


|  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 | Poehos I Project; Project Activity 0086 |
| DOE that requested for issuance and date of request | DNV CUK 13-09-07 |
| 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) | |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The DOE has verified that the project consists of a 15.2 MW hydroelectric power plant. However, the monitoring report and the spreadsheet indicated a capacity of 15.4 MW. Clarification is required. In addition the DOE shall further clarify how they have verified during the site visit that the actual implementation of the project was as described in the PDD and how they have verified the actual nameplate capacity of the generation equipment as well as calibration of generation metering. According to the monitoring plan, real NEC (Net Efficiency Conversions) per power plant needs to be taken from the most recently COES annual statistics. At the end of the year, NECs per technology should be replaced by using the most recent year published NEC information. However, it appears that the same values of NECs per technology as in the PDD have been used in this monitoring report. Clarification is required. The assumed efficiencies for the different power plant technologies underlying the calculation of the NECs seem unrealistic (80% for cogeneration regardless whether fuel is gas or coal, or combined cycle for coal at 55%). Clarification is required. The date and version numbers of monitoring report are missing. A revised monitoring report should be submitted. As the project description by the DOE in page 5 of 16 of the Verification and Certification Report states that "The project uses a portion of the discharged water from the Poehos Dam, affecting the flow of the Chira river and the Miguel Checa channel", the DOE shall further clarify how they have verified that there were no adverse impacts from the project activity. In addition, the DOE shall further clarify how they have verified that "During the site visit was assessed sustainable indicators from the first and second period" and which "Information was identified as correct" regarding those indicators, in order to close the pending open FAR, as stated in page 8 of 16 of the Verification and Certification Report.. The DOE shall further clarify how they have ensured that the mistakes as described in page 10 of 16 of the Verification and Certification Report: "The first emission factor spreadsheet delivered for verification contained a mistake related to the project generation, which affected the calculation of the operating margin and consequently the combined margin. Corrections were requested in the form of CAR 1" are avoided through a systematic approach to monitoring. The DOE shall provide further clarification of how they reviewed and crosschecked all delivered information related to the net amount of electricity was of 57 822 MWh generated during the period of 01 April 2006 to 31 March 2007 and thus the claimed emission reductions of 30 119 tCO₂e reported for the period 01 April 2006 to 31 March 2007. The DOE shall avoid typographic errors in their V&C report. | |
| Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat | |
| Date received at UNFCCC secretariat | 25/09/2007 |