issuance Information and Reporting Checklist" require that the verification report shall provide all the DOE's findings and conclusions as to whether the proposed project activity has been implemented in accordance with the PDD. However, the submitted verification report does not provide any conclusion on whether the proposed project activity has been implemented in accordance with the PDD.</p>
5	1158	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-21, Goias	01/02/08 - 31/08/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not have a clear statement on whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology (VVM v.1.2 para 203).</p> <p>VVM (paragraph 199) require that the DOE shall verify that the validated monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed CDM project activity. Furthermore, the "Issuance information and reporting checklist" and paragraph 202/220 of VVM require that the DOE shall provide a</p>



					statement that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed project activity. However, this statement is missing in the verification report.
6	1158	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-21, Goiás	01/02/08 - 31/08/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).</p> <p>The Monitoring Report (page 4 of 12) states that four sites have not completed construction. However, the Verification Report (page 5) states that "the digesters performance is as planned and the captured biogas is flared at all sites." Should this statement mean to refer to "all sites (for which emission reductions were reported)", then please kindly clarify while addressing issue 1 and 2 above.</p>
7	1528	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-22, Minas Gerais, Brazil	07/04/08 - 31/08/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>As per EB48 para10 (a.iv), "Monitoring report should contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan". The monitoring plan indicates that the calibration of the gas analyzer will be conducted as per "manufacture requirements", and the monitoring report states that "every 6 months they are sent back to the manufacture for recalibration", however the calibration dates provided for the LandTec Biogas Check gas analyzer does not cover the entire monitoring period (first date provided is 01/12/08).</p>
8	1528	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-22, Minas Gerais, Brazil	07/04/08 - 31/08/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).</p> <p>Additionally, while providing clarification response/ revised documents, please address the following inconsistencies: (a) The monitoring report indicates that the temperature values used for adjusting the methane density are obtained from the NOAA weather station database http://www7.ncdc.noaa.gov/IPS/MCDWPubs?action=getpublication) while the verification report indicates the source as</p>



					www.inmet.gov.br; (b) the deviation number I-DEV0301 stated by the DOE in page 5 of verification report refers to another project activity.
9	1162	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-27, Goias, Brazil	01/02/08 - 31/10/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>As per EB48/Annex 68 para10 (a.iv), "Monitoring report should contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan". The monitoring plan indicates that the calibration of the gas analyzer will be conducted as per "manufacture requirements", and the monitoring report states that "every 6 months they are sent back to the manufacture for recalibration", however the calibration dates provided for some of the LandTec Biogas Check gas analyzers in the monitoring report don't cover the entire monitoring period and reflect a delay in calibration considering a 6 months calibration frequency.</p>
10	1162	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-27, Goias, Brazil	01/02/08 - 31/10/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).</p> <p>Additionally, while providing clarification response/revised documents, please address the following inconsistency: The monitoring report indicates that the temperature values used for adjusting the methane density are obtained from the NOAA weather station database http://www7.ncdc.noaa.gov/IPS/MC/DWPubs?action=getpublication) while the verification report indicates the source as www.inmet.gov.br.</p>
11	1160	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-25, Minas Gerais	01/02/08 - 30/09/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>As per EB48/Annex 68 para10 (a.iv), "Monitoring report should contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan". The monitoring plan indicates that the calibration of the gas analyzer will be conducted as per "manufacture requirements", and the monitoring report states that</p>



					"every 6 months they are sent back to the manufacture for recalibration", however the calibration dates provided for some of the LandTec Biogas Check gas analyzers in the monitoring report reflect a delay in calibration considering a 6 months calibration frequency.
12	1160	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-25, Minas Gerais	01/02/08 - 30/09/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).</p> <p>Additionally, while providing clarification response/revised documents, please address the following inconsistencies: (a) The monitoring report indicates that the temperature values used for adjusting the methane density are obtained from the NOAA weather station database http://www7.ncdc.noaa.gov/IPS/MC/DWPubs?action=getpublication) while the verification report indicates the source as www.inmet.gov.br; (b) DOE states that "The methane content in the exhaust gas was not measured during the initial phase of the monitoring period" and applied a default value of 50% as per approved deviation (I-DEV0295) and also includes a CAR1 regarding the same issue, however the default value has only been applied from 01/02/2008 till 01/09/2008 for Fazenda Pig Light - sitio 2 in the Excel spreadsheet whilst the monitoring report Table B5 states that the default value has been applied from 01/02/2008 till 20/10/2008.</p>
13	1521	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-18,, Parana, Rio Grande do Sul, and Santa Catarina, Brazil	05/06/08 - 30/11/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>As per EB48/Annex 68 para10 (a.iv), "Monitoring report should contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan". The monitoring plan indicates that the calibration of the gas analyzer will be conducted as per "manufacture requirements", and the monitoring report states that "every 6 months they are sent back to the manufacture for recalibration", however the calibration dates provided for some of the LandTec Biogas Check gas analyzers in the monitoring report reflect a delay in</p>



CDM – Executive Board

					calibration considering a 6 months calibration frequency.
14	1521	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-18,, Parana, Rio Grande do Sul, and Santa Catarina, Brazil	05/06/08 - 30/11/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).</p> <p>Additionally, while providing clarification response/revised documents, please address the following inconsistency: (a) The monitoring report indicates that the temperature values used for adjusting the methane density are obtained from the NOAA weather station database http://www7.ncdc.noaa.gov/IPS/MC DWPubs?action=getpublication) while the verification report indicates the source as www.inmet.gov.br.</p>
15	1163	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-28, Santa Catarina, Brazil	01/02/08 - 30/11/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>As per EB48/Annex 68 para10 (a.iv), "Monitoring report should contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan". The monitoring plan indicates that the calibration of the gas analyzer will be conducted as per "manufacture requirements", and the monitoring report states that "every 6 months they are sent back to the manufacture for recalibration", however the calibration dates provided for some of the LandTec Biogas Check gas analyzers in the monitoring report don't cover the entire monitoring period and reflect a delay in calibration considering a 6 months calibration frequency.</p>
16	1163	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-28, Santa Catarina, Brazil	01/02/08 - 30/11/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).</p> <p>Additionally, while providing clarification response/revised documents, please address the following inconsistencies: (a) The monitoring report indicates that the temperature values used for adjusting the methane density are obtained from the NOAA weather station database http://www7.ncdc.noaa.gov/IPS/MC DWPubs?action=getpublication) while the verification report indicates the source as www.inmet.gov.br; (b) DOE states that "The methane</p>



					content in the exhaust gas was not measured during the initial phase of the monitoring period” and applied a default value of 50% as per approved deviation (I-DEV0303) and also includes a CAR2 regarding the same issue, however there is no default value applied in the monitoring period and the deviation is applied by the project activity but does not cover flare efficiency.
17	1531	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR07-S-31, Mato Grosso do Sul, Parana, Rio Grande do Sul, and Santa Catarina, Brazil	05/06/08 - 30/11/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>As per EB48/Annex 68 para10 (a.iv), “Monitoring report should contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan”. The monitoring plan indicates that the calibration of the gas analyzer will be conducted as per “manufacture requirements”, and the monitoring report states that “every 6 months they are sent back to the manufacture for recalibration”, however the calibration dates provided for some of the LandTec Biogas Check gas analysers in the monitoring report don’t cover the entire monitoring period and reflect a delay in calibration considering a 6 months calibration frequency.</p>
18	1531	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR07-S-31, Mato Grosso do Sul, Parana, Rio Grande do Sul, and Santa Catarina, Brazil	05/06/08 - 30/11/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b))</p> <p>Additionally, while providing clarification response/ revised documents, please address the following inconsistencies: (a) The total project emissions reported in the monitoring report (page 10) do not correspond to the values reported in the emission reduction calculation sheet (cell E290 to E295); (b) In Table D.4 of monitoring report, the values for “project emissions”and “lower of minus project emissions” do not correspond to the values reported in the emission reductions calculation sheet (cell E290 to E295, and cell F299 to F304 respectively); (c) The monitoring report indicates that the temperature values used for adjusting the methane density are obtained from the NOAA weather station database http://www7.ncdc.noaa.gov/IPS/MCDWPub?action=getpublicat</p>



					ion) while the verification report indicates the source as www.inmet.gov.br; (d) DOE states that "The methane content in the exhaust gas was not measured during the initial phase of the monitoring period" and applied a default value of 50% as per approved deviation (I-DEV0292) and also includes a CAR2 regarding the same issue, however there is no default value applied in the monitoring period and the deviation is applied by the project activity but does not cover flare efficiency.
19	0902	Yangquan Coal Mine Methane Advanced Industrial Furnace Utilisation Project	01/10/08 - 31/12/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The verification report does not contain an assessment on how the DOE verified the calibration delay of monitoring equipments against the requirements of EB52, Annex60.</p> <p>Gas analyzer 2# No.25941 was calibrated on 20/12/2007 and the verification report indicated that the calibration frequency is less than 1 year interval. Further clarification is requested how Annex 60 of EB 52 is correctly applied for the period when the calibration was delayed before the shut down of the plant on 11/01/09.</p>
20	0933	Jinan Landfill Gas to Energy Project	01/03/09 - 28/02/10	SGS	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain all parameters required to be monitored as per the monitoring plan/applied methodology (EB48 - Annex 68, paragraph 10 (a) (iii)).</p> <p>The Monitoring Report does not contain information regarding whether the flare operated in accordance with the specifications prescribed by the manufacturer, as required by the monitoring methodology and monitoring plan.</p>
21	0933	Jinan Landfill Gas to Energy Project	01/03/09 - 28/02/10	SGS	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not list all parameters required to be monitored according with the monitoring plan (VVM Version 1.2, paragraph 206.</p> <p>The Verification Report does not provide an assessment on whether the flare operated in accordance with the specifications prescribed by the manufacturer, as required by the monitoring methodology.</p>
22	0122	Agua Fresca Multipurpose and environmental services project	01/01/09- 31/12/09	ICONTEC	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan.</p> <p>As per EB 48-Annex 68-para 10 a</p>



					(iv), the PP did not provide information on calibration of monitoring meters.
23	0167	Landfill Gas to Energy Facility at the Nejapa Landfill Site, El Salvador	21/04/08 - 28/02/10	ICONTEC	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan.</p> <p>The monitoring plan and specifies that temperature and pressure sensors will be subjected to a regular maintenance and calibration regime to ensure accuracy; however the Monitoring Report does not provide information regarding the calibration of the pressure and temperature transmitters.</p>
24	0167	Landfill Gas to Energy Facility at the Nejapa Landfill Site, El Salvador	21/04/08 - 28/02/10	ICONTEC	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the values of monitored parameters.</p> <p>The calculation spreadsheet does not contain the monitored values of the parameter LFGTotal.</p>
25	0167	Landfill Gas to Energy Facility at the Nejapa Landfill Site, El Salvador	21/04/08 - 28/02/10	ICONTEC	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not list all parameters required to be monitored according with the monitoring plan.</p> <p>The Verification Report does not provide an assessment on how it verified the monitoring of the parameters LFGTotal, Flare Efficiency, electricity imported from the grid and fossil consumed. Additionally, the Verification Report does not provide an assessment on the approach adopted when the periodic measurement of methane content of flare exhaust gas was delayed.</p>
26	0167	Landfill Gas to Energy Facility at the Nejapa Landfill Site, El Salvador	21/04/08 - 28/02/10	ICONTEC	<p>Scope: The verification report does not contain information on how the DOE verified the calibration of monitored equipments with the calibration requirements (EB52/Annex 60 para (8) and/or EB55 Annex 35 in case of small scale methodology).</p> <p>The Verification Report contains Table 4 which illustrates the calibration of some of the monitoring instruments; however it's not clear which are the role and location of these instruments and whether a previous calibration was undertaken and whether the frequency is in line with the requirements from EB52 - Annex 60. Moreover, some "Date Changed" cells are blank and the serial number of the flow-meter is not related to the flow-meters</p>



CDM – Executive Board

					illustrated in Table 3. The DOE must provide information on calibration of all monitoring instruments.
27	2318	BRASCARBON Methane Recovery Project BCA-BRA-01	16/03/09 - 16/08/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the monitored parameters reported at the interval required by the monitoring plan / applied methodology (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iii)).</p> <p>As per paragraph 10 (a) iii, EB 48 Annex 68, the monitoring report shall contain all parameters required to be monitored and reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan. However, the monitoring report only specifies that the monitoring frequency of the parameter is monthly while, as per the monitoring plan, the methane content (WCH4) is required to be monitored at 95% confidence level. Further, the monitoring report states that “The flare efficiency is 90% when the flare temperature is higher or equal to 500°C for more than 40 minutes”. However, the ER calculation spreadsheet refer to “H(temp >=500°C) more than 40 minutes or H(100°C<temp <500°C) less than 20 minutes - DATA FROM FORM 08.001”. Further information is required.</p>
28	0812	BOG and COG Utilisation for Combined Cycle Power CDM Project in Jinan Iron & Steel Works	17/08/09 to 13/02/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).</p> <p>The verified emission reductions amount to 699152 CERs. However, the signed form as well as the project view page inconsistently indicates 699153.</p>
29	0290	Youngduk Wind Park Project	01/01/09 - 31/12/09	JACO	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a comparison of the actual emission reduction claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the registered PDD (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (viii)).</p> <p>The monitoring report does not contain a comparison of the actual CERs claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the PDD 10 as per EB 48 Annex 68(a)viii.</p>
30	0290	Youngduk Wind Park Project	01/01/09 - 31/12/09	JACO	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not have a clear statement on whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology (VVM v.1.2 para 203).</p> <p>The verification report does not contain the information that the revised monitoring plan is in</p>



CDM – Executive Board

					accordance with the applied methodology as per para.196,197& 220(d) of VVM (v.01.1).
31	0290	Youngduk Wind Park Project	01/01/09 - 31/12/09	JACO	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).</p> <p>The certification report refer to "the revised Monitoring Report revision 01, dated January 19, 2010" while the monitoring report submitted for request for issuance is the monitoring report of "Revision 2 Dated 2 August 2010".</p>
32	0290	Youngduk Wind Park Project	01/01/09 - 31/12/09	JACO	<p>Scope: Other</p> <p>The spreadsheet contains Japanese while the official language of the EB is English.</p>
33	1153	Methane recovery and utilisation project at United Plantations Berhad, Jendarata Palm Oil Mill, Malaysia	08/11/07 - 30/04/09	TÜV-SÜD	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>The monitoring report does not contain calibration frequency and it does not provide information on whether the calibration of the measuring instruments was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan (e.g. whether the calibration was conducted by third party accredited/authorized for calibrating the measuring equipment).</p>
34	1153	Methane recovery and utilisation project at United Plantations Berhad, Jendarata Palm Oil Mill, Malaysia	08/11/07 - 30/04/09	TÜV-SÜD	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the formulae for BE and/or PE and/or L (when applicable) and emission reductions calculations, including reference to formulae and methods used (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii)).</p> <p>The monitoring report neither provides calculation method/approach for estimating the project emissions from flaring of the biogas, project emissions due to the combustion of the methane in the steam boiler, project emissions from land application of the sludge, nor it gives any reference to the equations/formulas used.</p>
35	0673	Darajat Unit III Geothermal Project	01/09/07 - 01/11/08	DNV	<p>Scope: The verification report does not have a statement on whether the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan.</p> <p>The verification report didn't provide any conclusion as to whether</p>



CDM – Executive Board

					monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the registered monitoring plan.
36	0673	Darajat Unit III Geothermal Project	01/09/07 - 01/11/08	DNV	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not have a clear statement on whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.</p> <p>The verification report didn't provide any conclusion as to whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.</p>
37	0673	Darajat Unit III Geothermal Project	01/09/07 - 01/11/08	DNV	<p>Scope: The CER calculation spreadsheets are supplied in a protected format.</p>
38	2107	Sichuan Baihuatan 120MW Hydropower Project	05/02/09 - 25/08/09	JACO	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not have a clear statement on whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology (VVM v.1.2 para 203).</p> <p>VVM (paragraph 199) requires that the DOE shall verify that the validated monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed CDM project activity. Furthermore, paragraph 202 of VVM requires that the DOE shall provide a statement that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed project activity. However, this statement is missing in the verification report.</p>
39	0813	Installation of co-generation project at sugar manufacturing unit of Mawana Sugars Limited	17/03/07 - 19/04/08	TÜV-SÜD	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not indicate how the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources.</p> <p>The verification report does not contain information on how the DOE has verified that no fossil fuel consumption occurred at the project plant during the given monitoring period.</p>
40	1258	Quezon City Controlled Disposal Facility Biogas Emission Reduction Project	01/09/08 - 30/06/09	TÜV-SÜD	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a comparison of the actual emission reduction claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the registered PDD.</p> <p>The monitoring report does not contain a comparison of the actual CERs claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the PDD as per EB 48 Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (viii).</p>
41	1258	Quezon City Controlled Disposal Facility Biogas Emission Reduction Project	01/09/08 - 30/06/09	TÜV-SÜD	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not provide a conclusion on whether the calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage have been carried out in</p>



					<p>accordance with the monitoring plan and the applied methodology.</p> <p>It is noted that the annual calibration frequency of the methane content analyser (GA01) and exhaust gas analyser (GA02) was not met. The DOE is requested to clarify how Annex 60 of EB52 is correctly applied.</p>
42	1613	Yima Coal Industry (Group) Co., Ltd. CMM utilization project	01/04/09 - 31/03/10	CEC	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain all parameters required to be monitored as per the monitoring plan/applied methodology (EB48 - Annex 68, paragraph 10 (a) (iii)).</p> <p>The Monitoring Report does not contain information regarding the parameter PCCH₄, Concentration (in mass) of methane in extracted gas as required by the monitoring methodology and the registered monitoring plan. Page 34 of the registered PDD states that this parameter is measured on a daily basis; however the values of PCCH₄ are not reported in the monitoring report and CER spreadsheet.</p>
43	1603	Zhengzhou Coal Industry (Group) Co., Ltd. Coalmine Methane Utilization Project	01/04/09 - 31/03/10	CEC	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain all parameters required to be monitored as per the monitoring plan/applied methodology (EB48/Annex68 para (a) (iii)).</p> <p>PC CH₄, Concentration (in mass) of methane in extracted gas, is not reported at the intervals required by the registered monitoring plan. As per pg 36 of the registered PDD, this parameter is measured on a daily basis. The methane concentration values are not reported in the monitoring report and CER spreadsheet.</p>
44	0176	Meizhou Landfills Gas Recovery and Utilization as Energy	01/01/08 - 30/06/09	TÜV-SÜD	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the values of monitored parameters.</p> <p>The spreadsheet does not provide actual monitored data for LFG total, LFG flare and LFG electricity for the period of 28/11/08 - 04/12/08 as per EB48/Annex68 para 10 (b) (i).</p>
45	0176	Meizhou Landfills Gas Recovery and Utilization as Energy	01/01/08 - 30/06/09	TÜV-SUD	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the formulae of calculation (whenever possible).</p> <p>There are no formulae for calculation of the above values in the spreadsheet, using the error adjustment of 1.5%, as described in the verification report as per</p>



CDM – Executive Board

					EB/48/Annex 68 para 10(b)(ii).
46	1831	Fujian Wuyishan Wenlin River 2nd and 3rd Level Hydropower Station	11/12/08 - 22/04/10	CQC	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan.</p> <p>The monitoring report does not contain the calibration dates of the monitoring instruments.</p>
47	1831	Fujian Wuyishan Wenlin River 2nd and 3rd Level Hydropower Station	11/12/08 - 22/04/10	CQC	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the values of monitored parameters.</p> <p>The CER calculation spreadsheets do not contain the values of all monitored parameters, including EGs,y,1, EGs,y,2, EGg,y,1, and EGg,y,2.</p>
48	1831	Fujian Wuyishan Wenlin River 2nd and 3rd Level Hydropower Station	11/12/08 - 22/04/10	CQC	<p>Scope: The CER calculation spreadsheets are not in English.</p>
49	1831	Fujian Wuyishan Wenlin River 2nd and 3rd Level Hydropower Station	11/12/08 - 22/04/10	CQC	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not list all parameters required to be monitored according with the monitoring plan.</p> <p>The Verification Report does not list all parameters required to be monitored according with the monitoring plan, including EGs,y,1, EGs,y,2, EGg,y,1, EGg,y,2, EGs,y and EGg,y.</p>
50	0991	Bundled Wind Power project in Tamilnadu, India co-ordinated by the TamilNadu Spinning Mills Association (TASMA)	01/07/09 - 31/03/10	TÜV-Nord	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan.</p> <p>A) The monitoring report and excel file (with information on calibration) provide the date of calibration; however, it is not clear which are the main and backup meters that belong to TNEB (described in the revised monitoring plan) and which are those installed at each WEG.</p> <p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a comparison of the actual emission reduction claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the registered PDD.</p> <p>B) The comparison between estimations and actual values was done for different periods (annual estimation against 274 days), and therefore the comparison is not clear. Also, the explanation provided in the monitoring report is not consistent with the explanation</p>



CDM – Executive Board

					provided by the DOE in the verification report. Please clarify in the monitoring report and verification report.
51	1615	Wind power project by GFL in Gudhepanchgani	29/08/09 - 29/03/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The verification report does not have a statement on whether the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan.</p> <p>The verification report didn't provide any conclusion as to whether monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the registered monitoring plan.</p>
52	1615	Wind power project by GFL in Gudhepanchgani	29/08/09 - 29/03/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not have a statement on whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.</p> <p>The verification report didn't provide any conclusion as to whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.</p>
53	1005	Gansu Diebu Niaojiaga 12.9 MW Hydropower Station Project	14/05/07 - 31/07/08	TÜV-Nord	<p>Scope: The information on calibration of monitoring instruments reported is not in accordance with the specified by the monitoring methodology/ monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>The monitoring report states that the electricity meters were last calibrated on 26/07/2007 and the calibration frequency is one year according with the monitoring plan. The PP/DOE are required to apply the guidance from EB52 - Annex 60 on delayed calibration from the period 25/07/08 - 31/07/08.</p>
54	1005	Gansu Diebu Niaojiaga 12.9 MW Hydropower Station Project	14/05/07 - 31/07/08	TÜV-Nord	<p>Scope: The verification report does not contain information on how the DOE verified the calibration of monitored equipments with the calibration requirements (EB52/Annex 60 para (8) and/or EB55 Annex 35 in case of small scale methodology).</p> <p>The monitoring report states that the electricity meters were last calibrated on 26/07/2007 and the calibration frequency is one year according with the monitoring plan. The PP/DOE are required to apply the guidance from EB52 - Annex 60 on delayed calibration from the period 25/07/08 - 31/07/08.</p>
55	2365	13.95 MW grid connected wind electricity generation by SRF Limited	09/04/09 - 15/03/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not have a clear statement on whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology (VVM v.1.2 para 203).</p> <p>The verification report does not state</p>



CDM – Executive Board

					whether The monitoring plan is in accordance with The applied methodology.
56	2809	Jiangxi Jiujiang Changling Wind Farm Project	17/12/09 - 26/05/10	DNV	Scope: The Verification Report does not have a clear statement on whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology (VVM v.1.2 para 203). The verification report does not state whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.
57	1612	Shijiazhuang Jinshi N2O Abatement Project	27/06/08 - 13/03/09	DNV	Scope: Monitoring Report does not contain calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any), and emission reductions, including reference to formulae and methods used; (EB48/Annex68 para 10 (a) (vii)). The monitoring report neither provides calculation method/approach used for the calculation of permitted operating conditions, baseline campaign emissions, project campaign emission, nor it gives any reference to the equations/formulae used.
58	1612	Shijiazhuang Jinshi N2O Abatement Project	27/06/08 - 13/03/09	DNV	Scope: The spreadsheet for calculation of emission reductions should provide explanation on application of formulae (EB48/Annex68 para 10 (b) (iii)). The spreadsheets for the calculation of permitted operating conditions, baseline campaign emissions and project campaign emissions do not contain explanations about the main formulae applied thereby.
59	1947	Yingpeng HFC23 Decomposition Project	01/09/09 - 19/04/10	TÜV-Nord	Scope: Monitoring Report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan; (EB48/Annex68 para 10 (a) (iv)). The monitoring report states that the flow meters used to determine parameter q_HFC23 were recalibrated every week as required by the methodology. However, the verification report (Pg 51) states that “The zero-check of the mass flow meters was undertaken every month by competent staff of Yingpeng company, which is in line with the requirement of monitoring methodology”. However, this is not in line with the methodology.
60	2382	Jiangsu Qishuyan Natural Gas Based Power Generation Project	09/11/09 - 31/03/10	DNV	Scope: The Verification Report does not have a clear statement on whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied



					methodology (VVM v.1.2 para 203). The verification report does not state whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.
61	0273	Vajra and Chaskaman small hydro projects of Vindhyachal Hydro Power Ltd., Maharashtra, India	01/04/08 - 12/03/09	BVQI	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)). The quarterly tests reported for the meters of Vajra plant do not cover the whole monitoring period (i.e while the monitoring period starts on 01/04/08, the first test date reported is dated 24/06/08).
62	0273	Vajra and Chaskaman small hydro projects of Vindhyachal Hydro Power Ltd., Maharashtra, India	01/04/08 - 12/03/09	BVQI	Scope: The information on calibration of monitoring instruments reported is not in accordance with the specified by the monitoring methodology/ monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)). The Revised Monitoring Plan states that the test of the meters will be done quarterly, however the meters from Vajra were not tested in this frequency and the Guidance from EB52 - Annex 60 was not applied.
63	0928	Methane recovery and effective use of power generation project Norte III-B Landfill.	01/11/08 - 28/02/09	SGS	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the monitored parameters reported at the interval required by the monitoring plan / applied methodology (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iii)). The Monitoring Report only reports the flare efficiency calculated, without specifying whether the analyses were undertaken within the frequency stipulated by the monitoring plan and whether the flares were operated and maintained pursuant the manufacturer's specifications.
64	1473	10 MW biomass based power generation project at Wani, Yavatmal by Shalivahana Projects Limited	25/02/08 - 30/09/09	TÜV-Nord	Scope: The Verification Report does not indicate how the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources(VVM v.1.2 para 208 (b)) The verification report does not provide information on how the emission factor (applied for 08 and 09 generation data) was verified/crosschecked by the DOE with the data available from CEA.
65	1473	10 MW biomass based power generation project at Wani, Yavatmal by Shalivahana	25/02/08 - 30/09/09	TUV-Nord	Scope: The documents submitted in the request for issuance are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48/Annex68 para 7(b)).



		Projects Limited			<p>The verification report states on page 9 "The emission reduction is based on net electricity supplied from turbo generator and the validated ex-ante emission factor (0.84 tCO₂/Mwh), while the item 4.12 of the verification protocol states that the grid emission factor is monitored as per the latest data available at the CEA database which is authentic and official source. Please correct this inconsistency.</p> <p>The verification report states that the calorific value of Diesel is monitored from the latest CEA CDM data base and is in line with the registered PDD while the monitoring report states that the value is taken from IPCC as per registered PDD.</p>
66	1369	Project for the catalytic reduction of N₂O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia reactor of the N₁ & N₂ nitric acid plants at Haifa Chemicals Ltd., Israel	20/05/08 - 24/03/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not provide explanation on application of formulae.</p> <p>a) The spreadsheets submitted do not provide how N₂O baseline data measured during hours, where the operating conditions were outside the permitted range, were eliminated from the calculation of the baseline emission factor.</p> <p>b) The spreadsheet, 'HC-N₁-N₂ No 2 ghg calculation', does not provide how EFBL for N₁ 02-08 and N₁ 03-08 has been recalculated, applying the requirements under the guidance of EB51 Annex 12. It is required to submit a spreadsheet clearly indicating how the "N₂O values" have been used from the monitored data for recalculation.</p>
67	1596	Guangxi Bajiangkou Hydropower Project	26/05/09 - 25/03/10	JACO	<p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an explanation on the implementation status of the project (VVM v.1.2 para 198).</p> <p>The verification report does not contain details of the implementation of the project activity during the verified monitoring period.</p>
68	1612	Shijiazhuang Jinshi N₂O Abatement Project	14/03/09 - 08/09/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the formulae for BE and/or PE and/or L (when applicable) and emission reductions calculations, including reference to formulae and methods used (EB48/Annex68 para 10 (a) (vii)).</p> <p>The monitoring report neither provides calculation method/approach used for the calculation of permitted operating conditions, baseline campaign</p>



CDM – Executive Board

					emissions, project campaign emission, nor it gives any reference to the equations/formulae used.
69	1612	Shijiazhuang Jinshi N2O Abatement Project	14/03/09 - 08/09/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet for calculation of emission reductions should provide explanation on application of formulae (EB48/Annex68 para 10 (b) (iii)).</p> <p>The spreadsheets for the calculation of permitted operating conditions, baseline campaign emissions and project campaign emissions do not contain explanations about the main formulae applied thereby.</p>
70	2307	Federal Intertrade Pengyang Solar Cooker Project	27/03/09 - 31/10/09	TUV-Rhein	Scope/Issue: The monitoring report does not provide the implementation status of the project (EB48/Annex68 para 10 (a) (i)).
71	2307	Federal Intertrade Pengyang Solar Cooker Project	27/03/09 - 31/10/09	TUV-Rhein	Scope/Issue: The monitoring report does not contain a comparison of the actual emission reduction claimed in the monitoring period with the estimated in the registered PDD (EB48/Annex68 para 10 (a) (viii)).
72	1438	Hubei Hefeng Yanzi Town Baishun Village Taohuashan Hydropower Station	18/02/08 – 25/06/09	TÜV-SÜD	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan.</p> <p>The revised monitoring plan states that the electricity-meters will be calibrated annually; however the calibration dates were not provided in the monitoring report.</p>
73	1219	Coronel landfill gas capture project	30/06/08 - 31/07/09	SGS	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).</p> <p>1. Regarding the implementation status, while the verification report indicates that there is only 1 flare installed in the project activity (CAR 1 at page 25), the monitoring report indicates 'Flare temperature (for each flare)' on page 10. Since the PDD indicates the option of installing more flares, and the project status given in the monitoring report does not indicate the number of flares, it is not clear if one or two flares have been installed in the project activity at this monitoring period. Please clarify.</p> <p>2. Regarding the monitored parameters, the monitoring report states (page 8) that the "burning temperature of the biogas" is monitored while the verification report (page 12) states that the exhaust gas temperature is monitored by two thermocouples. It</p>



					<p>is not clear whether the flare temperature (combustion) or the exhaust gas temperature is being monitored by the project activity and reported in the monitoring report, as per applied methodology and monitoring plan.</p> <p>3. Regarding calibration of GA, the internal calibration frequency of gas analyzer as defined on of MR (page 7) is 15 days however the verification report (page 10) states that periodical checks are done about every month. Please clarify.</p>
74	1219	Coronel landfill gas capture project	30/06/08 - 31/07/09	SGS	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the monitored parameters reported at the interval required by the monitoring plan / applied methodology (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iii)).</p> <p>The compliance to the manufacturer specifications as indicated in the PDD at page 20 under PEflare.y should be monitored continuously as required by the Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing Methane. However the specifications contained in the PDD were not discussed in the MR. Also the MR states that the records are taken daily by the local staff however is not clear how continuous monitoring of manufacture specifications is conducted.</p>
75	1219	Coronel landfill gas capture project	30/06/08 - 31/07/09	SGS	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain monitoring systems and procedures (including any quality assurance and quality control system employed by the project activity (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii)).</p> <p>The monitoring report does not indicate how the 2 thermocouple values monitored are processed to get to the reported value in the ER sheet provided, since only one value is reported, please clarify. Additionally the monitoring report states that the process (control and management of data) is completely controlled by an electronic control system continuously and that measurements are taken manually by plant technicians. However it is not clear how records of the temperature at the flare is taken and its frequency since page 5 and 8 of the monitoring report do not include this information on this parameter.</p>
76	1219	Coronel landfill gas capture project	30/06/08 - 31/07/09	SGS	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as</p>



					<p>specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>1. The monitoring plan indicates that the electricity meter will be maintained and calibrated regularly to assure high levels of accuracy. However the calibration status of electricity meters is not defined in table on page 7 of MR and also the verification report does indicate how the DOE verified the calibration of the electricity meters as per monitoring plan.</p> <p>2. Details of differential pressure transmitter (EJX110A) and its calibration status is not discussed in the monitoring report while is indicated in the verification report (page 23).</p>
77	2318	BRASCARBON Methane Recovery Project BCA-BRA-01	17/08/09 - 30/04/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan (EB 48 Annex 68 para10 (a) iii).</p> <p>1. The monitoring report only specifies that the monitoring frequency of the parameter is monthly while, as per the monitoring plan, the methane content (WCH4) is required to be monitored at 95% confidence level.</p> <p>2. The monitoring report states that “The flare efficiency is 90% when the flare temperature is higher or equal to 500°C for more than 40 minutes”. However, the ER calculation spreadsheet refer to “H(temp >=500°C) more than 40 minutes or H(100°C<temp <500°C) less than 20 minutes - DATA FROM FORM 08.001”.</p>
78	2318	BRASCARBON Methane Recovery Project BCA-BRA-01	17/08/09 - 30/04/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The emission reductions spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation (EB48/Annex68 para 10 (b) (ii)).</p> <p>The parameter “ERy,estimated” is used to compare the baseline with the actual measured data to cap the maximal emission reduction in the year. However the data reported in the CER spreadsheet does not contain the complete calculation including formulae based on the original data defined ex-ante in the PDD.</p>
79	2318	BRASCARBON Methane Recovery Project BCA-BRA-01	17/08/09 - 30/04/10	DNV	<p>Scope/Issue: The verification report does not have a clear statement on whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied</p>



					methodology (VVM v.1.2 para 203).
80	0751	Sanquhar and Delta Small Hydro Power Projects	01/05/07 - 31/08/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The information on calibration of monitoring instruments reported is not in accordance with monitoring methodology/monitoring plan specifications (EB 48/ Annex 68 para 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>According to the Monitoring Report (p.3), the calibration for Delta's meter SN. 205017607 occurred in December 5th, 08. Therefore, in addition to the 6 months gap detected between April 2006 and October 2007 stated in the Verification Report (CL-1), another 2 month gap exists between October 3rd 08 and December 5th of the same year which has not been considered as per Annex 60 of EB 52.</p>
81	0751	Sanquhar and Delta Small Hydro Power Projects	01/05/07 - 31/08/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48/Annex68 para 7(b)).</p> <p>1. There are inconsistencies between the calibration dates reported on: CER spreadsheet (table in page 3), Monitoring Report (table in page 3), Appendix B and reference list of verification report.</p> <p>2. There are inconsistencies between the accuracy of meters. While the Appendix B of verification report (p.20) states "The meters in place are of 1% accuracy class", the Verification Report (p. 9, section 3.6) mentions a 0.5% maximum permissible error, and the error applied in the spreadsheet and the Monitoring Report for the calibration delay is 5%. In addition please clarify how the DOE verified the 0.5% maximum permissible error (e.g. as per delayed calibration certificate or as per manufacture specifications).</p> <p>3. There are inconsistencies between the electricity data reported in "ELECTRICITY OUTPUT AFTER PERMISSABLE ERROR CALCULATIONS" stated for both Sanquhar and Delta Mhp in the Monitoring report (p.3) and the CER spreadsheet Page 6 and Page 7.</p>
82	1601	Fujian Jiangle Gaotang Hydropower Project	16/01/09 - 27/09/09	JACO	Scope/Issue: The verification report does not have a statement on whether the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 203)
83	0889	RIMA Fuel Switch in Bocaiuva	01/02/09 - 30/11/09	ICONTEC	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration



					<p>of all the monitoring instruments (EB 48 Annex 68 para 10.a.iv).</p> <p>1. As per the registered PDD and validation report, measurements of calcite dolomite output are made by component BAD102, however the calibration data of such equipment is not included in the monitoring report.</p> <p>2. As per the registered PDD, the “output of the dolomite kiln” will be measured with a weigh feeder and periodic calibration will be conducted in accordance with industry standards and documented. However, the monitoring report does not contain information on the calibration of this instrument.</p>
84	0889	RIMA Fuel Switch in Bocaiuva	01/02/09 - 30/11/09	ICONTEC	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a comparison of the actual emission reduction claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the registered PDD, and explanation on any significant increase, as per EB 48, Annex 68 para. 10.a.viii.</p> <p>The emission reductions claimed in the monitoring report are higher than the ones estimated in the registered PDD, however the monitoring report does not contain the comparison and explanation of this increase.</p>
85	1462	ISL Waste Heat Recovery Project, India	01/01/09 - 31/08/09	TUV-Rhein	<p>Scope/Issue: The monitoring report does not contain a comparison of the actual emission reduction claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the registered PDD (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (viii))</p> <p>Additionally the DOE is requested to correct the project description under page 2 of verification report, section "GHG reducing measure/technology" since it appears that this description does not refer to the project activity verified.</p>
86	1636	Alto-Tietê landfill gas capture project	25/09/08 - 04/03/09	SGS	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain monitoring systems and procedures (including any quality assurance and quality control system employed by the project activity) (EB48/Annex68 para 10 (a) (ii)).</p> <p>The monitoring report does not contain information on whether the parameters were measured in the frequency stipulated by the monitoring plan/methodology and does not provide QA/QC procedures. Additionally, the monitoring report does not explain how the temperature of the exhaust</p>



					gas was monitored.
87	1636	Alto-Tietê landfill gas capture project	25/09/08 - 04/03/09	SGS	<p>Scope: The information on calibration of monitoring instruments reported is not in accordance with the specified by the monitoring methodology/ monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>Annex A provides information on calibration, however it only presents the instruments without specifying their roles related to the monitored parameters and, additionally, it's not clear if the calibration frequency is in accordance with the requirements from the approved tool/monitoring plan.</p>
88	1612	Shijiazhuang Jinshi N2O Abatement Project	09/09/09 - 23/02/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring does not contain the formulae for BE, PE and/or LE (when applicable) and emission reductions calculations, including reference to formulae and methods used (EB48 Annex 68 Para 10 (a) (vii)).</p> <p>The monitoring report does not give a formula, or reference to a formula, for EFBL and ER. Although these parameters are calculated in the CER sheet as per the formulae given in the applied methodology, it is required to provide (references to) the formulae in the monitoring report.</p>
89	0095	DSL Biomass based Power Project at Pagara	01/01/09 - 31/12/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not indicate how the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (b)).</p> <p>1. The verification report states that the accuracy of all meters was confirmed to be 1%. However the DOE does not inform how such accuracy was verified (either from manufacture specifications or from delayed calibration certificate) and applied as per EB52 Annex 60.</p> <p>2. The verification report states that the calorific value of each of the biomass used has been monitored, and the average values of each have been detailed in the excel file. However it is not stated how the monitored parameter as required by the monitoring plan was verified.</p>
90	2863	Hubei Enshi Laodukou Hydropower Station	02/01/10 - 27/06/10	BVC	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the formulae of calculation (whenever possible) (EB48/Annex 68 para 10 (b) (ii)).</p> <p>There are no formulas available for baseline emissions (cells C4:N12 in the spreadsheet). Moreover, it should</p>



					be clarified if the data reported in MWh in columns J-K is obtained from columns D-I or is directly obtained from the meters.
91	2863	Hubei Enshi Laodukou Hydropower Station	02/01/10 - 27/06/10	BVC	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not provide explanation on application of formulae (EB48/Annex 68 para 10 (b) (iii)).</p> <p>A note about transmission losses is included in cell C14 in the spreadsheet; however, as there are no formulas in the latter it is not possible to assess how the transmission losses were taken into account in the calculations.</p>
92	2467	Landfill Gas Recovery and Utilization at Bukit Tagar Landfill, Hulu Selangor in Malaysia	28/08/09-28/02/10	TUV-Nord	<p>Scope: The information on calibration of monitoring instruments reported is not in accordance with the specified by the monitoring methodology/ monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>As per monitoring plan, the calibration is to be done regularly according to manufacture. The monitoring report (Table C.2.2) contains the calibration frequency recommended for each equipment, and its calibration's dates. However delays in calibration for the instruments TT1 (ID1), TT3 (ID2), PT2 (ID3) and CH4 (ID6) are observed while considering the last calibration dates reported (17/08/08, 17/08/08, Oct 2008 and 18/09/08 respectively) and these delays have not been considered as per guidance of EB52 - Annex 60.</p>
93	2467	Landfill Gas Recovery and Utilization at Bukit Tagar Landfill, Hulu Selangor in Malaysia	28/08/09-28/02/10	TUV-Nord	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).</p> <p>The monitoring report states that the flow-meter shall be calibrated every 24-months however Section A.2 of the verification report states that "it was confirmed that the calibration is valid for 1 year". This inconsistency shall be addressed.</p>
94	2467	Landfill Gas Recovery and Utilization at Bukit Tagar Landfill, Hulu Selangor in Malaysia	28/08/09-28/02/10	TUV-Nord	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not indicate how the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (b)).</p> <p>The Verification Report does not describe how it verified the flare manufacturer's specifications, which are used by the project activity to apply the 90% default value of FE.</p>
95	1732	Fuzhou Hongmiaoling	17/11/08 - 31/05/09	JQA	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration



CDM – Executive Board

		Landfill Gas to Electricity Project			<p>of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan.</p> <p>The monitoring report does not provide the calibration dates for the monitoring instruments.</p>
96	1732	Fuzhou Hongmiaoling Landfill Gas to Electricity Project	17/11/08 - 31/05/09	JQA	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the values of monitored parameters.</p> <p>The spreadsheet does not contain the values of methane concentration.</p>
97	1732	Fuzhou Hongmiaoling Landfill Gas to Electricity Project	17/11/08 - 31/05/09	JQA	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the formulae of calculation (whenever possible).</p> <p>The spreadsheet does not contain the calculation of methane destroyed in the power plant and in the flare.</p>
98	1421	8.5 MW wind power project in Chitradurga district in Karnataka by Jindal Aluminium Ltd	16/07/08 - 31/03/09	BVC	<p>Scope: The information on calibration of monitoring instruments reported is not in accordance with the specified by the monitoring methodology/ monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>The calibration dates reported for the 1.9MW cluster meter (30/06/2007 and 17/07/2008) do not cover the entire monitoring period (16/07/2008-31/03/09), and show a delays in relation to the frequency reported (annually) while the guidance of EB52 - Annex 60 has not been taken into account.</p>
99	1421	8.5 MW wind power project in Chitradurga district in Karnataka by Jindal Aluminium Ltd	16/07/08 - 31/03/09	BVC	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).</p> <p>The verification report states that the calibration of the new meter for 6MW cluster was done on load and the net electricity exported to grid when the main meter is under faulty condition is accounted from the check meter. Considering that (1) the verification report states that the 6MW cluster main meter was replaced on October 13th 2008 by the new meter, while the calibration of this meter was only conducted later, on October 17th, 2008, and (2) the CER spreadsheet shows that for the entire October 2008 the recorded data used in ER calculation is taken from the main meter (cell H-15), it is not clear in both monitoring and verification reports which meter's record (main or check meter) was used from October 13th 2008 to</p>



CDM – Executive Board

					October 17th, 2008, and in case the records from the faulty/not calibrated main meter was used in this period, EB52 - Annex 60 has not been taken into account in the recorded data.
100	1421	8.5 MW wind power project in Chitradurga district in Karnataka by Jindal Aluminium Ltd	16/07/08 - 31/03/09	BVC	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not provide explanation on application of formulae (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).</p> <p>The ER Spreadsheet calculates the net electricity as: $E_{Gy} = E_{export, grid} - 1.15 * E_{import, grid}$ however no explanation is included in the ER Spreadsheet. Clarification is needed.</p>
101	0288	Sahabat Empty Fruit Bunch Biomass Project	01/03/08 – 31/12/09	SIRIM	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not indicate how the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (b)).</p> <p>Regarding the new meter for monitoring E parasitic, the verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information provided by project participant in response for CL1 raised that the meter had been factory calibrated and did not require calibration until 01/03/10.</p>
102	0069	Nubarashen Landfill Gas Capture and Power Generation Project in Yerevan	31/12/07 - 31/03/10	JCI	<p>Scope: The Monitoring Report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan as per para 10 (a) (iv) of EB48 Annex 68.</p> <p>The monitoring report does not contain information on the calibration dates for the gas analyzer and Watt hour meter.</p>
103	1166	Bundled wind energy power projects (2004 policy) in Rajasthan	30/10/08 – 30/11/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain all parameters required to be monitored as per the monitoring plan/applied methodology (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iii)).</p> <p>The spreadsheet to calculate emission reductions does not contain the values of all monitored parameters to reflect the approved revisions in the monitoring plan, including those such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EJMR Export, EJMR Import; • export and import Multiplication factor, among others. <p>The PP is requested to update, and the DOE to verify, the spreadsheet and explain how the procedures referred to in the revised monitoring plan were taken into account while</p>



					calculating the emission reduction figures, including the methods and formulae used to determine the values for the parameters in accordance with the revised monitoring plan.
104	2065	Guizhou Xingyi Laojiangdi Hydropower Station	20/10/09 - 19/08/10	TUV-Nord	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not provide explanation on application of formulae (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).</p> <p>According to the verification report, the PP and the grid company jointly read and record the meter (M1) readings at 0:00 on the 25th of each month. However, the monitoring period is from 09-10-20 to 2010-08-19, while the spreadsheet contains monthly readings from the 20th of each month. In accordance with EB 48/ annex 68 para 10 (b) (iii), the PP/ DOE is requested to clarify this inconsistency and explain how the data was recorded as mentioned in the spreadsheet- beginning the 20th of each month, when the readings were done on the 25th.</p> <p>Additionally, the Verification Report (pg 25 of 61) states that the power grid company has confirmed the power generation during 09-10-20 to 09-10-25 (at 0:00) and 2010-08-20 to 2010-08-25 (at 0:00), which was used to check the calculation of the emission reduction. Through this clarification, the PP/ DOE are also requested to explain how these adjustments were taken into account to determine the amount of electricity generated.</p>
105	1435	Regional landfill projects in Chile	01/10/09 - 31/07/10	SQS	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculating emission reductions does not contain all the formulae for calculation emission reductions (EB48/Annex68 para 10 (b) (ii)).</p> <p>The spreadsheet (ER Summary Chile 1 v2.xls) does not include the formulae to calculate the emission reduction deviation caused due to calibration delays for monitoring equipment.</p>
106	0331	Biomass based independent power project at Malwa Power Private Limited, Mukatsar, Punjab	01/01/09 - 31/08/09	TUV-SUD	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not have a clear statement on whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.</p> <p>The report shall list each parameter required by the monitoring plan and clearly state how the DOE verified the information flow (from data generation, aggregation, to</p>



CDM – Executive Board

					<p>recording, calculation and reporting) for these parameters including the values in the monitoring reports. (paragraph 206, Annex 43, EB55).</p> <p>The verification report does not state how the DOE verified that there was no coal consumption during the monitoring period.</p>
107	1162	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-27, Goias, Brazil	01/02/08 - 31/10/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain all parameters required to be monitored as per the monitoring plan/applied methodology.</p> <p>It is requested to provide the measurement dates in table D.6 of the monitoring report.</p>
108	1162	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-27, Goias, Brazil	01/02/08 - 31/10/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent.</p> <p>The amount of emission reductions reported in the monitoring report (12,468) and the spreadsheet (4,515) are not consistent. It is requested to clarify the inconsistency.</p>
109	1163	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-28, Santa Catarina, Brazil	01/02/08 - 30/11/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent.</p> <p>The total biogas volume reported in Table D.5 in the monitoring report is 602,484 m³ while the spreadsheet indicates it is 594,482.4786 m³. It is requested to clarify the inconsistency.</p>
110	1163	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-28, Santa Catarina, Brazil	01/02/08 - 30/11/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain all parameters required to be monitored as per the monitoring plan/applied methodology.</p> <p>It is requested to provide the measurement dates in table D.6 of the monitoring report.</p>
111	1163	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-28, Santa Catarina, Brazil	01/02/08 - 30/11/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The information on calibration of monitoring instruments reported is not in accordance with the specified by the monitoring methodology/ monitoring plan.</p> <p>The measurement for methane concentration at site 30052 in February 09 was conducted prior to the calibration of the Landtec gas analyzer (GM11594). It is requested to clarify how the DOE verified that EB52 annex 60 is correctly applied.</p>
112	2107	Sichuan Baihuatan 120MW Hydropower Project	05/02/09 - 25/08/09	JACO	<p>Scope: Monitoring Report shall contain the comparison of the actual emission reduction claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the registered PDD, and</p>



					<p>explanation on any significant increase as per paragraph 10 (a) (viii) of EB48, Annex 68.</p> <p>The monitoring report does not contain the comparison of the actual emission reduction claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the registered PDD, and explanation on any significant increase.</p>
113	0167	Landfill Gas to Energy Facility at the Nejapa Landfill Site, El Salvador	21/04/08 - 28/02/10	ICONTEC	<p>Scope: The information on calibration of monitoring instruments reported is not in accordance with the specified by the monitoring methodology/ monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>The flow-meter FM1 was calibrated on 30/03/2006 and replaced on 09/08/09; for the period between 01/04/09 to 09/08/09 a 1% discount was applied based on the maximum permissible error according with the manufacturer's information. However, EB52 - Annex 60 paragraph 4 requires that the maximum permissible error must be compared with the results of the delayed calibration, which was not provided in the report.</p>
114	0167	Landfill Gas to Energy Facility at the Nejapa Landfill Site, El Salvador	21/04/08 - 28/02/10	ICONTEC	<p>Scope: The information on calibration of monitoring instruments reported is not in accordance with the specified by the monitoring methodology/ monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>The flow-meter SN 8805CA16000 was first calibrated on 11/09/2006 and was not re-calibrated on 11/09/09, as per the frequency specified in the monitoring report, and the requirements form EB52 - Annex 60 were not followed.</p>
115	0167	Landfill Gas to Energy Facility at the Nejapa Landfill Site, El Salvador	21/04/08 - 28/02/10	ICONTEC	<p>Scope: The information on calibration of monitoring instruments reported is not in accordance with the specified by the monitoring methodology/ monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).</p> <p>The temperature transmitter TT-27 was first calibrated on 13/09/2006 and was not re-calibrated on 13/09/09, as per the frequency specified in the monitoring report, and the requirements form EB52 - Annex 60 were not followed.</p>
116	0167	Landfill Gas to Energy Facility at the Nejapa Landfill Site, El Salvador	21/04/08 - 28/02/10	ICONTEC	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the formulae for BE and/or PE and/or L (when applicable) and emission reductions calculations, including reference to formulae and methods used (EB48 -</p>



					Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii). Section E.2 states that no project emissions needs to be taken into account; however the project discounted emissions from the use of diesel.
117	0167	Landfill Gas to Energy Facility at the Nejapa Landfill Site, El Salvador	21/04/08 - 28/02/10	ICONTEC	Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the formulae of calculation (whenever possible) (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)). The spreadsheet does not contain the values of monitored amount of oil and the calculation to tCO ₂ .
118	0167	Landfill Gas to Energy Facility at the Nejapa Landfill Site, El Salvador	21/04/08 - 28/02/10	ICONTEC	Scope: The Verification Report does not list all parameters required to be monitored according with the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206). The project does not monitor LFG _{thermal} nor LFG _{electricity} and the Verification Report provided a Table 3 “Data to be collected or used to monitor emissions from the project activity, and how this data will be archived”; the Verification Report shall exclude this table or states that these parameters were not monitored for the given monitoring period.
119	0167	Landfill Gas to Energy Facility at the Nejapa Landfill Site, El Salvador	21/04/08 - 28/02/10	ICONTEC	Scope: The Verification Report does not indicate how the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (b)). The Verification Report does not provide an statement on which sources were verified for cross-checking the reported data (section 3.3.3: “Cross-checking and recalculation process was carried out by ICONTEC to a representative sample of the data in order to establish the accuracy and reliability of the data and calculation of the emission reductions”).
120	0167	Landfill Gas to Energy Facility at the Nejapa Landfill Site, El Salvador	21/04/08 - 28/02/10	ICONTEC	Scope: The Verification Report does not contain an assessment on whether appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and other reference values have been correctly applied (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (e)). The Verification Report does not contain an assessment on whether appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and other reference values have been correctly applied.
121	0902	Yangquan Coal	01/10/08 -	DNV	Scope: The spreadsheet of



CDM – Executive Board

		Mine Methane Advanced Industrial Furnace Utilisation Project	31/12/09		<p>calculation of emission reductions does not contain all values of monitored parameters (EB48/Annex68 para 10 (b) (i)).</p> <p>Values for monitoring parameters (P25 - concentration of methane in extracted gas) are not included in the spreadsheet.</p>
122	0902	Yangquan Coal Mine Methane Advanced Industrial Furnace Utilisation Project	01/01/10 - 30/06/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain all values of monitored parameters (EB48/Annex68 para 10 (b) (i)).</p> <p>Values for monitoring parameters (P25 - concentration of methane in extracted gas) are not included in the spreadsheet.</p>
123	0369	8.5 MW Biomass based Power Project	15/08/08 - 14/03/09	SGS	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the formulae for BE and/or PE and/or L (when applicable) and emission reductions calculations, including reference to formulae and methods used (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii)).</p> <p>The Monitoring Report does not contain reference to formulae and methods used for the calculation of the NCV of coal. The relevant data source/monitored values are not presented in the monitoring report.</p>
124	0369	8.5 MW Biomass based Power Project	15/08/08 - 14/03/09	SGS	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the formulae of calculation (whenever possible) (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).</p> <p>The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of the calculation of the weighted average of the NCV of coal. The relevant data source/monitored values are not presented in the spreadsheet.</p>
125	2217	Municipal Solid Waste based Composting at Kolhapur, Maharashtra	01/04/09 - 31/03/10	TUV-Rhein	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the formulae of calculation (whenever possible) (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).</p> <p>The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of the calculation of the average share of waste types. The relevant data source/monitored values are not presented in the spreadsheet.</p>