



Industrie Service

**Choose certainty.  
Add value.**

TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH · Westendstrasse 199 · 80686 Munich · Germany

## CDM Executive Board



DAP-PL-2885.99  
DAP-IS-2886.00  
DAP-PL-3089.00  
DAP-PL-2722  
DAP-IS-3516.01  
DPT-ZE-3510.02  
ZLS-ZE-219/99  
ZLS-ZE-246/99

Your reference/letter of	Our reference/name	Tel. extension/E-mail	Fax extension	Date/Document	Page
	IS-CMS-MUC/Mu Javier Castro	+49 89 5791-2686 javier.castro@tuev-sued.de	+49 89 5791-2756	2007-11-08	1 of 3

## Response to Request for Review

Dear Sirs,

Please find below the response to the request for review formulated for the CDM project with the registration number 0164. In case you have any further inquiries please let us know as we kindly assist you.

Yours sincerely,

Javier Castro  
Carbon Management Service

Headquarters: Munich  
Trade Register: Munich HRB 96 869

Supervisory Board:  
Dr. Axel Stepken (Chairman)  
Board of Management:  
Dr. Manfred Bayerlein (Spokesman)  
Dr. Udo Heisel

Telefon: +49 89 5791-  
Telefax: +49 89 5791-  
[www.tuev-sued.de](http://www.tuev-sued.de)  
**TÜV®**

TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH  
Niederlassung München  
Umwelt Service  
Westendstraße 199  
Westendstrasse 199  
80686 Munich  
Germany



## **Response to the CDM Executive Board**

### **Request 1, 2 and 3**

#### Issue:

While the spreadsheet includes imported electricity of 3,960 MWh for this monitoring period, the monitoring report stated that “BLFGE does not consume electricity from the grid, PEy = 0.” Further explanation is required on this increased electricity import from the grid and whether this level of consumption will continue in the future.

#### Response by TÜV SÜD

The imported electricity is only 38.123 MWh which is negligible, the value presented in the monitoring report is not correct. Nevertheless the project participant are whiling to accept their error and reduce the original amount of energy consumed presented in the MR even that is not correct and therefore reduce the CERs in about 1 000 tCO<sub>2eq</sub>. Additionally all the imported electricity is already taken into account in the net electricity use for the calculation of the emission reductions. The statement in the report refers to electricity consume that would cause project emissions and that is not included in the NET electricity. The monitoring report includes a comment regarding this issue.

### **Request 1, 2 and 3**

#### Issue:

The amount of LFG to the power house has been measured in accordance with the approved methodology while the monitoring plan states the calculation of the amount of the LFG to the power house. A request for revision of the monitoring plan prior should be submitted to include these changes.

#### Response by TÜV SÜD

At the same time of the submission of this response a revise monitoring plan will be submitted. It is kindly requested to the EB to approved the revised monitoring plan at the same time this request for review is analyze in the EB meeting in order not to delay the issuance of CERs.

### **Request 1, 2 and 3**

#### Issue:

The verification report (p. 5) stated that the verification covered “Technical aspects of sugar mill processes and bagasee cogeneration management systems.” However, this project is the land-fill gas project. Therefore, the DOE is requested to further clarify why they have included this competency requirement in their competence and capability of the audit team requirements and delete this scope in its verification report if an error.

#### Response by TÜV SÜD

This statement is a mistake and has been changed in the revised verification report attach to this response.

## **Request 2**

### Issue:

The DOE shall further clarify how they have assessed and verified that the calibration frequency for the flow meters, thermometers and manometers, is appropriate as per the applied methodology.

### Response by TÜV SÜD

The methodology does not require any specific calibration frequency for the different equipment. During verification it was confirmed that the equipment is calibrated in the frequency higher than the recommended by the manufacturer. The calibration certificates have been check on-site and attached are the samples for 2 flow meters and for temperature and pressure devices. (See Annex 2 "Statement of manufacturer" and Annex 3 Calibration certificates)

## **Request 2**

### Issue:

The DOE shall further clarify the rationale for the acceptance of two Forward Action Requests (FAR) issued:

- a. Calibration of the new installed temperature devices over the main LFG pipe and the line to the flare
- b. Reinforcement of the data management and internal verification procedures to avoid the transfer data errors being checked in the next verification period.

### Response by TÜV SÜD

The mentioned FARs are issues that will be check during the next verification period. In order to avoid possible misunderstandings, we have erase the word "OK" at the beginning of the conclusion for this FARs to emphasized that the issues are not solved and will be check during the next verification period.