

 <b>CDM project activity issuance review form</b> <i>(By submitting this form, a Party involved (through the designated national authority) or an Executive Board member may request that a review is undertaken)</i>	
<b>Designated national authority/Executive Board member submitting this form (Name in print)</b>	
<b>Title of the proposed CDM project activity for which issuance is requested</b>	0096 Copiulemu landfill gas project (Center for the Storage and Transfer, Recovery and Control of Waste, Treatment and Disposal of Industrial and Household Waste)
<b>DOE that requested for issuance and date of request</b>	SGS 23/07/08
<b>Please indicate, in accordance with paragraphs 65 of the CDM modalities and procedures, for which reason(s) you request review. (Place a cross (X) in front of the reason)</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Fraud</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Malfeasance</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Incompetence</i>	
<b>Please indicate reasons for the request for review and attach any supporting documentation to this request form. (if space is not sufficient please attach further reasons)</b>	
<p>1. The methane fraction in landfill gas was measured daily, however the ACM0001 ver1 requires that when periodical measurement is chosen, it should be done at 95% confidence level and taking a statistically valid number of samples. The DOE performed a statistical analysis to determine confidence level on the monthly interval and performed the adjustments to a 95% confidence level which resulted in a difference of 1.1% in the final emission reduction calculations. The DOE considered this was not material, therefore closed the issue, but indicated in the verification report that “it is necessary to improve the data statistical analysis to assure the achievement of the methodology”. Further clarification is required how the approach taken by the DOE is in accordance with the ACM0001 version1 and how the DOE considered the impact of the difference as immaterial to the final emission reductions.</p> <p>2. Description of step 7 in the monitoring report needs to be adjusted to ensure consistency with the formulae in the spreadsheet.</p> <p>3. The verification report is missing a reference document which confirms the flare efficiency test conducted in December 2006, from which the test results were used in this monitoring period.</p>	
<b>Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat</b>	
Date received at UNFCCC secretariat	18.07.2008