



Industrie Service

**Choose certainty.
Add value.**

TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH · 80684 Munich · Germany

CDM Executive Board



DAP-PL-2885.99
DAP-IS-2886.00
DAP-PL-3089.00
DAP-PL-2722
DAP-IS-3516.01
DPT-ZE-3510.02
ZLS-ZE-219/99
ZLS-ZE-246/99

Your reference/letter of	Our reference/name	Tel. extension/E-mail	Fax extension	Date/Document	Page
	IS-CMS-MUC/Mu Javier Castro	+49 89 5791-2686 javier.castro@tuev-sued.de	+49 89 5791-2756	2008-05-09	1 of 2

Response to Request for Review

Dear Sir,

Please find below the response to the request for review formulated for the CDM project with the registration number 1447. In case you have any further inquiries please let us know as we kindly assist you.

Yours sincerely,

Javier Castro
Carbon Management Service

Headquarters: Munich
Trade Register: Munich HRB 96 869

Supervisory Board:
Dr.-Ing. Axel Stepken (Chairman)
Board of Management:
Dr. Peter Langer (Spokesman)
Dipl.-Ing. (FH) Ferdinand Neuwieser

Telefon: +49 89 5791-2246
Telefax: +49 89 5791-2756
www.tuev-sued.de

TÜV®

TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
Niederlassung München
Umwelt Service
Westendstrasse 199
80686 Munich
Germany

Response to the Request for Review

Issue 1:

As the start date of the project activity is prior to the commencement of validation the PDD should contain a full description of the evidence of the prior serious consideration of the CDM and the validation report must provide greater details regarding how compliance with this requirement has been validated

Response by TÜV SÜD:

The consideration of the CDM has been clearly done before the starting of the project activity. The evidence of this statement, which has been confirmed on-site, is presented attached as Evidence 1, "Energy Use Planning Report" dated May 2005, where is clearly specify as expected benefit the amount of emission reductions per year to be achieved. As further information since the beginning of the project development it was clear that the project will reduce emission that affect the climate change as is presented in the Evidence 2, which clearly shows that part of the background is that now is "the era of the climate change"

Issue 2:

The DOE is requested to describe how the appropriateness of the discount rate/benchmark of 10% has been validated

Response by TÜV SÜD:

The benchmark use by the project proponent is the internal benchmark they have been using since 2005 as shown in the Evidence 3 "Investment Management Standard": As an internal standard it can be considered as appropriate benchmark for the project activity.

Issue 3:

The DOE is requested to provide details regarding how the input values used in the investment comparison, in particular the electricity tariff and operation costs, have been validated.

Response by TÜV SÜD:

The input values have been validated based on the internal data presented by the project proponent. The electricity tariff has been calculated based on the invoices received for the years 2000 to 2004. The operation cost has been calculated by the technical department of the project owner, the assessment team has checked the plausibility of the data presented base on the technical experience of the team, see Evidence 4; Evidence 5 is based on a proposal presented to the project proponent. Further input values have been checked base on similar documentation and technical expertise of the team.