

TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH \cdot 80684 München \cdot Germany

Choose certainty.
Add value.

CDM Executive Board

Your reference/letter of

Our reference/name

IS-USC-MUC/Bb

Tel. extension/E-mail +49-89 5791-2170

Fax extension

Telefon: +49 89 5791-1733 Telefax: +49 89 5791-2756

www.tuev-sued.de

+49-89 5791-2756

Date/Document 2006-11-27

Page 1 of 2

Werner Betzenbichler Werner.Betzenbichler@tuev-sued.de

Request for review

Dear Sirs,

Please find below the response to the request for review formulated for the CDM project with the registration number 0545. In case you have any further inquiries please let us know as we kindly assist you.

Yours sincerely,



Werner Betzenbichler Carbon Management Service Page 2 of 2 Our reference/Date: IS-USC-MUC// 2006-11-27



Response to the CDM Executive Board

Issue 1:

The monitoring plan does not conform to the reporting format as required in the PDD, nor does use data ID numbers or the general descriptive format as stated in AM0010. The monitoring plan should be adjusted according to the format of AM0010.

While the validation report confirmed that "a detailed 'Monitoring Plan' has been submitted as attachment to the PDD", it is a stand-alone document produced by the PCF dated September 2005. The PCF document does not conform to the reporting format as required in the PDD, nor does it use the data ID numbers or general descriptive format as stated in AM0010. The data parameters listed in the PCF monitoring plan do not correlate entirely with those required for monitoring in AM0010. In sum, the monitoring plan submitted lacks transparency and direct correlation to AM0010, making it difficult to determine whether or not it complies fully with the approved methodology.

Response by TÜV SÜD:

The PP provided a revised PDD responding to the issues raised. This revised PDD is following the guidance on the required details in monitoring plans. Additionally TÜV SÜD issues a revised validation report referring to the changes in the PDD. It should be noted that due to the long validation process the discrepancy in the provided approach is related to the changes in guidance and requirements. The approach to submit a separate PDD version has been used by the project participants already before similar requirements have been stated by the EB requesting the details in annex 4 of PDD format version 2.

We apologize for the missing transparency when accepting alternative identifiers for parameter.

Attachments:

Durban PDD Nov22 2006 track changes.doc Durban PDD Nov22 2006 clean version.pdf Validation_Report_LaMercy_20061127 track mode.doc Validation_Report_LaMercy_20061127 incl. Annexes.pdf