



**CDM project activity/programme of activities issuance request review form  
(Version 03.0)**

**Section 1. General Information**

|  |   |           |
|--|---|-----------|
| <b>Designated national authority or Executive Board member submitting this form</b>                                |   |           |
| <b>Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity or programme of activities (PoA)</b>                  | Dehydration and incineration of sewage sludge in Singapore (3042) |           |
| <b>Titles and reference numbers of the component project activities (CPAs) covered by the request for issuance</b> | CPA ref. number   | CPA title |
|  |   |           |
| <b>Date of request for issuance</b>  | 23 Jan 12   |           |
| <b>Monitoring period to which the request for issuance applies</b>   | 13 Sep 10 - 30 Apr 11   |           |
| <b>UNFCCC reference number of the request for issuance (For PoA only)</b>  |   |           |

**Section 2. Basis for review request**

*Please indicate, in accordance with paragraphs 65 of the CDM modalities and procedures, for which reason(s) you request review.*

☐ Fraud
 ☐ Malfeasance
 ☒ Incompetence

**Section 3: Comments Supporting Review Request**

**Please elaborate the reason for requesting a review on the issues you indicated in section 2 above**

**OTHER ISSUES:**

1) The DOE has verified that the calibration of the sludge weighbridge complies with the monitoring plan, considering that calibration is conducted quarterly by a certified third-party and that the accuracy of the weigh bridge is within  $\pm 10\text{kg}$  for the 30 ton range. However, a 20-day delay is observed between 1st calibration (08 Aug 2010) and 2nd calibration (28 Nov 2010), which means that the calibration validity does not cover the period 8-27 November 2010. The DOE is requested to clarify how the requirements of EB52 Annex 60 has been applied to the calibration delay observed for the sludge weighbridge. Please refer to Paragraph 184 (a) (ii).

2) For the period 13 September 2010 - 20 April 2011, monitored data of the parameter "Stack gas volume flow rate (SGy)" from the 5 trains (i.e. sludge treatment plant) installed at the project site were not available due to gas flow meters malfunctioning. The design gas flow rate at current level of Dry Sludge and Dewatered Sludge of 581.78 Nm<sup>3</sup>/min.train has been used instead, in order to calculate the total volume of stack gas (i.e. 581.78 Nm<sup>3</sup>/hour.train multiplied by hours of operation of the plants).

The DOE is requested to clarify: i) how the design value of 581.78 Nm<sup>3</sup>/min.train has been derived and verified to be correct and appropriate, considering that the registered PDD assumed a value of approximately 766 Nm<sup>3</sup>/min.train; ii) how the data about the plants' operation hours have been obtained and verified to be correct and appropriate; and iii) how it has been verified that the PP approach is the most conservative assumption theoretically possible, or why a deviation has not been requested before submitting the request for issuance, in line with the requirement of paragraph 208 (a) of VVM 1.2.

Please refer to Paragraph 208 of VVM 1.2..

3) For the period 21 to 30 April 2011, monitored data of the parameter "Stack gas volume flow rate (SGy)" are available from trains 1-4 only, as the stack flow meter of train 5 was under repair. For the train 5, the average of values monitored from trains 1-4 is used instead [6,318,547 Nm<sup>3</sup>.train5 = AVERAGE (6,824,552 Nm<sup>3</sup>.train1, 6,759,423 Nm<sup>3</sup>.train2, 5,807,588 Nm<sup>3</sup>.train3, 5,882,623 Nm<sup>3</sup>.train4)].

The DOE is requested to clarify how it has been verified that the PP approach is the most conservative assumption theoretically possible, or why a deviation has not been requested before submitting the request for issuance, in line with the requirement of paragraph 208 (a) of VVM 1.2. Please refer to Paragraph 208 of VVM 1.2..