

Validation Report

Abonos Colombianos SA.

VALIDATION OF THE CDM-PROJECT:

PROJECT FOR THE CATALYTIC REDUCTION OF N₂O EMISSIONS WITH A SECONDARY CATALYST INSIDE THE AMMONIA OXIDATION REACTORS OF THE NAN1 AND NAN2 NITRIC ACID PLANTS AT ABONOS CO-LOMBIANOS SA ("ABOCOL"), COLOMBIA

REPORT NO. 948604

2007, August 14

TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH

Carbon Management Service Westendstr. 199 - 80686 Munich – GERMANY



Page 1 of 15

Report No.	Date of first issue	Revision No.	Date of this revision	Certificate No.
948604	2007-03-09	3	2007-08-14	-

Subject: Validat	ion of a CDM Project			
Accredited TÜV	/ SÜD Unit:	TÜV SÜD Contract Partner:		
TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH Certification Body "climate and energy" Westendstr. 199 - 80686 Munich Federal Republic of Germany		TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH Carbon Management Service Westendstr. 199-80686 Munich Federal Republic of Germany		
Client:		Project Site(s):		
Abonos Colombianos S.A. Via Mamonal km 11/PO Cartagena Colombia		Abonos Colombianos S.A. Via Mamonal km 11/PO Cartagena Colombia		
Project Title: Project for the catalytic reduction of ammonia oxidation reactors of the anos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia		of N_2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colom	the 1bi-	
Applied Methodology / Version: AM0034 vers		ion 2 Scope(s): 5		
First PDD Versi	on:	Final PDD version:		
Date of issuance	e: 2007-01-17	Date of issuance: 2007-06-06		
Version No.:	1.a	Version No.: 2.a		
Starting Date of	GSP 2007-01-20			
Estimated Annu	ual Emission Reduction:	339 688 tons CO _{2e}		
Assessment Te	am Leader:	Further Assessment Team Members:		
Javier Castro		Nikolaus Kröger (GHG auditor)		
Summary of the	e Validation Opinion:			
The pro opin recu all	e review of the project design docume vided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence nion, the project meets all relevant UNF ommend the project for registration by t Parties involved will be available before	ntation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. In FCCC requirements for the CDM. Hence TÜV SÜD the CDM Executive Board in case letters of approva the expiring date of the applied methodology(ies)	ave our will I of) or	

The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have not provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. Hence TÜV SÜD will not recommend the project for registration by the CDM Executive Board and will inform the project participants and the CDM Executive Board on this decision.

the applied methodology version respectively.



Page 2 of 15

Abbreviations

ACM	Approved Consolidated Methodology
AM	Approved Methodology
AOR	Ammonia Oxidation Reactor
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CR	Clarification Request
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EB	Executive Board
EIA / EA	Environmental Impact Assessment / Environmental Assessment
ER	Emission reduction
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
KP	Kyoto Protocol
MP	Monitoring Plan
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
TÜV SÜD	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVM	Validation and Verification Manual



Page 3 of 15

Table of Contents

Page

1	INTRODUCTION	4
1.1	Objective	4
1.2	Scope	4
2	METHODOLOGY	6
2.1	Appointment of the Assessment Team	8
2.2	Review of Documents	8
2.3	Follow-up Interviews	9
2.4	Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests	10
2.5	Internal Quality Control	10
3	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	11
4	COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS	14
5	VALIDATION OPINION	15

Annex 1: Validation Protocol

Annex 2: Information Reference List



Page 4 of 15

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The validation objective is an independent assessment by a Third Party (Designated Operational Entity = DOE) of a proposed project activity against all defined criteria set for the registration under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). Validation is part of the CDM project cycle and will finally result in a conclusion by the executing DOE whether a project activity is valid and should be submitted for registration to the CDM-EB. The ultimate decision on the registration of a proposed project activity rests at the CDM Executive Board and the Parties involved.

The project activity discussed by this validation report has been submitted under the project title:

Project for the catalytic reduction of N_2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia.

1.2 Scope

The scope of any assessment is defined by the underlying legislation, regulation and guidance given by relevant entities or authorities. In the case of CDM project activities the scope is set by:

- > The Kyoto Protocol, in particular § 12
- Decision 2/CMP1 and Decision 3/CMP.1 (Marrakech Accords)
- ➤ Further COP/MOP decisions with reference to the CDM (e.g. decisions 4 8/CMP.1)
- Decisions by the EB published under <u>http://cdm.unfccc.int</u>
- Specific guidance by the EB published under http://cdm.unfccc.int
- Guidelines for Completing the Project Design Document (CDM-PDD), and the Proposed New Baseline and Monitoring Methodlogy (CDM-NM)
- The applied approved methodology
- > The technical environment of the project (technical scope)
- Internal and national standards on monitoring and QA/QC
- > Technical guideline and information on best practice

The validation is not meant to provide any consulting towards the client. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the project design.

Once TÜV SÜD receives a first PDD version, it is made publicly available on the internet at TÜV SÜD's webpage as well as on the UNFCCC CDM-webpages for starting a 30 day global stakeholder consultation process (GSP). In case of any request a PDD might be revised (under certain conditions the GSP will be repeated) and the final PDD will form the basis for the final evaluation as presented by this report. Information on the first and on the final PDD version is presented at page 1.

The only purpose of a validation is its use during the registration process as part of the CDM project cycle. Hence, TÜV SÜD can not be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based



Page 5 of 15

on the validation opinion, which will go beyond that purpose.

The first version of the Project Design Document for this project was made with the intention of a baseline certification. This was also the purpose of the first on-site visit made on October 26-27, 2006. The intention has not been continued and the validation process has been followed whit a second on-site visit on January 23-25, 2007.



Page 6 of 15

2 METHODOLOGY

The project assessment aims at being a risk based approach and is based on the methodology developed in the Validation and Verification Manual (for further information see <u>www.vvmanual.info</u>), an initiative of Designated and Applicant Entities, which aims to harmonize the approach and quality of all such assessments.

In order to ensure transparency, a validation protocol was customised for the project. TÜV SÜD developed a "cook-book" for methodology-specific checklists and protocol based on the templates presented by the Validation and Verification Manual. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), the discussion of each criterion by the assessment team and the results from validating the identified criteria. The validation protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organises, details and clarifies the requirements a CDM project is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent validation process where the validator will document how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the validation.

The validation protocol consists of three tables. The different columns in these tables are described in the figure below.

Validation Protocol Table 1: Conformity of Project Activity and PDD								
Checklist Topic / Question	Reference	Comments	PDD in GSP	Final PDD				
The checklist is organised in sec- tions following the arrangement of the applied PDD version. Each section is then further sub- divided. The low- est level consti- tutes a checklist question / crite- rion.	Gives ref- erence to documents where the answer to the check- list question or item is found in case the comment refers to documents other than the PDD.	The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist question and/or the conformance to the question. It is further used to explain the conclusions reached. In some cases sub-checklist are applied indicating yes/no decisions on the compliance with the stated criterion. Any Re- quest has to be substanti- ated within this column	Conclusions are presented based on the assessment of the first PDD ver- sion. This is either acceptable based on evidence pro- vided (D), or a Corrective Action Request (CAR) due to non- compliance with the checklist question (See below). Clari- fication Request (CR) is used when the validation team has identified a need for further clarification.	Conclusions are presented in the same manner based on the as- sessment of the final PDD version.				

The completed validation protocol is enclosed in Annex 1 to this report.



Page 7 of 15

Validation Protocol Table 2: Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests									
Clarifications and cor- rective action re- quests	Ref. to table 1	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclu- sion						
If the conclusions from table 1 are either a Cor- rective Action Request or a Clarification Re- quest, these should be listed in this section.	Reference to the checklist question number in Table 1 where the Corrective Action Request or Clarification Request is explained.	The responses given by the client or other project participants during the communica- tions with the valida- tion team should be summarised in this section.	This section should sum- marise the validation team's responses and final conclusions. The conclu- sions should also be in- cluded in Table 1, under "Final PDD".						

In case of a denial of the project activity more detailed information on this decision will be presented in table 3.

Validation Protocol Table 3: Unresolved Corrective Action and Clarification Requests							
Clarifications and cor- rective action re- quests	Id. of CAR/CR 1	Explanation of the Conclusion for Denial					
If the final conclusions from table 2 results in a denial the referenced request should be listed in this section.	Identifier of the Re- quest.	This section should present a detail explanation, why the project is finally considered not to be in compli- ance with a criterion.					



Page 8 of 15

2.1 Appointment of the Assessment Team

According to the technical scopes and experiences in the sectoral or national business environment TÜV SÜD has composed a project team in accordance with the appointment rules of the TÜV SÜD certification body "climate and energy". The composition of an assessment team has to be approved by the Certification Body ensuring that the required skills are covered by the team. The Certification Body TÜV SÜD operates four qualification levels for team members that are assigned by formal appointment rules:

- Assessment Team Leader (ATL)
- Greenhouse Gas Auditor (GHG-A)
- Greenhouse Gas Auditor Trainee (T)
- Experts (E)

It is required that the sectoral scope linked to the methodology has to be covered by the assessment team.

The validation team was consisting of the following experts (the responsible Assessment Team Leader in written in bold letters):

Name	Qualification	Coverage of technical scope	Coverage of sectoral expertise	Host coun- try experi- ence
Javier Castro	ATL	M	M	M
Nikolaus Kröger	GHG-A	M	V	

Javier Castro is deputy of Certification Body "Climate and Energy", expert for CDM and JI projects at TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH. He has an academic background in chemical engineering and energy systems. In his position he participates as an expert in energy related projects during the validation, verification and certifications processes for GHG mitigation projects.

Nikolaus Kröger is environmental engineer and expert for emissions monitoring and quality assurance at the department "Environmental Service" of TÜV SÜD. He is located in the Hamburg office and is also engaged as personally accredited verifier in the EU-ETS serving the Northern German market. Being auditor for CDM projects he has already been involved in several CDM activities with a special focus on industrial non-CO2 projects.

2.2 Review of Documents

The first PDD version submitted by the client and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline were reviewed as initial step of the validation process. A complete list of all documents and proofs reviewed is attached as annex 2 to this report.



Page 9 of 15

2.3 Follow-up Interviews

In the period of October 26 to 27, 2006 and January 23 to 27, 2007 TÜV SÜD performed interviews on-site with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the first document review. The table below provides a list of all persons interviewed in the context of these on-site visits.

Name	Organisation
Luis Navas	Local N.Serve representative
Christopher Brandt	Project Manager N.Serve
Marten Von Velsen	MD, N.Serve
Nelson Guevara	Process Engineer Abocol
William Ruiz	Maintenance responsible Abocol
Daño Londoño	Instrument engineer Abocol
Johana Rodriguez	Director Process Engineer AbocolKazuki Miura



Page 10 of 15

2.4 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the validation is to resolve the requests for corrective actions and clarifications and any other outstanding issues which needed to be clarified for TÜV SÜD's positive conclusion on the project design. The Corrective Action Requests and Clarification Requests raised by TÜV SÜD were resolved during communication between the client and TÜV SÜD. To guarantee the transparency of the validation process, the concerns raised and responses that have been given are summarised in chapter 3 below and documented in more detail in the validation protocol in annex 1.

2.5 Internal Quality Control

As final step of a validation the validation report and the protocol have to undergo and internal quality control procedure by the Certification Body "climate and energy", i.e. each report has to be approved either by the head of the certification body or his deputy. In case one of these two persons is part of the assessment team approval can only be given by the other one.

It rests at the decision of TÜV SÜD's Certification Body whether a project will be submitted for requesting registration by the EB or not.



Page 11 of 15

3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

As informed above all findings are summarized in table 2 of the attached validation protocol. In total the assessment team expressed 5 Clarification Requests and 21 Corrective Action Requests.

Although the amount of requests is comparatively high, this fact is more related to the aspect that this is the first time of applying this methodology with the new PDD format.

The key findings in the PDD versions were related to the provision of information on the intended monitoring approach and the source of the information given.

Furthermore the surveillance of the introduction of new regulatory thresholds was not ensured by the first PDD version as this aspect of the methodology was not reflected within the document.

The first PDD have used only one campaign for NAN2 for fixing the operational parameters. This has been corrected in the last version. For the final PDD only 2 campaigns have been used, the reasons are clearly explained in the PDD and the same have been confirmed on-site and through documents submitted to the validator.

Before the start of the baseline campaign the project proponent have installed all the monitoring system. The same has been confirmed on-site.

In order to follow the requirements of the methodology it is necessary to demonstrate that the monitoring system complies with the EN 14181. The equipment to measure the pressure, temperature and flow in the stack gas has a QAL1 certification; in the case of the N2O analyzer it was not possible to confirm this document; moreover at the moment of the installation of the equipment in Abocol facilities no analyzers have obtained the QAL-1 certificate. Additionally the project participant has presented documentation which confirms the intention of the equipment provider to realise the QAL-1 test. With the information provided it is not possible to confirm that the monitoring system complies with the requirements presented in the methodology (EN 14181). This issue has to be confirmed in the verification and with the result of the QALs is possible to determine the final UNC value, which is still considered as an estimation.

The data has been checked but in the state of validation is not possible to confirm the emission factor for the baseline as the uncertainty of the data is not available.

The data provided for the baseline has to be confirmed during verification as only the calculation process, which includes the methods to transfer, store, archive and compile the information, has been validated and not the final values.

The additionality is correctly discussed by the PDD. There is no concern on this discussion as the continuation of the current situation is obviously the most likely scenario as long as there are no le-gal constraints.

Request for Review: Issue 1:

The PDD states that the NAN2 baseline emission factor has been calculated based on historic data

from two campaigns (p.27) while the Validation Report states data from three campaigns have been used (p.11).

Response by TÜV SÜD:

The statement contained in the **PDD is correct**. The revised validation report is attached.



Page 12 of 15

Request for Review: Issue 2:

Detailed calculation of the baseline emission factor for NAN2 is not made available in the PDD.

Response by Project participant:

At the time the request for registration was submitted to the UNFCCC secretariat via TÜV SÜD, the **baseline data** had **not** been **available**. Thus, the project participants did not provide any more detailed information on the baseline emission factor for NAN2 at that time.

Also, the project participants intend to have the operational parameters and thus the baseline emission factor for both plants audited during the first verification rather than during the validation. This is in line with the clarification provided by the CDM EB in its 32nd meeting (paragraph no. 28).

Response by TÜV SÜD:

As mentioned above during validation the complete baseline data had not been available and following the clarification given in EB report 32, paragraph 28, it is accepted at this stage not to confirm the baseline data. Therefore the detailed calculation of the baseline is not available in the PDD.

Request for Review: Issue 3:

An arithmetic average has been calculated to determine baseline emissions from both plants. Since the capacities of the two plants are different, further clarification is required as to why an arithmetic average has been justified as appropriate to represent the baseline emission factor for the project activity.

Response by Project participant:

At the time the request for registration was submitted, the baseline data had been unavailable. Thus, the NAN2 baseline emission factor is an **estimate only**. The difference in production capacity between the two plants has been taken into account by weighting the known NAN1 emission factor with less significance than the (at that time estimated) emission factor for NAN2.

Response by TÜV SÜD:

The baseline emissions estimation is based on a weighted average, taking in account the forecasted production of each installation. Nevertheless even a direct arithmetic average gives almost the same value as the one used for the estimations and taking into account that the baseline has not been confirmed during validation the used approach has been found acceptable.

Request for Review: Issue 4:

According to the PDD, the effect of pressure drop in operation of NAN2 would be compensated by



Page 13 of 15

reducing flow air and increasing the ammonia input (p.7). Clarification is required as to how the leakage emissions associated with the increase in ammonia production would be addressed.

Response by Project participant:

The statement only refers to a relative increase in ammonia. By decreasing the air flow whilst keeping the ammonia inflow steady, the ammonia to air ratio increases. So in fact, in absolute terms **ammonia input remains constant**. Therefore, no leakage emissions occur.

Response by TÜV SÜD:

As it is mentioned in the PDD the increment of ammonia is in percentage which is clearly explainable due to the reduction of the air flow and with it, the total amount of gas. Therefore no additional leakage calculation has been required.

Request for Review: Issue 5:

Project participant shall clarify the sharp increase in nitric acid demand which is currently not cov-

ered in the methodology.

Response by Project participant:

This may be a slight misunderstanding. The planned increase in production output is due to commercially highly sensitive business plans of Abocol's management. Abocol intends to expand its business activities in the following years and has introduced a detailed business plan to the audit team of TÜV SÜD during the on-site validation visit.

However, the **capacity installed has not been increased** after the 31st December 2005. NAN1 and NAN2 have both been fully operational before the 31st December 2005 as required by the applicability criteria of AM0034. The new plant NAN3 that shall be installed in 2010 is not and will not be part of this CDM project activity.

Response by TÜV SÜD:

The methodology clearly mentions that the total installed capacity should not be increased. The project does accurately comply with this criterion, as the new capacity expansion to be installed is not part of this CDM project.

The increment in the total annual production is due to a current limitation of the productive time due to low demand levels, which Abocol expects to be of transitory nature. The assumed increase in production is feasible on the basis of the presently installed capacity (as required by the methodology). In so far as the planned nitric acid production exceeds the combined capacity of NAN1 and NAN2 (after the installation of NAN3 in 2010), the N₂O emissions due to that additional yield will not be taken into account by the CDM project activity.

Abocol has explained the underlying business plan that was assessed during the on-site audit. The information contained in this business plan is based on confidential marketing information.



Page 14 of 15

4 COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS

TÜV SÜD published the project documents on UNFCCC website by installing a link to TÜV SÜD's own website and invited comments by Parties, stakeholders and non-governmental organisations during a period of 30 days.

The following table presents all key information on this process:

webpage:						
http://www.netinform.net/KE/Wegweiser/Guide2.aspx?ID=24988&Ebene2_ID=740&mode=1						
Starting date of the global stakeholder consultation process:						
Comment submitted by: Issues raised:						
Response by TÜV SÜD:						
-						



Page 15 of 15

5 VALIDATION OPINION

TÜV SÜD has performed a validation of the following proposed CDM project activity:

Project for the catalytic reduction of N_2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia.

The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM. Hence TÜV SÜD will recommend the project for registration by the CDM Executive Board.

An analysis as provided by the applied methodology demonstrates that the proposed project activity is not a likely baseline scenario. Emission reductions attributable to the project are hence additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity. Given that the project is implemented as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated amount of emission reductions as specified within the final PDD version.

The validation is based on the information made available to us and the engagement conditions detailed in this report. The validation has been performed using a risk based approach as described above. The only purpose of this report is its use during the registration process as part of the CDM project cycle. Hence, TÜV SÜD can not be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the validation opinion, which will go beyond that purpose.

Munich, 2007-08-14

Certification Body "climate and energy" TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH

Munich, 2007-08-14

price lostro

Assessment Team Leader



Annex 1: Validation Protocol

Project Title:

itle: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD		
A. Ger	. General description of project activity						
A.1. T	itle of the project activity						
A.1.1.	Does the used project title clearly enable to identify the unique CDM activity?		The project title includes the name of the company, therefore is unique.	Ø	Ŋ		
A.1.2.	Are there any indication concerning the revision number and the date of the revision?		The PDD is version 1a dated 17 th January 2007	Ø	Ŋ		
A.1.3.	Is this consistent with the time line of the project's history?		The date is also the date of submission of the PDD to the valida- tion team	Ø	Ø		
A.2. Description of the project activity							
A.2.1.	Is the description delivering a transparent overview of the project activities?		The PDD clearly define the typo of project activity	Ø	Ŋ		
A.2.2.	What proofs are available demonstrating that the project description is in compli- ance with the actual situation or planning?	3	During the onsite visit it was clear that the statements clearly represent the actual situation of the project activities <u>Corrective Action Request No.1.</u> The layout of the PDD includes twice the page number, please correct this layout	CAR 1	Ŋ		
A.2.3.	Is the information provided by these proofs consistent with the information pro- vided by the PDD?	4, 10	The installation of the monitoring equipment has been confirmed by the audit team	Ø	N		
A.2.4.	Is all information presented consistent with details provided by further chapters of the PDD?	3	The information is consistent. Clarification Request No. 1. Please clarify all the statements related to "Detail information will be added to the final version of the PDD"	CR1	Ŋ		

Project Title:

Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION		COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
A.3. Pr	oject participants				
A.3.1.	Is the form required for the indication of project participants correctly applied?		The form is correctly applied and mention 2 project participants	Ø	Ø
A.3.2.	Is the participation of the listed entities or Parties confirmed by each one of them?		It has been confirmed on site	Ŋ	M
A.3.3.	 Is all information on participants / Parties provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of the PDD (in particular annex 1)? 		The information is consistent.	Ø	Ø
A.4. Te	chnical description of the project activ	vity			
A.4.1.	Location of the project activity	_			
A.4.1.1.	Does the information provided on the lo- cation of the project activity allow for a clear identification of the site(s)?		The location of the project is correct and has been confirmed by the audit team	Ø	V
A.4.1.2.	A.4.1.2. How is it ensured and/or demonstrated, that the project proponents can implement the project at this site (ownership, li- censes, contracts etc.)?		Abocol is owner of the installations	Ŋ	Ø
A.4.2.	Category(ies) of project activity				
A.4.2.1.	To which category(ies) does the project activity belonging to? Is the category cor- rectly identified and indicated?	14	The project belongs to category 5 and is correctly stated n the PDD	V	Ø
A.4.3.	Technology to be employed by the project a	activity			
A.4.3.1.	Does the technical design of the project activity reflect current good practices?		The technique use in the project is state of the art technique	Ø	Ø

Project Title:

Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
A.4.3.2.	Does the description of the technology to be applied provide sufficient and trans- parent input/ information to evaluate its impact on the greenhouse gas balance?		The description in the PDD clearly shows that such a technology will not increase any impact on the GHG balance		Ø
A.4.3.3.	Does the implementation of the project ac- tivity require any technology transfer from annex-I-countries to the host country(ies)?		The technology is available in Germany and is transfer to Colom- bia.		
A.4.3.4.	Is the technology implemented by the pro- ject activity environmentally safe?		The technology is not wide spread even in annex 1 countries, but it is expected to be environmental safe	Ø	V
A.4.3.5.	Is the information provided in compliance with actual situation or planning?		The information has been confirmed on site		
A.4.3.6.	Does the project use state of the art tech- nology and / or does the technology result in a significantly better performance than any commonly used technologies in the host country?		The project does use project of the art technology that even in annex 1 countries is not widely used.	Ø	Ø
A.4.3.7.	Is the project technology likely to be sub- stituted by other or more efficient tech- nologies within the project period?		The technology is not expected to be substitute during the credit- ing period		V
A.4.3.8.	Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to be carried out as scheduled during the project period?	20	Yes, the project secures initial training. It was confirmed on site that part of the training has been already done <u>Corrective Action Request No.2.</u> Please submit the future training plan for the operators.		Ø
A.4.3.9.	Is information available on the demand and requirements for training and mainte- nance?	20	See CAR 2	CAR2	N

Project Title:

Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION		Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD	
A.4.3.10.	Is a schedule available for the implemen- tation of the project and are there any risks for delays?		The baseline has been already realised and no delays under than CDM related delays are expected	Ŋ	Ŋ	
A.4.4.	Estimated amount of emission reductions o	ver the	chosen crediting period			
A.4.4.1.	Is the form required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?		The form is correctly applied. Additional information is presented in this chapter	Ø	Ø	
A.4.4.2.	Are the figures provided consistent with other data presented in the PDD?	16	The figures are obtained base on the work plan of the plant which has been confirmed onsite	V	V	
A.4.5.	.5. Public funding of the project activity					
A.4.5.1.	Is the information provided on public fund- ing provided in compliance with the actual situation or planning as available by the project participants?		The project use only private founds	Ŋ	Ø	
A.4.5.2.	Is all information provided consistent with the details given in remaining chapters of the PDD (in particular annex 2)?		Yes	R	Ŋ	
B. Appli	cation of a baseline and monitoring	meth	odology			
B.1. Tit	le and reference of the approved basel	line an	d monitoring methodology			
B.1.1.1.	Are reference number, version number, and title of the baseline and monitoring methodology clearly indicated?	14	The methodology is corrected mention in the PDD	Ø		
B.1.1.2.	Is the applied version the most recent one and / or is this version still applicable?		Yes as the date of the first PDD is the most recent one	V	V	

Project Title:

tle: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION		Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD				
B.2. Ju	B.2. Justification of the choice of the methodology and why it is applicable to the project activity								
B.2.1.1.	Is the applied methodology considered the most appropriate one?	14	Yes as the project developer has proposed the methodology for approval	Ø	Ø				
Integrate answered	Integrate the required amount of sub-checklists on the applicability criteria as given by the applied methodology and comment on at le answered with "No";								
B.2.2.	Criterion 1: The applicability is limited to the existing production capacity measured in tonnes of nitric acid, where the commercial produc- tion had began no later than 31 December 2005. Definition of "existing" production capacity is applied for the process with the existing ammonia oxidization reactor where N2O is generated and not for the process with new ammonia oxidizer. Ex- isting production "capacity" is defined as the designed capacity, measured in tons of nitric acid per year.		Applicability checklistYes / NoCriterion discussed in the PDD?yesCompliance provable?yesEvidences provided in the PDD?yesCompliance verified?yes						
B.2.3.	Criterion 2: The project activity will not result in the shut down of any existing N2O destruction or abatement facility or equipment in the plant.		Applicability checklistYes / NoCriterion discussed in the PDD?yesCompliance provable?yesEvidences provided in the PDD?yesCompliance verified?yes		Ø				
B.2.4.	Criterion 3:	16		Ø	Ø				

Project Title:

Fitle:Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation re-
actors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
	The project activity shall not affect the level of nitric acid production		Applicability checklistYes / NoCriterion discussed in the PDD?yesCompliance provable?yesEvidences provided in the PDD?yesCompliance verified?yes		
B.2.5.	Criterion 4: There are currently no regulatory require- ments or incentives to reduce levels of N2O emissions from nitric acid plants in the host country.	6	Applicability checklistYes / NoCriterion discussed in the PDD?yesCompliance provable?yesEvidences provided in the PDD?yesCompliance verified?yes		
B.2.6.	Criterion 5: No N2O abatement technology is cur- rently installed in the plant.		Applicability checklistYes / NoCriterion discussed in the PDD?yesCompliance provable?yesEvidences provided in the PDD?yesCompliance verified?yes		Ø
B.2.7.	Criterion 6: The project activity will not increase NOx emissions.		Applicability checklistYes / NoCriterion discussed in the PDD?yes	V	Ø

Project Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
			Compliance provable?yesEvidences provided in the PDD?yesCompliance verified?yes		
B.2.8.	Criterion 7: NOx abatement catalyst installed, if any, prior to the start of the project activity is not a Non- Selective Catalytic Reduction (NSCR) DeNOx unit.	7	Applicability checklistYes / NoCriterion discussed in the PDD?yesCompliance provable?yesEvidences provided in the PDD?yesCompliance verified?yes	Ø	
B.2.9.	Criterion 8: Operation of the secondary N2O abate- ment catalyst installed under the project activity does not lead to any process emissions of greenhouse gases, directly or indirectly.		Applicability checklistYes / NoCriterion discussed in the PDD?yesCompliance provable?YesEvidences provided in the PDD?yesCompliance verified?yes		Ø
B.2.10.	Criterion 9: Continuous real-time measurements of N2O concentration and total gas volume flow can be carried out in the stack: - Prior to the installation of the secondary		Applicability checklistYes / NoCriterion discussed in the PDD?yesCompliance provable?yesEvidences provided in the PDD?yes	Ø	Ø

Project Title:

Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
	catalyst for one campaign, and - After the installation of the secondary catalyst throughout the chosen crediting period of the project activity		Compliance verified?	yes		
B.3. D	B.3. Description of the sources and gases included in the project boundary					
Integrate swered w	the required amount of sub-checklists for sour	rces and	d gases as given by the methodology applied and	comment on at leas	st every lir	ne an-
B.3.1.	Source: Waste stream exiting the stack of the Ni- tirc Acid plant (Burner inlet to stack) Gas(es): N2O Type: Baseline Emissions and Project Emissions		Boundary checklistYSource and gas(es) discussed in the PDD?yInclusion / exclusion justified?yExplanation / Justification sufficient?yConsistency with monitoring plan?y	Yes / No yes yes yes yes	Ŋ	Ŋ
B.3.2.	Do the spatial and technological bounda- ries as verified on-site comply with the discussion provided by / indication in- cluded to the PDD?		The PDD includes a diagram of the installations a boundaries of the project	and mention the	Ŋ	V
B.4. D	escription of how the baseline scenario	is ide	ntified and description of the identified bas	eline scenario		
The base "Catalytic	line scenario shall be identified using procedu N2O destruction in the tail gas of Nitric Acid F	re for Ic Plants" v	lentification of the baseline scenario described in tl /ersion 03.	he approved metho	odology Al	V10028
B.4.1.	Have all technically feasible baseline sce- nario alternatives (at least all scenarios listed under step 1a in AM0028, vers.3) to the project activity been identified and dis-		All possible scenarios have been included and th ered to be complete as no other technical solution in the market	ie list is consid- ins are available	V	V

Project Title:

e: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
	cussed by the PDD? Why can this list be considered as being complete?				
B.4.2.	Have all technically feasible alternatives (at least all scenarios listed under step 1a in AM0028, vers.3) to handle NOx emis- sions been identified and discussed by the PDD?		All the scenarios have been discussed in the PDD		Ø
B.4.3.	Does the project identify correctly and ex- clude those options not in line with regula- tory or legal requirements?	6	es, as no regulation for N2O exists in Colombia		V
B.4.4.	Have applicable regulatory or legal re- quirements been identified?		No legal requirements have been found		Ø
B.4.5.	Is a complete list of barriers developed that prevent alternatives to occur (step 3a)?		The barriers are clearly explain in the PDD		Ŋ
B.4.6.	Is transparent and documented evidence	3	The barriers are based on national situation.	CAR3	V
	provided on the existence and signifi-		Corrective Action Request No.3.	CAR4	
	cance of these barriers?		Please include a clear reference of the given gas price.		
			Corrective Action Request No.4.		
			It should be clearly explained why it is assumed that extra heat would be necessary in case of the use of NSCR to reduce the NOx		
B.4.7.	Is it transparently shown that at least one of the alternatives is not prevented by the identified barriers (step 3b)?		Yes, as far as the above CRs and CARs are solved, the status quo does not have any barriers.	open	V
B.4.8.	Does the PDD include an appropriate dis- cussion if and how any alternatives gen-		As only one alternative is possible no step 4 is presented		V

Project Title:

le: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
	erate financial or economic benefits? (step 4)				
B.4.9.	In case of Option I: Is the least costly al- ternative clearly identified?		Not applicable	Ø	Ø
B.4.10.	In case of Option II: Is the most suitable financial indicator clearly identified?		Not applicable	Ø	Ŋ
B.4.11.	In case of Option II: Is the calculation of financial figures for this indicator correctly done for all remaining alternatives?		Not applicable	Ø	V
B.4.12.	In case of Option II: Is the investment analysis presented in a transparent man- ner providing public available proofs for data?		Not applicable	Ŋ	Ŋ
B.4.13.	In case of Option II: Is the sensitivity analysis evidencing the robustness of the financial attractiveness of the selected baseline scenario?		Not applicable	Ø	V
B.4.14.	In case of Option II: Have reasonable variations been applied in critical assump- tions?		Not applicable	Ø	Ŋ
B.4.15.	In case of a re-assessment in the course of the project's lifetime: Are there any new or modified NOx-emission regulations, which may address the project baseline?	3	Corrective Action Request No.5. The PDD should include the step 5, related to new or modify regulations, according to the methodology.	CAR5	Ŋ
B.4.16.	In case of a re-assessment in the course of the project's lifetime: Have new base- line scenarios been properly discussed re-		See CAR 5	CAR5	R

Project Title:

Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
	flecting the altered situation?				
B.4.17.	In case of a re-assessment in the course of the project's lifetime: Are there any new or modified N2O-emission regulations, which may address the project baseline?		See CAR 5	CAR5	
B.4.18.	In case of a re-assessment in the course of the project's lifetime: Have new base- line scenarios been properly discussed re- flecting the altered situation?		See CAR 5	CAR5	Ŋ
B.5. Do in	escription of how the anthropogenic en the absence of the registered CDM pro	nissior oject ad	ns of GHG by sources are reduced below those that would ctivity (assessment and demonstration of additionality):	have occ	urred
B.5.1.	In case of applying step 2 / investment analysis of the additionality tool: Is the analysis method identified appropriately (step 2a)?		The option I is correctly applied	Ø	Ŋ
B.5.2.	In case of Option I (simple cost analysis): Is it demonstrated that the activity pro- duces no economic benefits other than CDM income?		It is clear that no other income will be related to this kind of pro- jects	Ø	Ŋ
B.5.3.	In case of Option II (investment compari- son analysis): Is the most suitable finan- cial indicator clearly identified (IRR, NPV, cost benefit ratio, or (levelized) unit cost)?		Not applicable	Ø	V
B.5.4.	In case of Option III (benchmark analysis): Is the most suitable financial indicator clearly identified (IRR, NPV, cost benefit ratio, or (levelized) unit cost)?		Not applicable		V

Project Title:

Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.5.5.	In case of Option II or Option III: Is the calculation of financial figures for this indi- cator correctly done for all alternatives and the project activity?		Not applicable	Ø	Ø
B.5.6.	In case of Option II or Option III: Is the analysis presented in a transparent man- ner including publicly available proofs for the utilized data?		Not applicable	V	V
B.5.7.	In case of applying step 3 (barrier analy- sis) of the additionality tool: Is a complete list of barriers developed that prevent the different alternatives to occur?		Not applicable	Ø	Ø
B.5.8.	In case of applying step 3 (barrier analy- sis): Is transparent and documented evi- dence provided on the existence and sig- nificance of these barriers?		Not applicable	Ø	Ø
B.5.9.	In case of applying step 3 (barrier analy- sis): Is it transparently shown that the exe- cution of at least one of the alternatives is not prevented by the identified barriers?		Not applicable	Ŋ	R
B.5.10.	Have other activities in the host country / region similar to the project activity been identified and are these activities appro- priately analyzed by the PDD (step 4a)?		Other activities in the region have been identified and the known projects are CDM activities	Ø	Ŋ
B.5.11.	If similar activities are occurring: Is it demonstrated that in spite of these simi- larities the project activity would not be implemented without the CDM component		See comment above	Ø	Ŋ

Project Title:

Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
	(step 4b)?				
B.5.12.	Is it appropriately explained how the ap- proval of the project activity will help to overcome the economic and financial hur- dles or other identified barriers (step 5)?		Yes, as the CERs are the only source of income, the project is totally linked to the CDM process		Σ
B.6. En	nissions reductions				
B.6.1.	Explanation of methodological choices				
B.6.1.1.	Is it explained how the procedures pro- vided in the methodology are applied by the proposed project activity?	17	The PDD follows exactly the procedure as in the methodology	Ŋ	Σ
B.6.1.2.	Is every selection of options offered by the methodology correctly justified and is this justification in line with the situation veri- fied on-site?		The option adopted is to take the historical data. It was confirmed on site that the campaigns 1 and 3 should not be included in the analysis are they were irregular campaigns. In the case of the length of the campaign the campaign 5 could be not included as it was stopped for CDM reasons and not for technical reasons	Ŋ	Ŋ
B.6.1.3.	Are the formulae required for the determi- nation of project emissions correctly pre- sented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or moni- tored?		The formulae is correctly applied	Ø	Ŋ
B.6.1.4.	Are the formulae required for the determi- nation of baseline emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identifica- tion of parameter to be used and / or monitored?	23	Yes, all the formulae follows the methodology <u>Corrective Action Request No.6.</u> The campaign length for NAN2 should be calculated as stipulated by the methodology, and not based on assumptions	CAR6	Ŋ
B.6.1.5.	Are the formulae required for the determi-		According to the methodology no leakage has to be taken into		Ø

Project Title:

Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION		Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
	nation of leakage emissions correctly pre- sented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or moni- tored?		account			
B.6.1.6.	Are the formulae required for the determi- nation of emission reductions correctly presented?		Yes the formulae clearly shows how to calculat ductions	te the emission re-	Ŋ	Ŋ
B.6.2.	Data and parameters that are available at v	ralidatio	n			
B.6.2.1.	Is the list of parameters presented in chapter B.6.2 considered to be complete with regard to the requirements of the applied methodology?		Yes the list is considered complete.		Ŋ	Ŋ
Integrate t	the required amount of sub-checklists for mor	nitoring	parameter and comment on any line answered v	with "No"		
B.6.2.2.	Parameter Title: NCSG _{BC} N2O concentration in the stackgas	16, 17	Data ChecklistTitle in line with methodology?Data unit correctly expressed?Appropriate description of parameter?Source clearly referenced?Correct value provided?Has this value been verified?Choice of data correctly justified?Measurement method correctly described?The correct calculation process has been confiline data has to be confirmed by the verifier.	Yes / No Yes yes yes yes yes no yes yes yes irmed but the base-		To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑
B.6.2.3.	Parameter Title: VSG _{BC}	16, 17	Data Checklist	Yes / No	Ø	To be con-

Project Title:

Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
	Volume flow rate of the stack gas		Title in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?YesAppropriate description of parameter?YesSource clearly referenced?YesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?yesMeasurement method correctly described?yesThe correct calculation process has been confirmed but the baseline data has to be confirmed by the verifier.		firmed by the verifier ☑
B.6.2.4.	Parameter Title: BE _{BC} Total N2O for baseline campaign	16, 17	Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?YesAppropriate description of parameter?YesSource clearly referenced?YesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?yesThe correct calculation process has been confirmed but the baseline data has to be confirmed by the verifier.		To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑
B.6.2.5.	Parameter Title: OH _{BC} Operating hours	16, 17	Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?YesAppropriate description of parameter?Yes	Ø	To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑

Project Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.6.2.6.	Parameter Title: NAP _{BC} Nitric acid (100% concentrated) over baseline campaign	16, 17	Source clearly referenced?YesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?yesThe correct calculation process has been confirmed but the base- line data has to be confirmed by the verifier.Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?YesAppropriate description of parameter?YesSource clearly referenced?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?YesHas this value been verified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?yesThe correct calculation process has been confirmed but the base- line data has to be confirmed by the verifier. Value is based on the flow from raw data and a fix value for concentration taken in a conservative manner		To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑
B.6.2.7.	Parameter Title: TSG Temperature of stack gas	16, 17	Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?YesAppropriate description of parameter?YesSource clearly referenced?Yes		To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑

Project Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
			Correct value provided?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?yesMeasurement method correctly described?YesThe correct calculation process has been confirmed but the line data has to be confirmed by the verifier.	ne base-		
B.6.2.8.	Parameter Title: PSG Pressure of stack gas	16, 17	Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?YesAppropriate description of parameter?YesSource clearly referenced?YesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?yesThe correct calculation process has been confirmed but the line data has to be confirmed by the verifier.	ne base-		To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑
B.6.2.9.	Parameter Title: EF _{BL} Emissions factor for baseline period	16, 17	Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?yesData unit correctly expressed?yesAppropriate description of parameter?yesSource clearly referenced?yesCorrect value provided?yesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?Yes			To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑

Project Title:

Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
		The correct calculation process has been confirmed but the base- line data has to be confirmed by the verifier.		
B.6.2.10. Parameter Title: UNC Overall measurement uncertainty of the monitoring system	16, 17	Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?yesData unit correctly expressed?yesAppropriate description of parameter?yesSource clearly referenced?yesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?YesChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?YesThe correct calculation process has been confirmed but the base-line data has to be confirmed by the verifier.For the estimation of the value for validation porpouse, the actual approach of using manufacturer data is acceptable.		To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑
B.6.2.11. Parameter Title: AFR Ammonia gas flow rate to the AOR	16, 17	Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?yesData unit correctly expressed?noAppropriate description of parameter?yesSource clearly referenced?yesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?yesThe correct calculation process has been confirmed but the base-	CAR 7	To be con- firmed by the verifier

Project Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
		line data has to be confirmed by the verifier.			
		Corrective Action Request No.7.			
		The units for AFR should be in kg and not in tones			
B.6.2.12. Parameter Title: AFR _{max} Maximum ammonia flow rate	16, 17	Data ChecklistYes / NTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?noAppropriate description of parameter?YesSource clearly referenced?YesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?YesThe correct calculation process has been confirmed butline data has to be confirmed by the verifier.	the base-	CAR7	To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑
B.6.2.13. Parameter Title: AIFR Ammonia to Air ratio	16, 17	See CAR 7Data ChecklistYes / NTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?YesAppropriate description of parameter?YesSource clearly referenced?YesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?yes			To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑

Project Title:

Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUE	STION Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
		The correct calculation process has been confirmed but the base- line data has to be confirmed by the verifier.		
B.6.2.14. Parameter Title: CL _{BL} , Campaign length of base	line campaign 16, 17, 23	Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?YesAppropriate description of parameter?YesSource clearly referenced?YesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?YesChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?YesThe correct calculation process has been confirmed but the base-line data has to be confirmed by the verifier.Corrective Action Request No.8.Please use the total amount of acid produced during the campaign.	CAR 8	To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑
B.6.2.15. Parameter Title: CL _{normal} Normal campaign length	16, 17, 3	Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?yesData unit correctly expressed?yesAppropriate description of parameter?yesSource clearly referenced?noCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?Yes	CR2	To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑

Project Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
		The correct calculation process has been confirmed but the base- line data has to be confirmed by the verifier. <u>Clarification Request No. 2.</u> NAN2 does not use all historic campaigns as reference. Please clarify		
B.6.2.16. Parameter Title: AIFR _{max} Maximum ammonia to air ratio	16, 17	Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?YesAppropriate description of parameter?YesSource clearly referenced?YesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?yesThe correct calculation process has been confirmed but the base-line data has to be confirmed by the verifier.		To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑
B.6.2.17. Parameter Title: OT _h Oxidation temperature for each hour	16, 17	Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?YesAppropriate description of parameter?YesSource clearly referenced?YesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?yes		To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑

Project Title:

Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
		The correct calculation process has been confirmed but the base- line data has to be confirmed by the verifier.		
B.6.2.18. Parameter Title: OT _{normal} Normal operating temperature	16, 17	Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?YesAppropriate description of parameter?YesSource clearly referenced?YesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?yesMeasurement method correctly described?YesThe correct calculation process has been confirmed but the base-line data has to be confirmed by the verifier.		To be con- firmed by the verifier ₪
B.6.2.19. Parameter Title: OP _h Oxidation Pressure for each hour	16, 17	Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?YesAppropriate description of parameter?YesSource clearly referenced?YesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?yesThe correct calculation process has been confirmed but the base-line data has to be confirmed by the verifier.	ß	To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑
B.6.2.20. Parameter Title:	16,		Ø	To be

Project Title:

e: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
OP _{normal} Normal operating pressure	17	Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?YesAppropriate description of parameter?YesSource clearly referenced?YesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?yesThe correct calculation process has been confirmed but the base-Line data has to be confirmed by the verifier		con- firmed by the verifier ☑
B.6.2.21. Parameter Title: GS _{normal} , Normal gauze supplier for the operation condition campaigns		Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?YesAppropriate description of parameter?YesSource clearly referenced?YesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?YesChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?N/A		
B.6.2.22. Parameter Title: GS _{BL} Gauze supplier for baseline campaign		Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?Yes		Ø

Project Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CI	HECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.6.2.23. F	Parameter Title: GC _{normal} Gauze composition during the operation campaign.		Appropriate description of parameter? Source clearly referenced? Correct value provided? Has this value been verified? Choice of data correctly justified? Measurement method correctly described? Data Checklist Title in line with methodology? Data unit correctly expressed? Appropriate description of parameter? Source clearly referenced? Correct value provided? Has this value been verified? Choice of data correctly justified? Measurement method correctly described?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes N/A Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes		
B.6.2.24. F ((Parameter Title: GC _{BL} , Gauze composition during baseline cam- paign		Data Checklist Title in line with methodology? Data unit correctly expressed? Appropriate description of parameter? Source clearly referenced? Correct value provided?	Yes / No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Ø	

Project Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
			Has this value been verified?YesChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?N/A		
B.6.2.25	Parameter Title: EF _{reg} Emissions level set by incoming policies or regulations	16, 17	Data ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?YesData unit correctly expressed?YesAppropriate description of parameter?YesSource clearly referenced?YesCorrect value provided?YesHas this value been verified?NoChoice of data correctly justified?YesMeasurement method correctly described?YesThe correct calculation process has been confirmed but the base-line data has to be confirmed by the verifier.		To be con- firmed by the verifier ☑
B.6.3.	Ex-ante calculation of emission reductions				
B.6.3.1.	Is the projection based on the same pro- cedures as used for future monitoring?		Yes the procedures are the same that will be used in the future		
B.6.3.2.	Are the GHG calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?	3	Yes in the main <u>Clarification Request No. 3.</u> It should be clarified with an example how the results will be ob- tained	CR3	Ø
B.6.3.3.	Is the data provided in this section consis- tent with data as presented in other chap-	16, 17	The correct calculation process has been confirmed, the data pro- vided is consistent but will finally be confirmed by the verifier.	V	Ŋ

Project Title:

: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
	ters of the PDD?				
B.6.4.	Summary of the ex-ante estimation of emiss	sion rec	luctions		
B.6.4.1.	Will the project result in fewer GHG emis- sions than the baseline scenario?		Yes as the plant does not have actually any installation to reduce N2O	V	
B.6.4.2.	Is the form/table required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?		Yes the table is complete and clear	M	Ŋ
B.6.4.3.	Is the projection in line with the envisioned time schedule for the project's implemen- tation and the indicated crediting period?		As confirmed during onsite audit the schedule for the project is in line with the dates used in chapter C		V
B.6.4.4.	Is the data provided in this section in con- sistency with data as presented in other chapters of the PDD?		The correct calculation process has been confirmed, the data pro- vided is consistent but will finally be confirmed by the verifier.	Ŋ	V
В.7. Ар	plication of the monitoring methodolog	gy and	I description of the monitoring plan		
B.7.1.	Data and parameters monitored				
B.7.1.1.	Is the list of parameters presented in chapter B.7.1 considered to be complete with regard to the requirements of the ap- plied methodology?	3	 <u>Corrective Action Request No.9.</u> The identification number of the parameter is not always consistent with the methodology <u>Corrective Action Request No.10.</u> The gauze composition for the project campaigns have to be included in the monitoring plan <u>Corrective Action Request No.11.</u> Please include an statement that assure, the data will be achieved for at least 2 years "after crediting period" <u>Corrective Action Request No.12.</u> 	CAR9 CAR10 CAR11 CAR12	R
			The historical gauze composition should be available at time of		

Project Title:

Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
			validation and it is not possible to be monitored parameter from the monitoring plan.	, please delete this		
Integrate t	he required amount of sub-checklists for mo	nitoring	parameter and comment on any line answered w	vith "No"		
B.7.1.2.	Parameter Title: NCSG N2O concentration in the stackgas	24	Monitoring Checklist Title in line with methodology?	Yes / No Yes	CAR13	V
			Data unit correctly expressed? Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes Yes		
			Source clearly referenced? Correct value provided for estimation? Has this value been verified?	Yes Yes Yes		
			Correct reference to standards? Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes Yes Yes		
			QA/QC procedures appropriate? <u>Corrective Action Request No.13.</u> The calibration and maintenance proposed sch	edule should be		
			ment	le internal docu-		
B.7.1.3.	Parameter Title: VSG Volume flow rate of the stack gas	24	Monitoring Checklist Title in line with methodology? Data unit correctly expressed? Appropriate description of parameter? Source clearly referenced?	Yes / No Yes Yes Yes Yes	CAR13	

Project Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

C	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
			Correct value provided for estimation? Has this value been verified? Measurement method correctly described? Correct reference to standards? Indication of accuracy provided? QA/QC procedures described? QA/QC procedures appropriate? See CAR 13	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes no		
B.7.1.4.	Parameter Title: PE _n N2O emissions of nth project campaign	24	Monitoring Checklist Title in line with methodology? Data unit correctly expressed? Appropriate description of parameter? Source clearly referenced? Correct value provided for estimation? Has this value been verified? Measurement method correctly described? Correct reference to standards? Indication of accuracy provided? QA/QC procedures described? QA/QC procedures appropriate? See CAR 13	Yes / No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes no	CAR13	
B.7.1.5.	Parameter Title: OH Operating hours		Monitoring Checklist Title in line with methodology?	Yes / No Yes		V

Project Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
			Data unit correctly expressed?Appropriate description of parameter?Source clearly referenced?Correct value provided for estimation?Has this value been verified?Measurement method correctly described?Correct reference to standards?Indication of accuracy provided?QA/QC procedures described?QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes Yes N/A N/A Yes Yes N/A Yes yes		
B.7.1.6.	Parameter Title: NAP Nitric acid (100% concentrated)	24	Monitoring Checklist Title in line with methodology? Data unit correctly expressed? Appropriate description of parameter? Source clearly referenced? Correct value provided for estimation? Has this value been verified? Measurement method correctly described? Correct reference to standards? Indication of accuracy provided? QA/QC procedures described? QA/QC procedures appropriate? See CAR13	Yes / No Yes Yes Yes yes N/A N/A Yes Yes Yes No No No	CAR13	V
B.7.1.7.	Parameter Title:	24			CAR13	Ø

Project Title:

Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
	TSG Temperature of stack gas		Monitoring ChecklistTitle in line with methodology?Data unit correctly expressed?Appropriate description of parameter?Source clearly referenced?Correct value provided for estimation?Has this value been verified?Measurement method correctly described?Correct reference to standards?Indication of accuracy provided?QA/QC procedures described?See CAR13	Yes / No Yes Yes Yes yes N/A N/A Yes Yes No No No		
B.7.1.8.	Parameter Title: PSG Pressure of stack gas	24	Monitoring Checklist Title in line with methodology? Data unit correctly expressed? Appropriate description of parameter? Source clearly referenced? Correct value provided for estimation? Has this value been verified? Measurement method correctly described? Correct reference to standards? Indication of accuracy provided? QA/QC procedures described? QA/QC procedures appropriate? See CAR13	Yes / No Yes Yes Yes yes N/A N/A Yes Yes No No No	CAR13	Ø

Project Title:

Fitle:Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation re-
actors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.7.1.9. Parameter Title: EF _n Emissions factor calculated for nth cam- paign		Monitoring Checklist Title in line with methodology? Data unit correctly expressed? Appropriate description of parameter? Source clearly referenced? Correct value provided for estimation? Has this value been verified? Measurement method correctly described? Correct reference to standards? Indication of accuracy provided? QA/QC procedures described? QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes / No Yes Yes Yes yes N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A		
B.7.1.10. Parameter Title: EF _{mn,a} Moving average emissions factor		Monitoring Checklist Title in line with methodology? Data unit correctly expressed? Appropriate description of parameter? Source clearly referenced? Correct value provided for estimation? Has this value been verified? Measurement method correctly described? Correct reference to standards? Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes / No Yes Yes Yes yes N/A N/A Yes N/A N/A		

Project Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
		QA/QC procedures described? QA/QC procedures appropriate?	N/A N/A		
B.7.1.11. Parameter Title: AFR Ammonia gas flow rate to the AOR	24	Monitoring ChecklistTitle in line with methodology?Data unit correctly expressed?Appropriate description of parameter?Source clearly referenced?Correct value provided for estimation?Has this value been verified?Measurement method correctly described?Correct reference to standards?Indication of accuracy provided?QA/QC procedures described?See CAR13	Yes / No Yes Yes Yes yes N/A N/A Yes Yes Yes No No No	CAR13	Ŋ
B.7.1.12. Parameter Title: AIFR Ammonia to Air ratio	24	Monitoring Checklist Title in line with methodology? Data unit correctly expressed? Appropriate description of parameter? Source clearly referenced? Correct value provided for estimation? Has this value been verified?	Yes / No Yes Yes Yes yes N/A N/A	CAR13	Ø

Project Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.7.1.13. Parameter Title: CLn Campaign length	24	Measurement method correctly described? Correct reference to standards? Indication of accuracy provided? QA/QC procedures described? QA/QC procedures appropriate? See CAR13 Monitoring Checklist Title in line with methodology? Data unit correctly expressed? Appropriate description of parameter? Source clearly referenced? Correct value provided for estimation? Has this value been verified? Measurement method correctly described? Correct reference to standards? Indication of accuracy provided? QA/QC procedures described?	Yes No No No No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes N/A N/A N/A N/A NO No No No	GSP CAR13	PDD
B.7.1.14. Parameter Title: EF _p Emissions factor used to determine emis- sions reductions		QA/QC procedures appropriate? See CAR 13 Monitoring Checklist Title in line with methodology? Data unit correctly expressed?	No Yes / No Yes Yes		Ŋ

Project Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
		Source clearly referenced? Correct value provided for estimation? Has this value been verified? Measurement method correctly described? Correct reference to standards? Indication of accuracy provided? QA/QC procedures described? QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes N/A N/A Yes Yes N/A N/A N/A		
B.7.1.15. Parameter Title: EF _{min} Minimum emissions factor after 10 cam- paigns		Monitoring Checklist Title in line with methodology? Data unit correctly expressed? Appropriate description of parameter? Source clearly referenced? Correct value provided for estimation? Has this value been verified? Measurement method correctly described? Correct reference to standards? Indication of accuracy provided? QA/QC procedures described? QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes / No Yes Yes Yes N/A N/A Yes Yes N/A N/A N/A		
B.7.1.16. Parameter Title: OT _h	24	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	CAR13	V

Project Title:

Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
Oxidation temperature for each hour		Title in line with methodology?Data unit correctly expressed?Appropriate description of parameter?Source clearly referenced?Correct value provided for estimation?Has this value been verified?Measurement method correctly described?Correct reference to standards?Indication of accuracy provided?QA/QC procedures described?	Yes Yes Yes N/A N/A Yes Yes No No		
B.7.1.17. Parameter Title:	24	QA/QC procedures appropriate? See CAR13	No	CAR13	Ø
Oxidation Pressure for each hour		Monitoring ChecklistTitle in line with methodology?Data unit correctly expressed?Appropriate description of parameter?Source clearly referenced?Correct value provided for estimation?Has this value been verified?Measurement method correctly described?Correct reference to standards?Indication of accuracy provided?QA/QC procedures described?See CAR13	Yes / No Yes Yes Yes yes N/A N/A Yes Yes No No No		

Project Title:

Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.7.1.18. Parameter Title: GS _{project} Gauze supplier for the project campaigns		Monitoring ChecklistTitle in line with methodology?Data unit correctly expressed?Appropriate description of parameter?Source clearly referenced?Correct value provided for estimation?Has this value been verified?Measurement method correctly described?Correct reference to standards?Indication of accuracy provided?QA/QC procedures described?QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes / No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A		J
B.7.1.19. Parameter Title: GC _{project} Gauze composition during project cam- paign	3	Monitoring Checklist Title in line with methodology? Data unit correctly expressed? Appropriate description of parameter? Source clearly referenced? Correct value provided for estimation? Has this value been verified? Measurement method correctly described? Correct reference to standards? Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes / No	CAR10	J

Project Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.7.1.20. Parameter Title: UNC Overall measurement uncertainty of the monitoring system	3	QA/QC procedures described? QA/QC procedures appropriate? See CAR 10 Monitoring Checklist Yes / No Title in line with methodology? Data unit correctly expressed? Appropriate description of parameter? Source clearly referenced? Correct value provided for estimation? Has this value been verified? Measurement method correctly described? Correct reference to standards? Indication of accuracy provided? QA/QC procedures described? QA/QC procedures appropriate? Data uniter UNC should be included in the monitoring plan.	CAR14	
B.7.1.21. Parameter Title: EF _{reg} Emissions level set by incoming policies or regulations	3	Monitoring ChecklistYes / NoTitle in line with methodology?Data unit correctly expressed?Appropriate description of parameter?Source clearly referenced?	CAR15	Ŋ

Project Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
			Correct value provided for estimation? Has this value been verified? Measurement method correctly described? Correct reference to standards? Indication of accuracy provided? QA/QC procedures described? QA/QC procedures appropriate? Corrective Action Request No.15. The parameter EFreg should be included in the monitoring plan.		
B.7.2.	Description of the monitoring plan				
B.7.2.1.	Is the operational and management struc- ture clearly described and in compliance with the envisioned situation?	3	The structure is mainly clear <u>Corrective Action Request No.16.</u> The organisation diagram including responsibilities should be pre- sented.	CAR16	Ŋ
B.7.2.2.	Are responsibilities and institutional ar- rangements for data collection and archiv- ing clearly provided?	3	See CAR16	CAR16	V
B.7.2.3.	Does the monitoring plan provide current good monitoring practice?	19	The discussion about the EN 14181 shows current good monitor- ing practice.	Ŋ	Q
B.7.2.4.	Has the monitoring system installed using the European Norm 14181 (2004)?	19, 3	There is no confirmation of the QAL1 for the N ₂ O analyser and there is no QAL 2 and QAL3 confirmation for any of the equip- ments installed. <u>Corrective Action Request No.17.</u> Documentation to confirm the proper installation of the equip- ments and all the requirements from EN 14181 should be submit	CAR17	Ŋ

Project Title:

Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

(CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
			ted to the validator.		
B.7.2.5.	Will the three quality assurance levels been met by the planned Automated Measuring System (AMS) according to the EN14181?	19, 3	See CAR 17	CAR17	Ŋ
B.7.2.6.	Are the specific performance characteris- tics of the monitoring system chosen by the project listed in the PDD?		The information is included in annex 4	Ø	Ø
B.7.2.7.	Is information on the margins of errors and the cumulative error for the complete measurement system provided in the PDD?	4, 10, 3	The PDD use the manufacturer data, which is acceptable as an estimate. See CAR 14	CAR14	V
B.7.2.8.	Is the inclusion of external accredited ser- vices providers for calibration and function tests foreseen in the planning of the pro- ject?		Yes, this will be confirmed during the verification process.	Ø	V
B.7.2.9.	Are the requirements on the treatment of downtime of the AMS clearly reflected in the envisioned calculation routines?	3	Corrective Action Request No.18. The AMS downtime is not correctly address in the PDD	CAR18	Ø
B.7.2.10.	If applicable: Does annex 4 provide useful information enabling a better under- standing of the envisioned monitoring pro- visions?		Yes it includes additional information about accuracy for some equipment	Ø	Ŋ
B.8. Da per	B.8. Date of completion of the application of the baseline study and monitoring methodology an the name of the responsible person(s)/entity(ies)				
B.8.1.1.	Is there any indication of a date when the baseline was determined?		Yes the date is clearly express	Q	

Project Title:

Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.8.1.2.	Is this consistent with the time line of the PDD history?		Yes it is the same as for the complete PDD	Ø	Ŋ
B.8.1.3.	Is the information on the person(s) / entity (ies) responsible for the application of the baseline and monitoring methodology provided consistent with the actual situa- tion?		Yes it is correctly mention	Ø	Ŋ
B.8.1.4.	Is information provided whether this per-	3	Corrective Action Request No.19.	CAR19	\checkmark
	son / entity is also considered a project participant?		Please include that the persons are part of the project participants entities		
C. Duration of the project activity / crediting period					
C.1. Du	ration of the project activity				
C.1.1.	Are the project's starting date and opera- tional lifetime clearly defined and reason- able?		Yes it is reasonable to have 15 year of operational life	Ø	Ø
C.2. Ch	oice of the crediting period and related	d infor	mation		
C.2.1.	Is the assumed crediting time clearly de- fined and reasonable (renewable crediting period of max 7 years with potential for 2 renewals or fixed crediting period of max. 10 years)?		The project will use a fix crediting period of 10 years and the start- ing date is clearly mention	Ø	Ŋ
D. Envir	ronmental impacts				
D.1. Do	ocumentation on the analysis of the en	vironm	ental impacts, including transboundary impacts		
D.1.1.	Has the analysis of the environmental im- pacts of the project activity been suffi-		The project is expected to have no negative environmental impacts	V	Ø

Project Title:

le: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
	ciently described?				
D.1.2.	Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and if yes, has an EIA been ap- proved?	21, 22	In accordance with the resolution 0454 from the DNA an EIA is not required for this kind of projects	Ø	
D.1.3.	Will the project create any adverse envi- ronmental effects?		No	Ø	Ø
D.1.4.	Were transboundary environmental im- pacts identified in the analysis?		No the project will not have any transboundary impact	Ø	Ø
D.2. If si wi	D.2. If environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, please provide conclu- sions and all references to support documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party			onclu- Ince	
D.2.1.	Have the identified environmental impacts been addressed in the project design suf- ficiently?	3	Clarification Request No. 4. It should be clarified where in the methodology it is mentioned that no EIA is necessary	CR4	Ŋ
D.2.2.	Does the project comply with environ- mental legislation in the host country?		This will be confirmed with the LoA <u>Corrective Action Request No.20.</u> The LoA should be submitted before the submission for registra- tion of the project to the UNFCCC	CAR20	Ŋ
E. Stak	eholders' comments				
E.1. Br	rief description how comments by local	l stake	holders have been invited and compiled		
E.1.1.	Have relevant stakeholders been con- sulted?		Yes all relevant stakeholders have been consulted	Ø	Ø
E.1.2.	Have appropriate media been used to in-		Yes the invitations were made via newspaper and personally	V	Ø

Project Title:

tle: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
	vite comments by local stakeholders?				
E.1.3.	If a stakeholder consultation process is required by regulations/laws in the host country, has the stakeholder consultation process been carried out in accordance with such regulations/laws?		Yes and the project participants have followed the regulations	Ø	V
E.1.4.	Is the undertaken stakeholder process that was carried out described in a com- plete and transparent manner?		Yes see comment above	Ø	Ø
E.2. Sı	ummary of the comments received				
E.2.1.	Is a summary of the received stakeholder comments provided?	3	Corrective Action Request No.21. Please include any positive or negative comments given by the	CAR21	Ø
E3 Re	eport on how due account was taken of	any c			
E.3.1.	Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	3	See CAR21	CAR21	
F. Anne	exes 1 - 4				
F.1. Ar	nnex 1: Contact Information				
F.1.1.	Is the information provided consistent with the one given under section A.3?		Yes	Ø	Ø
F.1.2.	Is the information on all private partici- pants and directly involved Parties pre- sented?		Yes	V	Ŋ

Project Title:

e: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
F.2. A	nnex 2: Information regarding public fu	nding			
F.2.1.	Is the information provided on the inclu- sion of public funding (if any) in consis- tency with the actual situation presented by the project participants?		Not applicable	Ø	Ŋ
F.2.2.	If necessary: Is an affirmation available that any such funding from Annex-I- countries does not result in a diversion of ODA?		Not applicable	Ø	Ø
F.3. A	nnex 3: Baseline information				
F.3.1.	If additional background information on baseline data is provided: Is this informa- tion consistent with data presented by other sections of the PDD?	3	Clarification Request No. 5. The additional information given in the annex 3 of the PDD is not clear explained.	CR5	V
F.3.2.	Is the data provided verifiable? Has suffi- cient evidence been provided to the vali- dation team?		See CR5	CR5	Ŋ
F.3.3.	Does the additional information substanti- ate / support statements given in other sections of the PDD?		See CR5	CR5	Ŋ
F.4. A	nnex 4: Monitoring information				
F.4.1.	If additional background information on monitoring is provided: Is this information consistent with data presented in other sections of the PDD?		Yes additional information is given in this annex		V
F.4.2.	Is the information provided verifiable? Has		See CARs and CRs above	open	\checkmark

Project Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

	CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
	sufficient evidence been provided to the validation team?				
F.4.3.	Do the additional information and / or documented procedures substantiate / support statements given in other sections of the PDD?		In the main yes but see CARs and CRs above	open	

Project Title:

Title: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07 Number of Pages: 49

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Clarifications and corrective action re- quests by validation team	Ref. to table 1	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
Corrective Action Request No.1. The layout of the PDD includes twice the page number, please correct this layout	A.2.2	Amended according to request.	This has been correctly changed ☑
Clarification Request No. 1. Please clarified all the statements related to "Detail information will be added to the final version of the PDD"	A.2.4.	This has been done. Especially, information on the chosen abatement technology has been provided. Abo- col has made its choice on which secondary catalyst to install. The Colombian DNA has sent the Letter of approval for this project. The scheduled DNA-Meeting has been postponed which was the reason for delay.	All documents have been provided
Corrective Action Request No.2. Please submit the future training plan for the operators.	A.4.3.8	This has been sent to the auditor by mail dated 16 th Feb 07. The training plan is referred on page 70 of the PDD.	The training plan is clearly structured ☑
Corrective Action Request No.3. Please include a clear reference of the gas price use as reference.	B.4.6	Amended according to request (see footnote 28).	The reference is reliable ☑
Corrective Action Request No.4. It should be clearly explain why is assumed that extra heat would be necessary in case of a the use of NSCR to reduce the NOx	B.4.6	Amended according to request (see page 27 and foot- notes 27 and 29).	The information included clearly explained this issue ☑
Corrective Action Request No.5. The PDD should include the step 5, related to new or modify regulations, according to the	B.4.15	Amended according to request (see pages 24 and 29).	

Project Title:

Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

Clarifications and corrective action re- quests by validation team	Ref. to table 1	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
methodology.			
Corrective Action Request No.6. The campaign length for NAN2 should be calculated as stipulated by the methodology, and not base on assumptions	B.6.1.4	Amended according to request. The NAN2 campaign length was calculated based on historic campaigns 2 and 4 (out of a total of five historic campaigns the plant has been operated for.	The reasons given to not used the other campaigns has been confirmed with documentation provided
		Campaigns 1, 3 and 5 were not considered as repre- sentative for how NAN2 campaigns usually are oper- ated. Campaigns 1 and 3 were abnormal due to techni- cal abnormalities and campaign 5 was interrupted pre- maturely by Abocol management in order to start the baseline campaign.	M
		Documentation for these circumstances has been pro- vided during the on-site validation (October 26 th to 27 th and January 23 rd to 25 th) and by mail dated 16 th Feb 07 ("Declaracion 5 campagna").	
Corrective Action Request No.7. The units for AFR should be in kg and not in tones	B.6.2.11	Amended according to request.	This has been correctly changed ☑
Corrective Action Request No.8. Please use the total amount of acid produce	B.6.2.14	Amended according to request. The NAP production for NAN2 was in fact 23,781 tHNO3.	The document submitted clearly demonstrate and con-
during the campaign.		The value previously communicated had been calcu- lated incorrectly.	firmed the NAP data ☑
		This has been confirmed by Abocol in writing; the scanned document was sent to the validator by mail dated 6 th February 07.	
Clarification Request No. 2. NAN2 does not use all historic campaigns as	B.6.2.15	Amended according to request, see page 27 and references made on pages 27 and 28. Some footnotes were	The reasons have been con- firmed during validation

Project Title:

Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

Clarifications and corrective action re- quests by validation team	Ref. to table 1	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
reference. Please clarify		amended accordingly.	R
Clarification Request No. 3. It should be clarified with an example how the results will be obtained	B.6.3.2	Amended according to request. The entire sections B.6.3 and B.6.4 have been re-worded in order to ex- plain the data processing procedures and the calcula- tion of reductions achieved during the project cam- paigns more clearly.	Now is possible to under- stand the way of calculating the emission reductions I
Corrective Action Request No.9. The identification number of the parameter is not always consistent with the methodology	B.7.1.1	Amended according to request.	This has been corrected ☑
Corrective Action Request No.10. The gauze composition for the project cam- paigns have to be included in the monitoring plan	B.7.1.1	Amended according to request.	
Corrective Action Request No.11. Please include an statement that assure, the data will be achieved for at least 2 years "af- ter crediting period"	B.7.1.1	Amended according to request, see page 57 (section B.7.1).	Correctly included ☑
Corrective Action Request No.12. The historical gauze composition is not pos- sible to be monitored, please delete this pa- rameter form the monitoring plan	B.7.1.1	Amended according to request.	
Corrective Action Request No.13. The calibration and maintenance proposed schedule should be included in the PDD or at least a reference to the internal document	B.7.1.2	Amended according to request. References are con- tained in footnotes 52 and 56. The documents have been sent to the validator by mail dated 16 th February 07 and can be made available upon request.	The document clearly pre- sents the schedule ☑
Corrective Action Request No.14.	B.7.1.20	Amended according to request (page 67).	The parameter is complete

Project Title:

e: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

Clarifications and corrective action re- quests by validation team	Ref. to table 1	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
The parameter UNC should be included in the monitoring plan.			and clear ☑
Corrective Action Request No.15. The parameter EFreg should be included in the monitoring plan.	B.7.1.21	Amended according to request (page 69).	The parameter is complete and clear ☑
Corrective Action Request No.16. It should be clearly showed the organisation diagram including responsibilities.	B.7.2.1.	Amended according to request (page 71).	The information is clearly presented in the PDD ☑
Corrective Action Request No.17. Documentation to confirm the proper installa- tion of the equipments and all the require- ments from EN 14181 should be submitted to the validator	B.7.2.4.	As agreed with the validator during the on-site valida- tion and in subsequent discussions, the QAL 2 test for the relevant AMS parts will be conducted after the vali- dation and will be checked during the first verification.	This issue has to be checked during the verification ☑
Corrective Action Request No.18. The AMS downtime is not correctly address in the PDD	B.7.2.9	Amended according to request (page 28).	Now is correctly included ☑
Corrective Action Request No.19. Please include that the persons are part of the project participants entities	B.8.1.4	Amended according to request (page 74).	
Clarification Request No. 4. It should be clarified where in the methodol- ogy is mention that no EIA is necessary	D.2.1	This was a misunderstanding. N.serve did not mean to say that an EIA is not required due to any explicit statement in AM0034. An EIA for the planned project activity is not required according to Colombian Environmental Law. This has	It is confirmed that the EIA is not required in Colombia for this type of project Ø
		been confirmed by the responsible Colombian Envi- ronmental Authority CARDIQUE (see Annex 6.4 of the	

Project Title:

itle: Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia



Date of Completion: 22.01.07

Number of Pages: 49

Clarifications and corrective action re- quests by validation team	Ref. to table 1	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
		PDD).	
Corrective Action Request No.20. The LoA should be submitted before the submission for registration of the project to the UNFCCC	D.2.2.	The LoA of the Colombian DNA is not yet available. It will be submitted to the DOE prior to mandating the registration request with UNFCCC.	
Corrective Action Request No.21. Please include any positive or negative comments given by the stakeholders	E.2.1	Amended according to request (page 77).	The PDD clearly presents the comments given ☑
Clarification Request No. 5. It is not clear the additional information given in this annex 3	F.3.1.	Amended according to request (page 82).	The PDD has been correctly updated ☑

Table 3 Unresolved Corrective Action and Clarification Requests (in case of denials)

Clarifications and / or corrective action requests by validation team	ld. of CAR/CR	Explanation of Conclusion for Denial
-	-	-



Annex 2: Information Reference List

Final Report 2007-06-06 secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia Information Reference List	Page 1 of 2	Industrie Service
---	----------------	-------------------

Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
1	On-site interview at the offices and on site with the project developer and the representatives of Abocol conducted on 26-27 October, 2006 and 23 – 25 January, 2007 by auditing team of TÜV SÜD:
	Validation team on-site:
	Javier Castro TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
	Interviewed persons:
	Luis Navas Local N.Serve representative
	Christopher Brandt Project Manager N.Serve
	Marten Von Velsen MD, N.Serve
	Nelson Guevara Process Engineer Abocol
	William Ruiz Maintenance responsible Abocol
	Iohana Rodriguez Director Process Engineer Abocol
2	Draft PDD "Project for the catalytic reduction of N ₂ O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the
_	NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia", N.Serve, January 2007
3	Final PDD "Project for the catalytic reduction of N ₂ O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the
	NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"),Colombia", N.Serve, June 2007
4	Technical data D-FL 200 (flow meter), DURAG, January 2007
5	NO ₂ Analysis result, Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana, Medellin, Dated January 2006
6	Colombian decret "Decreto 02 de 1982" related to the NO _x regulation, submitted January 2007
7	General description of the Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) of NOx, installed in Abocol, dated May 30, 1996
8	Visual Basic routine for electronic transmission of data, submitted January 2007
9	Maintenance plan for Abocol, dated 01.17.2007
10	Technical data Pressure transmitter, ABB, January 2007
11	Servomex 4900C1 QAL1 documentation, dated 09.01.2007
12	Conformity validation by TÜV NORD (0045) for ABB pressure equipment
13	DURAG D-FL100 suitability tested by TÜV Nord, Report No 128CU11650 dated 29. March 1996
14	Approved methodology AM0034: Catalytic reduction of N ₂ O inside the ammonia burner of nitric acid plants, version 02, UNFCCC,

Final Report 2007-06-06 Validation of the Project for the catalityc reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia Information Reference List	Page 2 of 2	Industrie Service
---	----------------	-------------------

Reference	Document or Type of Information
No.	
	2006
15	UNFCCC, CDM: Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" approved by the EB (EB 16, annex 1).
16	Abocol excel files production data, confidential
17	Calculations of historic and baseline data N.Serve Submitted February 2007
18	Stakeholder meeting documentation for meeting performed in Cartagena: Invitation (direct, news papers and via e-mail), meeting
	report, presentation given at the meeting
19	European Norm EN 14181: Quality assurance of automated measuring systems, 2004;
20	Training documentation, Abocol, presented in the on-site audit
21	Columbian resolution No 0453, dated 27 April 2004
22	Columbian resolution No 0454 dated 27 April 2004
23	Confidential documentation to confirmed the production of the plant, submitted in march 2007
24	Calibration data from Abocol, submitted in March 2007