

**INFORMATION NOTE ON THE RESULTS OF THE COMPLETENESS CHECKS****01 July 2011 - 30 September 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 the two stages of assessment; completeness check and information & reporting check; that cover the Secretariat's initial assessment of submissions. An Information Note on the results of the two stages for requests for registration and issuance covering the period from 30 June 2010 to 23 October 2010 was published in November 2010 on the UNFCCC CDM website¹. According to the note, the Secretariat will publish results of its assessments on a regular basis. Thereafter three information notes for the subsequent periods; 24 October 2010 - 31 January 2011, 01 February 2011 - 30 April 2011 and 01 May 2011 - 30 June 2011; were published in February 2011, May 2011 and July 2011, respectively. This Information Note covers the period from 01 July 2011 - 30 September 2011, and includes 319 requests processed under completeness check for registration and likewise 470 requests for issuance. The total number of submissions during this reporting period is represented by; requests returned to DOEs as incomplete during the completeness check stage and information & reporting check stage, and the number of published requests, both for registration and issuance.

2. The tables below provide information on the requests for registration and issuance that were returned as incomplete during this reporting period. A detailed list compiling the reasons for returning requests is furnished in Appendix 1 to the Information Note.

Table 1 below comprises a summary of the reasons for which requests for registration and requests for issuance were returned during the completeness check stage.

Table 1: Reasons for returning requests during completeness check (CC)

Category	Registration Occurrence	Issuance Occurrence
Incomplete submission	16	4
Incomplete information	10	4
Inconsistency	24	37
Other	0	3
<i>Total</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>48</i>
<i>Number of requests returned to DOEs</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>39</i>

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



Table 2 below comprises a summary of the reasons for which requests for registration and requests for issuance were returned during the information & reporting check stage. Since the categories for returning requests are different for registration and issuance, they have been listed separately.

Table 2: Reasons for returning requests during information & reporting check (I&RC)

Registration		Issuance	
Category	Occurrence	Category	Occurrence
Additionality	74	Inconsistency of information	4
Baseline methodology	62	Implementation status/physical features of project	10
Monitoring methodology	9	Monitored Parameters	25
LoA	0	Monitoring system and procedures	14
DOE related issues	5	Calibration	53
Other	8	Emission Reduction calculation	10
		Default value/external data	3
		Other verification reporting requirements (Assessment of CARs/CLs/FARs, Crosschecking with other sources, and statement of compliance with methodology/monitoring plan)	5
		Other	2
Total	158		126
Number of requests returned to DOEs	70		52

Tables 3 and 4 below comprise a DOE-wise break-up of the requests for registration and issuance along with the data for percentage of requests that were incomplete during each stage. For more information on the reasons for incompleteness, please refer to Appendix 1.



Table 3: Requests for registration returned to DOE						
	Requests processed under CC	Returned During CC		Requests processed under I&RC	Returned during I&RC	
		#	%		#	%
AENOR	4	1	25%	2	0	0%
Applus	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
BVCH	39	6	15%	33	7	21%
CEC	10	2	20%	9	2	22%
CEPREI	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
CQC	2	1	50%	1	0	0%
Deloitte-TECO	2	1	50%	1	1	100%
DNV	72	2	3%	66	13	20%
ERM CVS	8	1	13%	6	1	17%
GLS	3	1	33%	3	1	33%
ICONTEC	6	1	17%	3	0	0%
JCI	5	2	40%	2	1	50%
JACO	9	2	22%	7	2	29%
JMA	1	0	0%	1	0	0%
JQA	0	0	0%	1	0	0%
KEMCO	2	0	0%	2	1	50%
KECO	2	1	50%	1	1	100%
KFQ	4	0	0%	4	1	25%
LRQA	9	2	22%	6	0	0%
RINA	5	1	20%	4	2	50%
SGS	20	0	0%	19	6	32%
SIRIM	7	1	14%	7	2	29%
SQS	7	2	29%	6	2	33%
TUEV Rheinland	39	6	15%	28	6	21%
TÜV Nord	35	3	9%	30	10	33%
TÜV SÜD	27	2	7%	24	11	46%
Total	319	38	12%	266	70	26%



Table 4: Requests for issuance returned to DOE

	Requests processed under CC	Returned During CC		Requests processed under I&RC	Returned during I&RC	
		#	%		#	%
AENOR	10	1	10%	8	4	50%
Applus	1	1	100%	0	0	0%
BVCH	65	3	5%	56	2	4%
CEC	11	1	9%	13	1	8%
CEPREI	1	0	0%	1	0	0%
CQC	14	2	14%	11	1	9%
Deloitte-TECO	2	0	0%	2	0	0%
DNV	106	7	7%	83	19	23%
ERM CVS	15	0	0%	14	1	7%
GLS	3	0	0%	3	0	0%
ICONTEC	8	2	25%	4	2	50%
JCI	0	0	0%	1	0	0%
JACO	3	1	33%	0	0	0%
JMA	1	0	0%	1	0	0%
JQA	3	0	0%	3	0	0%
KFQ	2	1	50%	1	0	0%
LRQA	10	0	0%	6	1	17%
RINA	7	0	0%	5	1	20%
SGS	91	1	1%	85	2	2%
SIRIM	4	1	25%	1	0	0%
SQS	2	0	0%	2	1	50%
TUEV Rheinland	14	2	14%	10	3	30%
TÜV Nord	58	13	22%	42	6	14%
TÜV SÜD	39	3	8%	35	8	23%
Total	470	39	8%	387	52	13%

History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision
01	10 November 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

Reasons for returning requests for registration and issuance during completeness check and information & reporting check stages

Table 1

Registration		Stage 1: Completeness Check		
#	PA	Project Title	DOE	Reasons
1	4867	Chantaburi Starch Wastewater Treatment and Biogas Utilization Project	TUEV Rheinland	Incomplete documentation: -The PP/ DOE are requested to provide an unprotected version of the spreadsheet for the assessment of the investment analysis and emission reductions as required by Guidance 8 of EB 51 Annex 58.
2	4346	(r) 1.8 MW Small Scale Wind Energy Project in Maharashtra-India by M/s Biotech Vision Care Pvt Ltd.	SIRIM	Inconsistency: -The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60. E.g. the project participant on the project view page is "Biotech Vision Care Private Limited", whereas that in the PDD is "M/s Biotech Vision Care Private Limited-Ahmedabad, India", and that in the LoA is "M/s Biotech Vision Care Private Limited".
3	4840	Leluasa Biomas Steam Plant in Lahad...	BVCH	Incomplete documentation: -The DOE is requested to upload a valid letter of approval/authorization (LoA) from the host party to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (c) and (d) and 10 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.
4	4379	(r) Hutama Green Energy Methane Capture and Utilization Project at Starch Tapioca Bandar Mataram, Central Lampung, Indonesia	TÜV Nord	Other: -The PP/ DOE are requested to apply a valid version of the methodology as required by paragraph 9(f) of EB 48 Annex 60. The methodology applied is expired.
5	4846	Wind Power Project in Tirunelveli T...	BVCH	Incomplete documentation: -The DOE is requested to submit a signed registration request form. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 10.e.
6	4884	Construction of "Janub" Combined Cycle Power Plant in Azerbaijan	BVCH	Incomplete documentation: -The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on the determination of baseline as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60. The spreadsheet for baseline calculation was not submitted. Incomplete documentation: -The DOE is requested to provide English version of following documents as requested by paragraph 9 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60. The LoA from the host country does not contain any English translation.
7	4836	Heilongjiang Wanyuan Biomass Cogeneration Project	DNV	Incomplete documentation: As this project has more than one PP authorized by the same Party (Finland), 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 Finland and ensure that all LoAs are combined into one pdf when uploaded. This ensures that statistics involving Parties in the CDM database are accurate.



CDM – Executive Board

8	4868	Changning Kawan 18.9MW Hydroelectric Project	Deloitte-TECO	<p>Inconsistency: There is inconsistency between the PDD, project view page, LoA and Registration request form related to the parties involvement as PDD mention that China and Japan are not directly involved while Registration request form and the view page mention direct involvement of the parties. In addition, the DOE should also confirm the Project Participant's name under section 3.1 of the Validation Report.</p>
9	3580	(r) Silau-2 small hydro power plant in North Sumatera Province, Indonesia	BVCH	<p>Incomplete information: -The PP/DOE are requested to upload the respective PDD to the project view page as requested by paragraph 8 (a) of EB 48 Annex 60. The PDD contains track changes. Please submit the clean final version of the PDD.</p> <p>Inconsistency: -The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the methodology/activity scale accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60. There is inconsistency of the version of the methodology used between the PDD and Validation Report AMS-I.D. ver. 15.</p>
10	4888	Pitak Palm Wastewater Treatment and Biogas Utilization Project	TUEV Rheinland	<p>Incomplete information: -The PP/ DOE are requested to provide a replicable and unprotected version of the Appendix 2-Separatesheets_Pitak Palm for the assessment of the investment analysis as required by Guidance 8 of EB 51 Annex 58.</p>
11	4879	Bundled green power supply to grid	TÜV Nord	<p>Incomplete documentation: -As per the Project Design Document and the Validation Report submitted, it seems that the project activity is a bundle of two small scale projects. However, the DOE has not submitted bundling form. Please clarify and revise the documents accordingly.</p>
12	4918	SB Chemical Zinc Plant Fuel Switching Project	KECO	<p>Incomplete documentation: -The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60. In particular section 3 and Annex 1 of the MoC should be signed by both Project Participants.</p>
13	4890	Sichuan Shimian 7.2 MW Bundled Small Hydropower Project	TUEV Rheinland	<p>Inconsistency: -The project title in LoA of UK (Shimian 7.2 MW Bundled Small Hydropower Project) is not consistent with other documents (Sichuan Shimian 7.2 MW Bundled Small Hydropower Project).</p>
14	4249	(r) Power generation by utilizing Blast Furnace Gas at Mukand Limited, Ginigera, Karnataka	LRQA	<p>Incomplete documentation: -The DOE is requested to upload the respective validation report to the project view page as requested by paragraph 8 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60. EB 59, Annex 12 paragraph 15 guidance indicates that "If the request for registration does not meet the requirements of the information and reporting check, then upon submission of the revised documentation the request for registration shall be treated as a new submission of a request for registration." Therefore, the DOE should have incorporated its answers to the incompleteness information and reporting check (letter dated 04 July 2011) into a new Validation Report. Please do so and resubmit.</p>
15	4815	Huangshi Landfill Gas Recovery for Power Generation Project	TÜV SÜD	<p>Inconsistency: -The DOE is requested to correct the inconsistencies in sectoral scopes between the PDD (scope 13), project view page (13), PDD-GSC (1 & 13) and VR (13 on page 2 and 1 & 13 on pages 26 and 68), as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.</p>



16	4935	Zhangbei Caoniangou 49.5MW Wind Power Project	DNV	<p>Incomplete documentation:</p> <p>-The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on additionality as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60. The aforementioned guidance, indicates that additional annexes to the PDD providing further details and/or supporting evidence related to the additionality of the project activity are expected to be submitted. Therefore, the DOE is expected to submit the investment analysis and sensitivity analysis spreadsheets. Please notice that only the emission reductions and emission factor spreadsheets were submitted.</p>
17	4079	Biomass Power Generation Project by Everbright Alternative Energy (Dangshan) Limited	CEC	<p>Incomplete documentation:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to upload the respective registration request form to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (f) and 10 (e) of EB 48 Annex 60. In doing so, the DOE shall sign the request form with a date.</p> <p>Incomplete documentation:</p> <p>-The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on the determination of baseline as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60. In doing so, the DOE shall provide a spreadsheet reflecting the calculation of emission reduction in a transparent manner.</p>
18	4970	Dak Mi 4 Hydropower Project, Vietnam	SQS	<p>Inconsistency:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the Host party project participant between the Registration request form and project view page (Vietnam Urban and Industrial Zone Development) and the rest of the documents submitted (Vietnam Urban and Industrial Zone Development Investment Corporation Company Limited (IDICO)) as required by Guidance 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.</p>
19	4925	Wutuhe 25MW First-Level Hydropower Project in Guizhou Province China	JACO	<p>Incomplete documentation:</p> <p>-The PP/DOE are requested to provide a disclosable version of the documents uploaded as confidential as per paragraph 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60. Excel version of the confidential PDF has not been submitted.</p> <p>Other:</p> <p>-The PP/DOE are requested to upload the respective PDD to the project view page as requested by paragraph 8 (a) of EB 48 Annex 60. The header of the PDD form is incomplete. The UNFCCC logo is missing and the spelling is incorrect.</p> <p>Inconsistency:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the methodology/activity scale accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60. Inside cover of the validation report (no page number) refers to '[the PDD] correctly applies the simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for category I.D. normal scale CDM project activities'.</p> <p>Inconsistency:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60. The emission reductions cited in the validation opinion are inconsistent with the rest of the submission.</p>



20	4948	Guangxi Wuming Jiaolong Alcohol Production Wastewater Treatment Project	TÜV SÜD	<p>Incomplete documentation: -The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60. In particular section 3 and Annex 1 of the MoC should be signed by the same Project Participants.</p> <p>Inconsistency: -The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the parties involvement as the PDD, Validation Report and PDD-GSC mention that China and Austria are not directly involved while Registration request form and the view page mention direct involvement of the parties as required by Guidance 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.</p>
21	4798	(r) Mitigation of GHG emissions through power generation at high efficiency	TÜV Nord	<p>Other: -The PP/ DOE are requested to apply a valid version of the methodology as required by paragraph 9(f) of EB 48 Annex 60. The methodology has applied ACM0013 ver. 3 which had expired at time of re-submission.</p>
22	4952	Sichuan Tiejue 25MW Hydro Power Project	JCI	<p>Incomplete information: -The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60. It is not clear how the DOE has validated the project location.</p>
23	5015	Kumbango POME methane capture project	TUEV Rheinland	<p>Incomplete information: -The PP/ DOE are requested to provide a replicable and unprotected version of the Appendix 2-EF_Kumbango POME for the assessment of the investment analysis as required by Guidance 8 of EB 51 Annex 58.</p> <p>Inconsistency: -The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the methodology between the PDD-GSC (AMS-III.H. ver. 13 and AMS-I.D. ver. 15) and the rest of the documents submitted (AMS-I.F., AMS-III.H. ver. 15 and AMS-I.D. ver. 16) accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60. Please ensure the version of the methodologies are valid at the time of submission. (EB 48, Annex 60, Section D)</p> <p>Inconsistency: -The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions between the PDD (62,282 CO₂) and PDD-GSC (41,089 CO₂) accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.</p>
24	5020	Mosa POME methane capture project	TUEV Rheinland	<p>Incomplete information: -The PP/ DOE are requested to provide a replicable and unprotected version of the Appendix 1-EF_Mosa POME for the assessment of the investment analysis as required by Guidance 8 of EB 51 Annex 58.</p> <p>Inconsistency: -The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the methodology between the PDD-GSC (AMS-III.H. ver. 13 and AMS-I.D. ver. 15) and the rest of the documents submitted (AMS-III.H. ver. 15 and AMS-I.D. ver. 16) accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60. Please ensure the version of the methodologies are valid at the time of submission. (EB 48, Annex 60, Section D)</p> <p>Inconsistency: -The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions between the PDD (51,476 CO₂) and PDD-GSC (47,407 CO₂) accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.</p>



25	4957	SECURITIZATION AND CARBON SINKS PROJECT	ICONTEC	<p>Incomplete information: -The PP/DOE are requested to provide a replicable and unprotected version of Appendix 2-Copia de TARAM V1.4_SIF_CHILE_december2010 as required by Guidance 8 of EB 51 Annex 58. In doing so, please double check whether there is any information missing as there are sheets showing empty cells such as Meth, BLS1, BLS6, SM1, etc.</p> <p>Inconsistency: -The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the parties involvement as the PDD, Validation Report, MoC and PDD-GSC mention that Spain is directly involved while Registration request form and the view page mention indirect involvement of the parties as required by Guidance 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.</p> <p>Inconsistency: -The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the parties involvement as the PDD, Validation Report, MoC and PDD-GSC mention that Spain is directly involved while Registration request form and the view page mention indirect involvement of the parties as required by Guidance 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.</p>
26	4840	(r) Leluasa Biomas Steam Plant in Lahad Datu, Sabah, Malaysia	BVCH	<p>Other: -The PP/ DOE are requested to apply a valid version of the methodology as required by paragraph 9(f) of EB 48 Annex 60. The methodology has applied AMS-I.C. ver. 17 which had expired at time of re-submission.</p>
27	4188	(r) Methane Recovery Project of Tiancheng Corn Development Co., Ltd.	RINA	<p>Inconsistency: -The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in sectoral scopes between the PDD (1 & 13), registration request form (1 & 13), PDD-GSC (1 & 13), Validation Report (1 & 13) and project view page (13), as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.</p> <p>Inconsistency: -The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the methodology between the PDD (AMS-III.H. ver. 16 and AMS-I.F. ver. 1), Validation Report (AMS-III.H. ver. 16 and AMS-I.F. ver. 1) and the project view page (AMS-III.H. ver. 16) accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.</p> <p>Inconsistency: -The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions between the PDD (35,522 CO₂) and PDD-GSC (34,381 CO₂) accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.</p>
28	5041	Beizhen City Wufeng Rice Trade Processing Co., Ltd. 10MW Biomass (Rice Husk) Power Plant Project	CQC	<p>Inconsistency: -The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the methodology/activity scale between the project view page (AMS-I.C. ver. 18) and the rest of the documents submitted (AMS-I.C. ver. 18 and AMS-I.D. ver. 16) accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.</p>
29	3771	(r) La Mora Hydroelectric Project	AENOR	<p>Other: -The PP/ DOE are requested to apply a valid version of the methodology as required by paragraph 9(f) of EB 48 Annex 60. The methodology has applied AMS-I.D. ver. 15 which had expired at time of re-submission. Please note that some text on page 71 of the Validation Report is overlapped into next page and not legible.</p>
30	5057	Tuobeiqu First and Second Cascade Bundled Project in Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region, China	JCI	<p>Incomplete information: -The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60. It is not clear how the DOE has validated the project location. Please provide information on the geo coordinates of the project location.</p>



CDM – Executive Board

31	4551	(r) Za Hung Hydropower Project	BVCH	<p>Other:</p> <p>-The PP/ DOE are requested to apply a valid version of the methodology as required by paragraph 9(f) of EB 48 Annex 60. The methodology has applied ACM0002 ver. 11 which had expired at time of re-submission.</p>
32	5056	Dak Mi 4c Hydropower Project, Vietnam	SQS	<p>Incomplete documentation:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60. The section 3 of the MoC is missing.</p>
33	5030	Nam Khanh Hydropower Project	TUEV Rheinland	<p>Incomplete information:</p> <p>-The PP/ DOE are requested to provide a replicable version of the spreadsheet for the assessment of the investment analysis as required by Guidance 8 of EB 51 Annex 58. In doing so, please provide a reproducible spreadsheet for IRR &ER calculation (Appendix 3 on the workflow).</p>
34	5082	Lopburi Solar Power Plant Project	LRQA	<p>Inconsistency:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60. In particular; the validation report does not indicate exact project location and geo-coordinates of the project site.</p>
35	5093	Jinhanlazha hydropower station (58MW) of Niru River, Yunnan Province, P.R.China	CEC	<p>Incomplete documentation:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60. In particular, two entities have been appointed as focal point for sole role, however when a focal point entity is sole for all scopes, no other entity should be mentioned. Please refer to EB 45, Annex 59, paragraph 6.</p>
36	3207	Aberdare Range / Mt. Kenya Small Scale Reforestation Initiative Kirimara-Kithithina Small Scale A/R Project	JACO	<p>Other:</p> <p>-The following document contains blank pages: PDD pages 18 & 78.</p> <p>Inconsistency:</p> <p>-The PP/ DOE are requested to explain the relevance of the "Financial Sheet" found in Appendix 3 -No. 2 TARASAM BGBM_PDD2_Kirimara-Kithithina as the PDD and Validation Report argue investment barrier with no reference to a financial analysis. In doing so please refer to VVM v. 1.2 paragraph 3 section 1 and EB 48 Annex 60 Para 7 (b).</p> <p>Inconsistency:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the scope accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60. In particular sectoral scope is not mentioned in the Validation report and the PDD.</p>
37	4986	Sichuan Zidazhai Hydropower Project	GLC	<p>Incomplete information:</p> <p>-The Validation Report contains comments in German on pages 17, 22, 25 and 28 "Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden". Please submit the clean final version of the Validation Report.</p> <p>Inconsistency:</p> <p>-There is inconsistency between the PDD, project view page, Validation Report, PDD-GSC and Registration request form related to the parties involvement as PDD mention that China is directly involved while Registration request form, PDD-GSC and the view page mention indirect involvement of the parties.</p>
38	3309	(r) Sichuan Muchuan County Huogu Hydropower Project	ERM CVS	<p>Incomplete information:</p> <p>-The MoC is not complete, The Annex I Party that authorizes the participation is missing.</p> <p>Inconsistency:</p> <p>-The Annex I Country mentioned in the LoA of host country is UK, whereas in other documents Netherlands is the Annex I Country.</p>



Table 2

Registration		Stage 2: Information and Reporting Check		
#	PA	Project Title	DOE	Reasons
1	3495	(r) West Kalimantan Biomass Co-Generation Project	TÜV Nord	<p>Baseline methodology:</p> <p>- The DOE is requested to describe how it has validated the project boundary as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 80. Information on project boundary that is requested to be documented in the PDD under page 5 of the applied methodology, i.e. "For each plant generating power and/or heat that has been operated at the project site within the most recent three years prior to the start of the project activity: the type and capacity of the heat generators, the types and quantities of fuels which have been used in the heat generators, the type and capacity of heat engines, and whether the equipment continues operation after the start of the project activity", has not been provided.</p> <p>Baseline methodology:</p> <p>-The PP/DOE are requested to indicate the reference and the versions of the applied methodology in the PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). The DOE shall check whether the correct version of the applied methodology has been used, as it appears that an older version of the methodology has been applied in some sections of the PDD (e.g. Page 9 of the PDD: "Scenario 21 from Table 2 is identified as the combination of project activity and baseline scenario description").</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76. Not all of the applicability conditions of the applied methodology have been discussed in the PDD (e.g. Condition no. 5 of the Applicability section).</p>
2	3699	Catalytic N2O abatement in the tail gas stream from the Nanjing Caprolactam production facility	ERM CVS	<p>Algorithms and/or formulae to determine emission reductions:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the equations applied to calculate the baseline/ project emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per the chosen methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92, in particular, equations 20 and 21 of the applied methodology and the calculation method in case the legal regulation for N2O are implemented, which are not described in section B.6.1 of the PDD.</p> <p>Compliance of the Monitoring Plan:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to validate the compliance of the monitoring plan with the approved methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 123(a) (ii), in particular the recording frequency of Mi (Measuring Interval) which is described as monthly while the approved methodology requires recording frequency as daily (PDD, page 29).</p>



3	4212	GHG emissions reductions from improved industrial wastewater treatment in Embaré – Lagoa da Prata, Minas Gerais, Brazil	DNU	<p>Additionality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed each barrier presented as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118 (a) and (b). It is not clear how the DOE has validated the information provided in the PDD (p.24-25) on how the CDM would alleviate the barriers that prevent the project activity from occurring in the absence of the CDM. <p>Additionality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data, input values and references used in the investment analysis and the results of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). The PDD does not list/discuss the relevant assumptions and references for the data used to conduct the investment analysis. The discount rate used is neither listed nor are the assumptions and references discussed in the PDD. <p>Additionality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The DOE is requested to report how it has validated common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121. The DOE has not provided a validation opinion on the common practice analysis indicated in the PDD (pp. 27-28) as step 4 in the baseline scenario identification and additionality assessment. <p>Baseline methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91. The DOE is requested to provide a statement on whether the data and parameters fixed ex-ante are conservative and appropriate. -The DOE is requested to state that the estimates in the PDD are reasonable for data and parameters that are monitored during implementation and are available after validation as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91. The DOE is requested to provide a validation opinion that the estimates in the PDD are reasonable for data and parameters that are monitored during implementation and are available after validation.
4	4214	(r) Wastewater Treatment with Biogas System (UASB) in a Starch Plant for Energy & Environment Conservation at Nakorn Ratchasima	SGS	<p>Monitoring methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). The monitoring plan should clarify the use of normalized flow meter to measure the Temperature and Pressure of biogas. (The VR states that the PPs will use a normalized flow meter to measure biogas flow, hence temperature and pressure of biogas need not to be monitored, which is in line with AMS-II.H v.15. However, this type of flow meter is not mentioned in the monitoring plan of the PDD.
5	4285	(r) Biogas Project at Prolific Yield Palm Oil Mill	DNU	<p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The DOE is requested to report why FAR 1 was raised considering that this relates to one applicability condition of the methodology AMS-I.F, paragraph 11 which should be confirmed by the DOE at validation stage and not at verification stage. Please refer to VVM, version 1.2, paragraph 37.



6	4286	(r) Xuzhou Zhonglian Cement 18MW Waste Heat Recovery as Power Project	TÜV SÜD	<p>Additionality:</p> <p>- The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In doing so, the DOE should explain:</p> <p>(1) how it validated the O&M costs, in particular (i) the repair charge, (ii) the other office expenses and (iii) the other factory expenses.</p> <p>(2) how it validated the annual electricity output the first five years of operation and the annual electricity output from the sixth year over. In doing this, the DOE should explain (i) how it validated the internal electricity consumption of 8,000 MWh and (ii) why WHR electricity generation of 114,300 MWh was used in investment analysis adopted instead of the electricity generation indicated in the FSR (121,600 MWh).</p> <p>(3) how lower electricity output in the first five years was validated.</p> <p>(4) how it validated (i) the depreciation, (ii) the financial expenses and (iii) the sales tax & additional tax.</p> <p>Baseline methodology:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to describe all the assumptions/ data/references listed in the PDD for the baseline identification as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87 (a). In doing so, the DOE should explain: (i) how baseline alternative P1 (proposed project activity not undertaken as a CDM) and P7 (Captive Electricity generation using waste energy (if project activity is captive generation using waste energy, this scenario represents captive generation with lower efficiency than the project activity) have been considered same; (ii) how P7 has been eliminated; (iii) why there is an inconsistency of remaining baseline alternative between the VR (W1(W2)/P6 and W4/P1, page 13) and the PDD (P1(P7)/W4 and P6/W1(W2), baseline matrix in page 13 of the PDD); (iv) how it validated the exclusion of baseline scenario P2, P3 and P5, in particular, the DOE is requested to explain how it validated that these scenarios (a) present prohibitive barriers to the implementation or (b) are clearly unattractive, as required by step 3 of identification of baseline scenarios in ACM 0012 version 3.2.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to describe how the data/parameters used in the equations were verified as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 93. In doing so, the DOE should explain how the grid emission factor was validated. In doing this, the DOE is requested to explain (i) how it validated the data used for calculation of this factor and (ii) how it validated that all data sources and assumptions are appropriate and calculations are correct, as required in paragraph 91 of VVM version 1.2</p> <p>Baseline methodology:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the equations applied to calculate the baseline/ project emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per the chosen methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92. In doing so, the DOE should describe how the value of Q OE, BL, sourced from FSR, is appropriate given that the methodology requires to estimate the theoretical recoverable energy based on manufacturer's specification or technical assessment prepared by qualified/certified external expert.</p> <p>Baseline methodology:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to provide a description of steps taken to cross-check the information given in the PDD as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 88. In doing so, the DOE should explain how</p>
---	------	---	---------	--



				the exclusion of P4 was validated.
7	4361	(r) Istmeño Wind Farm	BVCH	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). a- In particular it should clarify the inconsistencies between the tariff value mentioned in the PDD page 14 (i.e., 106.01US\$/MWh) and the spreadsheet "Input Data" cellH21 (i.e., 67.1US\$/MWh). b- It should also explain why the capacity of the plant has been calculated using 2.27MW (rated capacity) while the PDD page 5 states that "The Wind Turbine Generator FL 2500 constitutes a family of power plants with a nominal output of 2.5 MW and rotor diameters from 80 to 100 m." c- Report why the actual interest payments have not been considered in the income tax calculation in line with the requirements of EB62, Annex 5, paragraph 11.</p> <p>DOE related issue: -The DOE is requested to include a statement on the validation of the expected emission reductions in the validation opinion as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 176 (d).</p>
8	4406	(r) ERH – Biogas recovery, heat and electricity generation from effluents ponds in Honduras	RINA	<p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to describe whether the assumptions and data used for the baseline identification are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87 (c). The DOE is requested to describe how the data/parameters used in the equations were verified, in particular, the suitability of the 6,500 MWh/y boiler's operational hours used to calculate the net heat generation of the project (58,500GJ/yr) and of the TFF parameter which is fixed ex-ante in the PDD. In addition, please note that there are some inconsistencies between the PDD, Validation Report and spreadsheet submitted, in particular: a) the spreadsheet mentions that the average net electricity generation is 7.44 GWh/y whereas the Validation Report indicates on page 14 that "the emission reduction calculation it is expected to generate an estimated average of 6.63 to 7.04 GWh/year with the available methane"; and b) the values of UFBL, UFPE and Bo,ww are inconsistently mentioned in the Validation Report.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: - The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the equations applied to calculate the baseline/ project emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per the chosen methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92. The DOE should explain how paragraph 43 of AMS I.C (version 18) and paragraph 32 of AMS III.H (version 15) have been complied with. Moreover, there are some inconsistencies between the PDD and the Validation Report: a) the Validation Report (page 22) indicates that "PE_{ww,treatment,y} = PE_{ww,discharge,y} + PE_{fugitive,y}" while the PDD correctly mentions that these parameters are be calculated separately; and b) the paragraphs quoted in the Validation Report related to the calculation of leakage (i.e. para 37 of AMS I.C version 18 and 29 of AMS III.H version 15) are not correct.</p>



9	4594	Shanxi Huairen Chaigou Coal Mine Ventilation Air Methane Destruction Project	TÜV SÜD	<p>Additionality:</p> <p>- The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In doing so please provide clarification on the input values as there appears to be some inconsistency in the following: i) the IRR spreadsheet and PDD (page 19) indicate a static investment cost of 65.6 million RMB while the VR (page 17) indicate 65.5 million RMB, ii) the spreadsheet indicates O&M costs of 8.384 million RMB/year while the VR (page 17) shows a value of 2 million RMB/year, iii) the spreadsheet indicates cost of electricity of 6.384 million RMB/year while the VR (page 17) shows electricity cost of 5.244 million RMB/year, and iv) VR report indicates that the sensitivity analysis is varied $\pm 10\%$ while PDD (page 20) and IRR spreadsheet show a $\pm 20\%$ variation.</p> <p>Baseline methodology:</p> <p>- The DOE is requested to include description of the process taken to validate the accuracy and completeness of the project description in VR as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 64(a). In doing so please provide information clarifying i) why the project activity was web-hosted for global stakeholder consultation twice (January 2009 and September 2010) and ii) the change of the project ownership considering that CAR 1 was raised and it is not clear how it was closed.</p>
10	4603	(r) Qinghai Province Xinghai County Moduo Hydropower Project	DNV	<p>Additionality:</p> <p>- The DOE is requested to confirm the accuracy of the financial calculations carried out for the investment analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (c). In particular, why residual value for transmission project is not accounted in the investment analysis given that the base for depreciation calculation is fixed assets investment including transmission project.</p> <p>Baseline methodology:</p> <p>- The DOE is requested to include validation opinion on the accuracy and completeness of the project description in the validation report as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 64(b). In doing so please provide following information : (i) why the project can not be considered as the replacement of an existing grid-connected renewable power plant given that Qushian Hydro Power Station (3.75MW) will be decommissioned after the start of operation of the proposed project. If the project is replacement of an existing renewable energy power plant, the PP/DOE shall identify baseline scenario and calculate emission reductions for replacement plants as per methodology ACM0012 v12.1; and (ii) Do any infrastructures, components or equipments of the existing power plant are being used or intended for the use in the proposed project activity.</p> <p>Monitoring methodology:</p> <p>- The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the monitoring plan as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). In particular: (i) please provide line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points and connection point to the grid; (ii) how the import of electricity from grid will be monitored, if any; and (iii) what is the arrangement of main and backup meters for measurements of net electricity supplied to the grid.</p>



11	4622	(r) Henan Taiyangshi 5MW Cement Waste Heat Recovery Project	TUEV Rheinland	<p>Baseline methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76. (i). It is not clear how the applicability condition 6(f) has been validated, please provide more detailed information on pre-project scenario; (ii). Please further explain how the applicability has been validated as per 6(g)(iii) of AMS III.Q version 3, please also provide the information on the energy demand of the cement production process (e.g., based on specific energy consumption specified by the manufacturer). <p>Baseline methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91. It is not clear how the suitability and conservativeness of the parameter QOE,BL(output energy that can be theoretically produced) has been validated. Considering that the power generation of the project during the first half year of 2009 is 17643.8 MWh which is much higher than the assumed power generation (14580 MWh) of a half year.
12	4652	(r) “6.65 MW Wind Energy Generation by M/s GTN Enterprises Limited” at Ganapathypalayam in Coimbatore, Radhapuram, Kvalakuruchi in Tirunelveli and Govindapuram in Erode district, Tamilnadu.	SIRIM	<p>Additionality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). For each component of the bundle, the validation report should properly explain how the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis have been validated, in particular: O&M cost, capital cost and the applicability of a tariff of 2.7 for sub-bundle 3 for the first 2 years. Please notice that the VR does not contain details on how these values have been validated. The DOE shall refer to paragraph 111 (b) of the VVM 1.2 guidance - The DOE is requested to confirm the accuracy of the financial calculations carried out for the investment analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (c). The DOE shall ensure the consistency of the documentation submitted. Please notice that the PDD indicates that the IRR for the Sub-bundle 2 is 9.57%. Nevertheless the validation report and the investment analysis spreadsheet consider a value of 10.13% for the same sub-bundle. Please clarify. <p>Additionality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the actions taken to secure the CDM status between the project starting date and the start of validation as per EB 49 Annex 22 paragraph 8 b. The table used to validate the continuing and real actions to secure CDM is not consistent. Sub-bundle 3 appears to have different composition: 3 turbines on January 21, 2006; and 1 turbine on February 18, 2006. Please revise the table and name adequately each component of the bundle.



				<p>Baseline methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The DOE is requested to provide a statement whether the identified boundary, sources and gases are justified for the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 80. For each one of the three components of the bundle, the PDD and the validation report must separately indicate a clear description of: (a) the baseline scenario; (b) the type of grid used to deliver the electricity; (c) the recipient of the electricity generated. <p>Baseline methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76. The validation report should include a clear description of the applicability conditions of the methodology AMS-I.D for each component of the bundle. Please notice that the PDD mentions that for sub-bundle 1 and sub-bundle 2 the electricity will be initially sold to the grid and then wheeled to private users. For sub-bundled 3 it indicates that the electricity will be wheeled for captive consumption.
13	4670	(r) Mumbai Metro One, India	SQS	<p>Baseline methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PP/DOE are requested to list the data and parameters used to calculate the emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). In particular, to include the parameters and the calculations of the baseline emission from the electricity based transport, for example, the baseline rail system. In doing so, please provide spreadsheet for the ex-ante emission reduction calculations, including all baseline emission sources, project emissions and leakage.
14	4740	18 MW Wind energy project by Indowind Energy Limited	DNV	<p>Additionality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In particular, the DOE should provide a validation opinion on how it has cross-checked the suitability of the Book Depreciation Rate, the Accelerated Depreciation, the Working Capital and the Loan Interest Rate. Moreover, the DOE should confirm that the MAT has been appropriately applied. <p>Additionality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed the existence of the similar projects for common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (b). In doing so, the DOE should further explain why similar activities with installed capacity of less than 15MW were excluded from the analysis.
15	4741	Fujian Shaowu Jintang Hydropower Project	JACO	<p>Additionality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per the VVM v 1.2 paragraphs 111 and 113, in particular: a) the reason for conducting the Preliminary Design Adjustment Report; b) whether the Preliminary Design Adjustment Report and the Preliminary Design Report use different input values; and c) which was the basis for the electricity tariff of 0.475 CNY/kWh (incl. VAT) applied in the Preliminary Design Report.



16	4758	(r)Mashan Wastewater Treatment Project	TÜV SÜD	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114(a), in particular: a) the breakdown of the annual O&M cost, b) the annual coal substitution, including the assumptions made such as the operating hours, NCV, specific consumption, boiler efficiency and heat generation rate. Please also clarify the different amount of coal used for the baseline emissions calculation; c) the suitability of the coal price at the time of investment decision and against independent sources.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: - The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the equations applied to calculate the baseline/ project emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per the chosen methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92; in particular, the DOE should provide a validation opinion on the calculation of the annual gas generation. In doing so, the spreadsheet showing such calculation should be provided.</p> <p>- The DOE is requested to state if the methodology provides different options for equations and parameters and if the selection is appropriate as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 90. Specifically, the DOE should provide a validation opinion why equation 11 (AMS.I.C. version 18) for co-fired system was used to calculate baseline emissions from the heat generation component.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: - The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91. In doing so, the DOE should transparently validate the value applied to each ex-ante baseline assumption.</p>
17	4787	Yunnan Yingjiang Xiangbai River Lushan Hydropower Station	TÜV SÜD	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to clarify how it has confirmed the validity of the input values that were based on the FSR (September 2007) as it is stated on page 18 of the validation report " the input values used have been confirmed as valid on March 2004" based on the reference document 11 while the investment decision was made in December 2007 and the referred document (document 11) is dated September 2008 (Approval of the final FSR for 12.6 MW). In doing so please refer to VVM 1.2 paragraph 113.a.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations, in particular, the investment cost, O&M costs and the electricity tariff as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In doing so, please include: i) the breakdown of the total investment which has already been invested (70% of the total investment) and the remaining investment costs considering that the construction was scheduled to conclude in September 2009 (VR page 63); ii) the actual value of the validated O&M costs and its breakdown; and iii) information on how the reference tariff for the project activity (run-of-river) was calculated, especially the criteria applied in the selection of the project used for the calculation (PA 1779, reservoir-type project). In addition, please provide the respective spreadsheet.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to address the inconsistency in the power export to the grid: the PDD (page 29) indicates a value</p>



				<p>of 52,342 MWh/year while page 3 mentions 52,290 MWh/year. In doing so please refer to EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph and 7.b.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE/PP are requested to clarify the project description in line with VVM 1.2 paragraph 64, in particular, information on the change in the design capacity from 5 MW, 10 MW to 12.6 MW should be provided.</p>
18	4811	(r) Gansu Guazhou East Beidaqiao Wind Power Project	TÜV Nord	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to provide information on how the distinctive differences between the project activity and the similar projects identified in the selected scope are justified as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (c). The Validation Report lacks information on how the essential distinction in the common practice analysis was validated.</p>
19	4814	Zhejiang Guodian Beilun Ultra-supercritical Power Project	GLC	<p>Additionality: -The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on the input values to the investment comparison in line with the VVM para. 111, in particular: a) the material expenditure of the project activity (8 RMB/MWh) given that the value in the FSR for the same alternative is 4.5 RMB/MWh; b) the suitability of the fuel consumption of the baseline option (282 gce/kWh) considering that different sources provide different values and the one used in the project is not the most conservative option; and c) whether the reference used as source of the PLFs is in line with the "Guidelines for the Reporting and Validation of Plant Load Factors" EB 48 Annex 11.</p> <p>- The DOE should provide further details on the reference (2-4) used to cross-check the suitability of the input values to the investment comparison, including why those sources are appropriate in the context of the project activity (e.g. why the plants considered in the references cited are comparable to the alternatives presented in the PDD, etc.).</p> <p>Baseline methodology: - There is an inconsistency related to the η_{BL} parameter listed in section B.6.2 of the PDD (page 28) since it indicates that the "Energy efficiency of baseline domestic 600 MW sub-critical power generation which is identified as the most likely baseline scenario"; whereas the baseline scenario is the construction of 2x600MW coal-fired power plant with supercritical technology. Please note that the version of the methodology applied will no longer be valid upon re-submission and shall be therefore updated.</p>
20	4816	Gangakhed Sugar & Energy Private Ltd (GSEPL) 30 MW Bagasse Based Co-generation Power Project	SGS	<p>Additionality: -The DOE shall validate the suitability of input values applied in the investment analysis in line with VVM (v1.2), para. 111 (a) - (c), in particular 1) the investment cost of the project activity, considering the DOE has not explained why the estimated investment cost can be considered appropriate based on contract value; 2) fuel price, considering the DOE has not reported the date of the quotation for purchased biomass residues, neither it has elaborated how the fuel price has been crosschecked with the quotation; 3) electricity revenue, considering savings from electricity generation for internal consumption has not been considered in the investment comparison analysis.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The biomass consumption of the project activity applied in</p>



				the investment comparison analysis is 360252 ton/year, and 304222 ton/year for the reference plant. The DOE shall clarify why the consumption between these two scenarios are inconsistent considering scenario 4 has been determined as the baseline scenario. In doing so, please refer to ACM0006, ver. 10.1 page 11, the definition of scenario 4.
21	4819	Heilongjiang Huachuan Biomass Cogeneration Project	TÜV SÜD	<p>Additionality: -There is no validation opinion on the biomass amount used in the investment analysis and sensitivity analysis in VR.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The VR lacks information on the parameters used for baseline emission calculation, such as NCV, moisture content of each type of biomass.</p>
22	4829	Nam Trai 4 Hydropower Project	TUEV Rheinland	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b). VR lacks information on the parameters used for CAPM calculation.</p>
23	4835	Project of treatment and swine's manure utilization at Ecobio Carbon – Swine Culture N° 5	DNV	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In particular, the DOE is requested to provide more information on the following parameters: - Selection of the representative swine farm - Capital expenditures assumed for the biodigester and the generator. - O&M costs, potential electricity generation, relevant time frame of the investment analysis, as the equipment expected lifetime is 25 years (instead of 10 years).</p> <p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed each barrier presented as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118 (a) and (b). The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed each barrier presented as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118 (a) and (b). In particular, the DOE should provide more details on how it has validated the prevailing practice barrier (referred to as common practice barrier in the PDD/VR) and technological barriers.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The PP/DOE are requested to list the data and parameters used to calculate the emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). The PP/DOE are requested to list the data and parameters used to calculate the emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 7 (b) and (c). In particular, incompleteness/inconsistencies have been detected regarding the parameters MS% Bl,j and UFb (not listed on section B.6.2), MCF (values reported in B.6.2 correspond to 18-19° according to IPCC 2006 Table 10.17 (p. 10.45) whereas the PDD indicates that the average temperature on the project's region is 21° (PDD page 28)), and VSLT,y (values reported for ex-ante estimation on B.6.2 are inconsistent with the ex-ante values mentioned in B.7.1).</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a). The VR (p. 16), the DOE reports "The variable MCF considers the yearly average ambient temperature for Santa Catarina, Parana and Rio Grande do Sul States (21oC), however the MCF value used is 77%, which is</p>



				not in accordance with 2006 IPCC Guidelines (table 10.17). Also, in the PDD section B.6.1, it is referred to the temperature average of Minas Gerais (NOT PARANA), Santa Catarina and Rio Grande do Sul States. For project emissions, PEpower.y (emissions from electricity used for the operation of the installed facilities) - the VR refers only to the power capacity of the blower and does not provide information on the data in the PDD (P.38) and the emission reduction spreadsheet which include the project emissions from the blower, solenoid valves and plc.
24	4836	(r) Heilongjiang Wanyuan Biomass Cogeneration Project	DNV	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the auxiliary consumption rate, the quantity of water consumed, the total number of staff members (i.e. 55 persons), the Repair Fee and the Other Fee applied in the investment analysis spreadsheet, in accordance with VVM v 1.2 paragraph 111.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to state if the PDD provides a clear description of the baseline scenario(s) which includes description of the technology and the activities that would take place in the absence of the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 86. The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has verified during its site visit the following baselines for biomass and heat: (a) the biomass that is directly sourced from local rice industries and used by the project activity would be dumped or left to decay or burned in an uncontrolled manner without utilizing it for energy purposes (p. 18 of the VR); and (b) the thermal energy would be supplied by coal fired boilers, in particular for those consumers that are going to receive the thermal energy from the project activity.</p>
25	4848	Wind power project by PMPL in Maharashtra	TÜV Nord	<p>Additionality: -The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data, input values and references used in the investment analysis and the results of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). Inconsistency regarding the O&M cost is found. In VR page 122, it is indicated that the O&M cost is 10 INR Lakhs, however, the PDD page18 mentions the O&M cost is 11.24 INR Lakhs.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to confirm the accuracy of the financial calculations carried out for the investment analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (c). The VR has not reported how the DOE has validated the input values , in particular a)The assessment of project cost is missing in the VR page 120; and b) how the DOE has cross checked the tariff, deration rate, transmission loss and O&M cost.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a).The VR lacks information on whether the O&M cost and its associated escalation applied in the investment analysis are suitable and applicable at the time of investment decision.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated sensitivity analysis of the investment analysis as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 111 (e). The tariff after 13th year is used for sensitivity analysis in the PDD and IRR spreadsheet. The</p>



				VR doesn't report how the DOE has validated that using the tariff after 13th year for sensitivity analysis is suitable.
26	4853	Hebei Guyuan County Dongxinying 199.5 MW Wind Power Project	TUEV Rheinland	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In doing so, please include the value of the validated O&M costs and its breakdown. In addition, please provide local and sectoral expertise for the validated values.</p>
27	4855	Kim Hock Biomass Energy and Wood Recycling Plant	SIRIM	<p>Additionality: -The VR does not report how the DOE has validated the prevailing practice of the use of fossil fuel to generate steam and local industries using other fuels than biomass in the co-generation system in Singapore. -The VR and PDD have not reported why the quantitative approach to calculate the risk of damage has not been applied to substantiate the other barrier as required by EB50 Annex13 paragraph 8.</p> <p>Baselinemethodology: -In PDD page 7 , it is indicated that 'waste heat in the flue gas will be recovered for use in the wood chips drying process', which is inconsistent with the description in VR CL3 'From the spec provided, the amount of horticultural waste fed to the dryer is up to 11,000 kg/h and the moisture is reduced from 60% to 11% or less. This is equivalent to 5,000 kg/h water evaporated' and 'Biomass Fed to Dryer' in the ER calculation excel . It is not clear what will be heated by the dryer.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -In VR page A-28, the density of diesel is 0.82 and the consumption amount is 707l/h, which is inconsistent with the density of diesel 0.85 used in ER calculation and consumption amount 700l/h indicated in the PDD.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The VR has not reported how the DOE has validated the baseline scenario as required by the footnote 6 of AMS.I.C ver. 17 paragraph 15 and the clarification of the methodology SSC_478</p> <p>Monitoring methodology: -The VR has not reported why the continuous operation of the system/equipment and moisture content of the biomass residue required by the methodology are not included in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>-The VR has not reported how the DOE has validated the project emission regarding the ash disposal as it has been included in the monitoring plan in PDD page 52.</p>



28	4856	(r) Abohar Branch Canal Based Small Hydro Project in Punjab, India	TÜV SÜD	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In particular how the DOE has confirmed following input values are valid and applicable by comparing against third party or publicly available information : (i) investment cost (please provide detail information on cross checking); (ii) auxiliary consumption; (iii) interest on working capital; (iv) annual O&M cost and its escalation; (v) annual mill channel compensation; (vi) cess on water; (vii) depreciation rate; and (viii) insurance rate.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to confirm the accuracy of the financial calculations carried out for the investment analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (c). The DOE is requested to provide further detail information on tax and depreciation calculation.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to include validation opinion on the accuracy and completeness of the project description in the validation report as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 64(b). Please provide further information on : (i) whether each power plant can be operated independently without any technical problem since it is based on canal system; (ii) if each plant can be operated independently then why the project can not be considered as a bundle project.</p> <p>Other: -The DOE is requested to address the changes made to the project design since the global stakeholder consultation was conducted as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 173(c). The validation report doesn't list the major changes made in the final version of PDD since the PDD published for the global stakeholder consultation.</p>
29	4857	Shaanxi Ningshan Luotuoya bundle small hydro project	TÜV SÜD	<p>Additionality: -The VR has not reported the project activity's compliance with the EB 48 Annex 11 (Guideline for the reporting and validation of plant load factors) .</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to provide confirmation that the values used in PDD are fully consistent with the FSR as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 113 (b).</p>
30	4860	Project of treatment and swine's manure utilization at Ecobio Carbon - Swineculture N° 3	DNV	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In particular, the DOE is requested to provide more information on the following parameters: - Selection of the representative swine farm - Capital expenditures assumed for the biodigester and the generator. - O&M costs, potential electricity generation, relevant time frame of the investment analysis, as the equipment expected lifetime is 25 years (instead of 10 years).</p> <p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed each barrier presented as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118 (a) and (b). In particular, the DOE should provide more details on how it has validated the prevailing practice barrier (referred to as common practice barrier in the PDD/VR) and technological barriers.</p>



				<p>Baseline methodology:</p> <p>-The PP/DOE are requested to list the data and parameters used to calculate the emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 7 (b) and (c). In particular, incompleteness/ inconsistencies have been detected regarding the parameters MS% Bl,j and UFb (not listed on section B.6.2), MCF (values reported in B.6.2 correspond to 18-19° according to IPCC 2006 Table 10.17 (p. 10.45) whereas the PDD indicates that the average temperature on the project's region is 21° (PDD page 28)), and VSLT,y (values reported for ex-ante estimation on B.6.2 are inconsistent with the ex-ante values mentioned in B.7.1).</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/ references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a)."The variable MCF considers the yearly average ambient temperature for Minas Gerais (21oC), however the MCF value used is 77%, which is not in accordance with 2006 IPCC Guidelines (table 10.17).</p>
31	4862	Project of treatment and swine's manure utilization at Ecobio Carbon – Swine Culture N° 2	DNV	<p>Additionality:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a).In particular, the DOE is requested to provide more information on the following parameters: - Selection of the representative swine farm - Capital expenditures assumed for the biodigestor and the generator. - O&M costs, potential electricity generation, relevant time frame of the investment analysis, as the equipment expected lifetime is 25 years (instead of 10 years). Also the VR states "All of these data were considered feasible compared with data reported for other similar projects recovering methane in animal manure management systems in Brazil"; but information on the data or the range of data/value for other projects has not been provided.</p> <p>Additionality:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed each barrier presented as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118 (a) and (b).The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed each barrier presented as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118 (a) and (b). In particular, the DOE should provide more details on how it has validated the prevailing practice barrier (referred to as common practice barrier in the PDD/VR) and technological barriers.</p>



				<p>Baseline methodology:</p> <p>-The PP/DOE are requested to list the data and parameters used to calculate the emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). The PP/DOE are requested to list the data and parameters used to calculate the emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 7 (b) and (c). In particular, incompleteness/ inconsistencies have been detected regarding the parameters MS% Bl,j and UFb (not listed on section B.6.2), MCF (values reported in B.6.2 correspond to 18-19° according to IPCC 2006 Table 10.17 (p. 10.45) whereas the PDD indicates that the average temperature on the project's region is 21° (PDD page 28)), and VSLT,y (values reported for ex-ante estimation on B.6.2 are inconsistent with the ex-ante values mentioned in B.7.1).</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/ references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a). The VR (p. 14), the DOE reports "The variable MCF considers the yearly average ambient temperature for Minas Gerais, Santa Catarina and Rio Grande do Sul States is 21oC, however the MCF value used is 77%, which is not in accordance with 2006 IPCC Guidelines (table 10.17).</p>
32	4868	(r) Changning Kawan 18.9MW Hydroelectric Project	Deloitte-TECO	<p>Additionality:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In doing so, the DOE shall provide validation opinion on all input values including VAT rate, income tax rate, salvage value, interest rate. In addition, the DOE/PP shall also provide transparent calculation of the interest payment in the IRR calculation spreadsheet.</p> <p>Additionality:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to provide information on how the distinctive differences between the project activity and the similar projects identified in the selected scope are justified as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (c). In doing so, the DOE shall substantiate what reason has enable the unit investment of project Maomaotiao, Nanting, Xiashilong and Yanziya lower than that of the project activity.</p> <p>Additionality:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per the Glossary of the CDM and VVM v1.2, para 104 (a). In doing so, the DOE shall report how it has validated real actions taken by the PP or expenditures committed by the PP related to the construction or the implementation of the project activity, e.g. the grid connection agreement signed in 2006 and the construction contract.</p>



33	4874	Utilization of waste heat from Sulphur Recovery Unit to generate electricity	TÜV Nord	<p>Baseline methodology: -The PP/DOE are requested to complete all the PDD sections for the description of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). (1). It is not clear whether the waste heat of the proposed project activity is implemented at a new facility (page 49 of validation report) or an existing facility. If the project activity is implemented at an existing facility, please provide the information regarding the operation start date of the facility (CS2 plant). (2). Please provide information (both the scenario prior to the start date of the project activity and scenario after the capacity expansion of CS2 plant) on : (i) the total energy demand of the industry facility and specific energy consumption of the CS2 production; (ii) the quantity and energy content of the waste energy produced for the rated plant capacity/per unit of product produced, please also provide the energy balance of relevant sections of the CS2 plant; and (iii) use of the waste heat to meet the internal energy demand of CS2 plant. (3). Please also provide the information regarding the steam-driven blower, including the operation start date of the steam-driven blower, the source of the steam used for the blower, quantity and energy content of the steam used. (4). It is not clear whether the temperature and pressure of the waste heat steam remains stable prior to and during the implementation of the project activity. Please provide the information regarding the temperature and pressure of the steam.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76. The DOE shall further explain how it has validated the waste heat utilization in absence of the project activity as per paragraph 6(g) of AMS III.Q version 3. Please provide quantified information regarding the records of waste excess steam released to atmosphere and the energy bills prior to the start of the project activity.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to state if the methodology provides different options for equations and parameters and if the selection is appropriate as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 90. Please further explain the validation of the capping of the baseline emission, in particular why method-2 is selected to determine the fcap and why method-1 is not applicable.</p>
34	4878	Sichuan Dafan Hydropower Project	TÜV SÜD	<p>Additionality: -The DOE shall validate the common practice analysis in line with VVM ver. 1.2, para. 120 (c) and 121 (c), in particular the essential distinctions between the project activity and the identified five similar non-CDM projects, considering it is not clear the reasons that has enabled the project activity to have lower project IRR than those of the other five similar projects.</p> <p>DOE related issue: -The DOE requires the project participant report the location of main meter and back up meter in CR11. However, the required information can not be found in the PDD. The DOE shall further explain how "CR11" was considered closed in line with VVM ver.1.2, para. 38.</p> <p>Other: -The reservoir area mentioned in the monitoring plan (800,000</p>



				m2, PDD page 32) is inconsistent with the information (0.0145km2) at the rest of places in the PDD and the information in the validation report. The DOE shall clarify the inconsistency in line with EB48, Annex 60, para.7(b).
35	4881	Sihui Junma Cement Waste Heat Recovery Project	DNV	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In particular: (i) the capacity of 5.347 MW and auxiliary consumption of 8% applied in the calculation of annual electricity generation; (ii) the loan/equity rate (65:35), depreciation and salvage value.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated sensitivity analysis of the investment analysis as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 111 (e). In particular, how it was deemed “not possible” an increase in the operational hours over 10.8% in the sensitivity analysis, considering that in 2009, the production of clinker increased 22.3% over the average clinker production considered (1,182,462 tonnes instead of 966,515 tonnes);</p> <p>Monitoring methodology: -The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each monitoring parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). (i) the monitoring frequency for EI p,y according to the requirements of the applicable methodology; (ii) the QA/QC procedures to be followed for cross check, in accordance with the requirements of the methodology (page 19);</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to include description of the process taken to validate the accuracy and completeness of the project description in VR as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 64(a). In particular, how the production capacity of the clinker line (i.e. 3000 tonnes per day) has been validated given that the PDD indicates a total clinker production in 2009 over the maximum possible (1,182,462 tonnes, corresponding to 394 days operating at full capacity).</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to describe how the data/parameters used in the equations were verified as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 93. (i) EIB, (the energy consumption per unit of clinker in the baseline scenario) which has been validated as 3.59 GJ/tonne of clinker (page 38 of the VR) while the PDD indicates 3.49GJ/tonne of clinker (page 58). (ii) NCV fuel,B; The reported values of Q fuel, b and NCVfuel,B in the PDD (page 58) are 149,704 tonnes and 22.51 GJ/t. However, the VR reports a different NCVfuel,B value (22.83 GJ/t) (page 35) and the same FB (3369.84 TJ), which is not consistent. (iii) Ely , the average energy consumption in the project scenario, which is calculated in the PDD based on the reported value of clinker production in 2009 (1,182,462 tonnes). This figure corresponds to a clinker production line of 3,000 tonnes per day, operating during 394 days. If the maximum production capacity as per the project description (3,000 tonnes per day) was considered for Ely, the energy consumption per unit of clinker in the project scenario (based</p>



				on the data of PDD, page 58) would be 3.75 GJ/tonne, which is higher than the energy consumption in the pre-project scenario and the ex-ante estimation of project emissions (required as per the methodology (page 7) would be positive.
36	4883	Leak Reduction in Above Ground Distribution Equipment in the Gas Distribution Network UzTransgaz- Garbgaz (GGT)	SGS	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to clarify if the list of alternatives to the project activity in the PDD is complete according to the applied baseline methodology as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 107. Please provide information in detail with regard to elimination of similarly capable leak detection and measurement technologies as described in the methodology (step 1 of additionality section, AM0023 v03 and tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality v5.2).</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed each barrier presented as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118 (a) and (b). The DOE shall provide detail information on how requirements of "GUIDELINES FOR OBJECTIVE DEMONSTRATION AND ASSESSMENT OF BARRIERS v01 EB 50 Annex 13" has been fulfilled in each presented barriers.</p> <p>Additionality: The DOE is requested to include a clear validation opinion on the compliance of the project activity with the requirements made in EB 49 Annex 22 as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 104(c). For project activities with a starting date on or after 2 August 2008, the project participant must inform a Host Party designated national authority (DNA) and the UNFCCC secretariat in writing of the commencement of the project activity and of their intention to seek CDM status. However, it seems that the PP notified the UNFCCC secretariat only on 21/12/2010 (page 16, validation report).</p> <p>Additionality: The DOE is requested to report how it has validated common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121. In particular : (i) how the geographical scope of the common practice analysis has been validated; (ii) how it has assessed the existence of similar projects; (iii) how the essential distinctions between the proposed CDM project activity and any similar projects are assessed.</p> <p>Other: The DOE is requested to indicate in the validation report if the latest PDD template is used as per VVM v1.2, paragraph 55. The latest available PDD template is V03 (in effect as of July 28,2006).However, the validation report (page 10) and the header of the PDD indicate the project uses PDD template v3.1. Please clarify and correct.</p>
37	4884	(r) Construction of “Janub” Combined Cycle Power Plant in Azerbaijan	BVCH	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). The VR has not provided information on whether the actual payable tax has been taken into account in the calculation of income tax, in line with the EB62 Annex 5 paragraph 11.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76. The VR lacks information on how the DOE has validated point 3 of the</p>



				<p>applicability conditions of the methodology with regards to the future of the natural gas based power capacity additions.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the identification of the baseline scenario of the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87. The VR lacks information on the relevance of the information from EIA to eliminate the baseline alternatives.</p>
				<p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to describe whether the assumptions and data used for the baseline identification are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87 (c). (a) The VR lacks information on how the DOE has validated the following assumption in the baseline identification: (i) The plant capacity of alternative 2-4 (3x300 MW) as compared to 780 MW capacity of the PA; (ii) The expected electricity supplied to the grid from alternative 2-4 (6023 GWh/y) as compared to the PA (5220); (iii) The same plant load factors (80%) for all alternatives. (b) The VR lacks information on the relevance of study carried out by the UK's Royal Academy of Engineering to validate the O&M cost.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a). The VR lacks information on how the DOE has validated energy efficiency of the baseline technology (43%), in line with the VVM version 01.2 paragraph 91. Furthermore, the spreadsheet appears to consider efficiency of 37.5% for the baseline scenario.</p>
38	4891	Dak Psi 3 and 4 Hydropower Project	KEMCO	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated sensitivity analysis of the investment analysis as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 111 (e). In doing so, the DOE should provide information on why the variations in the key parameters that would make the IRR reach the benchmark are not likely to occur.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In particular, the DOE should provide a validation opinion on the suitability of the Insurance, the Interest rate on term loan and the Enterprise Income Tax.</p> <p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed the existence of the similar projects for common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (b). In doing so, the DOE should further explain why similar activities with installed capacity of less than 15MW were excluded from the analysis.</p>



				<p>Other:</p> <p>-The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the calculation of ex-ante emission reductions (with actual data and equations) as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). The PP/DOE are requested to revise the inconsistencies related to the value of the grid emission factor used in the PDD, given that a value of 0.602 tCO₂/MWh is mentioned on page 30 of the PDD; whereas the value validated by the DOE is 0.5764 tCO₂/MWh.</p> <p>-The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of all the ex-ante parameters in section B.6.2 of the PDD.</p>
39	4903	Fujian Shanghang Jiantou 9.8 MW hydropower Station Project	TÜV SÜD	<p>Additionality:</p> <p>-The PP/DOE are requested to describe the continuing and real actions taken to achieve CDM status for the project activity as per EB 49 Annex 22. As the gap between the start date of the project activity (March 2004) and the contract with the CDM development contract with Pengliqing Consulting (November 2006) is more than 2 years, the DOE is requested to clarify how it has validated the real and continuing actions to secure the CDM status. In doing so, the DOE is requested to refer to the Guidelines on the demonstration and assessment of prior consideration of the CDM, in particular, paragraph 8 of version 3 of the guidelines, EB 49, Annex 22 and [paragraph 6 (b) and paragraph 7 of version 4 of the guidelines (EB 62, annex 13).</p>
40	4906	Sungai Rek Mini Hydro, Kuala Krai, Kelantan, Malaysia	TUEV Rheinland	<p>Additionality:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In particular it should report why the PLF (85%) has been applied to the "net export capacity" of 2.8MW (therefore capping the electricity delivered to the grid to 20,849 MWh/y); accordingly please further report on the details of the Renewable Energy Power Purchase Agreement signed in 2006 (VR, p22). In doing so, it should also provide information on the investment cost and O&M cost ratios of the other two CDM project activities selected for the comparison (i.e., related to the project's capacities).</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to report how it has validated sensitivity analysis as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 111 (e). In particular the statement in the VR (page 26) that with a variation of +/-10 in the investment cost, electricity generation and tariff the benchmark is not reached as it is not consistent with the sensitivity results presented in the PDD (page 17) and spreadsheet (where the benchmark is reached).</p>



41	4914	Huadian Ningxia Ningdong Yangjiayao Wind Farm Expansion Project	BVCH	<p>Monitoring methodology: -The DOE is requested to describe how it has validated that the selected monitoring methodology(ies) are correctly applied and they are not subject to clarifications, revisions or deviations as per VVM v1.2, paragraphs 72-74. The DOE should clarify how export and import of electricity measured by meters M1 and M2 as shown on page 26 of the PDD will be cross checked with invoices for sale of electricity to the grid because invoices will be issued based on meter reading at substation that will measure net electricity for old and expansion project together.</p> <p>Other: -The PP/DOE are requested to complete all the PDD sections for the description of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). The total installed capacity of the project is based on rated turbine capacity as $1.5 \times 8 = 12.0$ MW. As per footnote 6 of General Guidelines to the SSC CDM methodologies, version 16 the total installed capacity for renewable electricity generation projects should be based on rated generator capacity which is 1.540 MW for this project. The DOE is requested to clarify whether the installed capacity for the project activity is in line with the fore mentioned guideline.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to include validation opinion on the accuracy and completeness of the project description in the validation report as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 64(b).</p>
42	4918	(r) SB Chemical Zinc Plant Fuel Switching Project	KECO	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to identify if the FSR has been the basis of the investment decision as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 113 (a). The DOE should clarify whether the FSR is the source of input values to the investment analysis, given that the Validation Report (page 43) indicates that the project participants do not rely on values from FSR, whereas in page 19 of the same Validation report the DOE states that the validation team has cross checked that each cost (investment cost) is consistent with FSR.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In particular, the DOE is request to provide a further validation opinion on: a) the initial investment cost, b) the O&M cost, c) the fuel price, d) the annual fuel consumption, e) the annual fuel cost, f) the annual production of zinc oxide and zince dust, and g) discount rates. In doing so, the DOE is required to provide details on the sources of evidence used to cross-check each parameter, including dates, nature, values shown and how these sources are appropriate in the context of the project activity.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to provide local and sectoral expertise on the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 113 (c).</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the sensitivity analysis as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 111 (e). In particular, the DOE should explain why the natural gas price, B-C oil price and discount rates were excluded from the analysis.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to describe how the data/parameters</p>



			<p>used in the equations were verified as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 93. In doing so, the DOE is requested to explain how it has validated the suitability of the net energy generated in the element process j (QBSL_j) and the quantity of natural gas consumed (FCy). The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to state whether the values for emission factors and NCVs of B-C oil and natural gas, the ex-ante fuel consumption of B-C oil, and the production of zinc oxide and zinc dust are conservative and appropriate. In doing so, the DOE is also requested to provide full details on the suitability of their sources (including dates, nature, values, etc.)</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76. Please note that further description is required on how the project complies with each applicability condition of the methodology. In addition, the applicability condition # 8 has not been confirmed by the DOE.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The PP/DOE are requested to describe the GHG sources within the project boundary in the PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). Please note that the GHG sources included in the project boundary are not discussed in section B.3 of the PDD.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to provide a statement whether the identified boundary, sources and gases are justified for the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 80. The DOE is requested to explain how it has validated the requirement as per VVM v1.2, paragraph 80 given that the selected sources and gases included in the project boundary are not documented in the section B.3 of PDD.</p> <p>Monitoring methodology: -The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). In doing so, the PP/DOE should ensure that all the monitoring parameters required by paragraph 22 of AMS III.B v.14 are included in the monitoring plan</p> <p>Other: -The PP/DOE are requested to indicate the starting date of crediting period in the PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). Section C.2.2.1 of the PDD indicates that the starting date of the fixed crediting period is "after CDM registration" but does not include any estimated starting date.</p> <p>Other: -The DOE is requested to address the changes made to the project design since the global stakeholder consultation was conducted as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 173(c).</p>
--	--	--	--



43	4920	4.5 MW wind power project of PCI Limited at Gujarat, India	TÜV Nord	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In doing so, please provide cross-checking of the input values, such as the project cost, tariff, O&M, as per VVM1.2 paragraph 111.</p>
44	4926	Huaneng Shanghai Chongming Qianwei Wind Farm Project	BVCH	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In doing so please provide a breakdown and details of the: i) O&M costs as there appears to be some inconsistency between the information given on validation report page 18 and page 92 (interest rate, depreciation, residual value have been considered on page 92) and ii) project activities (project numbers and PLFs applied) used to select the average plant load factor of 18.8% with which the proposed project activity was compared to.</p>
45	4931	The Second Hydropower Project in Hetao Irrigation District of Inner Mongolia	TUEV Rheinland	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to provide local and sectoral expertise on the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 113 (c). The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the suitability of the investment costs and O & M as per VVM para 113 (c).</p>
46	4936	Ouro Small Hydropower Plant – Brenand CDM Project Activity	TÜV SÜD	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to confirm the accuracy of the financial calculations carried out for the investment analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (c). In doing so, please provide information on the residual value.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). The DOE has not reported how it has validated that IRR calculation with an installed capacity of 16 MW is more conservative than it is with 12MW.</p>
47	4941	Uganda Nile Basin Reforestation Project No 4	JACO	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the IRR calculation and its input values as the spreadsheet (Appendix 1, Financial sheet, cell G89) shows a message that "excel is unable to calculate the IRR". The DOE shall also report how the alternate investment yields have been validated. In doing so please refer to VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a).</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to explain how it has validated investment barriers (pg. 13 of validation report) on the basis of an IRR analysis when the PDD does not refer to any IRR analysis for establishing project additionality. In doing so please refer to VVM v1.2, Para 118 (a), (b).</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE has reported different values for the total area of the project in different sections of the validation report; 370 ha (pg11), 468 ha (pg 12) and 347.1 ha (pg 18). The PDD mentions a total planting area of 347.1 ha. The DOE is requested to report which is the correct value of the total project area and how it was validated as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 64(a).</p> <p>Other: -The DOE is requested to upload an unprotected copy of Appendix 1 spreadsheet containing the emission reductions</p>



				and financial calculations as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(e) and EB 51, Annex 58 (Investment Analysis guidance) paragraph 8.
48	4944	Zhangjiakou Qiaodong District Heating Project	SGS	<p>Additionality:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated suitability of the annual operation and maintenance cost to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). All the items of O&M cost need to be validated separately by cross checking with credible third party evidences. In addition, how the assumed annual O&M cost estimated based on ratio of heating areas of existing building and new building can be considered as conservative one.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated suitability of the total investment cost to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In particular : (i) The specific investment cost of proposed activity is 44.6 RMB/m² in VR page 19 whereas it is 86.56RMB/m² in investment analysis working sheet (Cell 56, Project Cost). Please clarify; (ii) How the assumed total investment cost of the proposed activity estimated based on ratio of heating areas of existing building and new building can be considered as conservative one ? (iii) Why the existing carpet areas in 2009, 2010 and 2011 are different which are used to estimate investment cost, operation cost and fuel expenditures for the baseline alternatives ? Why the existing carpet area in 2009 can not be used for whole period of investment analysis ? (iv) How "Investment Estimation Guidelines of Municipal Work " and " Code of Construction of Urban heating plants", which are used for cross checking of total investment cost, can be considered as a credible third party evidence given that it is not clear whether estimation in the updated PDR is based on the same document or not. (v) Why investment cost for the baseline scenario is considered as zero.</p>
				<p>Additionality:</p> <p>The DOE is requested to provide information on how the distinctive differences between the project activity and the similar projects identified in the selected scope are justified as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (c).The PP/DOE shall provide further information on how district heating projects (newly constructed HOB) in Langfang City and Xintai City are essentially distinct than the proposed activity.</p> <p>Baseline methodology:</p> <p>The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the calculation of ex-ante emission reductions (with actual data and equations) as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). In particular : (i) the PP shall document measurement procedures, results and manufactures' information transparently in the PDD regarding determination of efficiency of the heat supply system that would have been used in the absence of the project as required by the methodology. Please provide calculation sheet for efficiency determination and sample size determination; and (ii) how the annual heat supplied to the existing building, which is used to estimate investment cost and O&M cost, have been validated.</p>



49	4954	Geothermal District Heating Project in Xianyang City, Shaanxi Province	KFQ	<p>Additionality: The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 111 (b) and paragraph 114 (a). In doing so, the DOE should provide further details (e.g. dates, nature) of the sources of evidence used to cross-check the heating fee, hot water cost, natural gas cost, labor cost, electricity cost, tax on natural resources and tax on ground water. The DOE should also further clarify the nature of the "Audited Financial Statements" used to cross-check the suitability of the hot water cost, total investment, project water cost, SGE expenses and interest rate on loan.</p>
50	4955	Dak Me 1 Hydropower Project in Vietnam	DNV	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). (i) The Validation Report (page 18) states that: "The input parameters used in the financial analysis were compared with the data reported for other similar small-scale hydropower CDM projects in Viet Nam comparing the investment costs per MW, electricity tariff, percentage of O&M costs relative to total investment costs". However the Validation Report does not report the verified values of the projects used for the comparison. (ii) A yearly escalation in the O&M costs has been applied in the spreadsheet submitted, however the Validation Report does not present information on the validation of this input value used.</p> <p>DOE related issue: -The DOE is requested to include appointment certificate or CV of each validation team member as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 174 (g). Page 11 of the Validation Report states that the qualification of each individual validation team member is detailed in Appendix C, however Appendix C cannot be found.</p> <p>DOE related issue: -The DOE is requested to resolve all CARs and CLs raised as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 37. As per the Validation Report page 9, Table 3 of the validation protocol describes any changes made to this version of the PDD as a result of CARs and CLs raised by DNV. However CARs, CLs and potential FARs have not been reported as there is no Table 3 in the Validation Protocol. Please submit a complete Validation Report.</p>
51	4958	Samra 300 MW combined cycle project	DNV	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a): (a) The VR lacks information on how the DOE has validated and crosschecked the total project costs and the O&M costs of the single cycle and combined cycle power plants in line with the VVM paragraph 111 a to c; (b) The DOE has not provided its opinion with regards to the availability of the following input values at the time of the investment decision in line with the EB62 Annex 5 paragraph 6: (i) The total project costs; (ii) the O&M costs; (iii) the escalation of the O&M costs; (c) The VR has not provided information on whether the actual payable tax has been taken into account in the calculation of income tax, in line with the EB62 Annex 5 paragraph 11</p>



				<p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a). The VR lacks information on how the DOE has validated the emission factor for upstream fugitive methane emissions of natural gas from production, transportation and distribution (EFNG,upstream,CH4).</p> <p>Monitoring methodology: -The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b). Monitoring parameters - NCV of the diesel oil, and annual quantity of natural gas consumed in project activity (FCf,y) at the project end, have not been included in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>DOE related issue: -The DOE is requested to identify if the PDD has been updated and rectified according to the responses to the CARs, CLs and or FARs raised during validation as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 39. CL12 indicates that the benchmark was derived from the average interest rates during year 2001-2005, which equals to 10%. However, the PDD mentions that the benchmark was as per year 2001-2003 which equals to 10.4%.</p>
52	4959	16.875 MW Large Scale Grid Connected Wind Electricity Generation Project by Indian Renewable Energy Foundation	BVCH	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to report how it has validated common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (b,c,d). In particular, the DOE should substantiate (a) the period selected for the assessment and how the policy changes have impacted the investment scenario and (b) why information on project activities lower than 15 MW were not taken into consideration, considering the project activity is 16.875 MW.</p>
53	4961	Zhoutian 10.5MW Hydropower Project	CEC	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the Plant Load Factor (PLF); this report shall include the value, source, etc. of the PLF. In doing so, please refer to EB 48, Annex 11,paragraphs 3.a and 3.b.</p>



54	4966	Waste Energy Recovery Project at PEMEX TMDB	TÜV Nord	<p>Baseline methodology: -The PP/DOE are requested to complete all the PDD sections for the description of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). Please ensure that the system diagram on page 7 of the PDD is presented correctly and completely.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to describe whether the assumptions and data used for the baseline identification are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87 (c). The DOE shall further explain how it has validated the baseline alternative H5 (existing or new renewable energy or other waste energy based boilers) and H7 (other heat generation technologies). Please provide detailed information.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91. It is not clear how the appropriateness and conservativeness of the parameter QOE,BL(output energy that can be theoretically produced) has been validated. Please provide the information on: (i) the total energy demand and specific energy consumption of de-watering and de-salting process; (ii) the quantity and energy content of the waste energy produced for the rated capacity/per unit of electricity produced of each electricity generator (captive power plant); (iii) the energy balance of the captive power generators; and (iv) the historical power generation of the captive power generators.</p>
55	4968	Hubei Dangyang 25MW Biomass Power Project	DNV	<p>Baseline methodology: -The PDD and validation report indicate that the turbine and generator installed, as part of the proposed activity, are second hand equipment. Therefore, the DOE should include in the validation report an assessment on how it has validated that the proposed project activity is in line with the following applicability condition of the methodology ACM0018 v1.2 guidance : "The installation of new biomass residues (co-)fired power-only plants, which replace or are operated next to existing power-only plants fired with fossil fuels and/or biomass residues (power capacity expansion projects)"</p>
56	4970	(r) Dak Mi 4 Hydropower Project, Vietnam	SQS	<p>Additionality: -The PP/DOE are requested to present the sensitivity analysis of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). The PP/DOE should subject the tariff to reasonable variation, as it is a variable which constitutes more than 20% of the total project revenues in the investment analysis presented.</p>
57	4974	Song Tranh 3 Hydropower Project	DNV	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated sensitivity analysis of the investment analysis as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 111 (e). In doing so please provide information justifying why the O&M costs were omitted from the sensitivity analysis.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b). In doing so please clarify the: i) beta value used to calculate the risk-free rate as the VR (page 17) mentions that the minimum re-levered beta value was used while the PDD (Table 5) shows that the average re-levered</p>



				<p>value of 1.71 was applied and ii) information provided on market return, Rm, (validation report page 17) mentions that "the investment capital of project sponsor (equity) in the project must be accounted for at least 30%" and this appears to be inconsistent with the PDD (page 14) which indicates that the market return is determined based on historical data from stock returns.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed the existence of the similar projects for common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (b) considering that PDD (page 18) mentions that before 2001 only state-owned entities were allowed to invest in and generate electricity while the VR (page 21) shows that Independent Power Producers (IPPs) were also involved.</p>
58	4975	CEMEX Panama: Bayano cement plant Alternative fuels project	TÜV Nord	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In doing so, the DOE shall validate how investment cost applied in the investment analysis has been cross checked in line with VVM v1.2, para. 111 (b).</p> <p>Additionality: -The DOE mentioned "no barrier analysis was used to demonstrate additionality" in validation report, page 60, while barrier analysis has been validated in the rest parts of the validation report. The DOE shall clarify the inconsistency.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to describe whether the assumptions and data used for the baseline identification are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87 (c), in particular, evidences used for F3: burning fossil fuel with different fuel mixture. In doing so, the DOE shall report the data vintage of coal price, and further explain why the coal price is deemed higher than petcoke price considering a new kiln fueled by coal will be built by PP in the project site.</p>
59	4977	Coke Dry Quenching Waste Heat Recovery for 50MW Power Generation Project in Guangxi Liuzhou Iron and Steel (Group) Company	SGS	<p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76. It is not clear how the DOE has validated the use of waste energy in absence of CDM project activity as per the paragraph ""Demonstration of use of waste energy in absence of CDM project activity"" of ACM0012 v3 (page 4 & 5) given that the site visit was performed on 30/11/2010-01/12/2010 which is dated after the start date of the project activity (30/05/2008)."</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to describe whether the assumptions and data used for the baseline identification are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87 (c). The DOE shall further explain on how it has validated the baseline alternative W3 (waste energy is sold as an energy source) and P5(existing or new other waste energy based existing captive or identified plant). Please provide detailed information."</p>



				<p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to state if the methodology provides different options for equations and parameters and if the selection is appropriate as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 90. The DOE shall further explain the suitability of the Case 1 of method-3 to determine the fcap as per ACM0012 v3 (page 26) given that it appears there is an intermediate energy recovery equipment using an intermediate source (water/steam) for the waste energy recovery.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91. It is not clear how the suitability and conservativeness of the parameter QOE,BL(output energy that can be theoretically produced) has been validated. Please provide the information on: (i) the total energy demand of the industry facilities; (ii) the quantity and energy content of the waste energy produced for the rated capacity/per unit of product produced in the coke plant; and (iii) the energy balance of the relevant sections of the plant.</p>
60	4978	Huaneng Inner Mongolia Wuchuan Heishatu Wind Farm Project	SGS	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In particular : (i) the depreciation period and depreciation rate; (ii) interest on short term loan, (iii) equipment input tax reimbursement and (iv) half VAT reimbursement (please provide detail information on calculation)</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to provide local and sectoral expertise on the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 113 (c). The DOE is requested to clarify why similar CDM projects from West Inner Mongolia Region only selected to cross check the input values given that the geographical scope for common practice analysis was set as Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region.</p>
61	4982	Guodian Ningxia Pingluo 10MWp Solar Photovoltaic Power Project	TÜV Nord	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In particular : (i) rate of residual value; (ii) depreciation period; (iii) amortization period; (iv) debt equity ratio;(v) formation rate for fixed assets and (vi) annual O&M cost (individual items of annual O&M cost shall be validated separately and clarify how "Interim Rule on Economic Assessment of Electric Engineering Retrofit Projects" and "Economic Evaluation Methods and Parameters for Construction Project" are applicable to this kind of project).</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b). It appears that the chosen benchmark is equity IRR with tax (page 105, Validation Report) whereas the chosen financial indicator of the proposed project is project IRR after tax. Please clarify.</p> <p>Other: -The DOE is requested to address the changes made to the project design since the global stakeholder consultation was conducted as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 173(c).</p>



				The DOE is requested to list major changes made between final version of PDD and PDD version published for global stakeholder consultation.
62	4984	Fujian Changle Wushan Wind Power Project	BVCH	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to report how it has validated common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (b). In particular, the DOE should substantiate why information on project activities lower than 15 MW were not taken into consideration in the common practice analysis.</p>
63	4988	El General Hydroelectric Project	TÜV Nord	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a). The DOE shall further explain how it has validated the project starting date given that there appears to be some earlier real actions before 26/01/2004(EPC contract), e.g. the supply contract “Oferta Vatech Equipos”(18/03/2002), the agreement with Owbow Power Co. (December 2002, page 118 of validation report), engineering contract HDG_GBEL (2001).</p> <p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). (i). The DOE shall further explain the availability and validity of each input value (both for the investment analysis and benchmark determination) at the time of investment decision. (ii). Please provide the information on the time when the source of input value "annual power generation" (EGHP Hydrology study calculation spreadsheet “Generation EGHP”) was available. (iii). The DOE shall further substantiate the suitability of total investment given that only the 70% of the total project investment costs.</p>
64	4989	Gansu Guazhou East Beidaqiao Wind Power Phase II Project	TÜV Nord	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In particular, the DOE shall provide a further validation opinion on the total Investment, loan Interest during construction period, long term loan, equity debt ratio, main equipment value and deductible VAT for main equipment.</p> <p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed the existence of the similar projects for common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (b). In doing so the DOE shall: a) clearly report the sources of evidence used to confirm the common practice analysis, b) provide the list of similar activities identified (including names and characteristics), and c) further explain why projects with installed capacity of less than 15MW were excluded from the analysis in line with the additionality tool.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91. The DOE should transparently report the value assumed for the ex-ante grid emission factor and explain how such factor was determined in line with the “Tool to calculate the emission</p>



				factor for an electricity system” (including the data vintage used, methodological choices, etc)
65	5027	Zhejiang Jiaying Ultra-supercritical Power Generation Project	CEC	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to confirm the accuracy of the financial calculations carried out for the investment analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (c). The VR lacks information on how the DOE validated that the baseline alternative is available to the PP in the case of investment comparison analysis, as requested by ACM0013 page 5.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to describe whether the assumptions and data used for the baseline identification are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87 (c). The VR lacks information on: (a) the 'other cost' for alternative A1 and A2; (b) how the DOE has crosschecked input to the alternative A2 values In line with the VVM version 01.2 paragraph 111 b and c, in particular: material cost, desulphurization cost, denitration cost, overhaul cost rate, number of employees, other cost and coal consumption rate.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a). (a) The VR lacks information on how gross coal consumption rate (299 gce/kWh) and plant consumption rate (5.20%) have been validated in line with the VVM version 01.2 paragraph 91. (b) The list of the plants identified in Steps 3 and 5, as well as relevant data on the fuel consumption and electricity generation of all identified power plants, have not been documented as required by the ACM0013 v04 page 9"</p>
66	5036	Jilin Taonan Xinli 49.5MW Wind Power Project	TÜV SÜD	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In doing so please provide details (project number, capacity and the corresponding O&M costs and PLF values) of the project activities with which the proposed project activity was compared to.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b). In doing so please clarify the applicable benchmark as the validation report (page 16) mentions that the applicable benchmark for the project activity is 8% while page 20 (VR) indicates 10%.</p> <p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the scope of the common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (a) as there appears to be some inconsistency in PDD (page 18) which shows that the project is located in Liaoning Province while the project description (PDD page 2) indicates that the project is located in Jilin province.</p>



67	5040	7.5 MW Biomass Based Power Plant	BVCH	<p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a). The VR lacks information on how the DOE validated the selected start date being the earliest date at which either the implementation or construction or real action of a project activity begins. The date of the Purchase Order of major equipment is missing.</p> <p>Additionality: -The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). (a) The VR has not provided information on how the following input values have been validated in line with the VVM version 01.2 paragraph 111b: (i) Specific Energy Consumption (16001.05 MJ/MWh) for both coal and biomass; (ii) NCV of biomass and NCV of coal; (iii) the annual coal price escalation indicated in the spreadsheet; and (b)The VR lacks information on how the input values sourced from DPR were applicable at the time of the investment decision in line with EB51 Annex 55 paragraph 6, given that there is no information with regards to the completion of the DPR.</p> <p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to state if all the documents/data used in the PDD for the emission reduction calculations are correctly quoted and interpreted in the PDD as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(b). The VR lacks information on how the DOE has validated the leakage from transportation of raw material and biomass being likely to be smaller than 10%.</p>
68	5058	Duolangqu First and Second Cascade Bundled Project in Wensu County, Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region, China	JCI	<p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to include description of the process taken to validate the accuracy and completeness of the project description in VR as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 64(a). In particular, the DOE is requested to explain how the total installed capacity of each project in the bundle was validated as $2 \times 3.4 \text{ MW} = 6.8 \text{ MW}$, while the PDD indicates (page 4) that the rated capacity of each turbine in the bundle is 3.579MW instead of 3.4 MW.</p>
69	5079	Numundo POME methane capture project	TUEV Rheinland	<p>Baseline methodology: -The DOE is requested to provide a validation opinion on the compliance of the project activity with paragraphs 18 and 19 of the methodology, AMS III.H version 15, in particular, why historical data of at least one year was not available for determining ex-ante baseline emissions.</p>



70	5087	<p>GHG abatement project through wind based energy generation, in Kutch, Gujarat</p>	<p>RINA</p>	<p>Additionality:</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b). In particular : (i) Please report how the suitability of the vintage of data selected for the market risk premium and beta that determine the WACC has been assessed given that shorter period of 8.5-8.9 years (April 1999 to Sep 2007 and April 1999 to Feb 2008) and about 3 yrs (Oct 2004 to Sep 2007 and March 2005 to Feb 2008) are selected for market return and beta value respectively which are not consistent with vintage years used for estimating the technical life of the project (20 yrs); (ii) Please provide information on key parameters of the government bond including the time of maturity; (iii) Please report how the beta value (determined based on power companies) corresponds to the risk profile of the proposed activity given that it appears that the PP is not a power company and the produced electricity is used for captive use in manufacturing units of the PP.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to confirm the accuracy of the financial calculations carried out for the investment analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (c).In particular, please report in detail tax calculation steps with reference to applicable host country tax regulations.</p> <p>-The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a).In particular : (i) book depreciation rate; (ii) machine availability; (iii) transmission and distribution loss; and (iv) total loan amount given that there is inconsistency in reported loan amount in financial calculation spreadsheet (1260 million INR for Phase 1 and 1260 million INR for Phase 2) and validation report, page 31 (1300 million INR for loan 1 and 650 million INR for loan 2).</p> <p>-The PP/DOE are requested to present the sensitivity analysis of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). Please report sensitivity analysis in B.5.section of the PDD including all the parameters that contribute to 20% of cost and revenue such as electricity tariff and annual O&M cost.</p> <p>Monitoring methodology:</p> <p>-The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the monitoring plan as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a). In particular : (i) please provide line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points and connection point to the grid; and (ii) please indicate in QA/QC procedures for parameter EG PJ.y (quantity of net electricity supplied by the project to the grid) under B.7.1. section of the PDD that electricity measurement will be crosschecked with the records for sold electricity .</p>
----	------	---	--------------------	---



Table 3

Issuance		Stage 1: Completeness Check			
#	PA	Project title	Monitoring period (MM/DD/YY)	DOE	Reasons
1	2893	Yunnan Yingjiang Mengyong River 1st Level Hydropower Station	04/12/09 - 10/03/11	CQC	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: The Verification Report refers to the Monitoring Report V2, dated 02/05/11. Please note that the date of the submitted Monitoring Report is 03/05/11. Kindly revise this inconsistency throughout the Verification Report. Scope: The submitted documentation are dated prior to the date of request for issuance submission. Issue: The date provided in the Certification Report (01/10/2007) is dated prior to the finalization of the Verification Report. Kindly address this inconsistency by providing a valid date in the Certification Report document for this and future submissions for request for issuance
2	2554	Doña Juana landfill gas-to-energy project	16/12/09 - 25/05/10	DNV	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(b) a spreadsheet containing emission reduction calculation must be submitted with a request for issuance. Issue: The CER calculation sheet contained in the zip files could not be opened and should be submitted as a simple Excel calculation sheet. Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(b) the submitted spreadsheet must be submitted in an assessable unprotected format. Issue: 1. The CER calculation sheet contained in the zip files could not be opened and should be submitted as a simple Excel calculation sheet
3	2667	Biogas Project, Olmeca III, Tecún Uman	23/11/09 - 30/10/10	ICONTEC	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(b) the submitted spreadsheet must be submitted in an assessable unprotected format. Issue: However, the submitted spreadsheets are not assessable. (CER Calculation spreadsheet, Illustration of logfile consolidation SD_01 Olmeca 2009-11 to 2010-11 - Full raw, SD_02 Olmeca 2009-11 to 2010-11 - server export)
4	0796	12MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Tenkasi, Tamilnadu	15/12/07 - 15/12/09	TÜV Nord	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: The submitted Verification report refers to several versions of the final Monitoring Report (page 2/Version 3, pages 20, 21, /Version 2 dated 25/05/10. This is not in consistency with the submitted Monitoring Report: Version 04 from 24/05/11. Kindly ensure consistency throughout the Verification Report.
5	1164	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-29, Sao Paulo, Brazil	01/02/08 - 31/03/10	DNV	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e),cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: The signed form for Request for Issuance corresponds to Project 1154, instead of project 1164. Kindly revise the reference number and title of the project activity. Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents must be correct and accurate. Issue: The number of CERs included in the signed form does not correpond to the number of CERs shown in the project viewpage (13,891 CERs).



6	0765	Catalytic N ₂ O destruction project in the tail gas of three Nitric Acid Plants at Hu-Chems Fine Chemical Corp.	01/01/11 - 31/03/11	DNV	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance. Issue: No revised Monitoring Report was submitted along with this request for issuance. Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: No revised Monitoring Report was submitted along with this request for issuance. Therefore, there is no information available regarding version and date of the revised Monitoring Report.
7	0728	Eurus Wind Farm	01/10/10 - 31/12/10	TÜV Nord	Scope: The submitted documentation are dated prior to the date of request for issuance submission. Issue: The date provided in the Certification Statement (20/11/10) and in the Verification Opinion page 27, (20/11/10) is prior to the finalization of the Verification Report, Monitoring Report and submitted signed form. Kindly address this inconsistency.
8	1899	Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment, Project AIN07-W-01, Sumatera Utara (North Sumatera), Indonesia	03/12/08 - 28/02/10	SIRIM	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(b) the submitted spreadsheet must be submitted in an assessable unprotected format. Issue: The file "ER spreadsheet_public-resubmission" is not an excel spreadsheet. Please provide an excel file with the CER calculation. The file "Detail ER_spreadsheet_confidential-resubmission" cannot be opened. Please provide an excel spreadsheet. Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68, paragraph 7(b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. Issue: The full project title is
9	1234	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-23, Mato Grosso and Goias, Brazil	04/02/08 - 31/05/10	DNV	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents must be correct and accurate. Issue: The amount of Total Project Activity Direct Emissions in the Excel Spreadsheet "1234-MONITORING REPORT TABLES" is inconsistent with the amount of ERs claimed in the Monitoring Report in pages 19 and 20.
10	2924	Ningxia Federal Solar Cooker Project	12/02/10 - 31/10/10	TUEV Rheinland	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document is correct and accurate. Issue: The date of the PDD, version 19, is not displayed correctly on the Certification statement (12-2-10 instead of 12-12-09). In the verification opinion of the Verification Report (page 3) it is stated once correctly and once incorrectly (2-12-09).
11	1481	Liuzhou Chemical Industry Co., LTD N ₂ O Abatement Project	05/06/08 - 30/09/08	DNV	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: The Certification Statement states: " In DNV's opinion the GHG emissions reductions of the "Liuzhou Chemical Industry Co., LTD N ₂ O Abatement Project" in China (UNFCCC Registration Reference No.1481) for the period 5 June 2008 to 30 September 2008 are fairly stated in the monitoring report (version2.0) dated 11 April 2011." However, the monitoring report submitted with this request for issuance is version 2.1 dated on 27 May 2011.
12	0752	Omnia Fertilizer Limited Nitrous Oxide (N ₂ O) Reduction Project	01/02/09 - 31-05-09	TÜV Nord	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: The version of the monitoring report described in the verification report on page 2 (version 2.1 from 14/06/2011) is not consistent with the version of the monitoring report itself (version 2.3 28/06/11). Kindly



CDM – Executive Board

					address this inconsistency throughout the verification and/or certification report.
13	2444	ADFEC 10 MW Solar Power Plant.	08/08/09 - 01/07/10	TÜV Nord	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: The verifier confirms on page 2 of the VR that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied approved CDM methodology ,i.e. . And so is stated throughout the documentation. However, page 32 of the VR, item 5.5. Compliance with the monitoring methodology states that the monitoring system is in compliance with the applied methodology AMS I.D (version 10): Grid Connected Renewable Electricity Generation, which is inconsistent with the registered version of the methodology AMS I.D. version 13
14	1373	Beijing No.3 Thermal Power Plant Gas-Steam Combined Cycle Project Using Natural Gas	01/12/09 - 31/03/10	TÜV Nord	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document is correct and accurate. Issue: The revised PDD refers to the version 6.2 dated 15/02/11 which was approved on 17/09/10. However, pages 10 and 39 refer to a different version and approval date the revised PDD. Kindly address these inconsistencies throughout the verification opinion.
15	1473	10 MW biomass based power generation project at Wani, Yavatmal by Shalivahana Projects Limited	01/10/09 - 30/09/10	TÜV Nord	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68, paragraph 7(b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. Issue: The crediting period of project activity 1473 is from 25 Feb 08 to 24 Feb 18 (Fixed), however page 49 of the verification report is shown as 25 Feb 08 - 24 Feb 17 (Fixed)
16	2527	Co-composting of EFB and POME project	18/07/09 - 31/07/10	ICONTEC	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents must be correct and accurate. Issue: The spreadsheet indicates the claimed CERs for this monitoring period to be 12,578. However, the Request for Issuance form, the Monitoring Report, Certification and Verification Report indicate 13,396 tonnes of CO2 equivalent. Further, the amount of ER for the month of December 2009 in the spreadsheet table and the table in the Monitoring Report is different.
17	1938	Guangxi Youjiang Naji Navigation and Power Generation Project	01/04/10 - 31/12/10	TÜV Nord	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, in the submitted Verification report, on pages 2 and 35 the version of the Final Monitoring report is indicated in several status (vers. 1, vers. 4.) This is not in consistency with the version and date of the submitted Monitoring Report (vers. 5, 24/5/11).
18	2426	El Platanal Hydropower Plant	01/02/10 - 31/01/11	AENOR	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document is correct and accurate. Issue: The version of registered PDD is given under references in the Verification Report, stating PDD registered version 7 . However, the registered PDD is version 04, dated 13/09/2009.



CDM – Executive Board

19	1126	7.5 MW biomass plants using agricultural waste Limited	03/09/07 - 30/09/09	DNV	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: In the certification statement on page 18 of the Verification/Certification Report the date of the monitoring report version 02 is once wrongly mentioned as 18 February 2011 and once correctly as 2 May 2011. The same applies for the list of CARs, where CAR 3 mentions date 2 May 2011 for v. 2 of the monitoring report and CAR 4 mentions date 18 February 2011.
20	1535	Changwa 10 MW Small-scale Hydro Project	09/07/08 - 31/08/09	TUEV Rheinland	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents must be correct and accurate. Issue: The Monitoring Report version 01.1 dated 13/05/11 refers to the amount of 26,436 CERs. However, this request for issuance is for 26,437 CERs. Kindly revise this information and consistency in pages 2, 10, 11 and throughout the Monitoring Report. The Certification Report refers to the amount of 26,436 CERs. This request for issuance is for 26,437 CERs. The Verification Report refers to the amount of 26,436 CERs. This request for issuance is for 26,437 CERs. Kindly revise this information and consistency in pages 2 and 21, and throughout the Verification Report. The calculation table "ER-calculation (#1535, 1stMP)" refers to the amount of 26,436 CERs, However, this request for issuance refers to the amount of 26,437 CERs. Kindly address these inconsistencies in the submitted documentation.
21	2893	Yunnan Yingjiang Mengyong River 1st Level Hydropower Station	04/12/09 - 10/03/11	CQC	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(f), the monitoring period throughout the documentation must be consistent. Issue: Summary of the verification opinion in the Verification report states that CQC confirms the reporting period from Reporting 04/12/2010 to 10/03/2011. The monitoring report for this request for issuance is 04/12/2009 to 10/03/2011.
22	1140	MSPPL WHR based power project at Chattisgarh, India	19/10/07 - 31/07/09	SGS	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document is correct and accurate. Issue: The registered PDD version 1.2 is dated 22/06/07. However, the certification and verification reports, pages 26 and 27 refer to the date of the registered PDD as of 17/08/07.
23	2834	Mokpo Landfill Gas Recovery Project for Electricity Generation	18/02/10 - 17/08/10	KFQ	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: Item 4, page 25 in the Verification report - The Verification Statement and Certification Report - refer to Monitoring Report Version 06 dated 18 April 2011. Certification report must confirm the verification of final Monitoring Report, in this case Version 07, dated 30/06/2011.
24	2347	150 MW grid connected Wind Power based electricity generation project in Gujarat, India	18/06/09 - 24/02/10	TÜV Nord	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents must be correct and accurate. Issue: However, the monitoring report, certification, verification reports and excel spreadsheet indicate the number of 185,275 CERs. Please note that according to the web interface and signed form, this request for issuance was submitted for 185,425 CERs.
25	2104	Baishuiquan Hydropower Project, Guizhou Province, China	08/05/09 - 25/03/10	CEC	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents must be correct and accurate. Issue: The verification, certification, monitoring report and excel spreadsheet documents refer to 32367 CERs.



CDM – Executive Board

					However, this request for issuance is for 36327 CERs. Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document is correct and accurate. Issue: The registered PDD, version 7.0 is dated 5 March 2009. The verification report, page 22, refers to PDD version 7.0 dated 9 March 2009. Kindly address this inconsistency.
26	1367	China Changniping Hydropower Project	21/08/09 - 25/06/10	TÜV Nord	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document is correct and accurate. Issue: The verification report refers in page 30 to the PDD version 07, dated 05/08/2008. However, the PDD shown in the project view page refers to version 08, dated 30/11/2010.
27	0796	12MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Tenkasi, Tamilnadu	15/12/07 - 15/12/09	TÜV Nord	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68, paragraph 7(b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. Issue: The header of page 2 of the Certification statement refers to "150 MW GRID CONNECTED WIND POWER BASED ELECTRICITY GENERATION PROJECT IN GUJARAT, INDIA" instead although the correct project title is: "12 MW Bundled Wind Power project in Tenkasi, Tamilnadu". Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: Issue: In the submitted CER calculation spreadsheet, reference is made to "version 2 dated 25/05/2010" and not to the most recent version of the Monitoring Report, which is version 4, dated 24/05/2011.
28	1314	Switching of fuel from coal to palm oil mill biomass waste residues at Industrial de Oleaginosas Americanas S.A. (INOLASA)	01/10/09 - 31/08/10	TÜV Nord	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(f), the monitoring period throughout the documentation must be consistent. Issue: The CER Calculation Spreadsheet refers to Monitoring Report version 4.2 dated 12/11/2010. However, the final monitoring report submitted with this request for issuance is version 6, dated 08/07/2011.
29	0543	Nova Sinceridade Small Hydroelectric Power Plant - Brascan Energética Minas Gerais S.A. (BEMG) Project Activity	01/01/10 - 31/12/10	BVCH	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: In the verification report and in the certification report, reference is made to Project Monitoring Report version 04, although the version submitted is version 03.
30	1835	Jradzor Small Hydroelectric CDM project	10/07/09 - 10/07/10	BVCH	Scope: The submitted documents should be dated according to the logical sign-off sequence. Issue: The Verification Report, page 1 shows that the date of the revision of this VR is 25/07/2010 and this is prior to the Monitoring Report, which is dated 09/05/2011.
31	2157	Gansu Kababanjiu 12.6MW Small Hydropower Project, China	01/01/10 - 25/05/11	Applus	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(d) a certification report must be submitted with a request for issuance. Issue: Certification report has not been submitted, Monitoring Report version 2 has been uploaded instead.
32	0837	Kaifeng Jinkai N2O Abatement Project	01/10/09 - 30/09/10	TÜV SÜD	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68, paragraph 9(d) all documents must be in English or contain a full translation of relevant sections into English, in cases where DOE considers the provision of the original document to be necessary for the purposes of transparency. Issue: The spreadsheet contains a table with Chinese titles. Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: The verification report refers to the wrong monitoring report (version 10 instead of version 11).



CDM – Executive Board

33	2309	Shaanxi Xinghua N2O Abatement Project	15/05/10 - 15/10/10	TÜV SÜD	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(f), the monitoring period throughout the documentation must be consistent. Issue: The monitoring period is from 12 May 2010 to 15 October 2010. However, the following documents refer to the wrong monitoring period dates: Enclosure spreadsheet (Cell B18), Enclosure 1 spreadsheet (Cell B18) and Enclosure 2 spreadsheet (Cell B19) where 24/10/2009 to 11/05/2010 was referred to.
34	0277	12.3 MW wind energy project in Tamil Nadu, India	01/05/06 - 30-06-08	DNV	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(b) a spreadsheet containing emission reduction calculation must be submitted with a request for issuance. Issue: The monitoring period runs from 01/05/2006 to 30/06/2008; however, the worksheets of the CER calculation spreadsheet, including the summary worksheet, only cover the period 01/06/2006 (some worksheets start even later) to 30/06/2008. Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(f), the monitoring period throughout the documentation must be consistent. Issue: In all documents, including in the title line of the summary worksheet of the CER calculation spreadsheet, the stated monitoring period is 01/05/2006 to 30/06/2005; however, the actual monitoring period covered in the worksheets only starts on 01/06/2006 (or later for some of the worksheets). The same applies to the baseline emissions calculation table in section E.1 of the MR.
35	1268	Tungabhadra wind power project in Karnataka	27/10/08 - 30/11/09	TÜV Nord	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: The verification report refers to the monitoring report version 5 dated 25.07.2011 (page 2) where as version 5 is dated 3.8.2011.
36	3440	Point of Use Abatement Device to Reduce SF6 emissions in LCD Manufacturing Operations in the Republic of Korea (South Korea)	01/01/11 - 30/04/11	TÜV SÜD	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: There appears to be some inconsistency in the applied methodology as the verification report (pages 11 & 26) and the certification report mention ACM0078 while the monitoring report shows AM0078.
37	2359	7.5 MW Bundled Small Hydropower Project in Qiandongnan Autonomous Region, Guizhou Province, P.R. China	21/08/09 - 20/09/10	JACO	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68, paragraph 7(b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. Issue: Monitoring Report section A.7: crediting period dates wrong
38	1757	Offis Textile Ltd. Fuel Switch, Israel	07/04/09 - 31/03/11	TÜV Nord	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate. Issue: The verification report refers to the wrong monitoring report (version 1 dated 15.04.2011 instead of version 3 dated 4.8.2011) on page 2.
39	2203	Hubei Maduhe Hydro Project	11/01/10 - 31/01/11	BVCH	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents must be correct and accurate. Issue: However, the monitoring report, certification, verification reports and CER Calculation spreadsheet indicate the number of 36,296 CERs. Please note that according to the web interface and signed form, this request for issuance was submitted for 39,296 CERs.

Table 4

Issuance		Stage 2: Information and Reporting Check			
#	PA	Project title	Monitoring period (MM/DD/YY)	DOE	Reasons
1	0249	Biomass Energy Plant-Lumut	01/01/10 - 31/12/10	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>Issue: the meter S.N. 2051632 was calibrated on 29 June 2009 and the calibration of first meter was due on 29 June 2010, but the meter was continuously used without calibration until 1 September 2010 when it was replaced by a second meter (S.N.:2003-2033596 was calibrated on 10 July 2010 and valid till 10 July 2011.T). As stated by the DOE, a maximum deduction of 4% was applied to the throughout the entire monitoring period (01/01/10-31/12/10). EB52 - Annex 60 paragraph 4 requires "a) Applying the maximum permissible error of the instruments to the measured values, if the results of the delayed calibration do not show any errors in the measuring equipment, or if the error is smaller than the maximum permissible error; or b) Applying the error identified in the delayed calibration test, if the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the measuring equipment"</p> <p>However, the results of the delayed calibration were not provided in the report.</p>
2	0008	Brazil Novagerar Landfill Gas to Energy Project	01/01/09 - 31/12/09	AENOR	<p>Scope 1: 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>Issue 1: The temperature of flare is not reported in the monitoring report and/or spreadsheet at the interval required by the monitoring plan.</p> <p>Scope 2: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan and clearly state how the DOE verified the information flow (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting) for these parameters including the values in the monitoring reports (VVM 1.2. para 206).</p> <p>Issue 2: The verification report does not contain how the DOE verified that the temperature of flare was verified at the interval required by the monitoring plan.</p>
3	0461	Pronaca: Valentina-San Javier Swine Waste Management	01/10/08 - 30/04/10	TÜV-SÜD	<p>SCOPE I: 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>ISSUE: The Monitoring Report only provided the calibration dates of the weighing scales without explaining whether the calibration frequency is in accordance with the requirements from paragraph 8 from EB52/Annex 60. Additionally, the response of CAR 3 in the Verification Report states that delays on calibration were "addressed according to EB Guidelines and this is reflected both in the calculation tool and in the MR", however the monitoring report does not identify which meter had a delayed calibration and whether the requirements from paragraphs 4 or 6 from EB52/Annex 60 were correctly followed.</p> <p>SCOPE II: The verification report does not contain information on how the DOE verified the calibration of</p>



					<p>monitored equipments with the calibration requirements (EB52/Annex 60 para (8) as per VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii))</p> <p>ISSUE: The DOE closed-out CAR 3 stating that “The correction has been done for all the period where the calibration was delayed”, however it is not clear which instrument had a delayed calibration and whether the requirements from paragraphs 4 and 6 from EB52/Annex 60 were complied.</p>
4	0673	Darajat Unit III Geothermal Project	01/08/09-31/10/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b))</p> <p>Issue: Please exclude the data after 24:00 31 October 2010 as the monitoring period ends at 31 October 2010.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not clearly state how the DOE verified the information flow (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting) for the values in the monitoring report (VVM 1.2 para 206))</p> <p>Issue: Petrol consumption has been accounted in emission reduction calculation. It is however not clear how the petrol (gasoline) consumed in the project has been measured in accordance with the monitoring plan and the methodology.</p> <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>Issue: Only partial information on calibration date and validity has been provided for some of the monitoring equipment including steam flow differential multivariable transmitter (91H411324-815, calibrated on 26/02/09). It is thus not clear how the DOE verified the calibration for some of the monitoring equipments in the whole monitoring period. Please provide in monitoring report and verification report the detailed calibration date of monitoring equipment including the steam flow differential pressure multivariable transmitter, the steam flow pressure multivariable transmitter, steam pressure meter and the two diesel dispensing meters.</p>
5	2175	Xinning County Dalong Small-scale Hydropower Bundled Project	25/04/10 - 24/03/11	TÜV-Nord	<p>SCOPE: The Verification Report does not provide an explanation on the reasons for delays in the implementation and/or does not provide an explanation on the expected implementation date (VVM v.1.2 para 198).</p> <p>ISSUE: The Verification Report acknowledges that by the end of this monitoring period only the 2nd plant was operational and explains that the 1st plant was under construction. However, the reasons for the delay in the construction and the date expected to start the operations of the 1st plant were not provided.</p>
6	2228	Wind power plant No. 1 - Bihn Thuan 30 MW	22/08/09 - 31/0310	BVCH	<p>Scope: The Verification Report does not inform whether all physical features of the project are in place (VVM v.1.2 para 196).</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring and verification reports do not contain information on physical features of the project activity.</p>



7	1664	Mianyang Landfill Gas Utilisation Project	01/10/10 - 24/02/11	CQC	<p>SCOPE I: 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>ISSUE I-I: The "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing Methane" requires the monitoring of "Other flare operation parameters" when the default value is used to determine the flare efficiency, however this parameter was not reported in the monitoring report</p> <p>ISSUE I-II: The "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing Methane" states that temperatures of the exhaust gas above 700°C may indicate that the flare is not being operated adequately. The monitoring report does not contain explanations on how this specification was met.</p> <p>SCOPE II: 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>ISSUE II: The monitoring report provides two different calibration frequencies for the electricity-meters (Section D.2 and Annex D). These frequencies shall be consistent and shall follow the requirements from EB52 - Annex 68, paragraph 8.</p> <p>SCOPE III: The Verification Report does not inform whether all physical features of the project are in place (VVM v.1.2 para 196).</p> <p>ISSUE III: In the previous verification, the DOE raised CL1 regarding the model of the engines installed which are different from the provided in the registered PDD. The PP responded that this was due to a typo mistake and the DOE correctly closed this clarification after assessing the relevant evidences. However, in current the Verification Report, it was confirmed that the models installed are the same as from the registered PDD. The DOE shall confirm again that this difference is due to a typo mistake. The PP shall also correct the monitoring report and explain the reasons for this difference.</p> <p>SCOPE IV: 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) as per VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii))</p> <p>ISSUE IV: The previous calibration dates of the electricity-meters are inconsistent with the dates provided in the monitoring report - 25/07/2009 (Verification Report) and 25/07/2008 (Monitoring Report)</p> <p>SCOPE V: The Verification Report does not provide a conclusion on whether the calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage have been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan and the applied methodology (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c)).</p> <p>ISSUE V: The Verification Report does not have an assessment on how the combustion efficiency of the generators was taken into account when calculating ERs.</p>
8	2092	Wind Electricity Generation Project	31/01/09 - 23/08/10	Tuev Rheinland	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report does not contain the calibration information which covers the whole monitoring period.</p>



9	1036	Khon Kaen Sugar Power Plant	27/07/07 - 31/12/09	TÜV-NORD	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue1: The monitoring report does not contain the parameter “Moisture content of the biomass residues”, which is required to be monitored by the applied methodology for each biomass residue type k combusted by the project.</p> <p>Issue2: The monitoring report does not contain the parameter “Average CO2 emission factor for the trucks during the year y” monitored at least annually as required by the applied methodology, but considers it as fixed parameter not to be monitored during the monitoring period, which is not in line with the requirement of the applied methodology.</p> <p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report does not contain QA/QC procedures employed by the project for cross-checking: i) the monitored value of biomass combusted (BFy) with an annual energy balance that is based on purchased quantities and stock changes; and ii) the monitored values of net electricity generation (EGprojectplant,y and EGtotal,y) with the quantity of biomass fired to show that the electricity generation divided by the quantity of biomass fired results in a reasonable efficiency as compared with previous year.</p> <p>Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?</p> <p>Issue: The spreadsheet does not contained the values of the parameters: i) Quantity of biomass residue type k combusted in the project plant during the year y (BFy); ii) Moisture content of the biomass residues for each biomass residue type k; and iii) Average CO2 emission factor for the trucks during the year y.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)</p> <p>Issue: The verification report does not clearly state how the DOE verified the information flow for the amount of bagasse combusted in the project activity, considering that the verification report focuses only on ‘outside’ biomass residues transported by truck to the project site, while the registered PDD states that bagasse is transported to the plant by conveyor from the adjacent sugar mill.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))</p> <p>Issue: The Verification Report does not indicate how: i) the monitored value of biomass combusted (BFy) has been cross-checked with an annual energy balance that is based on purchased quantities and stock changes; and ii) the monitored values of net electricity generation (EGprojectplant,y and EGtotal,y) have been cross-checked</p>
---	------	-----------------------------	---------------------	----------	---



					with the quantity of biomass fired to show that the electricity generation divided by the quantity of biomass fired results in a reasonable efficiency as compared with previous year.
10	1909	Kunming Dongjiao Baishuitang LFG Treatment and Power Generation Project	21/11/08 - 31/03/10	RINA	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring plan states that the gas flow monitored will be converted to normalized conditions through the use of pressure and temperature transmitters. The monitoring report provides the calibration of the main and spare flow-meters, but does not provide the calibration dates of the pressure and temperature sensors used.</p> <p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any), and/or emission reductions, including reference to formulae and methods used. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii))</p> <p>Issue: The formulae and values of the “Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane” are not described in the monitoring report</p> <p>Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).</p> <p>Issue: The spreadsheet does not contain formulae for calculating the flare efficiency and ERs based on metered LFG collected and destroyed.</p> <p>Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).</p> <p>Issue: The submitted spreadsheet does not provide explanation in a traceable way with regard the application of formulae.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring plan states that the gas flow monitored will be converted to normalized conditions through the use of pressure and temperature transmitters. The DOE verified the calibration of the main and spare flow-meters, but did not explain how the calibration of the pressure and temperature transmitters were verified.</p>



CDM – Executive Board

11	0798	Zámbiza Landfill Gas Project	01/05/09 - 30/09/10	SGS	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report does not provide the dates and results of the flare efficiency monitoring. It also does not explain whether the flare was operated according with the manufacturer's recommendations, according with the monitoring methodology in case of enclosed flares.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan or monitoring methodology (VVM v.1.2 para 206)</p> <p>Issue: The Verification Report does not provide the dates and results of the flare efficiency monitoring. It also does not explain how the DOE verified that the flare was operated according with the manufacturer's recommendations, according with the monitoring methodology in case of enclosed flares.</p>
12	0528	Shri Bajrang WHR CDM Project	01/05/08 - 31/08/08	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain reference to the approved revised PDD, which resulted from the notification/ request for approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD sought by PP/DOE and approved by the Executive Board. (EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The Validation Opinion for the Notification/Requesting approval of changes from the project activity states that the changes were effective from 13th August 2008 (Page 1). Given that the current Monitoring Period is from 1st May 2008-31st August 2008, please clarify why the notification or approval of changes is not relevant in the current monitoring period.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not contain reference to the approved request for notification/request for approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 198 (d))</p> <p>Issue: The Validation Opinion for the Notification /requesting approval of changes from the project activity stated "that the changes occurred on 13th August 2008, when the 60 TPH AFBC boiler has been commissioned". However the Verification Report states that the changes from PDD effective only from 1st September 2008 and not applicable to this monitoring period. The DOE is requested to clarify the discrepancies in dates (since both the Validation Opinion and the Verification Report is done by the same DOE).</p>
13	1428	Monomeros Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project	25/03/09 - 03/05/09	ICONTEC	<p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: According to the Annex 1 of the monitoring report, the calibration of the N2O analyzer, the stack gas flow meter, the stack pressure meter and the stack temperature meter has been delayed. However the DOE did not provide an assessment of the compliance with the calibration frequency requirements.</p>



14	1154	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-19, Goiás, Brazil	01/02/08 - 31/05/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The verification report does not describe the implementation status of the project. (For project activities that consist of more than one site, the report shall clearly describe the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site. For CDM project activities with phased implementation, the report shall state the progress of the proposed CDM project activity achieved in each phase under verification). (VVM v.1.2 para 198 (a)).</p> <p>Issue: Section 3.2 states that three sites (26352, 26552 and 27032) have not yet completed construction. However, the reasons for delay and the expected implementation dates for those sites were not reported.</p>
15	1134	ESTRE Pedreira Landfill Gas Project (EPLGP)	01/07/08 - 27/08/09	LRQA	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: According with the "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing Methane", the thermocouples used to monitor the temperature in the exhaust gas of the flare should be calibrated or replaced yearly and the Monitoring Report states that the calibration frequency is every 2-years. If the calibration is found to be delayed, guidance from EB52 - Annex 60 shall be followed.</p> <p>Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?</p> <p>Issue: According with the "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing Methane", the project must monitor other flare operating parameters when adopting a 90% default value, however the Spreadsheet does not contain any explanation or check on whether this requirement was met.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)</p> <p>Issue: According with the "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing Methane", the project must monitor other flare operating parameters when adopting a 90% default value, however the Verification Report does not provide an assessment on how this parameter was verified.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: According with the "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing Methane", the thermocouples used to monitor the temperature in the exhaust gas of the flare should be calibrated or replaced yearly and the Verification Report states that the calibration frequency is every 2-years. If the calibration is found to be delayed, guidance from EB52 - Annex 60 shall be followed.</p>



16	0459	<p align="center">Pronaca: Afortunados Swine Waste Management</p>	<p align="center">01/10/08 - 31/12/10</p>	<p align="center">TÜV-SÜD</p>	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The Monitoring Report only provided the calibration dates of the weighing scales without explaining whether the calibration frequency is in accordance with the requirements from paragraph 8 from EB52/Annex 60. Additionally, the response of CAR 4 in the Verification Report states that "in order to be conservative the correction has been done in both directions (adding and subtracting the error of the balances) for project emissions and baseline respectively assuring a conservative approach" and the response from CAR 5 states that "The result of one calibration (even that there was no delay in the calibration) shows that the balance has been adjusted, hence this adjustment has been included in the calculations in a conservative way", but these explanations were not provided in the Monitoring Report.</p> <p>Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).</p> <p>Issue: It can be identified some blue highlighted cells on the sheet "AFT 2008" (columns K-L and S-U), but no explanations were provided on the reasons for "Corrected Plus" and "Corrected Minus" and why the values were added/discounted by 1. The PP may also wish to include the units of the parameters described on row 14 in the "Calculation" sheet.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: The DOE raised CAR 3 and CAR 5, requesting the PP include the calibration frequency according with the manufacturer or national/international requirements and to correct the weights cells due to adjustments done during the calibration and due to delays during calibrations. CAR 3 was addressed by the PP, informing that the calibration frequency is every 6-months (at the project site) and every year (national regulations), however the weigh scale used for animals exiting the farm (SN B 8917890) was calibrated on May/2008 and October/2009 as reported in the Monitoring Report. If the calibration frequency of this scale is found to be delayed, guidance from EB52 - Annex 60 must be applied.</p>
17	1370	<p align="center">Project for the catalytic reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia reactor of the N4 nitric acid plant at Haifa Chemicals Ltd., Israel.</p>	<p align="center">05/11/08- 28/02/10</p>	<p align="center">DNV</p>	<p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: According to the monitoring report (p.45) and to the verification report (p.10 and p.12), the calibration of the instruments labelled N47-FI-5101 and N47-AI-5103 has been delayed. However the DOE did not provide an assessment of the compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for the calibration delay.</p>



18	1198	<p align="center">Co-composting of EFB and POME – MG BioGreen Sdn.Bhd (MGBG)</p>	<p align="center">04/11/07 - 31/01/09</p>	<p align="center">TÜV-SÜD</p>	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).</p> <p>Issue: Annex 1 from the monitoring report lists several instruments used to monitor the project activity. It is identified that different instruments were used to monitor the same parameter, like 3 flow-meters to monitor the quantity of POME and 2 flow-meters used to monitor the quantity of runoff water. However, it is not clear whether those instruments operated at the same time (for example, it is not clear whether the flow-meters SN 05W307496 and 07W306963 operated together with or replaced the meter SN 05W330771).</p> <p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: Annex 1 provides the calibration dates for all monitoring instruments. However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the calibration dates for POME and Run-off Water flow-meters (SNs 05W330771, 05W307496 and 04W022714) were not provided; ii) the monitoring period starts on November/2007, but the monitoring report does not explain whether the calibration of the digital thermometers were conducted prior to the calibration date provided on Annex 1; iii) the monitoring report states that for the instruments with delayed calibration, guidance from EB52 - Annex 60 was applied, but the report does not explain whether the result of the delayed calibration was compared against the maximum permissible error of the instrument, according with paragraphs 4 and 5 <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: i) the DOE raised CAR 2 requesting the calibration of the monitoring instruments. It requested that "Previous calibration for all instruments has to be indicated transparently in the MR, as monitoring period started on 04/11/2007", however previous calibration for digital thermometers were not provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) the DOE closed-out CAR 2 explaining that the PP applied a conservative approach, following the guidance from EB52 - Annex 60, but did not explain whether the maximum errors were compared with the results from the delayed calibration according with paragraphs 4 and 5 from the guidelines.
----	------	---	---	-------------------------------	---



19	2482	Sarbari-I small hydro project of DSL Hydrowatt Limited (DSLHL), Himachal Pradesh, India	27/07/09-25/08/10	SGS	<p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: Errors due to calibration delay for meters including HPB 00259&260 and HPB 00261&262 have been calculated based on 1 year calibration frequency. However there is discrepancy on the calibration frequency of net electricity meter: in the PDD it is every 6 months (p. 19) and in the verification report (including p.43) is 1 year.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring plan (p. 37) requires "Hourly meter readings of the power generated shall be recorded in a log book", however only daily recordings have been referred in the verification report.</p>
20	2307	Federal Intertrade Pengyang Solar Cooker Project	01/05/10 - 31/10/10	TUV Rheinland	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology.</p> <p>Issue: The project participant is requested to provide the daily value of the operating hours of each solar cooker of the sample during the monitoring period as per the monitoring plan in the registered PDD.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)</p> <p>Issue: The DOE is requested to indicate the number of households it visited to assess that all the solar cooker of the project are in place. The DOE is also requested to provide with the rationale behind the number of the visited households to ensure that this number is sufficient.</p>
21	0708	Huaycoloro landfill gas capture and combustion	05/03/08 - 04/03/09	TÜV-SÜD	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report does not provide information regarding the quarterly maintenance and testing of gas analyzers 7374 and GEM 2000 as described in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: It is not clear how the DOE verified the quarterly maintenance and testing of gas analyzers 7374 and GEM 2000 as described in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issues:</p> <p>i. for both meters 7374 and GEM 2000, the assessment regarding the calibration date, the result of the delayed</p>



					<p>calibration, the comparison to the maximum permissible error of the meters and correct application of error as per EB52 are missing in the verification report;</p> <p>ii. the CER sheet does not contain the discount due to delayed calibration of GA 7374 and no explanation is provided by the DOE.</p>
22	2183	Curva de Rodas and La Pradera landfill gas management project	06/02/09 - 30/11/10	SQS	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The calibration/installation dates provided in the monitoring report do not cover the whole monitoring period for the monitoring instruments of TFlare, Pressure and Temperature of the Landfill gas in La Pradera I and La Pradera II (ex Curva de Rodas) Landfills.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)</p> <p>Issue: the verification report does not provide an assessment of the Tflare & Flare Efficiency applied during the monitoring period considering the following indications of the Tool:</p> <p>a) Page 14: An excessively high temperature at the sampling point (above 700 °C) may be an indication that the flare is not being adequately operated or that its capacity is not adequate to the actual flow.</p> <p>b) Page 10: For continuous monitoring of flare efficiency, 0% of flare efficiency is to be used if the temperature of the exhaust gas of the flare (Tflare) is below 500 °C during more than 20 minutes during the hour h. The same is required by the monitoring plan as "If the temperature is less than 500 °C or no temperature records exist, the flare efficiency shall be assumed to be zero".</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>i. Calibration dates of flow meters are inconsistent between monitoring report and verification report.</p> <p>ii. For parameters "Methane fraction in the landfill gas" and "Volumetric fraction of O2 in the exhaust gas of the flare", it is not clear if DOE has confirmed which is the calibration frequency of the instrument required by manufacture and if the same has been followed.</p> <p>iii. The date of calibration/replacement for thermocouple of La Pradera II is inconsistent between the monitoring report and verification report.</p> <p>iv. Additionally the DOE does not indicate how it verified the installation dates of the thermocouples, which are not stated in the monitoring report.</p>



23	1175	<p>9.8 MW Renewable Energy Generation for the grid at South Asian Agro Industries Limited in Raipur District, Chattisgarh</p>	<p>01/02/08 - 31/12/09</p>	<p>DNV</p>	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).</p> <p>Issue: Monitoring points for gross electricity generation, auxiliary electricity consumption, power import (check and main meter), and power export (check and main meter) are not clearly indicated in the line diagrams.</p> <p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: Section D of the Monitoring Report does not contain the parameter “Surplus biomass availability” as per requirements of EB54 Annex34.</p> <p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: With regard to the parameters “Power import” and “Power export”: i) the monitoring report does not specify frequency and validity of calibrations to be conducted as per the industrial standards and procedures of India as specified in the monitoring plan; ii) the monitoring report considers the calibrations of only two energy meters (Serial N. CSE37885 and APM99860), while a total of four meters (2 main meters and 2 check meters) should have been installed and calibrated as per description in section C of the monitoring report.</p> <p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any), and/or emission reductions, including reference to formulae and methods used. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii))</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report does not contain calculation of baseline emissions, project emissions, and emission reductions during the trial operation period from 12 December 2008 to 30 December 2008.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: As specified in the monitoring plan, calibrations of energy meter is to be conducted as per the industrial standards and procedures of India; however, the verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of energy meters is conducted in line with industrial standards and procedures of India.</p>
----	------	--	----------------------------	------------	--



24	1199	<p align="center">9.8 MW Biomass Based Power Plant at Lahari Power & Steels Limited in Champa-Janjgir District, Chattisgarh</p>	<p align="center">03/09/07 - 31/12/09</p>	<p align="center">DNV</p>	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).</p> <p>Issue: Monitoring points for gross electricity generation, auxiliary electricity consumption, power import (main and check meter), and power export (main and check meter) are not clearly indicated in the line diagrams.</p> <p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: Section D of the Monitoring Report does not contain the parameter “Surplus biomass availability” as per requirements of EB54 Annex34.</p> <p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: With regard to the parameters “Power import” and “Power export”: i) the monitoring report does not specify frequency and validity of calibrations to be conducted as per the industrial standards and procedures of India as specified in the monitoring plan; ii) the monitoring report considers the calibrations of only two energy meters (Serial N. CSEE29169 and APM20048), while a total of four meters (2 main meters and 2 check meters) should have been installed and calibrated as per description in section C of the monitoring report.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: As specified in the monitoring plan, calibrations of energy meter is to be conducted as per the industrial standards and procedures of India; however, the verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of energy meters is conducted in line with industrial standards and procedures of India.</p>
25	0889	<p align="center">RIMA Fuel Switch in Bocaiúva</p>	<p align="center">01/12/09 - 28/02/11</p>	<p align="center">DNV</p>	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments used for monitoring the net calorific value of charcoal fines in line with EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: The DOE is requested to further explain how they have verified the compliance of VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a)</p>



					and EB 52 Annex 60 for the period of delay in the calibration of weigh scale to measure the consumption of charcoal fines at the rotary kiln and the output of the dolomite kiln
26	0116	N2O Emission Reduction in Paulínia, SP, Brazil	16/05/11 - 14/06/11	ERM	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report only contains the information about the last calibration dates, which do not cover the whole monitoring period for some monitoring equipment. Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: The verification report only contains the information about the last calibration dates, which do not cover the whole monitoring period for some monitoring equipment.</p>
27	2554	Doña Juana landfill gas-to-energy project	16/12/09 - 25/05/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: Information in the verification report does not match with the calibration information in the monitoring report. The monitoring report contains two different serial numbers for flare thermocouples. (CDV0903107- 02 and CDV0903107-04 in the monitoring report and CDVN° 1006030 and CDVN° 1006031 in Annex 02 of the monitoring report)</p>
28	2621	Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment, Project AIN07-W-05, Sumatera Utara, Indonesia	01/07/10 - 31/03/11	DNV	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?</p> <p>Issue 1: The analysis results and dates of CODuntreated and CODtreated, which were performed on monthly basis as per verification report, are not reported (showed as an average for the whole monitoring period).</p> <p>Issue 2: The values of monitoring parameter CFEww applied during the monitoring period (0%, 50% or 90%) as per monitoring plan are not reported in the excel sheet and no further explanations are provided.</p> <p>Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).</p> <p>Issue 1: The spreadsheet does not allow to track the calculations for some reported parameters (e.g. Biogas Flared adjusted for efficiency, Total Methane destroyed (Tonnes CO2), Project Emission due to Electricity Consumption, Total Methane Produced, etc).</p> <p>Issue 2: The adjustment made to the methane content of biogas measured on March 2011, due to a calibration delay as per EB 52 Annex 60, is not reflected in the CER sheet.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions</p>



					<p>achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))</p> <p>Issue: In Section 3.6, the DOE describes how the calculation of emission reductions were determined in line with the monitoring plan and AMS-III.H v09. However, in section 3.6.2, the DOE describes that emissions due to electricity produced by fossil fuel “(EGfossil fuel) will be assumed to be 100% and the emission factor of the diesel of 0.8 kgCO₂e/kWh and in addition 10% of distribution loss will be used for the project emission calculation.” Nevertheless, the formulae used does not show the addition of 10% in the calculation of EGfossil fuel.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: The verification report does not indicate whether the DOE confirmed if the adjustment applied in the measurement of methane content of biogas due to the calibration delay on March 2011 was based on the delayed calibration result or in the maximum permissible error of the monitoring equipment, as per EB52.</p>
29	0839	Talia Landfill Gas Recovery Project and Electricity Production	01/02/09 - 01/02/10	TÜV-SÜD	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report (Page 40) states that “On 29.10.09 the Hagal gas analyzer Visit 4, s/n 515, was found with CH₄ sensor fail”. However, the PP did not report what considerations had been taken for the values of the CH₄ content in the time between the last verification of the instrument and the time the error has been found.</p> <p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: On the report of General Events (Spreadsheet) it is stated that during the periods from 11/06/09 to 14/06/09, from 6/07/09 to 12/08/09 and from 29/10/09 to 31/12/09 the portable analyzer was used for CH₄ measurement, the same as from 11:00 to 14:00 on 13/09/09 and from 14:00 to 20:00 on 28/09/09. However, the PP did not report the calibration dates on the portable gas analyzer even considering that the methodology (page 7) requires the use of “calibrated portable gas meters” when taking periodical measurements.</p>



CDM – Executive Board

30	0678	Nakoda WHR CDM Project	01/04/10 - 31/01/11	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).</p> <p>Issue: The PP/DOE is requested to provide an explanation on Annex 1 (Single Line Diagram) in the Monitoring Report with clearly denoting the main metering points. In doing so the PP/DOE should also clearly indicate the impact of the 12 MW power plant and its relevance to the project activity.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))</p> <p>Issue: The PDD (Section D.3) and the Monitoring Report (Section C and D.2) states that the electricity supplied to third parties will be crossed checked with sales receipts and accounts. However there is no reference of the same in the Verification Report. Moreover it is not clear how the DOE cross checked the electricity generation records with the DCS as there is no mention of the same in the Verification Report. The DOE is requested to incorporate the details of the cross checking mechanism for better clarity. Further the PP/DOE shall also clarify the term "third party".</p>
31	0335	AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-01, Minas Gerais, Brazil	01/10/09 - 31/05/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).</p> <p>Issue: Regarding the electricity consumption by the project activity the CER sheet presents a value without formula or calculations whereas, as per revised monitoring plan, the parameters is calculated.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not describe the implementation status of the project. (For project activities that consist of more than one site, the report shall clearly describe the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site. For CDM project activities with phased implementation, the report shall state the progress of the proposed CDM project activity achieved in each phase under verification). (VVM v.1.2 para 198 (a)).</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report (Section B.1, table B.1) indicates for the site "Granja CFM" its operation status as "site is stopped", however the verification report does not provide an assessment on each site's operational status.</p>
32	0008	Brazil NovaGerar Landfill Gas to Energy Project	01/01/09 - 31/12/09	AENOR	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report does not indicate the result of the flare efficiency analysis conducted for each one of the dates of analysis provided in the monitoring report, for both Adrianopolis and Marambaia landfills.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report indicates when the temperature of the flare is below 760°C for any particular</p>



					hour, it is assumed that during that hour the flare efficiency is zero and therefore the baseline emissions are zero. The verification report does not indicate how this assumption has been verified to be correctly applied in emission reductions calculation.
33	2667	Biogas Project, Olmeca III, Tecún Uman	23/11/09 - 30/11/10	ICONTEC	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report states in section D.2 that the final sludge will be used for soil application, however does not indicate if the same has been removed/applied during this monitoring period.</p> <p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The calibration date provided for the temperature meter to monitor the temperature of the flare (calibrated on 02/06/2009, next calibration due to 28/06/2010, as per Annex 2) do not cover the whole monitoring period (23/11/2009 - 30/11/2010).</p> <p>Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).</p> <p>Issue: In the excel sheet provided identified as "CER Calculation spreadsheet Olmeca", under "EBpower log", values are missing in between 1st and 5th of July 2010 where cell are highlighted however no explanations are provided or the information assessed in verification report.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)</p> <p>Issue: Under section 3.2 "Project Implementation", the verification report does not provide information on assessment of the flaring system. Additionally the report indicates that the methane combustion units consists of 2 GENSET units of each 1,050 kW installed capacity while the monitoring report indicates the installed capacity as 1,059 kW</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)</p> <p>Issue: The verification report does not indicate how the DOE verified the information flow for each monitoring parameter, including what type of instrument has been used for monitoring purpose (missing from Table 3).</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))</p> <p>Issue: The verification report does not indicate how the DOE verified all COD external tests conducted in the monitoring period (including for COD untreated) and how it verified the manufacturer's specifications on proper operation of the flare which is used to determine the default values used for flare efficiency.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring</p>



					<p>equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology, EB guidance, or the monitoring plan.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: The last calibration date provided in the monitoring report for the temperature meter to monitor the temperature of the flare is on 02/06/2009 and this delay, if any, has not been assessed by the DOE.</p>
34	1369	<p>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</p>	20/05/08 - 24/03/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the implementation status of the project (including a brief description of the installed technology and/or equipments, relevant dates of project activity e.g. date of construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) during the monitoring period under consideration. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (i) & EB 54 Annex 34).</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>The monitoring plan should include information regarding the actual operation of the project activity during this monitoring period, including information on special events, for example overhaul times, downtimes of equipment, exchange of equipment, etc.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>According to the monitoring report (p.51) and to the verification report (p.B-6-8 and p.B-6-10) , the calibration of the instruments labelled NAT-1134 and NFQ-1141 has been delayed (from 20/02/09 to 24/03/09). However the DOE did not provide an assessment of the compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for the calibration delay.</p>
35	2243	<p>Reduction of N2O emissions at shop#25, production line #1 at "Navoiazot" plant</p>	28/08/09 - 05/01/10	TÜV-SÜD	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report should provide the relevant date of AST calibration for the equipments labelled 3.355110.7 , UJ021208 and 2607112900.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: According to the monitoring report (p.20) and to the verification report (p.21) , the calibration of the instrument labelled MSP-2 9124 has been delayed (calibration certificate was valid until 11/10/09). However the DOE did not provide an assessment of the compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for the calibration delay.</p>



36	1216	2.5 MW BEL grid-connected wind power project at Davanagere district, Karnataka, India	05/11/07 - 31/03/09	TÜV-Nord	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>The monitoring report does not provide values for the parameters EGy, EGexport, EGimport and TE for the period from 05 November 2007 to 30 November 2007.</p> <p>Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?</p> <p>Issue: The spreadsheet does not provide values for the parameters EGy, EGexport, EGimport and TE for the period from 05 November 2007 to 30 November 2007.</p>
37	1174	Project for the catalytic reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia reactor of the N3 nitric acid plant at Haifa Chemicals Ltd., Israel	03/04/09- 02/03/10	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: MR provides only calibration information for what is considered relevant monitoring equipment (measuring VSG, NCSG, NAP, PSG and TSG). No information is provided on the calibration frequency, precise calibration dates and calibration validity of equipment that measure parameters related to the process as required by the methodology (ex ammonia gas flow rate, oxidation pressure and temperature). Furthermore MR indicates that NAP values for project campaign N3-368 was observed to be unrealistic results from (29. December 2009 – two days after last reported calibration) until 15 February 2010. However no information on a potential new calibration is provided.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)</p> <p>Issue: DOE is silent on how it has verified the information flow of operating parameters such as such as oxidation pressure and temperature, ammonia gas flow.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))</p> <p>Issue: DOE is silent about data and parameters that were available at validation: and their correct use during this period (ex the calculated uncertainty of the overall Automated Monitoring System (AMS)).</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: No discussion is provided on QAL1 of the AMs nor on the QAL1 of the gas flow meter recently installed (page 13 of the VR). Additionally DOE is silent with respect to QAL3 procedures and frequency for the equipment measuring VSG. Similarly DOE is silent on the calibration status of equipment associated to operating parameters such as oxidation pressure, temperature and ammonia gas flow.</p>



38	0591	Shalivahana Non-Conventional Renewable Sources Biomass Power Project	25/01/10 - 24/01/11	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report does contain neither a description of emergency procedures for the monitoring system nor a line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))</p> <p>Issue1: The verification report does not determine if emission factors, default values and other reference values used in the calculation of project emissions due to diesel consumption have been correctly applied.</p> <p>Issue2: As verified by the DOE i) the ex-ante figure of 0.8345 kg CO₂ e/ kWh in the validated and registered PDD has been used for the calculation of emission reductions; ii) the monitored values of carbon content in coal are used in estimation of project emissions; however, the DOE has not confirmed that the above values are in line with VVM 1.2, para 208 (d) and (e).</p>
39	2243	Reduction of N2O emissions at shop#25, production line #1 at “Navoiazot” plant	06/01/10 - 11/05/10	TÜV-SÜD	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report should provide the relevant date of AST calibration and the test outcome for the equipments labelled 3.355110.7 , UJ021208 and 2607112900.</p>
40	1282	Tuanpo Hydro Power Project, Guizhou Province, China	01/01/10 - 31/12/10	CEC	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).</p> <p>Issue 1: The Monitoring Report does not contain information regarding meters M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, M9, M10.</p> <p>Issue 2: The Monitoring Report does not contain a description on how the calculated monthly net electricity delivered to the grid was cross checked with the data measured by the two main Meters, as indicated in the Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>Issue 3: Additionally, the Layout diagram of the project presented in page 5 of the MR does not show all relevant monitoring points as specified in the Revised Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified</p>



					<p>by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The Monitoring Report does not contain information on calibration of meters M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, M9, M10.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: The verification report does not provide an assessment regarding the calibration of meters M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, M9, M10.</p>
41	2232	Catalytic N2O Abatement Project in the tail gas of the Caprolactam production plant in Thailand	01/10/09 - 30/09/10	TÜV-SÜD	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10</p>
42	2486	Conversion of SF6 to the alternative cover gas SO2 at RIMA magnesium production	01/07/10 - 28/02/11	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The Monitoring Plan (page 3) requires the monitoring of the SO2 consumption for each equipment k in each segment j per year. However, the monitoring report (page 18) refers to “Excel spreadsheet “RIMA_ SO2 consumption 2010-Jul to 2011 Feb” for consumption per equipment”, which has not been submitted in the request for issuance documentation</p> <p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: Monitoring Plan (page 13) states that “Most of the scales and flowrates have a 6 months period for new calibrations”. However, the PP did not report the calibration frequencies of the SO2 flow meters.</p>
43	0367	8MW Waste Heat Recovery based Captive Power Plant	01/04/09 - 28/02/11	DNV	<p>Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)</p> <p>Issue: Page 6 of the revised monitoring plan states that “Gas Flow meter should be placed at the inlet of the WHR boiler to measure the total volume of flue gas utilized per kWh of power produced. The temperature, pressure and chemical composition of the flue gas should also be monitored for evidence that electrical energy being generated with zero net GHG emission.” However, neither the monitoring report nor the verification report contains any information regarding these parameters. Further clarification is required.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))</p> <p>Issue: The approved revised monitoring plan states that the data for the “total electricity generated” and the “auxiliary consumption” are available in the plant DCS. However the DOE is requested to clarify how it verified that the monitoring of the parameter is in accordance as neither the monitoring report nor the verification report contain any details regarding the same.</p>



44	1749	Xiaoxi Hydropower Project	01/08/10 - 30/04/11	Tuev Rheinland	<p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)</p> <p>Issue: In the verification report the DOE confirms that it verified through the equipments' nameplates that all physical features of the project have been implemented as per PDD, however there is an inconsistency between the generator model indicated in the monitoring report (SF15-32/5720) and in the verification report (SF15-32/5730).</p>
45	1212	Shaanxi Province Xunyang County Guihua Small Hydropower Project (SXGSHP)	01/07/08 - 24/12/09	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).</p> <p>Issue: The ER spreadsheet contains a column called "The Net Eg (subtracted the line loss)", which calculates electricity discounted by 5.81% of transmission losses. However, the monitoring report does not contain any relevant explanations on the reasons for this discount and the source of the transmission loss.</p> <p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: the monitoring report only provides the values of the net electricity supplied to the grid by the project, without making any reference to transmission losses and comparing the metered values with the invoices.</p>
46	0174	San Isidro Hydroelectric Plant	29/06/09 - 31/05/10	AENOR	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report provides, on section D.2, two frequencies of calibration (i.e. yearly and valid for 18 months). The correct calibration frequency must be in accordance with guidance from EB52 - Annex 60 (Paragraph 8). If the calibration is found to be delayed, the requirements from EB52 - Annex 60 (Paragraphs 4 to 6) must be applied.</p>
47	0172	Matanzas Hydroelectric Plant	29/06/09 - 31/05/10	AENOR	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report provides, on section D.2, two frequencies of calibration (i.e. yearly and valid for 18 months). The correct calibration frequency must be in accordance with guidance from EB52 - Annex 60 (Paragraph 8). If the calibration is found to be delayed, the requirements from EB52 - Annex 60 (Paragraphs 4 to 6) must be applied.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan. (VVM v.1.2 para 206 & 221(d))</p>



					Issue: The Verification Report states, on Section 3.8, that "monitoring process carried out during the current period is deemed appropriate and consistent with the revised monitoring plan", however no revision of monitoring plan was requested and/or approved.
48	2444	ADFEC 10 MW Solar Power Plant.	08/06/09 - 01/07/10	TÜV-Nord	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).</p> <p>Issue: Monitoring points are not clearly depicted on the monitoring scheme presented on page 19 of the Monitoring Report. The meters in the substation (ADDC main meters, marked with a green box according to the legend) could not be found on the figure presented in page 19 of the MR; likewise, only 14 out of 16 on-site meters are indicated in the graph. Please clarify.</p> <p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring plan states that calibration of TEGy will be undertaken once a year (p. 28), whereas the Monitoring Report (p. 22) indicates that calibration frequency for this parameter is once every three years.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)</p> <p>Issue: The VR (page 30) indicates that 16 meters are installed on-site; however, the VR later on the same page mentions that only 14 meters (1-6, 9-11, 12, 13, 14-16) have been checked during on-site visit.</p>
49	2113	CGN Inner Mongolia Huitengliang 300MW Wind Power Project	01/04/10 - 31/3/2011	BVCH	<p>Scope: The monitoring report is not consistent in the implementation status of the project during the monitoring period under consideration. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (i) & EB 54 Annex 34).</p> <p>The DOE/PP is requested to clarify the implementation schedule of the project activity and the implementation status during the relevant monitoring period. In particular, the DOE/PP is requested to explain the inconsistency in the dates of installation of the last 12 turbines of this project activity (I.e. Table 2 (Operation date of Wind turbines) of the monitoring report (monitoring period 01 Apr 10 - 31 Mar 11) indicates that operation dates of last 12 turbines are in 2009 whereas rest of MR and VR indicate that all the turbines were operation on 29/04/2010).</p>



50	1373	<p align="center">Beijing No.3 Thermal Power Plant Gas-Steam Combined Cycle Project Using Natural Gas</p>	<p align="center">01/12/09 - 31/03/10</p>	<p align="center">TÜV-Nord</p>	<p>Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology. (VVM v.1.2 para 200, 203 & 221(d)) Issue: The methodology page 11 requires the monitoring of total fuel consumption both at supplier and project end. However, there appears to be an inconsistency. The Monitoring Report page 17 mentions: "The total fuel consumption has been monitored both at supplier and project end for cross-verification". However, Verification Report page 60 mentions: "The measurement is performed on a continuous basis under the purview of the gas supplier."</p>
51	0986	<p align="center">Bundled 15 MW Wind Power Project in India</p>	<p align="center">28/04/07 - 01/04/08</p>	<p align="center">TÜV-Nord</p>	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34). Issue: The Annex 2 of the Monitoring Report does not provided clear description of the location of the meters. The abbreviations do not match the diagram. For example in page 12, the diagram shows MM, however, what MM is has not been described. Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34) Issue: The Monitoring Report page 8 mentions the calibration frequency of the meter as annually. However, Annex 1 of Monitoring Report has not provided information of the date of calibration that covers the whole monitoring period. For example, calibration date of meter for WTG K-47 is 14/08/2007 while the monitoring period started from 01/05/2007. Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology? Issue: The monitoring plan requires monthly monitoring of the electricity supplied. The spreadsheet appears to have overlapping monitoring periods. For example, line 11 of "Generation Details" sheet shows 01/05/07 to 01/06/07 and line 12 shows 01/06/07 to 02/07/07. It is not clear whether data of date 01/06/07 falls into the first line or the second line or even into both lines. Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology. (VVM v.1.2 para 200, 203 & 221(d)) Issue: The Monitoring Report page 8 mentions the accuracy of the meters as 0.5s, while the Verification Report mentions it as 0.2s.</p>



CDM – Executive Board

52	0379	Russfin Biomass CHP Plant Project.	04/06/07 - 31/03/08	DNV	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The REVMP specifies that for the back-up diesel electricity generators operational time (Hdiesel) and Biomass steam boiler operational time (Hbiomass), meters will be subject to regular maintenance and testing regime to ensure accuracy. However, the Monitoring Report does not provide information on the calibration of the meters.</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)</p> <p>Issue: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the following parameters: i) Hdiesel; and ii) Hbiomass</p> <p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: The Verification Report does not not provide an assessment on whether the maintenance and testing of measuring equipments was conducted as specified in the revised monitoring plan for the back-up diesel electricity generators operational time (Hdiesel) and Biomass steam boiler operational time (Hbiomass).</p>
----	------	------------------------------------	---------------------	-----	--