

 CDM project activity issuance review form <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>	
Designated national authority/Executive Board member submitting this form (Name in print)	
Title of the proposed CDM project activity for which issuance is requested	Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga Small Hydropower Projects (0085)
DOE that requested for issuance and date of request	DNV-CUK
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)	
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Fraud</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Malfeasance</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Incompetence</i>	
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)	
<p>1. Some reported outputs in the monitoring report exceed technical limit of the power plants. For example, outputs of Hapugastenna Phase II for the months of May, June and August in the year 2004. According to the PDD the rated capacity of this plant is 2.4MW (Table 1, Page 5, PDD). The verification team found it a bit higher, 2.526MW (Page 4, Verification/Cerification Report). Even considering the higher value, the plant cannot produce more than 1,879,344 kWh in May and August, each month (2526kW x 31 day x 24 hour/day) and more than 1,818,720 kWh in June (2526kW x 30 day x 24 hour/day). But the reported outputs in the monitoring report are 1,947,540 kWh for May, 1,906,630 kWh for June and 2,907,890 kWh for August. These numbers are higher than technical limit of the plant. Moreover, power plants normally operate at capacity lower than rated capacity because of scheduled and unscheduled maintenance.</p> <p>The observation mentioned above clearly leads to the conclusion that the DOE failed to meet the verification requirements. The DOE is expected to crosscheck the numbers presented in the monitoring report.</p> <p>2. According to the validated monitoring plan, electricity meters should be tested and calibrated annually. The DOE could not obtain calibration and test reports during the site visits. The reports were submitted to DOE later (Page 4, Verification/Certification report). However, the DOE has not included its assessment on those calibration and test reports. Is the DOE satisfied with the test and calibration reports? Please include DOE's assessments on it in the verification report.</p> <p>3. Although the monitoring report presents electricity output from each plant, it is not clear whether the output presented in the report is electricity sales to the Ceylon Electricity Board (CEB) or electricity generated from the power plant. Digging upon the calculation of GHG mitigation it appears that the reported numbers are "sales", but it is designated as "output", which is generation rather than sales. The power plants must have some auxiliary consumption (or own use); amount of auxiliary consumption is not known. Please clarify.</p>	
Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat	
Date received at UNFCCC secretariat	15/08/2006