

 <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>	Rang Dong Oil Field Associated Gas Recovery and Utilization Project; Project Activity 0152
<b>DOE that requested for issuance and date of request</b>	SGS 07-12-07
<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>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The carbon content of April, May and June 2004 in the monthly gas composition data at the Rang dong oil field (appendix 9-1 of the monitoring report) shows 0.683, 0.796 and 0.682 respectively. Further clarification is required on how the DOE verified the value of May 2004.</li> <li>2. For the parameter "Gas composition of recovered gas at Point A" the monthly gas composition data at the Rang dong oil field (appendix 9-1) did not present the monthly data from October to December 2003. The values for the measurements prior to the gap are systematically higher (average 0.76 with deviations of less than 0.01) than those after the gap (average 0.71, except the April 2004 value of 0.796 all values are around 0.68 with deviations of less than 0.01). In the verification report, there is no convincing explanation about this systematic shift in carbon content of 7% (even 9% if the unusual value of April 2004 is not considered). The DOE shall provide evidence that the shift is not a consequence of two differing measurement techniques used before and after the gap and further clarify how the measurements were cross checked and verified.</li> <li>3. The DOE states that that the composition of the recovered gas at point X (W carbon X,y) was stable (and thus 3-monthly measurement instead of the monthly measurement specified in the monitoring plan is sufficient) "since the average during the period 2001 until 2005 is 0.755 and standard deviation is 0.0131 corresponding to 1.74% of the average". However, there are variations between one monitoring point to the next of up to 5% (see p. 23 of the monitoring report, difference between March and June 2003). Appendix 9-1 of the monitoring report shows that carbon content of associated gas in the Rang Dong field varied by as much as 16.5% between one month and the next (April and May 2004). Further clarification is required.</li> <li>4. The DOE shall further clarify whether and how it has verified that the appropriate approved monitoring plan has been applied.</li> </ol>	
<b>Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat</b>	
Date received at UNFCCC secretariat	24/12/2007