

## Final Ruling Regarding the Request for Issuance of CERs

### “Small Hydropower Projects at Alupola and Badulu Oya.” (0100)

In line with “*Procedures for review of requests for issuance of CERs*”, version 1.3, EB 55 Annex 41, paragraph 24, the CDM-Executive Board decided to reject the request for issuance for the above project activity on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2011, for the monitoring period 01/10/2008 - 31/12/2009.

In accordance with paragraphs 27 and 28 of the above mentioned procedures, the CDM-Executive Board concluded that it could not issue the requested CERs to the project activity because:

- the discrepancy between the actual project activity and the description in the PDD is not properly addressed as per Annex 66, EB48, and accordingly the PP/DOE shall submit a notification or request for approval prior to submitting the request for issuance; and
- the DOE did not provide any response of how it has included project emission of 479.5 tCO<sub>2</sub> which occurred in the first monitoring period..

The request for issuance of CERs is rejected because:

- (a) the verification report is not in compliance with the requirement of paragraph 197 of the latest “Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Manual”, version 01.2, EB 55, Annex 1, which states that “If the DOE identifies that the implementation or operation of CDM project activity does not conform with the description contained in the registered PDD, the DOE shall conduct an assessment on the potential impacts due to these changes following the relevant guidelines established by the CDM Executive Board and based on this assessment, the DOE shall submit a notification or a request for approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD prior to the conclusion of the verification/certification for the corresponding monitoring period.” as per EB 48, Annex 66. The DOE failed to raise concerns regarding non-conformity of the implementation of the actual project activity with the description contained in the registered PDD with regard to different turbine capacity and did not submit a notification or a request for approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD prior to the conclusion of the verification/certification; and
- (b) the DOE failed to appropriately verify how the inclusion of 479.5 tCO<sub>2</sub> of project emission which occurred in the first monitoring period(01/06/2004 - 31/12/2005) is in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology for the calculation of project emissions for the fourth monitoring period (01/10/2008 - 31/12/2009).

Please note, in accordance with paragraph 96 of the Report of the 28<sup>th</sup> EB Meeting, in cases where the reasons for rejection can be addressed by means of a revised verification report based on a revised monitoring report, the DOE may request permission (including explanation of reasons) to submit a revised request for issuance for the same monitoring period covered by the rejection. The Board will consider such a request at the subsequent EB meeting following that request in accordance with the procedures and decide on a case-by-case basis. In these cases the Board will provide further guidance, as appropriate. In cases where such a revised request for issuance is also rejected it shall not be possible to resubmit for a third time.

- - - - -



### History of the document

<b>Project</b> 0100	Related to EB 55 Annex 41 Paragraphs 24, 27 & 28	<b>Decision Class:</b> Ruling <b>Document Type:</b> Information Note <b>Business Function:</b> Issuance
------------------------	--	---