

RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR REVIEW

Bureau Veritas Certification had performed the validation of the CDM Project “Biomass based renewable energy project in a Solvent Extraction Plant, India” by M/s. The Ambika Solvex Ltd., The request for registration was made in July 2007 and was under review from 03/08/07 to 01/09/07. Subsequently, there have been 3 (Three) requests for review, which were received on 31/08/2007. All the three requests are found to be identical and therefore we are providing our responses in common to all these.

We thank the CDM executive board and the secretariat for giving us the opportunity to clarify about our considerations in validating the said project.

The project participants have provided to us their response. We observe that this response and the information therein are in line with the discussions we had with the project participants during the course of the validation. We therefore endorse the response given by the participants

Our response to the review points have referred to various annexes which are attached by Project Participant along-with their response. These are not separately attached with our response again.

Reasons and background for Request for Review	Bureau Veritas Certification response
1.The validation report should clearly state how the barriers listed in the PDD have been validated and on which basis the DOE considered the project to be additional.	<p>1. Validation team considered the several documents / evidences provided by project participant as well as observations/interactions during site visit on additionality. Validation team has considered the claims on technical additionality and prohibitive barrier being ‘First of kind’ to be barriers to consider project to be additional.</p> <p>We have also assessed the other claims like Investment barrier, biomass availability etc. mentioned in PDD. These are considered to be only support arguments to above mentioned barriers and not real barriers for project implementation.</p> <p>Evidences are now specifically included in the validation report ‘Report No: INDIA-Val/61.49/2007/Rev03 dated 20 September 2007. (Page Nos. 10 &11).</p>
2. The remaining lifetime of the existing boiler should be validated to confirm that it would not be required to be replaced during the crediting period of the project.	<p>2. Project participant has obtained the certificate from chartered Engineer for remaining lifetime of the boiler. As per the certificate issued by this competent authority, the remaining lifetime of the boiler is 15years, which is beyond the end date of crediting period. (Refer Annex. 6 – (i) & (ii) of response from Project Participant. These are also</p>

<p>3. The Monitoring Plan does not include the annual evaluation of whether there is a surplus of biomass in the region and any leakage that may need to be estimated and deducted from the emission reductions in accordance with the Board's "General guidance on leakage in biomass project activities (Ver.2)"</p>	<p>referred in Section 6 of Validation report INDIA-Val/61.49/2007/Rev03 dated 20 September 2007. (Page Nos. 18 &19)</p> <p>3. Monitoring plan now includes annual evaluation of biomass to estimate whether there is surplus biomass in the region and any leakage that may need to be estimated and deducted from the emission reductions in accordance with the Board's "General guidance on leakage in biomass project activities (Ver.2)". Refer section D.3 of PDD – Version 1.6 dated 11/09/2007. PDD, on page 24 also provides formula to calculate leakage if for a particular year, biomass is not available in sufficient quantity.</p>
--	--