

## INFORMATION NOTE ON THE RESULTS OF THE COMPLETENESS CHECKS FOR REQUESTS FOR ISSUANCE

**01 October 2011 - 31 March 2012**

**(Version 01)**

1. The Executive Board at its 54<sup>th</sup> meeting adopted new procedures for registration of project activities and issuance of CERs. Along with the procedures, the Board issued checklists for the two stages of assessment; completeness check (CC) and information & reporting check (I&RC) that cover the Secretariat's initial assessment of submissions. An Information Note on the results of the two stages for requests for registration and issuance covering the period from 30 June 2010 to 23 October 2010 was published in November 2010 on the UNFCCC CDM website<sup>1</sup>. According to the note, the Secretariat will publish results of its assessments on a regular basis. Thereafter, four information notes for the subsequent periods were published, as follows:

Period	Publication Date
24 October 2010 - 31 January 2011	February 2011
01 February 2011 - 30 April 2011	May 2011
01 May 2011 - 30 June 2011	July 2011
01 July 2011 - 30 September 2011	October 2011

This Information Note covers the period from 01 October 2011 - 31 March 2012, and includes 1,130 requests processed under completeness check for issuance. The total number of submissions during this reporting period is represented by requests for issuance returned to DOEs as incomplete during the completeness check stage and information & reporting check stage, and the number of published requests.

2. The tables below provide information on the requests for issuance that were returned as incomplete during this reporting period. Detailed lists compiling the reasons for returning requests during CC and I&RC are furnished in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, respectively, to the Information Note.

<sup>1</sup> <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Notes/index.html>.



Table 1 below comprises a summary of the number of requests for issuance processed under CC and I&RC and the number of requests returned to the DOE.

**Table 1: Requests for issuance processed and returned to the DOE**

	<b>Total processed</b>	<b>Total returned to DOE</b>
Completeness Check (CC)	1,130	65
Information and Reporting Check (I&RC)	1,050	170

**CDM – Executive Board**

Table 2 below comprises a DOE-wise break-up of the requests for issuance along with the data for percentage of requests that were incomplete during each stage. For more information on the reasons for incompleteness, please refer to Appendix 1 and to Appendix 2.

<b>Table 2: Requests for issuance returned to DOE</b>						
	Requests processed under CC	Returned During CC		Requests processed under I&RC	Returned during I&RC	
		#	%		#	%
<b>AENOR</b>	22	2	9%	18	4	22%
<b>Applus</b>	5	1	20%	4	1	25%
<b>BVCH</b>	147	11	7%	146	12	8%
<b>CCSC</b>	1	-	-	1	-	-
<b>CEC</b>	26	2	8%	26	2	8%
<b>CEPREI</b>	12	1	8%	10	2	20%
<b>CQC</b>	30	-	-	32	-	-
<b>CRA</b>	2	-	-	1	1	100%
<b>Deloitte-TECO</b>	12	-	-	10	2	20%
<b>DNV</b>	247	10	4%	220	42	19%
<b>ERM CVS</b>	38	-	-	39	6	15%
<b>GLC</b>	17	4	24%	12	3	25%
<b>ICONTEC</b>	24	2	8%	20	9	45%
<b>JACO</b>	6	-	-	8	2	25%
<b>JCI</b>	10	3	30%	6	1	17%
<b>JQA</b>	14	1	7%	12	2	17%
<b>KBS</b>	1	-	-	1	-	-
<b>KECO</b>	1	-	-	1	-	-
<b>KEMCO</b>	1	-	-	1	-	-
<b>KFQ</b>	5	-	-	5	-	-
<b>LRQA</b>	29	1	3%	29	4	14%
<b>RINA</b>	18	1	6%	17	1	6%
<b>SGS</b>	141	1	1%	147	13	9%
<b>SIRIM</b>	18	5	28%	16	7	44%
<b>SQS</b>	8	-	-	7	3	43%
<b>TÜV NORD</b>	154	10	6%	148	20	14%
<b>TÜV Rheinland</b>	51	4	8%	44	9	20%
<b>TÜV SÜD</b>	90	6	7%	76	24	32%

**CDM – Executive Board**

Table 3 below comprises a summary of the reasons for which requests for issuance were returned during the CC and I&RC stage.

**Table 3: Reasons for returning requests for issuance**

<b>Completeness Check (CC)</b>		<b>Information and Reporting Check (I&amp;RC)</b>	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Occurrence</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Occurrence</b>
Incomplete documentation	32	Calibration	104
Incomplete information	3	Comparison/increase of CERs	1
Inconsistent information	46	ER Calculation	53
Other	6	Implementation Status/physical features of project	38
		Monitored Parameters	65
		Monitoring systems and procedures	38
		Other verification reporting requirement	51
		Others	1
		Reference values/assumptions	32
		Reporting of approved requests	5
<b>Total Occurrences</b>	<b>87</b>		<b>388</b>

**CDM – Executive Board**

Table 4 below comprises a DOE-wise break-up of the issues for returning during CC. For more information on the reasons for incompleteness, please refer to Appendix 1.

<b>Table 5: Issues for returning during CC</b>								
	<b>Number of requests returned</b>							
	<b>Incomplete documentation</b>		<b>Incomplete information</b>		<b>Inconsistent information</b>		<b>Other</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>AENOR</b>	1	33%	-	-	2	67%	-	-
<b>Applus</b>	1	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>BVCH</b>	9	75%	-	-	3	25%	-	-
<b>CEC</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>CQC</b>	-	-	-	-	2	67%	1	33%
<b>CRA</b>	-	-	-	-	1	100%	-	-
<b>Deloitte-TECO</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>DNV</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>ERM CVS</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>EYG</b>	3	27%	-	-	8	73%	-	-
<b>GLC</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>ICONTEC</b>	2	50%	-	-	1	25%	1	25%
<b>JACO</b>	1	50%	-	-	-	-	1	50%
<b>JCI</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>JQA</b>	2	33%	-	-	4	67%	-	-
<b>KECO</b>	-	-	-	-	1	100%	-	-
<b>KEMCO</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>KFQ</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>KSA</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>LRQA</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>PJRCES</b>	4	80%	-	-	1	20%	-	-
<b>RINA</b>	1	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>SGS</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100%
<b>SIRIM</b>	2	29%	2	29%	3	43%	-	-
<b>SQS</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>TÜV NORD</b>	4	24%	1	6%	11	65%	1	6%
<b>TÜV Rheinland</b>	2	50%	-	-	2	50%	-	-
<b>TÜV SÜD</b>	-	-	-	-	7	88%	1	13%



## CDM – Executive Board

Table 5 below comprises a DOE-wise break-up of the issues for returning during I&RC. For more information on the reasons for incompleteness, please refer to Appendix 2.

	Calibration		Comparison / increase of CERs		ER Calculation		Implementation Status / physical features of project		Monitored Parameters		Monitoring systems and procedures		Other verification reporting requirement		Others		Reference values / assumptions		Reporting of approved requests	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>AENOR</b>	-	-	-	-	3	60%	-	-	2	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Applus</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>BVCH</b>	7	30%	-	-	3	13%	2	9%	4	17%	3	13%	-	-	-	-	4	17%	-	-
<b>CCSC</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>CEC</b>	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-	2	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>CEPREI</b>	1	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	33%	1	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>CQC</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>CRA</b>	1	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Deloitte-TECO</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	50%	1	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>DNV</b>	21	23%	-	-	17	19%	10	11%	12	13%	6	7%	13	14%	-	-	10	11%	1	1%
<b>ERM CVS</b>	2	20%	-	-	1	10%	1	10%	2	20%	1	10%	3	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>GLC</b>	1	17%	-	-	1	17%	-	-	3	50%	-	-	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>ICONTEC</b>	8	38%	-	-	2	10%	3	14%	1	5%	2	10%	3	14%	-	-	2	10%	-	-
<b>JACO</b>	3	27%	-	-	2	18%	-	-	3	27%	-	-	1	9%	-	-	-	-	2	18%
<b>JCI</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>JQA</b>	1	33%	-	-	1	33%	1	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>KBS</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>KECO</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>KEMCO</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>KFQ</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>LRQA</b>	6	67%	-	-	1	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>RINA</b>	1	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>SGS</b>	1	5%	-	-	5	26%	-	-	3	16%	3	16%	4	21%	1	5%	2	11%	-	-
<b>SIRIM</b>	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>SQS</b>	-	-	-	-	2	15%	2	15%	5	38%	1	8%	1	8%	-	-	2	15%	-	-
<b>TÜV NORD</b>	11	22%	-	-	4	8%	8	16%	7	14%	4	8%	9	18%	-	-	6	12%	2	4%
<b>TÜV Rheinland</b>	13	28%	-	-	3	7%	7	15%	8	17%	8	17%	5	11%	-	-	2	4%	-	-
<b>TÜV SÜD</b>	17	30%	-	-	7	12%	3	5%	13	23%	8	14%	5	9%	-	-	4	7%	-	-



-----

**History of the document**

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Nature of revision</b>
01.0	20 June 2012	Further to EB54 Annex 35, paragraphs 10 & 12.
<b>Decision Class:</b> Ruling <b>Document Type:</b> Information Note <b>Business Function:</b> Issuance		



## Appendix 1

Reasons for returning requests for issuance during CC stage.

Stage 1: Completeness Check							
#	PA	ProjectTitle	Monitoring Period	DOE	Category	Reason	Comment
1	2661	Univanich TOPI Biogas Project	01/10/2009 to 31/12/2010	SIRIM	Incomplete information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68, paragraph 9(d) all documents must be in English or contain a full translation of relevant sections into English, in cases where DOE considers the provision of the original document to be necessary for the purposes of transparency.	Issue: Spreadsheet UNV Topi Flare Tool V2 26 5 11 amounts cannot be seen.
					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents must be correct and accurate.	Issue: CER Calculation Spreadsheet is not consistent with the total request for issuance of 75,262 CER's
					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to the EB 48, Annex 68, paragraph 10 (a) vii, the Monitoring Report contains calculation of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any) and emission reductions.	Issue: Project Emissions calculation in the ER Calculation Spreadsheet is not consistent with the Monitoring Report, Verification and Certification report
2	2266	8.5 MW Wind Energy Project by KS Oils Limited, India	25/11/2009 to 24/09/2010	DNV	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(b) a spreadsheet containing emission reduction calculation must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: ER calculation for 25-30/11/2009 missing.
3	3435	Guangxi Baise Tianlin Dongba Hydropower Station	26/09/2010 to 20/03/2011	GLC	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate.	Issue: Web ver. 1.0, 12/04/2011, VR ver. 2, 01/06/2011, CER calculation spreadsheet ver. 1, 20/03/2011.
4	2214	Zuo XI Hydropower power plant	03/12/2009 to 28/05/2011	Applus	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(b) a spreadsheet containing emission reduction calculation must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: The emission reduction calculation spreadsheet has not been submitted though it is mentioned in the request for issuance form.
5	2028	Methane capture and destruction on La Hormiga landfill in San Felipe and El Belloto landfill in Quilpue Bundle CDM project.	01/08/2010 to 08/06/2011	GLC	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: Only version 1 of the Monitoring Report was submitted, although reference is made to version 2, dated 11/7/2011, in the Certification and Verification report.
6	1405	CEMEX Costa Rica: Use of biomass residues in Colorado cement plant	01/01/2009 to 30/06/2009	TÜV NORD	Incomplete information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(b) the submitted spreadsheet must be submitted in an assessable unprotected format.	Issue: The CER calculation spreadsheet is read-only.





## CDM – Executive Board

7	1899	Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment, Project AIN07-W-01, Sumatera Utara (North Sumatera), Indonesia	01/03/2010 to 31/12/2010	SIRIM	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate.	Issue: Verification and Certification report refers to an old version of Monitoring Report v.4 22/08/2011
8	0837	Kaifeng Jinkai N2O Abatement Project	01/10/2009 to 30/09/2010	TÜV SÜD	Other	Scope: The submitted documentation are dated prior to the date of request for issuance submission.	Issue: The signed form is not the last dated document.
9	1668	Baotou Iron & Steel Coke Dry Quenching #3 and Waste Heat Utilization for Electricity Generation Project	29/05/2010 to 28/12/2010	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: Certification and Verification reports refer to monitoring report version 2 dated 15.07.2011 which has not been submitted.
10	2054	Shangri-La Langdu River 2nd Level Hydropower Station	26/06/2010 to 25/06/2011	TÜV NORD	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: The Monitoring report contains track changes. Please submit the clean final version.
11	2038	Fuhui Inner Mongolia Tugurige Wind Farm Project	01/05/2010 to 30/04/2011	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: The monitoring report version 1.1 of 18/08/2011 has not been uploaded.
12	2072	Fuhui Inner Mongolia Narenbaolige Wind Farm Project	01/05/2010 to 30/04/2011	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: The Monitoring Report version 1.1 of 18/08/2011 has not been uploaded.
13	2001	Zhongfang County Pailou Hydro Project, China	21/10/2009 to 25/04/2011	TÜV Rheinland	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(f), the monitoring period throughout the documentation must be consistent.	Issue: Throughout the submitted documentation, the monitoring period is incorrect, being indicated as 21 Oct 2009 - 25 Apr 2011, while the monitoring period on the project view page is: 21 Oct 2009 - 25 Apr 2010.
14	1909	Kunming Dongjiao Baishuitang LFG Treatment and Power Generation Project	21/11/2008 to 31/03/2010	RINA	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(b) a spreadsheet containing emission reduction calculation must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: ER calculation spreadsheet for the 21 Nov 08 - 31 Mar 10 monitoring period has not been submitted. (It has been submitted the master spreadsheet for only the month of December as an example).
15	1168	Enercon Wind Farm (Hindustan) Ltd in Rajasthan	15/03/2010 to 30/09/2010	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: The last version 03 Monitoring Report dated 18/08/2011 has not been submitted.
16	2088	Hebei Yuxian Kongzhongcaoyuan 49.5MW Wind Farm Project	25/06/2010 to 24/06/2011	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: Certification and Verification reports refer to monitoring report version 2 dated 07.09.2011 which has not been submitted.
17	3439	Inner Mongolia Chifeng Gaofeng Wind Power Project	25/10/2010 to 30/06/2011	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: Verification and certification reports refer to monitoring report



## CDM – Executive Board

							version 2 dated 20.09.2011 which has not been submitted.
18	3478	Guangxi Xinglong Small Hydropower Project	13/08/2010 to 31/05/2011	TÜV Rheinland	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: Verification and certification reports refer to monitoring report version 4 dated 10.09.2011 which has not been submitted.
19	2457	Yamunanagar & Sonipat (India) OSRAM CFL distribution CDM Project	16/07/2009 to 31/03/2011	TÜV SÜD	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to the EB 48, Annex 68, paragraph 10 (a) vii, the Monitoring Report contains calculation of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any) and emission reductions.	Issue: Baseline and project emissions are not consistent between the Monitoring report, spreadsheet, Verification as well as the Certification Reports.
20	3386	Gansu Longchanghe IV 5.4MW Hydro Power Project	06/07/2010 to 24/06/2011	TÜV NORD	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(d) a certification report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: The Certification report contains comments in German "Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden". Please submit the clean final version of the Certification report.
21	0313	Pandurang SSK RE Project	01/04/2007 to 16/08/2008	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: The Monitoring Report version 3 of 08/10/2011 for the monitoring period 01/04/2007-16/08/2008 has not been submitted.
22	2111	Banna Liusha River Fifth Level Power Plant Project	29/07/2010 to 27/08/2011	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(b) a spreadsheet containing emission reduction calculation must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: No emission reduction spreadsheet has been submitted.
23	1818	The Third Cascade Hydropower Station of Niduhe River	01/12/2009 to 30/11/2010	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(b) a spreadsheet containing emission reduction calculation must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: The spreadsheet of the emission reduction calculation has not been provided.
24	3435	Guangxi Baise Tianlin Dongba Hydropower Station	26/09/2010 to 20/03/2011	GLC	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: Monitoring Report version 2 dated 01/06/2011 has not been submitted. (Verification and Certification report refer to this last MR version 2)
25	2613	15MW Grid connected renewable energy generation by RSMML	12/09/2009 to 01/10/2010	SIRIM	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(b) a spreadsheet containing emission reduction calculation must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: There is inconsistency of total sum of the Net electricity export to grid between the Emission reduction spreadsheet (21280995) and the monitoring report (21284281).
26	2092	Wind Electricity Generation Project	31/01/2009 to 23/08/2010	TÜV Rheinland	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate.	Issue: There are inconsistencies regarding the version and date of the Monitoring Report: The Monitoring Report uploaded for this request for



## CDM – Executive Board

							issuance is version 6, dated 01.08.2011; the Certification Report refers to Monitoring Report version 5, also dated 01.08.2011; the Verification Report inconsistently refers to Monitoring Report version 5 and Monitoring Report version 6, both dated 01.08.2011 (p. 5, p. 8); the Emission Reductions Spreadsheet refers to Monitoring Report version 5, dated 02.05.2011.
27	2925	Wind based renewable energy project in Gujarat	13/02/2010 to 31/12/2010	DNV	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(f), the monitoring period throughout the documentation must be consistent.	Issue: The Request for Issuance form and the webpage state the monitoring period as 13 Feb 2010 - 31 Jan 2011. The Monitoring Report v02 and the Verification/Certification Report state it as 13 Feb 2010 - 31 Dec 2010.
28	3804	Shaanxi Hanjiang Shuhe Hydropower Station	18/11/2010 to 31/03/2011	CEPREI	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate.	Issue: Instead of referring to the latest Monitoring Report (version 3, dated 15.11.2011), the Certification Report (p. 1) and the Verification Report (p. 26 and p. 27, table 7-1) still refer to the previous Monitoring Report (version 2, dated 29.06.2011) as the final Monitoring Report.
29	0086	Poechos I Project	01/04/2009 to 31/03/2010	DNV	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate.	Issue: In particular, there are inconsistencies regarding the date and version of the Monitoring Report: The uploaded Monitoring Report is version 6, dated 08.11.2011, whereas the combined Verification/Certification Report - including the Certification Statement -, dated 03.11.2011, refers to Monitoring Report version 5, dated 01.11.2011.
30	1405	CEMEX Costa Rica: Use of biomass residues in Colorado cement plant	01/07/2009 to 30/06/2010	TÜV NORD	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document is correct and accurate.	Issue: The uploaded PDD is version 6, dated 07.12.2010, whereas the validation report exclusively refers to the older PDD version 3, dated 29.05.2008.
31	1405	CEMEX Costa Rica: Use of biomass	01/07/2010 to	TÜV	Inconsistent	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-	Issue: The uploaded PDD is version 6,



## CDM – Executive Board

		residues in Colorado cement plant	30/06/2011	NORD	information	referencing and versioning within and between the document is correct and accurate.	dated 07.12.2010, whereas the validation report exclusively refers to the older PDD version 3, dated 29.05.2008.
32	0986	Bundled 15 MW Wind Power Project in India	28/04/2007 to 01/04/2008	TÜV NORD	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68, paragraph 10(e), the request for issuance form must correspond to the correct number of Certified Emission Reduction, specified by the DOE.	Issue: The amount of CER indicated in the signed form is 16,680 where as all other documents indicate the amount of CER as 16,674.
					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate.	Issue: Page 2 of the verification report refers to MR version 1.3 dated 22.10.2011, where as the MR version 1.3 is dated 4.10.2011.
33	0541	La Joya Hydroelectric Project (Costa Rica)	01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010	ICONTEC	Other	Scope: The submitted documentation are dated prior to the date of request for issuance submission.	Issue: The Verification Report (revised and tracked changes) refer to version 01, dated 26 August, 2011 (eg. page 3). Since this request for issuance is a re-submission after incomplete; for consistency purposes, we kindly request to update the version and date of the revised Verification Report. The Request for Issuance form refers to version 02 of the Monitoring Report, however the submitted Monitoring Report, after re-submission, refers to version 03.
34	1158	AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-21, Goias, Brazil	01/09/2009 to 28/02/2011	DNV	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents must be correct and accurate.	Issue: Inconsistencies between the Amount of CER's requested in the Signed Form/Project view page and the amount in the Excel Sheets attachments, Certification Report, Verification Report and Monitoring Report.
35	1295	10 MW biomass based power project of Ind Power limited	26/11/2007 to 30/09/2009	TÜV Rheinland	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: The final monitoring report (version 3, 29.09.2011) has not been submitted.
36	0936	Grid connected 13MW biomass power project in Maharashtra	04/05/2010 to 01/05/2011	DNV	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents must be correct and accurate.	Issue: In section E.5 of the monitoring report ("Actual values reached during the monitoring period"), the CER amount is not correctly indicated.
37	2036	Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited (BPCL)'s Wind Power	27/02/2009 to 01/12/2009	TÜV NORD	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: Appendix B of the monitoring report does not include monitoring



## CDM – Executive Board

		Project, India			Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(b) a spreadsheet containing emission reduction calculation must be submitted with a request for issuance.	data from 1st of December 2009. Issue: The spreadsheet does not include monitoring data from 1st of December 2009. Also in the spreadsheet "% error main & check meter" dates are not correct (March 2008-November 2008).
					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate.	Issue: Verification report refers to monitoring report version 3 dated 26.08.2011 on page 2 where as the submitted monitoring report is version 4 dated 23.11.2011.
38	0867	Kim Loong Methane Recovery for Onsite Utilization Project at Kota Tinggi, Johor, Malaysia.	01/02/2009 to 31/12/2010	SIRIM	Incomplete information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(b) the submitted spreadsheet must be submitted in an assessable unprotected format.	Issue: 2 ER Spreadsheets are protected.
39	0402	SEO Biomass Steam and Power Plant in Malaysia	01/01/2008 to 30/06/2010	BVCH	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68, paragraph 7(b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent.	Issue: Crediting period date in the Project view page is not consistent with the Verification Report and Monitoring Report.
40	0069	Nubarashen Landfill Gas Capture and Power Generation Project in Yerevan	01/04/2010 to 31/07/2011	JCI	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(b) a spreadsheet containing emission reduction calculation must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: CER calculation excel spreadsheet has not been attached.
41	0374	KMS Power 6 MW Renewable Sources Biomass Power Project.	23/07/2009 to 21/07/2011	DNV	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68, paragraph 7(b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent.	Issue: There is an inconsistency of project emission due to transport between the monitoring report ( 268.13) and the verification report as well as the CER spread sheet transport sheet (267.45).
42	0982	DSCL Sugar Ajbapur Cogeneration Project Phase II	01/12/2007 to 31/03/2010	DNV	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(e) a request for issuance form must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: The document attached belongs to another project.
43	0508	Onyx Alexandria Landfill Gas Capture and Flaring Project	01/02/2010 to 30/04/2011	TÜV SÜD	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents must be correct and accurate.	Issue: The CER Calculations sheet - Introduction page in the submitted Spreadsheet shows the number of CERs to be 171,052.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document is correct and accurate.	Issue: The version and the date of the registered PDD (version 4 of April 2006) does not correspond to the version and the date of PDD indicated under Verification and Certification Statement (PDD, version 5 dated October 2006) in your Verification and Certification Report. Even though it has been stated in the verification report that this PDD version 5 is available only under the "registration full history" in the UNFCCC webpage <a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/SGSUKL1152286575.05/history">http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/SGSUKL1152286575.05/history</a> ; this PDD version 5 in page 3 is dated April 2006.
44	2186	Monterrey II LFG to Energy Project	23/11/2009 to 31/12/2010	AENOR	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: Last version of Monitoring Report (version 04, 16/12/2011) was not submitted
45	1310	Guohua Qiqihaer Fuyu 1st Stage Wind Farm Project	01/06/2010 to 30/06/2011	SGS	Other	Scope: The submitted documentation are dated prior to the date of request for issuance submission.	The sign-off date of the following documentation is not consistent:
46	2801	N2O abatement in MP Nitric Acid plants at Rashtriya Chemicals & Fertilizers Limited, India	26/02/2010 to 03/09/2010	TÜV NORD	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate.	Issue: The uploaded final Monitoring Report is version 5, dated 26.12.2011, whereas the Validation Report (p. 2 and p. 48), dated 03.11.2011, only refers to version 4, dated 25.10.2011, as the final Monitoring Report. The DOE is requested to update the Validation Report accordingly.
					Other	Scope: The submitted documentation should be dated according to the logical sign-off sequence.	Issue: In particular, the Certification Report, dated 03.11.2011, has an earlier sign-off date than the final Monitoring Report, version 5, dated 26.12.2011. The DOE is therefore requested to submit an updated Certification Report.
47	0839	Talia Landfill Gas Recovery Project and Electricity Production	01/02/2009 to 01/02/2010	TÜV SÜD	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents must be correct and accurate.	Issue: Validation report, Monitoring Period and Calculation excel sheet specify a CER amount (24,397) that is not consistent with the amount of CER requested.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to the EB 48, Annex 68, paragraph 10 (a) vii, the Monitoring Report contains calculation of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any) and emission reductions.	Issue: Calculations in the MR and Excel sheet are not consistent with the CER amount requested
48	0500	Efficient utilisation of waste heat and natural gas at Dahej complex of GACL	01/01/2003 to 31/03/2008	DNV	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document is correct and accurate.	Issue: There is an inconsistency in the version of the PDD. In particular verification report refers to the PDD version 3 which was not submitted. The submitted PDD is version 2 dated 30.12.2012.
49	2213	Luoyingkou Hydropower Project in Heping County Guangdong Province, China	22/08/2009 to 10/01/2011	JQA	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(f), the monitoring period throughout the documentation must be consistent.	Issue: There is inconsistency of Monitoring period end date between the view page (22 Aug 09 - 11 Jan 2011) and all other documents submitted (22 Aug 09 - 10 Jan 2011).
50	3663	Active Synergy Landfill Gas Power Generation Project Nakhon Pathom	18/11/2010 to 31/05/2011	SIRIM	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(c) a verification report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: Verification Report submitted belongs to another Project (1899)
51	3153	Tongliao Naiman Banner Baxiantong Haritang Wind Power Project	30/10/2010 to 30/06/2011	CEC	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate.	Issue: Certification report refers to monitoring report version 1 & 2 where as the submitted monitoring report is version 3 dated 13.1.2012.
					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68, paragraph 7(b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent.	Issue: Verification report refers to the registration date as 27.06.2009 where as the project view page and the monitoring report refer to the registration date as 27.06.2010.
52	0374	KMS Power 6 MW Renewable Sources Biomass Power Project.	23/07/2009 to 21/07/2011	DNV	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68, paragraph 7(b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent.	Issue: You have not responded to the initial incomplete issue of an inconsistency of project emission due to transport between the monitoring report ( 268.13) and the verification report as well as the CER spread sheet transport and CER sheet (267.45). Please address this issue accordingly.
53	1509	Biogas energy plant from palm oil mill effluent	01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010	ICONTEC	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(d) a certification report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: Certification report submitted dated 13/Oct/2011 (previous to the Monitoring report) refers to the verification report CDMVER 041-03 and the last Verification report submitted is CDMVER041-04, and refers as well to the Monitoring report v.03 - 23/12/2011.



## CDM – Executive Board

54	0775	West Nile Electrification Project (WNEP)	01/01/2005 to 31/10/2009	DNV	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents must be correct and accurate.	Issue: There is an inconsistency of CERS between the submitted documents and the Verification/Certification report. Also there is an inconsistency within the verification report itself (p. 2,19,21 refer to 20,096 but the table in p. 19 refers to 20,095 CERs).
					Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(b) a spreadsheet containing emission reduction calculation must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: In particular the spreadsheets submitted for Monthly data as well as daily recorded and calculated data are from May 2005 to 31 October 2009 where as the monitoring period is from 01 January 2005 to 31 October 2009.
55	0835	Switching of fuel from Low Sulphur Waxy Residue fuel oil to natural gas at Gangnam branch Korea District Heating Corporation Project	01/04/2008 to 31/03/2009	TÜV SÜD	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate.	Issue: In particular, the project title is inconsistent in the submitted documents (project view page: "Switching of fuel from Low Sulphur Waxy Residue fuel oil to natural gas at Gangnam branch Korea District Heating Corporation Project", PDD: "Switching of fuel from Low Sulphur Waxy Residue fuel oil (LSWR) to natural gas at heat-only boiler in district heating system"; in the monitoring, certification, and verification reports, both of these project titles are used).
56	3462	Bangkok Kamphaeng Saen East: Landfill Gas to Electricity Project	01/06/2011 to 31/10/2011	LRQA	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: The monitoring report submitted refers to an incorrect monitoring period (21/01/2011 - 31/05/2011)
					Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(b) a spreadsheet containing emission reduction calculation must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: Excel sheet calculations are based in another monitoring period (21/01/2011 - 31/05/2011)
					Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(c) a verification report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: Verification report refers to an incorrect monitoring period (21/01/2011 - 31/05/2011)
					Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(d) a certification report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: Certification report refers to an incorrect monitoring period (21/01/2011 - 31/05/2011)





## CDM – Executive Board

					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(f), the monitoring period throughout the documentation must be consistent.	Issue: Excel CER Calculation, Monitoring Report, Verification & Certification Report refer to an incorrect monitoring period.
57	3153	Tongliao Naiman Banner Baxiantong Haritang Wind Power Project	30/10/2010 to 30/06/2011	CEC	Other	Scope: The submitted documentation are dated prior to the date of request for issuance submission.	Issue: Signed form (16.01.2012) is dated prior to the Certification and Verification report (10.02.2012).
58	2675	Changzhou Panshi Cement Waste Heat Recovery for Power Generation Project	02/12/2009 to 01/04/2011	JCI	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document is correct and accurate.	Issue: Certification report refers to the PDD version 7 dated 2.12.2012 where as the submitted PDD is version 7 dated 3.11.2009.
					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate.	Issue: There is an inconsistency of methodology between the project view page ( AMS-I.D. version 13, AMS-I.C. version 13, AMS-III.Q) and the rest of the documents submitted (AMS-III.Q version 2, ACM0012 version 3.1).
					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(f), the crediting period throughout the documentation must be consistent.	Issue: Verification report refers to the 1st crediting period (2.12.2009-1.4.2011) which is the monitoring period.
					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate.	Issue: Page 5 of Verification report refers to the monitoring report version 1.1 dated 18.10.2012.
59	1648	Top Gas Pressure Recovery based Power Generation from ‘G’ Blast Furnace	24/12/2009 to 31/10/2010	BVCH	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document is correct and accurate.	Issue: Certification report refers to the PDD version 3 as the final PDD, where as the final PDD submitted is version 4.
					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(f), the crediting period throughout the documentation must be consistent.	Issue: Verification report refers on page 46 (CL 2) to the crediting period 24 Dec 2009-31 Oct 2011 where as it should be 24 Dec 2009-23 Dec 2019.
60	4224	Fuel Switching from Mazout to Natural Gas in Misr Fine Spinning & Weaving and Misr Beida Dyers at Kafr El Dawar	01/02/2011 to 30/06/2011	GLC	Other	Scope: The submitted documentation are dated prior to the date of request for issuance submission.	Issue: The Verification Statement is signed and dated 15/02/2012 which is prior to the final version and revision of the Certification Report dated 16/02/2012.
61	0580	Calope Hydroelectric Project	01/09/2010 to 31/08/2011	AENOR	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents must be correct and accurate.	Issue: The number of CER provided within the Certification Report is not consistent with the rest of



## CDM – Executive Board

							documentation submitted .
					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(f), the monitoring period throughout the documentation must be consistent.	Issue: The Monitoring Period dates provided within the Certification Report are not consistent with the documentation submitted .
62	2055	Shangri-La Langdu River 3rd Level Hydropower Station	21/09/2010 to 25/06/2011	TÜV NORD	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68, paragraph 7(b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent.	Issue: CER calculation spreadsheet has the title "Shangri-La Langdu River 4th Level Hydropower Station" where as all other documents refer to "Shangri-La Langdu River 3rd Level Hydropower Station".
					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(f), the monitoring period throughout the documentation must be consistent.	Issue: Page 32 of the Verification report refers to the monitoring period 21.9.2010-11.5.2012 where as all other documents refer to monitoring period 21.9.2010-25.6.2011.
					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate.	Issue: CER calculation spreadsheet is version 2 dated 2.2.2012 where as MR is version 2 dated 20.2.2012.
					Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document is correct and accurate.	Issue: The submitted PDD is version 4 dated 1.8.2008 but VR refers to PDD version 3 dated 22.5.2008 on page 33.
63	0099	N2O Emission Reduction in Onsan, Republic of Korea	01/01/2012 to 31/01/2012	TÜV SÜD	Inconsistent information	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68, paragraph 7(b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent.	Issue: 1) The project title is wrong in the Certification Report on page 2, referring to "N2O Decomposition Project in Onsan, Republic of Korea" while the correct project title is: "N2O Emission Reduction in Onsan, Republic of Korea"; 2) The project title is also wrong in the Verification Report on page 32, referring to "N2O Decomposition Project in Onsan, Republic of Korea" while the correct project title is: "N2O Emission Reduction in Onsan, Republic of Korea" .
64	2844	Gansu Yongchang County Donghewan Cascaded Hydropower Project	31/07/2010 to 31/07/2011	JCI	Incomplete documentation	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 8(a) a monitoring report must be submitted with a request for issuance.	Issue: The Doe should provide Monitoring Report V.2 3/2/2012 as indicated in the Verification Report page 2.
65	1896	Jincheng Sihe Coal Mine CMM	01/01/2010 to	TÜV	Inconsistent	Scope: According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(e), cross-	Issue: Verification report refers to

**CDM – Executive Board**

		Generation Project	30/06/2010	NORD	information	referencing and versioning within and between the document must be correct and accurate.	monitoring report version 2 dated 23.12.2012 where as the submitted monitoring report is version 3 dated 23.12.2011.
--	--	--------------------	------------	------	-------------	--	--



## Appendix 2

Reasons for returning requests for issuance during I&RC stage.

Stage 2: Information & Reporting Check							
#	PA	ProjectTitle	Monitoring Period	DOE	Category	Reason	Comment
1	2705	Hangzhou Huadian Banshan Power Generation Co., Ltd.'s Natural Gas Power Generation Project	23/12/2010 to 31/03/2011	BVCH	Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain emission factors, IPCC default values, and/or other reference values used in the calculation of emission reductions. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (v)).	Issue: the PDD (page 50) states that "Unit standard coal consumption" is fixed ex-ante at 320 gce/kWh while the monitoring report refers to 314.35 gce/kWh.
2	0099	N2O Emission Reduction in Onsan, Republic of Korea	01/06/2011 to 30/06/2011	TÜV SÜD	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency in the accuracy level of the quality control system employed in measuring the percentage of production time that the N2O is sent to the decomposition facility, "%_on-line", as section D.3 of the registered PDD shows equipment accuracy level of $\pm 1\%$ , the monitoring report (page 26) indicates that the accuracy is not applicable and the verification report (page 54) reports that the equipment accuracy is below 1%.
3	2185	Methane Capture and On-site Power Generation Project at Sungai Kerang Palm Oil Mill in Sitiawan, Perak, Malaysia	01/06/2009 to 31/12/2009	SIRIM	ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208)	Issue: The DOE shall explain how the most conservative assumption theoretically possible was taken during the period when the methane analyzer Serial No. I-04857 was replaced by the analyzer Serial No. 29326, in particular, which set of data for the methane concentration was assumed between 13/12/09 and 31/12/09.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The DOE is requested to explain how it has assessed the calibration of all the measuring equipment used in project activity in line with the requirement of VVM v.1.2 para 184 given that the assessment of the calibration of COD Reactor, COD Colorimeter, pressure sensors and temperature sensors is not provided in the verification report.



## CDM – Executive Board

4	1994	Yunnan Lincang Zhenai Hydropower Project	21/02/2010 to 20/03/2011	BVCH	ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))	Issue: The DOE shall explain the inconsistency of the total amount of CER value and electricity supplied to the grid as the Monitoring Report shows 35,594 tCO <sub>2</sub> and 42,204 MWh while the CER spreadsheet calculation, Verification Report, Signed form and Certification Report show other values (such as 35,610 tCO <sub>2</sub> and 42,229 MWh).
5	3204	Antu 303 Hydropower Project	01/06/2010 to 31/05/2011	LRQA	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))	Issue: The DOE is requested to explain how it has crosschecked the values provided in the monitoring report/emission reduction spreadsheet as per the requirement of para 208(b) of VVM v.1.2 given that the values of the sale's records are calculated values in cell C05 to C10 and C15 in the "summary" worksheet.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)	Issue: The DOE is requested to explain how it has closed CAR02 in line with the requirement of para 194 of the VVM (v.1.2) given that section D.2 of the revised monitoring report shows that the second calibration date is 06/04/2010, whereas the verification report states this date as 06/04/2011.
6	2243	Reduction of N <sub>2</sub> O emissions at shop#25, production line #1 at "Navoiazot" plant	12/05/2010 to 13/09/2010	TÜV SÜD	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report should provide the relevant information (e.g. date and result) of AST for the equipments labeled 3.355110.7, UJ021208, 2607112900 and 487792-4/6408032706. In addition, information is required as to whether the equipments labeled 487792-4/6408032706 were duly calibrated during baseline campaign. Previous calibration dates should be reported.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The verification report should provide the relevant information (e.g. date and result) of AST for the equipments labeled 3.355110.7, UJ021208, 2607112900 and 487792-4/6408032706. In addition, information is required as to whether the equipments labeled 487792-4/6408032706 were duly calibrated during baseline campaign. Previous calibration dates should be reported.
7	2243	Reduction of N <sub>2</sub> O emissions at shop#25, production line #1 at "Navoiazot" plant	14/09/2010 to 07/01/2011	TÜV SÜD	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report should provide the relevant information (e.g. date and result) of AST for the equipments measuring following parameters: NCSGBC; VSGBC; TSGBC; PSGBC; NCSG;VSG;TSG and PSG. In addition, information is required as to whether the equipments measuring VSG was duly calibrated during baseline campaign. Previous calibration dates should be reported.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The verification report should provide the relevant information (e.g. date and result) of AST for the equipments measuring following parameters : NCSGBC; VSGBC; TSGBC; PSGBC; NCSG;VSG;TSG and PSG. In addition, information is required as to whether the equipments measuring VSG was duly calibrated during baseline campaign. Previous calibration dates should be reported.
8	1947	Yingpeng HFC23 Decomposition Project	01/10/2010 to 31/12/2010	TÜV NORD	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The methodology (AM0001 v05.2 on page 16 requires all of the measurement instruments are to be recalibrated "monthly" per internationally accepted procedures except for the HFC 23 flow meters whose recalibration frequency is six months with a zero check being conducted weekly to reduce the error level. The DOE must report the dates on which each of the equipment measuring the required parameters was re-calibrated as per internationally accepted procedures except for the HFC23 flow meters. In case of any delayed calibration, the DOE must provide information on the compliance with EB52 Annex 60.
9	2092	Wind Electricity Generation Project	31/01/2009 to 23/08/2010	TÜV Rheinland	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: Further verify how the distribution percentage at the Undale meter (Emission Reduction spreadsheet, 'Gen' sheet, column N) is in accordance with the monitoring plan. Please also confirm that the magnification factors have been applied correctly.
					Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: Clarify how reading the meters at the end of the month is in compliance with the monitoring plan, considering that such readings should be done in the first week of each month as per the approved monitoring plan.
10	0390	Perpetual 7.5 MW Non-Conventional Renewable Sources Biomass Power Project	01/04/2009 to 23/03/2010	DNV	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan. (VVM v.1.2 para 206 & 221(d))	Issue: According to Table D.3 of the revised monitoring plan, the auxiliary consumption is "measured" parameter. However this parameter is "calculated" based on the gross generation and the net power exported. The DOE in its VR states that "Though auxiliary consumption is also measured by a calibrated meter, to effect transmission losses, auxiliary consumptions are reported as difference of gross power generation and power export to grid, which is inline with the registered PDD". The PP/DOE is requested to incorporate the measured values of the auxiliary consumption in the emission reduction worksheet in order to ensure completeness of the information submitted.
11	2924	Ningxia Federal Solar Cooker Project	12/02/2010 to 31/10/2010	TÜV Rheinland	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: the information provided in one sheet (Data source) of the excel file is different from the information provided in the Monitoring report and verification report: a) the monthly solar irradiance rate in project region is different



## CDM – Executive Board

							from the values used in the calculation. b) the number of solar cookers installed in the project activity is 17,000 instead of 19,000, which is the value used in the calculation of baseline emissions. c) the names of the townships involved in the project, and d) the monthly operating time of each solar cooker.
12	2308	Reduction of N2O emissions at "Maxam-Chirchik" plant	23/10/2009 to 15/07/2010	TÜV SÜD	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: No information was provided concerning AST, QAL1 or QAL3 of the devices measuring NCSG, VSG, TSG and PSG during the project campaign. Furthermore, information is required as to whether the equipments measuring NCSGBC, VSGBC, NAPBC , TSGBC, PSGBc were duly calibrated during baseline campaign. Previous calibration dates should be reported.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: Data and information (e.g. spreadsheets) containing historical campaigns values must be provided.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: Information (e.g. dates and test result) on verification findings should be provided concerning AST, and QAL3 for the devices measuring NCSG, VSG, TSG and PSG during the project campaign. Furthermore, the DOE should provide information as to whether the equipments measuring NCSGBC, VSGBC, NAPBC , TSGBC, PSGBc were duly calibrated during baseline campaign.
13	2308	Reduction of N2O emissions at "Maxam-Chirchik" plant	16/07/2010 to 22/03/2011	TÜV SÜD	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: No information was provided concerning AST, QAL1 or QAL3 of the devices measuring NCSG, VSG, TSG and PSG during the project campaign. Furthermore, information is required as to whether the equipments measuring NCSGBC, VSGBC, NAPBC , TSGBC, PSGBc were duly calibrated during baseline campaign. Previous calibration dates should be reported.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: Data and information (e.g. spreadsheets) containing historical campaigns values must be provided.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: Information (e.g. dates and test result) on verification findings should be provided concerning AST, and QAL3 for the devices measuring NCSG, VSG, TSG and PSG during the project campaign. Furthermore, the DOE should provide information as to whether the equipments measuring NCSGBC, VSGBC, NAPBC , TSGBC, PSGBc were duly calibrated during



## CDM – Executive Board

						baseline campaign.	
14	1126	7.5 MW biomass plants using agricultural waste Limited	03/09/2007 to 30/09/2009	DNV	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan. (VVM v.1.2 para 206 & 221(d))	Issue: There is inconsistency in the monitoring of the grid emission factor. The monitoring report contains the ex-ante value, however, the DOE (VR page 7) states it should be monitored ex-post but as the ex-ante is more conservative, it was accepted. However, the validation report (page 7) states that it is fixed ex-ante.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)	Issue: The DOE raised CAR2 regarding the source of the biomass fuel (small branches of trees) that were used in the project plants and closed it when the PP provided a letter from the village administrative indicating the source of biomass from infrastructure development activities and field clearance works. However, the DOE shall also confirm if the source of the biomass used is renewable biomass as required by the applicable methodology.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The DOE in the verification report (page 15) states that “The calibrations of the meters have been performed once a year and not once in six months as mentioned in the registered PDD. The annual calibration certificates for Export/import meters confirm that the errors are within accuracy limits of class 0.2 at all times. Since the stated frequency of calibration was not adhered to, as per the “Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements” the maximum inaccuracy class of the meter has been applied for the measured value for calculating the emission reductions.” However, the DOE makes no reference to the calibration of the meter with serial number of 06767466 which was installed at the Dindigul Plant, calibrated on 20 November 2006 and replaced on 24 July 2008.
15	2863	Hubei Enshi Laodukou Hydropower Station	28/06/2010 to 27/05/2011	BVCH	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: The monitoring plan (the registered PDD, page 32) requires the monitoring of "TEGy" (measured continuously and recorded on a monthly basis) – "Total electricity produced by the project activity in year y" as a separate parameter. However, the monitored data for this parameter has not been reported in the spreadsheet. Kindly provide the required information.





## CDM – Executive Board

16	0534	6.0 MW Biomass based power project of Agri Gold Projects Limited (AGPL), Prakasham District, Andhra Pradesh.	01/04/2007 to 31/03/2009	TÜV NORD	Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the implementation status of the project (including a brief description of the installed technology and/or equipments, relevant dates of project activity e.g. date of construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) during the monitoring period under consideration. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (i) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The date of construction has not been included in the monitoring report.
					Reporting of approved requests	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain reference to the approved revised PDD, which resulted from the notification/ request for approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD sought by PP/DOE and approved by the Executive Board. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report does not contain the description on whether there is any change of the project activity.
					Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: the description of data collection procedures, organizational structure, emergency procedures for the monitoring system and line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points is not clear in the monitoring report.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))	Issue: It is not clear how the biomass calorific value, auxiliary energy consumption and energy generated have been cross-checked.
					ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))	Issue: There is no conclusion on the compliance with the applied methodology.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: There is 4 days delay of the calibration of the weighbridge between 21/09/2007 and 25/09/2007.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not describe the implementation status of the project. (For project activities that consist of more than one site, the report shall clearly describe the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site. For CDM project activities with phased implementation, the report shall state the progress of the proposed CDM project activity achieved in each phase under verification). (VVM v.1.2 para 198 (a)).	Issue: The exact starting date of operation is not included in the verification report.
17	0459	Pronaca: Afortunados Swine Waste Management	01/10/2008 to 31/12/2010	TÜV SÜD	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: Section C of the MR does not provide a full description of the monitoring system and procedures. The MR does not contain: data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not describe the implementation status of the project. (For project activities that consist of more than one site, the report shall clearly describe the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site. For CDM project activities with phased implementation, the report shall state the progress of the proposed CDM project activity achieved in each phase under verification). (VVM v.1.2 para 198 (a)).	Issue: Page 1 of the VR stated that the implementation of the project has been carried out in 8 barns, however, the MR and other sections of the VR state that the implementation has been done in 7 barns.
18	0987	Energy Efficiency through Alteration of fuel oil atomizing media in coal-fired thermal power plant	01/11/2009 to 31/12/2010	DNV	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)	Issue: The DOE raised CL regarding the use of compressor rated capacity during outage period. However, the DOE did not provide information on 1) what was the reason of the outage of the in-line air compressor for 2,965 hours for this monitoring period and 2) how it has validated the rated capacity and actual operation of any stand-by air compressor used during project implementation.



## CDM – Executive Board

19	2527	Co-composting of EFB and POME project	18/07/2009 to 31/07/2010	ICONTEC	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: the verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the following parameters as per requirements of para 206 of VVM version 1.2: ID3: COD POME,y; ID9 i: CTy,EFB; ID9 ii: DAFEFB; ID9 iii: CTy,comp; ID9 iv: DAFy,comp; and ID11: CODrun-off-water .
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))	Issue: the verification report does not indicate how the DOE cross-check the data for the following parameters: ID3: COD POME,y; ID9 i: CTy,EFB; ID9 ii: DAFEFB; ID9 iii: CTy,comp; ID9 iv: DAFy,comp; and ID11: CODrun-off-water .
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue 1: the verification report does not determine if default values, IPCC values and other reference values have been justified and correctly applied. Issue 2: the project consumed gasoline and diesel, but in the calculation of emission reductions only diesel reference values (NCV, density, emission factor) are applied. The DOE has not determined if this approach is justified and correct. Issue 3: density values for diesel is taken from Energy Statistics Working Group Committee, IEA, Paris, Nov 2004. No assessment is contained in the verification report on justification and correctness of this value, and on whether its application is line with para 17(b) of the General Guidelines to SSC CDM methodologies.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue 1: the DOE has not provided an assessment on whether or not monitoring instruments have been calibrated as per requirements of the registered Monitoring Plan (i.e. instruments' calibration will occur at intervals determined on the basis of instrument manufacturers' recommendations, stability, purpose, usage and history of repeatability). No info is contained in the verification report on manufacturer's recommendations against which calibrations have been assessed. Issue 2: for the parameters QPOME,y and Qrun-off-water,y a declaration of conformity is provided instead of a calibration certificate. The verification report does not indicate if the use of declaration of conformity is justified for assessing validity of



## CDM – Executive Board

						calibration, considering that the flow meters may have been installed and used earlier than the issuance of the declarations.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60) Issue: date of calibration of spectrophotometer used for COD runoff is 03.09.2009, which is 47 days after the starting date of the monitoring period. The DOE has not provided any assessment on the compliance with EB52 Annex 60.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not describe the implementation status of the project. (For project activities that consist of more than one site, the report shall clearly describe the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site. For CDM project activities with phased implementation, the report shall state the progress of the proposed CDM project activity achieved in each phase under verification). (VVM v.1.2 para 198 (a)). Issue: the verification report does not describe the implementation status of the project (starting date of operation, periods of downtime and overhaul, etc.)
20	1502	American Israel Paper Mill (AIPM) Natural Gas Fuel Switch	01/06/2010 to 31/03/2011	TÜV NORD	Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e)) Issue: The DOE is requested to explain how it has determined if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied in line with the requirement of para 208 (d) & (e) given that the ex-ante values determined in the PDD and used in the emission reduction calculations are not reported in the verification report.
21	1658	Yinshan Profiled Iron Co., Ltd. 25 MW Waste Gas Power Generation Project of Laiwu Iron & Steel Group Corp.	28/04/2010 to 27/04/2011	ERM CVS	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34). Issue: the data collection procedure and the emergency procedure have not been included.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology? Issue: The spreadsheet does not contain the raw data of auxiliary electricity consumption, which is not consistent with description in page 17 of the verification report ("the raw data and calculation processes are presented in a spreadsheet /2/").



## CDM – Executive Board

22	0167	Landfill Gas to Energy Facility at the Nejapa Landfill Site, El Salvador	01/03/2010 to 31/12/2010	ICONTEC	ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))	Issue: The emission reductions achieved by the project were higher than the ex-ante estimations, however the VR does not contain any verification opinion about the increase of actual values of ER.
23	2569	Reforestation as Renewable Source of Wood Supplies for Industrial Use in Brazil	10/11/2000 to 09/11/2010	DNV	ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).	Issue: Emission reduction calculations are based on the actual stand volumes obtained from the monitored data collected from the sample plots. In the spreadsheet submitted, it is not shown how the stand volume values have been estimated. The DOE is requested to submit additional calculations of the stand volumes based on allometric equations and monitored data. In doing so, the DOE may provide the complete calculation method for the stand volume of at least one age class (Vijk,m) appearing in the TARAM model, in order to explain how the monitored data is being used in the calculation of emission reductions.
24	0306	Project for HFC23 Decomposition at Changshu 3F Zhonghao New Chemical Materials Co. Ltd, Changshu, Jiangsu Province, China	26/03/2011 to 25/06/2011	SGS	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: The CER spreadsheet only presents consolidated values of all the required monitored parameters for the entire monitoring period whereas the revised monitoring plan (page 19-22) and the methodology AM0001 v3 (page 7 to 9) require data to be recorded/reported monthly. Kindly provide the required monitored parameters at the required recording interval.
25	2969	CDM LUSAKA SUSTAINABLE ENERGY PROJECT 1	09/01/2010 to 31/12/2010	TÜV SÜD	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: Different sections of the Monitoring Report refer to data/values presented in a table in section E.4. However, there is no table in section E.4 of the Monitoring Report.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The verification report does not list the parameters Nmonitored, Noperating.
					Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for parameters Nmonitored, Noperating. Further, the Verification Report does not provide information on how the DOE assessed that the number of monitored households is in accordance with the monitoring plan
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not describe the reasons for the phased-implementation delay and/or does not present the expected implementation dates. (VVM v.1.2 para 198 (a)).	Issue: The verification report (page 62) states that the PP's response to CAR 9 was: "There was a delay in the implementation of cooking systems in relation to the anticipated time schedule."
26	3107	Xinjiang Dabancheng	26/11/2010 to	SGS	Monitored	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters	Issue: The applied methodology version 9 (page 16/19) requires



## CDM – Executive Board

		Sanchang Phase IV Wind Power Project	27/06/2011		Parameters	required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	the monitoring of parameter 'TEGy = Total electricity produced by the project activity, including the electricity supplied to the grid and the electricity supplied to internal loads', as well as parameter "PEFC <sub>j,y</sub> = CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion in process". However, no monitored data have been submitted. Kindly provide the required monitoring results for this required parameter.
27	0814	Waste heat recovery from Process Gas Compressors (PGCs), Mumbai high south (offshore platform) and using the recovered heat to heat process heating oil	01/04/2009 to 30/06/2010	DNV	ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).	Issue: Spreadsheet does not include explanation for the heading used in the PGC Train B calculation spreadsheet since: (i) the heading for parameter "HOT OIL MEAN SP HEAT J/g-K" is missing, and (ii) the headings used for the parameters "HOT OIL FLOW RATE (MT/HR)" "RUNNING HOURS" "Specific Heat (kJ/kg/C)" are misleading
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The verification report does not contain the explanation of the formulae used for emission reduction calculation in relation to the use of 0.66 kg/liter for the specific gravity of hot oil during the periods 1 April 2009 to 31 May 2009 and 29-34 July 2009 for PGC Train A and 30 April 2009 for PGC Train B; while the verification report includes only an explanation for the use of a specific gravity of 0.64 kg/liter and 0.625 kg/liter for train A and train B respectively.
28	1171	Project for the catalytic reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia reactor of the No. 9 nitric acid plant at African Explosives Ltd ("AEL"), South Africa	05/11/2007 to 10/02/2008	DNV	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: The spreadsheet do not contain all the parameters required to be monitored during historical campaigns. The historic data of daily NH3 consumption used to determine the range of AFR for the five historic campaigns should be provided.
29	3804	Shaanxi Hanjiang Shuhe Hydropower Station	18/11/2010 to 31/03/2011	CEPREI	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan. (VVM v.1.2 para 206 & 221(d))	Issue: The approved monitoring plan does not provide for grid electricity to be by-passed through the bus line of the project activity. Clarify how the electricity that was diverted through the project activity (electricity not eligible for emission reductions) was separated from the electricity usually exported from the project activity (electricity eligible for emission reductions) .



## CDM – Executive Board

					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: Calibration dates for M7, M8 and M9, as presented in the Verification Report, are inconsistent with the dates presented in the Monitoring Report.
30	1370	Project for the Catalytic Reduction of N <sub>2</sub> O Emissions with a Secondary Catalyst Inside the Ammonia Reactor of the N4 Nitric Acid Plant at Haifa Chemicals Ltd., Israel.	01/03/2010 to 03/05/2010	DNV	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistencies in: i) Gauze composition during the project campaigns, GC_project, as the MR (Annex 2) indicates that the gauze composition was different during the project and baseline campaigns while the verification report (Table 1; parameter 5) mentions that the "composition kept same as in last monitoring period" and does not report any changes in the gauze composition; ii) NAP monitoring equipment as the MR (Annex 3) indicates an accuracy level of $\pm 0.27\%$ while the verification report (Table 1) shows an accuracy level of $\pm 0.24\%$ .
31	1088	"Forced Methane extraction from Organic wastewater", at Mandya District, Karnataka by M/s Sri Chamundeswari Sugars Ltd.	01/01/2009 to 31/12/2010	DNV	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The DOE stated that the flare temperature and operation time have been recorded every five minutes and aggregated monthly; however, it is not clear how the aggregated value can be considered appropriate. The DOE should provide the monitored values of flare temperature and operation time.
32	1171	Project for the catalytic reduction of N <sub>2</sub> O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia reactor of the No. 9 nitric acid plant at African Explosives Ltd ("AEL"), South Africa	11/02/2008 to 04/08/2009	DNV	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The spreadsheet do not contain all the parameters required to be monitored during historical campaigns. The historic data of daily NH <sub>3</sub> consumption used to determine the range of AFR for the five historic campaigns should be provided.
33	0499	Destruction of HFC-23 at refrigerant (HCFC-22) manufacturing facility of Chemplast Sanmar Ltd	16/02/2011 to 30/06/2011	SGS	ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))	Issue: In the calculation of the actual average of HFC 23/ HCFC 22 to calculate the eligible HFC23, the generated HFC23 waste stream (without adjustment of the purity) has been used. It is requested to correct this value by using the pure HFC23 incinerated.



## CDM – Executive Board

34	1289	Fuel switchover from higher carbon intensive fuels to Natural Gas (NG) at Indian Farmers Fertiliser Cooperative Ltd (IFFCO) in Phulpur Village, Allahabad, Uttar Pradesh by M/s Indian Farmers Fertiliser Cooperative Ltd (IFFCO)	01/04/2010 to 31/03/2011	SGS	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology. (VVM v.1.2 para 200, 203 & 221(d))	Issue: The DOE validated that the monitoring plan is in accordance with version 3 of ACM0009 (available version at the time of registration); however, version 3.2 was already available at the time of verification. Please note that according to the EB guidelines, the latest editorial version of the methodology should be used for the request for issuance.
					Others	Scope: The certification report does not indicate the monitoring period under verification and/or the corresponding number of CERs requested by the DOE. (EB48 Annex 68 para 10 (d))	Issue: There are two different monitoring periods presented in the certification report. The DOE is requested to correct the monitoring period under consideration in the certification report in line with the requirement of EB48, Annex 68 para 10(d).
35	1873	Hebei Chengde Huifeng Windfarm Project	01/04/2010 to 30/04/2011	SGS	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The DOE/PP are requested to clarify if adequate monitoring system and procedures have been put in place as the MR (page 5) mentions that "the company will establish a CDM project management office and assign dedicated people responsible for the monitoring and reporting of the generation and emission reductions of the project activity" which appears to be the same statement mentioned in the PDD (page 23) and the monitoring report does not report how this has been implemented.
36	2882	Tao River Haidianxia 60MW Hydropower Project in Gansu Province, China	27/12/2009 to 29/12/2010	ERM CVS	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The values for EGy and EGex provided in page 9 of the monitoring report are not consistent with the values provided in the other part of the monitoring report as well as verification report.
37	1947	Yingpeng HFC23 Decomposition Project	01/01/2011 to 19/04/2011	TÜV NORD	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: (a) The DOE indicates that in order to meet monthly recalibration requirement the meters measuring q_HFC23y are shifted from time to time (page 31 of Verification Report). However no information is provided with respect to the precise date for each equipment to ensure that throughout the entire monitoring period an equipment with valid calibration was used. (b) The DOE indicates that the equipment measuring p_HFC23y was recalibrated on 1 January, February and March, 2011 (page 33 of Verification Report). Precise calibration dates are not provided for February and March to ensure that the equipment was duly calibrated during the entire monitoring period. (c) The DOE indicated that the main meter (SN 8184) measuring Q-LPGy was recalibrated on 19th January, 18th February, 16th





## CDM – Executive Board

							<p>March, and 13th April, 2011 (page 34 of Verification Report). Information should be provided on calibration status of the equipment from the period of 1 of to 18th of January, 2011 which is within this monitoring period. No information was provided on recalibration of back-up meter (SN 8185) and if it was used during this monitoring period.</p> <p>(d) The DOE indicated that the equipment measuring ND_HFC23y was recalibrated on 1 January, February and March, 2011 (page 33 of Verification Report). Precise calibration dates are not provided for February and March to ensure that the equipment was duly calibrated during the entire monitoring period. The relevant information should be provided.</p> <p>(e) The DOE indicated that the main meter measuring Q_Elec was recalibrated by comparing the periodical reading with another certified meter providing details of such meter calibration (page 32 of Verification Report). However, the DOE has not provided information to confirm that this is an acceptable practice considering national calibration standards. Furthermore, recalibration dates were reported as 29 January, 28 February, 31 March 2011 (page 32 of Verification Report). No information is provided related to the period before January 29th. In addition, information should be provided on recalibration dates of other 2 meters (SN 211-784809 and SN 203-145608) which as per the Monitoring Report (page 18) were used during this monitoring period.</p> <p>(f) The DOE indicated (page 34 of Verification Report) that the equipment measuring Q_Steamy were recalibrated on 13 of April, 2011 (SN 20080345, 080225008 and L81A1103) and on 19th January, 18th February, 16th March, 13 April, 2011 (SN 20090436, 08225004 and L81A1104). Calibration information does not cover the entire monitoring period.</p> <p>(g) DOE does not provide precise dates for the calibration of the equipment measuring Q_HCFC22y to ensure that all 7 equipments were duly calibrated during the entire monitoring period (page 33 of Verification Report).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



## CDM – Executive Board

38	0580	Calope Hydroelectric Project	01/09/2009 to 31/08/2010	AENOR	ER Calculation	Scope: The parameters shown in section E of the monitoring report, are not clearly defined. For example:	The parameters shown in section E of the monitoring report, are not clearly defined. For example: (a) section E.1, refers to a parameter 'EB' which is not previously defined. (b) in section E.2 the equation for emission reductions is not clear as this corresponds to the equation for the monitored baseline emissions. (c) in section E.4 the value (60,031 tCO <sub>2</sub> ) corresponds to monitored baseline emissions and not to project emissions. Please amend section E following the methodology ACM0002 terminology for the parameters used to calculate emission reductions. In doing so please also provide a translated diagram of the electric parameters shown in page 3 of the monitoring report. Please refer to EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii).
39	2307	Federal Intertrade Pengyang Solar Cooker Project	01/05/2010 to 31/10/2010	TÜV Rheinland	Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)	Issue: Information should be provided as to the source of the "sampling theory" used (page 13 of the verification report). The DOE is requested to provide a replicable excel spreadsheet of the calculations leading to the required sampling quantity (page 14 of the verification report). Furthermore, information shall be provided on how the DOE justified the use of the formula leading to the required sampling theory and the value used for z, e, S, B and r (page 14 of the verification report)
40	3598	Manglad Small Hydroelectric Project	18/09/2010 to 31/05/2011	DNV	Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain emission factors, IPCC default values, and/or other reference values used in the calculation of emission reductions. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (v)).	Issue: The DOE should clarify the inconsistencies related to the source of the NCV <sub>i,y</sub> value between the emission reduction spreadsheet, MR, verification report and PDD. In doing so, please confirm the source provided (1996 IPCC guidelines) in the ER spreadsheet.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan. (VVM v.1.2 para 206 & 221(d))	Issue: The DOE should verify whether the monitoring of the NCV <sub>i,y</sub> and EFCO <sub>2,i,y</sub> parameters is in accordance with the approved monitoring plan. In doing so, please clarify why both parameters have been mentioned under section D.1 of the MR (i.e. parameters not monitored).
41	0501	Bentong Biomass Energy Plant in Malaysia	01/01/2008 to 30/06/2009	BVCH	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report does not contain information regarding the national regulations applicable for the calibration frequency of the electricity meter as required by the revised monitoring plan.



## CDM – Executive Board

					ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).	Issue: The submitted spreadsheet does not contain the FOD model calculations for estimating the amount of baseline emissions from the biomass that would have been decayed in absence of the project activity.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The verification report does not contain information regarding the following monitoring parameters (i) Total organic carbon (ii) Distance (between biomass and landfill and between biomass and project) (iii) Biomass Survey (iv) Landfill gas collection occurs on the landfill near the project
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The verification report does not confirm that the calibration of the electricity meter complies with national standards as required by the revised monitoring plan.
42	2756	Miyi Wantan Hydroelectric Project	26/03/2010 to 25/05/2011	CEC	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The Monitoring Report does not contain information on the parameter CAPpj - Installed capacity of the hydropower plant after the implementation of the project activity. This parameter should be monitored annually as per page 17 of the methodology ACM0002 v7 but it is not reported.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology. (VVM v.1.2 para 200, 203 & 221(d))	Issue: The Verification Report on page 12 (sections 3.3) does not provide information on how the DOE verified that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology, in particular with regard to the required parameter CapPJ (as per page 17 of the methodology) . Information should be provided.
43	1262	Waste gases utilisation for Combined Cycle Power Plant in Handan Iron & Steel Group Co., Ltd	01/04/2011 to 30/06/2011	TÜV NORD	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: Regarding the monitoring of EGGEN and EGAUX, the DOE shall confirm that the monitored results of functional meters (excluding meter M26) have been reported in the monitoring report as per the methodology and registered PDD.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: Regarding the monitoring of EGGEN and EGAUX, the DOE shall confirm that the monitored results of functional meters (excluding meter M26) have been reported in the spreadsheet as per the methodology and registered PDD.
44	0541	La Joya Hydroelectric Project (Costa Rica)	01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010	ICONTEC	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	In particular: the DOE has not provided information on whether: (i) calibration of main meter (M1) is valid from 01/01/2010 to 01/06/2010; and (ii) the calibration of secondary meter (M2) is valid from 01/01/2010 to 31/05/2010. In doing so, please provide the information of the validity of the



## CDM – Executive Board

						calibration of meters during the current monitoring period (01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010).
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))  Issue: The MR/VR doesn't describe how PP/DOE cross-checked the EG of the project by sales invoices.
45	0928	Methane recovery and effective use of power generation project Norte III-B Landfill.	01/06/2010 to 31/01/2011	SGS	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).  Issue: i) according to the monitoring methodology, enclosed flares "shall be operated and maintained as per the specifications prescribed by the manufacturer", however the monitoring report neither describes the manufacturer's specifications nor confirms that these specifications were met during the monitoring period; ii) Annex I provides the results of the flare efficiency, but the dates when the analyses were made were not reported;
46	0799	Santa Marta Landfill Gas (LFG) Capture Project.	01/04/2009 to 31/08/2009	TÜV SÜD	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)  Issue: the Parameters "CEFthermal energy" and "CEF LPGenergy" are not listed in the verification report.
					Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)  Issue: the verification report does not state how the DOE verify the information flow for the parameters "CEFthermal energy" and "CEF LPGenergy".
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))  Issue 1: the verification report does not indicate how the DOE cross-checked the information provided in the monitoring report with regard to the paramters "CEFthermal energy"and "CEF LPGenergy". Issue 2: the verification report does not indicate how the DOE cross-checked that the flares operated and were maintained as per specification prescribed by the manufacturer, as per QA/QC requirement applicable to Flare Efficiency. Issue 3: the verification report does not indicate how the DOE has cross-checked the information provided in the monitoring report with regard to the emission factor of the Chilean grid, considering that the MR refers to a 2008 EF of 0.6620 tCO <sub>2</sub> e/MWh and the VR (page 15) refers to a 2007 EF of 0.452 tCO <sub>2</sub> e/MWh.
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2  Issue: the verification report does not determine if the following assumptions have been correctly applied: i) Density of fuel diesel; ii) NCV diesel;



## CDM – Executive Board

						para 208 (d) & (e))	iii) NCV LPG; iv) EFDiesel; v) EF LPG.
47	0799	Santa Marta Landfill Gas (LFG) Capture Project.	01/09/2009 to 31/01/2010	TÜV SÜD	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: the Parameters "CEFthermal energy" and "CEF LPGenergy" are not listed in the verification report.
					Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: the verification report does not state how the DOE verify the information flow for the parameters "CEFthermal energy" and "CEF LPGenergy".
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))	Issue 1: the verification report does not indicate how the DOE cross-checked the information provided in the monitoring report with regard to the parameters "CEFthermal energy" and "CEF LPGenergy". Issue 2: the verification report does not indicate how the DOE cross-checked that the flares operated and were maintained as per specification prescribed by the manufacturer, as per QA/QC requirement applicable to Flare Efficiency. Issue 3: the verification report does not indicate how the DOE has cross-checked the information provided in the monitoring report with regard to the emission factor of the Chilean grid, considering that the MR refers to a 2009 EF of 0.6987 tCO <sub>2</sub> e/MWh and the VR (page 15) refers to a 2007 EF of 0.5016 tCO <sub>2</sub> e/MWh.
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: the verification report does not determine if the following assumptions have been correctly applied: i) Density of fuel diesel; ii) NCV diesel; iii) NCV LPG; iv) EFDiesel; v) EF LPG.
48	0799	Santa Marta Landfill Gas (LFG) Capture Project.	01/02/2010 to 31/08/2010	TÜV SÜD	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: the Parameters "CEFthermal energy" and "CEF LPGenergy" are not listed in the verification report.
					Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: the verification report does not state how the DOE verify the information flow for the parameters "CEFthermal energy" and "CEF LPGenergy".



## CDM – Executive Board

					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))	Issue 1: the verification report does not indicate how the DOE cross-checked the information provided in the monitoring report with regard to the parameters "CEFthermal energy" and "CEF LPGenergy". Issue 2: the verification report does not indicate how the DOE has cross-checked the information provided in the monitoring report with regard to the emission factor of the Chilean grid, considering that the MR refers to an EF of 0.6987 tCO <sub>2</sub> e/MWh and the VR (page 16) refers to an EF of 0.5016 tCO <sub>2</sub> e/MWh.
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: the verification report does not determine if the following assumptions have been correctly applied: i) Density of fuel diesel; ii) NCV diesel; iii) NCV LPG; iv) EFDiesel; v) EF LPG.
49	1405	CEMEX Costa Rica: Use of biomass residues in Colorado cement plant	01/01/2009 to 30/06/2009	TÜV NORD	Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The DOE shall report that how it has verified all the default factors listed in the revised PDD dated 07/12/2010.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: Please clarify that how DOE verified the gaps in calibration for instrument calciner Meter (Bunker & Residual Oils) which was used to monitor parameter QFF (Fuel type) from 16/01/09 to 20/01/09 and 16/03/09 to 16/04/09.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)	Issue: In doing so, the DOE shall report the relevant dates for the project activity (e.g. construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc). In addition, please report the period of overhaul times or downtime of equipments due to preventive maintenance in the plant.
50	2183	Curva de Rodas and La Pradera landfill gas management project	06/02/2009 to 30/11/2010	SQS	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The Monitoring Report does not contain information on Regulatory Requirements to be checked annually as per PDD.



## CDM – Executive Board

				ER Calculation	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any), and/or emission reductions, including reference to formulae and methods used. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii))	Issue: The monitoring report does not provide calculations related to PEflare.
				Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The DOE does not provide an assessment on the parameter TDLY listed in the monitoring plan.
				Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The information flow of the listed parameters is not clearly assessed by the DOE in its verification report. In response of an incomplete submission, the flare manufacture's operational range for the flare temperature reported has been changed, and some of the listed parameters' monthly values reported (such as LFGflare - including increase, nFlare, PEflare.y - not affected while other parameters are affected reported in "CER spreadsheet" for La Pradera II) have also changed. Hence the DOE is requested to clearly assess the information flow of the associated parameters and calculations. Additionally, the DOE is requested to assess the relation of this operational range of flare temperature to the default values used for flare efficiency (0%, 50% and 90% if applicable) and its impact on the emission reduction calculation during the monitoring period.
				Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The PDD indicates for the default value of emission factor applied that "The validity of the value applied will be checked annually from the applied tool" while this check is not assessed by the DOE in its verification report. Additionally the DOE has not provided an assessment on Regulatory Requirements, to be annually checked as per PDD.
				Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)	Issue: CAR 1 refers to the information stated in the monitoring report as "no emission reductions were claimed during the relevant twelve (12) days period" however after closing CAR 1, the monitoring report has not been corrected.
				Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not describe the implementation status of the project. (For project activities that consist of more than one site, the report shall clearly describe the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site. For CDM project activities with phased implementation, the report shall state the progress of the proposed CDM project activity achieved in each phase under verification). (VVM v.1.2 para 198 (a)).	Issue: The DOE does not provide an assessment on the status of La Carrilera section of La Pradera landfill, as it has provided for La Musica and Altair sections, in the verification report.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)	Issue: The DOE has not provided an assessment on all events occurred in the monitoring period related to the project activity operation such as limitations of the flaring system shut-downs and other unusual occurrences as reported in the monitoring report, and how the same has been verified for each one of the periods affected.
51	1604	Guangxi Xiafu Hydro Power Project	26/03/2010 to 25/03/2011	Deloitte-TECO	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The PP/DOE explained that the 1st generator was stopped for overhaul between 01 Nov 2010 and 30 Jan 2011. However the verification report does not indicate how the DOE has verified the following information: * There is not electricity going through the anmeter EM1 which is connected to all three generators during the overhaul period; * The spreadsheet shows no electricity output through anmeter EM2 in the periods 26 Nov-25 Dec 2010 and 26 Jan-25 Feb 2011; and * the spreadsheet shows a reduced electricity generation from EM2GS (2nd generator) during the overhaul time of the 1st generator.
52	2183	Curva de Rodas and La Pradera landfill gas management project	01/12/2010 to 30/06/2011	SQS	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report does not provide the values of: - Oxygen and methane concentration in exhaust gas; and - Average technical transmission and distribution losses in the grid.
					ER Calculation	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any), and/or emission reductions, including reference to formulae and methods used. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii))	Issue: The calculation of emissions from flaring (including the estimation of flare efficiency) are not presented.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: The calculation of emissions from flaring (including the estimation of flare efficiency) are not presented.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: See issue above (paragraph 1.6 of checklist)
53	2359	7.5 MW Bundled Small Hydropower Project in	21/08/2009 to 20/09/2010	JACO	Reporting of approved requests	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain reference to the revised monitoring plan sought by PP/DOE and approved by the Executive Board. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: the project monitoring plan is revised and approved on 26 May 2011, but the monitoring report does not contain reference to the revised monitoring plan.





## CDM – Executive Board

		Qiandongnan Autonomous Region, Guizhou Province, P.R. China			Reporting of approved requests	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain reference to the approved revised PDD, which resulted from the notification/ request for approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD sought by PP/DOE and approved by the Executive Board. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: a notification for approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD was submitted and approved on 12 August 2011, but the monitoring report does not contain reference to the approved revised PDD.
					Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue 1: the calibration frequency for the electricity meters installed at Qingxin II project (i.e. 5 years) and at Wawadong II project (i.e. 6 and 5 years) is not in line with the calibration requirement of the revised monitoring plan and the General Guidelines on SSC CDM Methodologies (i.e. at least every 3 years). Issue 2: as per revised monitoring plan the net electricity at Wawadong (II) project is measured by mean of three meters: one meter installed at the substation, one meter installed at Wawadong (II) project site, and one meter installed at the nearby Wawadong (I) project site. However, the monitoring report contains calibration information on two meters only.
					ER Calculation	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any), and/or emission reductions, including reference to formulae and methods used. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii))	Issue 1: The monitoring report does not include formulae and methods used for the calculation of transmission losses for Cengong Sandengkan Project. Issue 2: he monitoring report does not include formulae and methods used for the calculation of net electricity supply for Wawadong (II) project as per the apportioning approach described in the revised monitoring plan
					ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).	Issue: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae used to calculate Transmission Loss for Cengong Sandenkan project.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology. (VVM v.1.2 para 200, 203 & 221(d))	Issue: The verification report does not contain a clear statement that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: the Verification Report does not clearly list each parameter required to be monitored as per revised monitoring plan.
54	1428	Monomeros Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project	25/03/2009 to 03/05/2010	ICONTEC	ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).	Issue: The PP is requested to clarify the use of "F. Scio" in cells C306-312 of the "production" sheet of the spreadsheet.
					Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The DOE should clearly report how it verified the information flow for each required parameters including how each of the required parameters was generated, aggregated, transferred and reported.



## CDM – Executive Board

55	1790	CEMEX Colombia: Biomass project at Caracolito cement plant.	01/04/2009 to 31/08/2009	TÜV NORD	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology. (VVM v.1.2 para 200, 203 & 221(d))	Issue: The methodology requires to estimate 1) alternative fuel reserve available in the region and 2) alternative fuel used by other users on yearly basis, while these two parameters were reported on monthly basis (7,500 t/month and 4,411 t/month) in the annual biomass availability study conducted by the PP. The DOE shall: 1) explain how 7,500 t/month and 4,411 t/month have been arrived; and 2) shall verify how the demonstration on the availability of the alternative fuels (rice husk in this case) has been considered in line with the methodology. In addition, the DOE shall report how it has verified external reports referred by PP for its biomass residue availability study.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: the calibration on weighting feeder scales was conducted based on manufacturer specification. However, it is not clear what the calibration frequency is required in the specification and whether the calibration frequency implemented during the monitoring period (monthly as stated in the verification report) has been in line with the specification. In doing so, the DOE shall refer to EB 52 Annex 60.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not describe the implementation status of the project. (For project activities that consist of more than one site, the report shall clearly describe the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site. For CDM project activities with phased implementation, the report shall state the progress of the proposed CDM project activity achieved in each phase under verification). (VVM v.1.2 para 198 (a)).	Issue: the DOE has not reported when the project started operation and whether the project activity was implemented on phase.
56	2334	Anaerobic digestion at Armenis Farm Ltd., Cyprus	12/06/2009 to 31/12/2009	TÜV Rheinland	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The monitoring report does not contain the information flow from data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation to reporting for each monitoring parameters and how this was employed by the project activity during the monitoring period. Additionally the monitoring report does not report the outcome of on site inspections conducted. Also, Section C does not indicate to which parameter "Store of automatically recorded data in measuring system" is applicable (e.g. B.Gburnt, pressure, temperature of biogas, electricity, etc).



## CDM – Executive Board

				Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report does not provide a calibration date for the flow meter ensuring that calibration is covered for the monitoring period. Additionally, dates of calibration for gas analyzer serial number 046 03 000637 covering the period which the instrument has been used have not been reported in the monitoring report.
				ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).	Issue: In CER excel sheet, the sheet named "Methane Fraction raw data" contains data of methane concentration for the period 01/06/09 to 11/06/09 while this period is not part of the monitoring period and does not contain data for 31/12/2009 (which is part of the monitoring period). Additionally, the same sheet provides reading of methane concentration for every 30 minutes for the entire period reported, however does not indicate which records from the ones reported for July 2009 were taken using the portable gas analyzer (periodical measurements). Also the sheet "Confidence interval" provides calculation which is not possible to track from sheet "Methane fraction raw data" provided. Additionally the CER sheet in "Armenis Calculation Sheet" does not provide explanation on the calculation applied to obtain the monthly values reported for pressure of biogas (e.g. it is not clear if 2 mbars have been the actual measured value for all months).
				Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The verification report does not list and assess the on-site inspections for the farms (monitoring parameter).
				Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: the verification report does not indicate, for each monitored parameter, how the information flow including data generation, frequency of records, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting has been verified. In doing so, the DOE is requested to clearly indicate the source of information verified, listed in the reference list of the verification report.
				Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The grid emission factor reported in the verification protocol does not correspond to the value indicated in the PDD/monitoring report.
				Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The monitoring report indicates that both gas analyzers used in the monitoring period are of accuracy 1% while the verification report indicates +/-3%. Additionally the verification report does not clearly indicate how it verified (source of information) the calibrations frequencies and calibration dates of each metering equipments used in the monitoring period (including calibrations conducted for pressure and temperature



## CDM – Executive Board

							of biogas meters in March 2008).
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The verification report states that “In cases where the calibration frequency is not according to registered PDD calibrations afterwards have been performed” however does not indicate for which meter and which specific period the DOE confirmed that the calibration has been delayed and EB52 Annex 60 applied as required.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not provide the findings of the desk review and/or site visit? (If an on-site visit is not conducted, the DOE shall justify the rationale of the decision). (VVM v.1.2 para 221 (c)).	Issue: The date when the site visit was conducted is not clearly reported by the DOE since the verification report indicates in its Appendix A that the site visit was conducted on June 17, 2009 (before the monitoring period ended), while page 10 indicates dates from 06/2010 and 10/2010 in section “On-site visit and follow-up interviews with project stakeholders”.
57	2331	Anaerobic digestion at Animalia Genetics Ltd., Cyprus	25/02/2009 to 31/12/2009	TÜV Rheinland	Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the implementation status of the project (including a brief description of the installed technology and/or equipments, relevant dates of project activity e.g. date of construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) during the monitoring period under consideration. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (i) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: As per monitoring report Section A.4, the project has been continuously operating since it entered into operation apart from brief stops of the Plant for maintenance purposes. However in Section B.1 of monitoring report it states that "The project activity has operated as planned. No special events have taken place. The project has been implemented continuously in the monitoring period." Please address this inconsistency.
					Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The monitoring report does not contain the information flow from data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation to reporting for each monitoring parameters and how this was employed by the project activity during the monitoring period. Additionally the monitoring report does not report the outcome of on site inspections conducted. Also, Section C does not indicate to which parameter "Store of automatically recorded data in measuring system" is applicable (e.g. BGburnt, pressure, temperature of biogas, electricity, etc). Also, the monitoring plan states that the number of trips for manure transportation are cross checked with the size of supplying farms mentioned in the PDD and that biogas production will be cross checked with electricity production however these crosschecking and results are not reported in the monitoring report.
					Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The calibration date for the electricity meter (January 2010) does not covers the monitoring period.



## CDM – Executive Board

ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).	Issue: In CER spreadsheet, sheet "Methane fraction raw data", the values of methane concentration reported as of 2/6/2009 are daily values (different from the recording frequency observed in the remaining period) and no explanations have been provided. Additionally the same sheet contains data for dates which are not part of the monitoring period. Also the CER sheet in "Animalia" does not provide explanation on the calculation applied to obtain the monthly values reported for pressure of biogas (e.g. it is not clear if 2 mbars have been the actual measured value for all months).
Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The verification report does not assess the on-site inspections for the farms as reported in the monitoring report.
Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: the verification report does not indicate, for each monitored parameter, how the information flow including data generation, frequency of records, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting has been verified. In doing so, the DOE is requested to clearly indicate the source of information verified, listed in the reference list of the verification report.
Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The grid emission factor reported in the verification protocol does not correspond to the value indicated in the PDD/monitoring report.
Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)	Issue: The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies of findings discussed in the verification protocol (Appendix A), which are listed in "Table 2: List of Requests for Corrective Action (CAR) and Clarification (CL)" and the related parameter assessed in verification report page 15. E.g., A FAR 1 is raised in the verification protocol (Appendix A) regarding the lack of evidence to crosscheck the monitored parameter "number of trips", while the FAR 1 listed in Table 2 relates to the two additional gen-set being tested as observed in the site visit. The value for "number of trips" verified reported in verification report page 15 is 124 while the number reported in the verification protocol (Appendix A) is 111.
Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para	Issue: The verification report does not indicate how it verified the calibration of flow meter, gas analyzer, manometer and thermometer reported as conducted in 01st August 2008 in the monitoring report. Additionally the accuracy verified and reported by the DOE in the verification report (3%) differs from



## CDM – Executive Board

						184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	the one reported in the monitoring report (1%). Additionally the verification report does not clearly indicate how it verified (source of information) the calibrations frequencies and calibration dates of each metering equipments used in the monitoring period
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The verification report does not indicate how DOE verified the calibration delay (reported as January 2010 hence not covering the monitoring period) for both electricity meters as per EB 52 Annex 60. Additionally, the verification report states that “In cases where the calibration frequency is not according to registered PDD calibrations afterward have been performed” however does not indicate for which meter and which specific period the DOE confirmed that the calibration has been delayed and EB52 Annex 60 applied as required.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not provide the findings of the desk review and/or site visit? (If an on-site visit is not conducted, the DOE shall justify the rationale of the decision). (VVM v.1.2 para 221 (c)).	Issue: The date when the site visit was conducted is not clearly reported by the DOE since the verification report indicates in its Appendix A that the site visit was conducted on June 16, 2009 (before the monitoring period ended), while page 9 indicates dates from 06/2010 and 10/2010 in section “On-site visit and follow-up interviews with project stakeholders”.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)	Issue: VR states "During onsite visit two additional gen-set were just testing phase. The onsite visit was mid of June 2010, so six months after the monitoring period be be verified here. Thus the testing of those new installations are not part of this verification either." however does not indicate how the DOE confirmed that testing in those generators did not take place during the monitoring period.
58	2329	Anaerobic digestion of animal manure at Farma Andreou & Costi Ltd., Cyprus	31/03/2009 to 31/12/2009	TÜV Rheinland	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The monitoring report does not contain the information flow from data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation to reporting for each monitoring parameters and how this was employed by the project activity during the monitoring period. Additionally the monitoring report does not report the outcome of on site inspections conducted. Also, Section C does not indicate to which parameter "Store of automatically recorded data in measuring system" is applicable (e.g. BGburnt, pressure, temperature of biogas, electricity, etc). Also, the monitoring plan states that the number of trips for manure transportation are cross checked with the size of supplying farms mentioned in the PDD and that biogas production will be cross checked with electricity production however these crosschecking and results are not reported in the monitoring report.



## CDM – Executive Board

				Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report states that "The crosscheck with the amount of trips as calculated in the PDD, based on the size of the supplying farm, showed that the number of trips in the PDD is higher than the monitored amount of trips." However the monitoring report and CER sheet do not indicate which was the monitored value obtained used for such comparison and how the reported value has been calculated.
				Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The calibration date reported for the electricity meter (January 2010) does not cover the monitoring period.
				ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).	Issue: Values monitored for March 2009 (part of monitoring period) are excluded in the CER sheet and no further explanations are provided. Additionally, data monitored on 31/12/2009 (part of monitoring period) for methane concentration in methane raw data sheets for both sites is missing.
				Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The verification report does not list and assess the on-site inspections for the farms (monitoring parameter).
				Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: the verification report does not indicate, for each monitored parameter, how the information flow including data generation, frequency of records, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting has been verified. In doing so, the DOE is requested to clearly indicate the source of information verified, listed in the reference list of the verification report
				Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: the verification report does not report how it verified the calibration for the flow meter conducted on October 2008 and the calibration for the gas analyzers conducted on 13 January 2009, as reported in the monitoring report.
				Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The verification report does not indicate how DOE verified the calibration delay (reported as January 2010 hence not covering the monitoring period) for the electricity meters as per EB 52 Annex 60.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not provide the findings of the desk review and/or site visit? (If an on-site visit is not conducted, the DOE shall justify the rationale of the decision). (VVM v.1.2 para 221 (c)).	Issue: The date when the site visit was conducted is not clearly reported by the DOE since the verification report indicates in its Appendix A that the site visit was conducted on June 15, 2009 (before the monitoring period ended), while page 9 indicates dates from 06/2010 and 10/2010 in section “On-site visit and follow-up interviews with project stakeholders”.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)	Issue: The monitoring report and verification report does not provide explanation on why manure has not been transported in the monitoring period from farms.
59	3440	Point of Use Abatement Device to Reduce SF6 emissions in LCD Manufacturing Operations in the Republic of Korea (South Korea)	01/01/2011 to 30/04/2011	TÜV SÜD	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The PP/DOE are requested to: i) report on the minimum frequency for the cleaning or replacement of the FTIR windows, and ii) recalibration of the FTIR devices considering that the Monitoring Report (section B.1) reports that the SF6 abatement system was shutdown from 1/01/2011 to 19/01/2011 due to the maintenance of the pre-treatment system. In doing so please refer to the AM0078 methodology, page 12.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The DOE is requested to: i) clarify the inconsistency in the FTIR device calibration as the verification report (page 19) indicates that the last calibrations on FTIRs were done on 08 November 2010 while the Monitoring Report (pages 28/29) show that the calibrations were done on 08 November 2010 and 07 December 2010; ii) provide information on the calibration frequency of the electricity meters and LNG flowmeters.
60	1291	Enercon Wind Farms in Karnataka Bundled Project – 30.40 MW	18/03/2010 to 31/08/2010	DNV	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: In some cells there are imbedded formulas, which are not explained. Specifically, for the months of April, May and June the generated electricity and the imported electricity from the turbines owned by Panama Business Center (see cells L4, M4, Q4, R4, V4 and W4 of worksheet "Generation Detail") have been adjusted by +/-0.2%. Also for the month of August, the generated electricity and the imported electricity from the turbine owned by Power Link System private Limited (see cells AF22 and AG22 of worksheet "Generation Detail") have been adjusted by +/-0.5%.
					ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet.	Issue: As per comment under 2.1, it is not clear why some values in the cells have been modified. Explanations are needed.





## CDM – Executive Board

						(EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).	Further detailed information is required on: What are the meters having a delayed calibration; what are these meters for (Exp.? or Imp.); what maximum accuracy level has been applied for these different type of meter (0.5/0.2, 15%?) to export and import.
61	2309	Shaanxi Xinghua N2O Abatement Project	12/05/2010 to 15/10/2010	TÜV SÜD	ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))	Issue: Monitoring Report (page 39) states that there were 2 AMS downtimes (trouble time) in Line 1. However, the Verification Report (page 63) states that "There were no AMS downtimes during the 2nd verification period." Kindly clarify the inconsistency and in case of any AMS downtime, the DOE must confirm by providing information on how the relevant methodology requirements were met.
62	0819	Zhongjieneng Suqian 2*12MW Biomass Direct Burning Power Plant Project	01/08/2010 to 31/07/2011	SGS	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The MR does not contain description of the emergency procedures for the monitoring system.
63	1140	MSPPL WHR based power project at Chattisgarh, India	19/10/2007 to 31/07/2009	SGS	ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))	Issue: Please explain the appropriateness and conservativeness of the calculation of ST turbine (energy content of the steam supplied at the inlet of turbine), in particular, whether the enthalpy of the feed water of WHRB should be considered into the calculation.
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: Please justify the conservativeness of the calculation of H FWA (the enthalpy of feed water supplied to AFBC), in particular, why the maximum hourly recorded value has been used.
64	2318	BRASCARBON Methane Recovery Project BCA-BRA-01	17/08/2009 to 30/04/2010	DNV	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology. (VVM v.1.2 para 200, 203 & 221(d))	Issue: Since a 90% default value for the flare efficiency was chosen by the PP, the DOE should clarify how it has verified that continuous monitoring of compliance with the manufacturer's specifications for the flare (i.e. temperature, flow rate of residual gas at the inlet of the flare, etc) was performed



## CDM – Executive Board

						during the monitoring period. The DOE should also confirm that a 50% default value for the flare efficiency was used in the calculations when in a specific hour any of such parameters were out of the limit of the manufacturer's specifications in accordance with the "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane"
					Reporting of approved requests	Scope: The verification report does not contain reference to the revision of monitoring plan requested and approved by the Executive Board. (VVM v.1.2 para 203) Issue: The DOE should clarify how the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the revised monitoring plan given that it was submitted on 25 August 2011 but not yet approved by the EB.
65	2563	Jilin Liaoyuan 50MW Level Biomass Cogeneration Project	09/03/2010 to 24/12/2010	BVCH	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34). Issue: the monitoring report does not contain description of the emergency procedures for the monitoring system
66	0169	Composting of Organic Waste in Dhaka	25/11/2008 to 31/07/2010	DNV	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34) Issue: The monitored values of the share of different types of organic wastes have not been provided; the spreadsheet only presents the aggregated annual values for 2008, 2009 and 2010.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194) Issue: The DOE has not justified why the following corrective action requests were closed: - CAR2: the classification of waste composition and decay rates in the revised monitoring report (p14) are not consistent with the registered PDD; - CAR5: the DOE has not explained if the method used to account for the delay in calibration of the oxygen analyzer (reduction of 3.42% of total CERs) complies with the guidelines of EB 52 Annex 60;
67	2417	Chile: Lircay Run-Of-River Project	04/08/2009 to 31/12/2009	AENOR	ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)). Issue: The spreadsheet provided does not allow the verification of the Operating Margin EF calculation on other days than 31 December 2009.
68	0922	Catalytic N2O Abatement Project in the Tail Gas of the Nitric Acid Plant of the Hanwha	01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010	DNV	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex Issue 1: The calibration dates for NDIRs are not fully reported in the monitoring report. It is requested to report all the calibration dates which cover whole monitoring period. Issue 2: The date of last calibration of NDIR instrument No. AI-061 is reported as February 28, 2010 which is not consistent



## CDM – Executive Board

		Corporation (HWC) in Ulsan, Republic of Korea				34)	with the date in the verification report (February 28, 2011.) It is requested to provide consistent information.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue 1: The calibration dates for NDIRs are not fully reported in the verification report. It is requested to report all the calibration dates which cover whole monitoring period. Issue 2: It is reported that a calibration (QAL2 test) was performed every 10 days for NDIR 10-AT-062. However, it is reported that QAL2 test was performed only on 7 February 2008. It is required to provide consistent information.
69	0239	Wigton Wind Farm Project (WWF)	29/04/2009 to 28/04/2010	SQS	Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The verification report does not include information on how the DOE verified during on site visit that the value of the grid emission factor (0.834 tCO <sub>2</sub> /MWh) is appropriate considering that this value was not mentioned in the PDD.
70	0546	SRGEL Non-Conventional Energy Sources Biomass Power Project	24/10/2009 to 17/02/2011	DNV	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan. (VVM v.1.2 para 206 & 221(d))	Issue: The verification report states (page 12) that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the registered monitoring plan. However, there has been a revised monitoring plan that was approved on 04-10-2009. The DOE shall provide information on how it verified the project monitoring against the approved revised monitoring plan and provide its verification statement as per paragraph 203 of the VVM version 1.2.
71	2417	Chile: Lircay Run-Of-River Project	01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010	TÜV NORD	ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).	Issue: The spreadsheet provided does not allow the verification of the Operating Margin EF calculation on other days than 31 December 2010.
72	0867	Kim Loong Methane Recovery for Onsite Utilization Project at Kota Tinggi, Johor, Malaysia.	01/02/2009 to 31/12/2010	SIRIM	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The DOE has not reported compliance with EB 52 Annex 60, taking into account that the monitoring plan requires methane analyzers, used for monitoring parameter D.3-7 and D.3-10 shall be calibrated annually. It is reported that the analyzer was installed on 20/06/2008, and recalibration was performed after more than a year on 02/09/2009.
73	2028	Methane capture and destruction on La Hormiga landfill in San Felipe and El Belloto landfill in Quilpue Bundle CDM project.	01/08/2010 to 08/06/2011	GLC	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)	Issue: the DOE did not provide an assessment on the response from the PP on CAR6 and whether it was closed-out or remained open.



## CDM – Executive Board

74	1509	Biogas energy plant from palm oil mill effluent	01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010	ICONTEC	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: a 36-day delay of the calibration of the energy meter measuring the parameter EGy,1 is observed; last calibration is on 11/09/2010, while previous calibration was on 07/08/2009 (Monitoring Report, Annex 2). The verification report does not assess the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 for the calibration delay.
75	2661	Univanich TOPI Biogas Project	01/10/2009 to 31/12/2010	SIRIM	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: Regarding the calibration of the equipment used to measure the temperature and pressure of the biogas, the Monitoring Plan (page 40) states that the calibrations will be performed according to the manufacturer's specifications. However, there is no information on the calibration of the instruments used to measure the temperature of the biogas entering the biogas engine 1, 2, 3 and the flare and on the instruments to measure the pressure of the biogas entering the biogas engine 1, 2 and 3 (i.e., TI61, TI62, TI63, TI64, PI61, PI62 and PI63 as per page 7 of the monitoring report) . The Verification Report (Section 3.3), states that these instruments are used to convert the biogas flows from m3 to Nm3.
76	0673	Darajat Unit III Geothermal Project	01/08/2009 to 31/10/2010	DNV	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: 1) Only partial information on calibration date and validity has been provided for some of the monitoring equipment including steam differential pressure multivariable transmitter and steam flow pressure multivariable transmitter (91H411324-815, calibrated on 13/01/10 while the monitoring period is 01 Aug 09 - 31 Oct 10). 2) The DOE states that there was only one steam ejector orifice meter. However, the certificates for the calibration show two different serial numbers, S/N: 91F721595 and S/N: 91F72159-628 3) The DOE states that there was only one steam temperature transmitter yet the calibration certificates show two different serial numbers, S/N: 97W056109 and C2F607444-625.
77	1433	Hubei Xuan'en Dongping Hydropower Station	28/11/2010 to 27/08/2011	TÜV NORD	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan. (VVM v.1.2 para 206 & 221(d))	Issue: The registered monitoring plan (page 31 of the PDD) states that the accuracy class of the main meter M1 is of 0.5s class. However, the project has been continuously using 0.2s meters. Information shall be provided as to why a request for revision of monitoring plan was not submitted to reflect the actual monitoring.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The PDD (page 28) requires that the "surface area at full reservoir level" be "measured" and this parameter is listed as a monitoring parameter. However, the Verification Report states (page 24) that this is determined at the start of the project activity. Since this is no longer a parameter required to be measured, information shall be provided as to why a request for revision of monitoring plan was not submitted to reflect the actual monitoring.
78	0837	Kaifeng Jinkai N2O Abatement Project	01/10/2009 to 30/09/2010	TÜV SÜD	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The information on calibration for the thermo-couple for Tg, pressure transmitter for Pg, Orifice flow meter for AOR,d and Orifice flow meter for QNG,y does not cover the whole monitoring period. It is requested to report the calibration information which covers the whole monitoring period.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The information on calibration for the thermo-couple for Tg, pressure transmitter for Pg, Orifice flow meter for AOR,d and Orifice flow meter for QNG,y does not cover the whole monitoring period. It is requested to report the calibration information which covers the whole monitoring period.
79	1482	Conversion of existing open cycle gas turbine to combined cycle at the Central Termica Patagonia power station, Comodoro Rivadavia, Argentina	31/05/2009 to 31/05/2010	SGS	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report has not provided the value for parameter Plant Name - Identification of the power plants for the OM and for the BM. Furthermore, the submitted spreadsheets only provide the incomplete name of the plants (in abbreviations).
80	3280	Yunnan Wenshan Yanlashan Hydropower Project	26/11/2010 to 23/08/2011	Applus	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan. (VVM v.1.2 para 206 & 221(d))	Issue: The DOE shall explain why the CL 01 has been closed considering the meter (M5) used to monitor electricity imports from the grid for residual area and emergency was not included in the monitoring plan of the registered PDD, in line with VVM paragraph 204 and 206. Also, please further explain the term used 'residual area' and the reference to the 'emergency event'.
81	2205	Hebei Wanquan Yulong Wind Power Project	01/02/2010 to 31/05/2011	LRQA	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The calibration information given in the Monitoring Report for meter M2 does not cover the whole monitoring period and is valid only between 03 July 10 - 31 May 11.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: According to the verification report on page 31, meter M2 was calibrated on 03 July 10 and the calibration is valid until 02 July 11. However, it is not clear how the DOE verified that the meter M2 was calibrated as per requirements for the monitoring period between 01 Feb 10 - 02 July 10. In doing so, the DOE shall specify the calibration frequency applied by the PP in accordance with EB52/Annex 60 para (8) and/or EB55 Annex 35.
82	1835	Jradzor Small Hydroelectric CDM project	10/07/2009 to 10/07/2010	BVCH	Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the implementation status of the project (including a brief description of the installed technology and/or equipments, relevant dates of project activity e.g. date of construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) during the monitoring period under consideration. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (i) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The monitoring report (p2) states that "Head unit of Jradzor SHPP should be equipped with two-packaged hydropower equipment with 4.0 MW installed capacity." However, the monitoring report (p4) states that "Currently only one unit with 20% of the capacity, instead of two, is operating at the Jradzor plant. The additional contract for the equipment was signed and the installation of the new generator is expected in October-November 2010. The current installed capacity of the Jradzor SHPP is 3 MW, and it will be increased to 5.93MW after the installation of the new generator." Further clarification is required.
					Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report does not contain the relevant dates of calibration and/or validity of the monitoring instrument. Further there is an inconsistency in calibration frequency. The monitoring report (p 5) states that "The meters are calibrated yearly" while the report (p 7) states "calibration frequency – monthly".
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain emission factors, IPCC default values, and/or other reference values used in the calculation of emission reductions. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (v)).	Issue: The monitoring report does not contain the NCV and carbon content for the fuels used by the power plants in the Grid during the monitoring period.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The monitoring plan requires monitoring of the identification of power source plant for the BM & Identification of power source plants for the OM. However, the verification report does not present an opinion on their absence from the monitoring report.
					Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The monitoring plan includes Identification of power source plant for the BM & Identification of power source plants for the OM. However, the DOE did not provided information flow of the verification of these two parameters.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The Verification report does not consider the provisions of EB 61, Annex 21, para 17 (c) which requires calibration at least once in three years, and the DOE accepts the technical specifications of the meters which require calibration once at eight years.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not describe the implementation status of the project. (For project activities that consist of more than one site, the report shall clearly describe the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site. For CDM project activities with phased implementation, the report shall state the progress of the proposed CDM project activity achieved in each phase under verification). (VVM v.1.2 para 198 (a)).	Issue: The information on project implementation is based on the monitoring report which is not complete. Please provide the implementation status clearly based on the site visit done on 11 – 12/10/2010.
83	1899	Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment, Project AIN07-W-01, Sumatera Utara (North Sumatera), Indonesia	01/03/2010 to 31/12/2010	SIRIM	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The DOE has not provided an assessment of the delay in calibration of the data logger (calibrated on 25/02/08; due for calibration after 2 years on 24/02/10; but was only replaced on 08/06/10).
84	0956	Demand side energy efficiency projects at RIL-PG.	04/05/2007 to 31/05/2009	TÜV NORD	Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the implementation status of the project (including a brief description of the installed technology and/or equipments, relevant dates of project activity e.g. date of construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) during the monitoring period under consideration. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (i) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The Monitoring Report has not provided any information with regard to the technical data for small blower under Measure II.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report has not reported the total values of each parameter for the considered monitoring period.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)	Issue: CAR E3 concluded that the approach taken during the shut down of STG during Sep 2008 to Nov 2008 is conservative. However, the Verification Report has not provided information about the emission factor of the gas turbine that can conclude the approach is conservative. Furthermore, the Verification Report has not provided any information with regard to the shut down of STG outside the above mentioned period that is stated in the monitoring report.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para	Issue: There was an inconsistency of the reported calibration dates for portable power meters (for parameters PC and PB). The Monitoring Report version 04 page 17 reports the dates as 14/02/2007, 04/09/2008 and 03/09/2009, while the Verification Report page 56 reports them as 14/02/2007, 14/02/2008 and



## CDM – Executive Board

						184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	04/09/2008.
85	0264	Waste heat based 7 MW Captive Power Project Godawari Power and Ispat Ltd (GPIL)	01/01/2007 to 30/11/2009	GLC	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: While the monitoring report lists the parameters to be monitored, the monitoring report does not present the actual values for the parameters monitored for the monitoring period. The PP/DOE shall revise the monitoring report to contain the actual monitoring values for the parameters of the monitoring plan.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: The spreadsheet does not present the actual values for the parameters monitored for the monitoring period. The PP/DOE shall revise the spreadsheet to contain the actual monitoring values for the parameters of the monitoring plan.
					ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).	Issue: the spreadsheet does not contain the formulae required by the monitoring plan (parameters required for those formula are unreported in the spreadsheet), for example: the calculation of EGgen and EGaux requires the use of the calculated values for H1, H2 and H3 (used to work out the fraction of heat provided to the common header by the project activity) - not only are the values of H1, H2 and H3 and the underlying monitored values used for their calculation not reported in the spreadsheet but the EGgen and EGaux are directly entered into the spreadsheet and how these values were derived are therefore not transparent or replicable. The PP/DOE should resubmit the spreadsheet containing the parameters and formulas required by the monitoring plan in a transparent and replicable manner.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The verification report does not state an opinion of the validity of the actual values for the parameters monitored for the monitoring period as these are not presented. In addition, the verification report does not list nor assess the calculated parameters H1, H2 and H3. The PP/DOE shall revise the verification report to contain the actual monitoring values for the parameters of the monitoring plan as well as the missing calculated parameters.
86	1781	Chuanhua N2O Abatement Project	19/07/2010 to 20/03/2011	DNV	Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the implementation status of the project (including a brief description of the installed technology and/or equipments, relevant dates of project activity e.g. date of construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) during the monitoring period under consideration. (EB48 - Annex	Issue: The PDD states (page 3) that the design capacity is 270 metric tonnes of HNO3 (100%) per day and that the design operating time is 330 days a year. However the Monitoring report states (page 7) that NAP is compared against nameplate capacity based on 365 days/year. It also states (page 30) that 330 days of operating time per year are assumed. The project





## CDM – Executive Board

						68 paragraph 10 (a) (i) & EB 54 Annex 34).	participant is requested to clarify these inconsistencies.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)	Issue: The verification report states (page 8) that the design operating time is 330 days a year. However it also states (page 14) that the nameplate (design) implies the total yearly capacity, (considering 365 days of operational time per year). The DOE is requested to clarify these inconsistencies.
87	1821	Wulashan Line1 N2O Abatement Project	10/12/2010 to 10/06/2011	DNV	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The dates for QAL3 tests are not fully reported in the monitoring report. It is requested to report all dates for QAL3 tests.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The dates for QAL3 tests are not fully reported in the verification report. It is requested to report all the dates for QAL3 tests.
88	0961	Sasol Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project	10/08/2008 to 03/08/2009	TÜV SÜD	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The dates for QAL2 and ASTs are reported only up to month in the monitoring report. It is requested to report the exact dates.
89	2029	Pan Ocean Gas Utilization Project	01/02/2011 to 30/04/2011	ERM CVS	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: In doing so, please clarify the inconsistency in the calibration dates of the orifice flow meter (FT -003) used to monitor LP inlet gas (VA3,y) i.e. MR states the calibration date as 29/11/2010 and the verification report states 01/12/2010.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)	Issue: In doing so, the DOE shall explain: a) if the designed capacity has been changed given that the PDD (page 6) states that the compression facility will have a “feed rate (design)” of 135 mmcsfd whereas the Monitoring Report (Section A.4) states that the plant is designed to process approximately 130 mmcsfd of associated gas; and b) if there has been a change to the (compression) gas sales specification given that the PDD (page 6) states a specification of “450 psi to 1300 psi” whereas the Monitoring Report (Section A.4) states a specification of “450 psi to 1200 psi”.
90	2801	N <sub>2</sub> O abatement in MP Nitric Acid plants at Rashtriya Chemicals & Fertilizers Limited, India	26/02/2010 to 03/09/2010	TÜV NORD	Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the implementation status of the project (including a brief description of the installed technology and/or equipments, relevant dates of project activity e.g. date of construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) during the monitoring period under consideration. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (i) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue 1: The monitoring report does not contain the dates of the project campaigns 2 and 3 that are included in this monitoring period. The project participant is requested to provide the relevant dates of the project activity. Issue 2: The monitoring report (page 28) states that the monitoring period ends on 07 June 2010 but the request for issuance states that the monitoring period ends on 3 september 2010. The project participant is requested to clarify this inconsistency.
					Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report does not contain the exact dates of AST done in 2009 and 2010. The Project Participant is requested to provide the relevant dates of calibration and validity of each of the equipment.
					ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).	Issue: The spreadsheet contains a circular reference. The project participant is requested to correct the formulae
					ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))	Issue: The verification report (page 2) states that the amount of CERs claimed in the PDD is 9,019,68 t/a ; the amount of CERs claimed in the draft monitoring report is 1,86,209 tCO <sub>2</sub> and the verified amount is 177,766 tCO <sub>2</sub> . The DOE is requested to correct these numbers and to consistently use an international format for all the amount of tCO <sub>2</sub> in the documentation provided.



## CDM – Executive Board

91	0500	Efficient utilisation of waste heat and natural gas at Dahej complex of GACL	01/01/2003 to 31/03/2008	DNV	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The data collection procedure and the line diagram showing all relevant monitoring points were not reported.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology. (VVM v.1.2 para 200, 203 & 221(d))	Issue: Please explain how the DOE has verified that the monitoring plan is in line with the applied methodology (AMS I.I.D version 7).
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The DOE shall substantiate the correctness of the applied assumption of natural gas consumption in PAP Boiler (15,000 SCM/day) in the baseline scenario. In doing so, please also explain whether the conservativeness and appropriateness of this value has been validated as per the applied methodology and whether it has been determined in the registered PDD.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)	Issue: It is not clear how the DOE has verified the physical features of the proposed CDM project activity. In particular, (i) the amount of captive power plants/units within the project boundary; (ii) the type of each power plant/unit within the project boundary (e.g. gas turbine or steam turbine etc.); (iii) the fuel used in each power plant/unit; and (iv) the source of the waste energy recovered by the waste heat boiler and the output of the waste heat recovery boiler (section A.4 of the monitoring report).
92	3736	Jiangsu Rudong (II) Expansion Wind Power Project	23/11/2010 to 30/06/2011	DNV	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology. B48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (i)	Issue: According to the monitoring plan, electricity is delivered from the project to the grid through two substations, Dongling and Huangang, each having a bidirectional main meter as well as a meter for back-up import. The spreadsheet does not report the monthly monitored values obtained from the two main meters and back-up import meters, installed at individual substations.
93	2539	Sichuan Jinxi Hydropower Project	26/08/2010 to 25/04/2011	Deloitte-TECO	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring plan requires the monitoring of "Total electricity generation by the project " based on "monthly aggregated". However, the monitoring report does not contain the monitored data of this specific parameter.
94	1126	7.5 MW biomass	03/09/2007 to	DNV	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an	Issue: The DOE states that the meter with serial number



## CDM – Executive Board

		plants using agricultural waste Limited	30/09/2009			assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	06767466 was on line till 24 July 2008 and it was replaced by meter with serial number APM99616. The DOE states that the meter with serial number 06767466 (main meter) was calibrated on 20 November 2006 but provides no further calibration information for this meter. However, as per EB52 Annex 60 ("Guidelines For Assessing Compliance With The Calibration Frequency Requirement") the PP shall apply "the maximum permissible error of the instrument to the measured values, if the results of the delayed calibration do not show any errors in the measuring equipment, or if the error is smaller than the maximum permissible error", thus, the PP/DOE shall provide the value of the delayed calibration of meter with serial number 06767466 in order to apply the maximum inaccuracy class of the meter.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)	Issue: The PDD (page 6) states that the Dindigul plant is located in the coordinates: Latitude: 10° 42' 35" N & Longitude: 78° 5' 42" E while the monitoring report (page 3) states that the plant is located in Latitude: 10° 17' 33.97" N & Longitude: 77° 52' 6.60" E. Further, regarding the Pattukottai plant, the PDD states that it is located at 10.43° N 79.32° E while the monitoring report states it is located at Latitude: 10° 24' 10.48" N & Longitude: 79° 15' 06.89" E. However, the DOE makes no reference to the difference in the location coordinates for the two plants.
95	2457	Yamunanagar & Sonipat (India) OSRAM CFL distribution CDM Project	16/07/2009 to 31/03/2011	TÜV SÜD	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: - The PP/DOE should provide the monitored values of Or,d,q (operating hours monthly measured by valid meter r) and the calculation of m bl,d (average daily operational hours in the baseline), as required by the MP in the registered PDD (page 20, formula 6). The DOE should state how the calculation of m bl,d was verified, considering that the monitored values of Or,d,q are not reported in the MR nor in the spreadsheet of calculation. - The PP/DOE should provide the monitored values of Om,l,q (operating hours monthly measured by valid meter m in the project scenario) and the calculation of m pj,l,d (average daily operational hours in the project scenario) as required by the MP in the registered PDD (page 21, formula 9). The DOE should state how the calculation of m bl,d was verified, considering that the monitored values of Om,l,q are not reported in the MR nor in the spreadsheet of calculation.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The PP/DOE should explain why the emission reduction calculation considers the whole monitoring period of 609 days for all the lamps installed/replaced, considering that the actual operational days of the installed/replaced lamps are different. Please, refer to paragraph 209 (c) of VVM version 01.2. The PP/DOE should explain how it has verified the number of operational CFLs during the project activity implementation. In particular, how many samples (one, two or more) have been collected to monitor the number of checked CFLs during cross-check CC in this monitoring period. If there are more than one sample, the PP/DOE shall provide the number of bulbs checked in each sampling survey and provide the relevant calculation of the Correction Factor according to the actual number of samples in the spreadsheet of calculation. The DOE should explain how the correctness of the calculation of power rating of non readable GLS before replacement with a 95% confidence interval was verified according to the statistical formulae referring to a Normal Distribution.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)	Issue: The PP/DOE shall explain how it has verified that the project activity has been implemented as per the registered PDD (page 41, footnote 45). In particular, the PP/DOE should provide an explanation of the rationale of scrapping more incandescent lamps (456,371 GLS lamps) than installed CFLs (454,483), considering that, according to the registered PDD, each CFL replaces a GLS.
96	0504	Wastewater treatment using a Thermophilic Anaerobic Digester at an ethanol plant in the Philippines	30/06/2008 to 30/06/2010	LRQA	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	No information has been is provided for the calibration requirements of the spectrophotometer used for determining COD concentration of waste flows from and into the outlet
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	The verification report should include information on the calibration requirements of the spectrophotometer used for determining COD concentration of waste flows from and into the outlet



## CDM – Executive Board

97	1153	Methane recovery and utilisation project at United Plantations Berhad, Jendarata Palm Oil Mill, Malaysia	08/11/2007 to 30/04/2009	TÜV SÜD	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: the monitoring report does not contain a description of the organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system and a line diagram showing all relevant monitoring points.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: the spreadsheet does not contain monitored parameters and calculation relevant to the project emissions from flaring of the residual gas stream as per Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane
					ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).	Issue: the spreadsheet does not contain explanation about the formulae used for the application of instrumental errors as per EB52 Annex 60 during periods when calibration delays occurred.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)	Issue: with reference to CAR 10 and the calibration delays addressed thereby, it is not clear how the DOE verified compliance with the requirement of EB52 Annex 60 for each delayed calibration and what are the resulting changes in the monitoring report and ER calculation spreadsheet.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: calibration delays are observed for the following instruments / parameters ID: i) POME flowmeter / ID 1; ii) Biogas flowmeter / ID 20; iii) Biogas flowmeter / ID 18; iv) Biogas flowmeter / ID 28; v) Steam flowmeter / ID 9; vi) POME flowmeter / ID14; vii) kWh meter / ID 12. It is not clear in the Verification Report how the DOE has assessed compliance with EB52 Annex 60 (para 4 and 5) for each delayed calibration.
98	2421	Nubika Jaya Biogas Extraction for Bio-Hydrogen Production	01/05/2010 to 31/07/2010	JQA	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The DOE is requested to clarify how the calibration frequency for the parameter Qy,ww, to be performed every 2 years as per the revised monitoring plan has been assessed, as the latest calibration reported was performed on 18/09/2007.



## CDM – Executive Board

99	3153	Tongliao Naiman Banner Baxiantong Haritang Wind Power Project	30/10/2010 to 30/06/2011	CEC	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))	Issue: It is not clear how the imported electricity has been cross-checked with the invoices, in particular, why the value of the invoice (261.13 MWh) is 253% higher than the results measured by the main meter (73.92 MWh).
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: It is not clear whether the calibration frequency is in line with the industry standards as per the monitoring plan. Please also specify the requirement of the calibration frequency, the valid period of the calibrations of each meter.
100	2232	Catalytic N <sub>2</sub> O Abatement Project in the tail gas of the Caprolactam production plant in Thailand	01/10/2009 to 30/09/2010	TÜV SÜD	ER Calculation	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any), and/or emission reductions, including reference to formulae and methods used. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii))	Issue: The monitoring report states page 28 that Caprolactam production was behind the permitted range. In this case (case 1), the baseline does not have to be recalculated. However it is also stated on the same page that "therefore, the baseline is recalculated". The project participant is requested to clarify this inconsistency.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: The spreadsheet provided does not contain the parameters related to the version 9 of the monitoring report. The project participant is requested to provide a spreadsheet corresponding to the version 9 of the monitoring report.
					ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))	Issue: The monitoring report (page 28) states that the baseline has to be recalculated. However the formulae provided (page A-52) of the verification report for the baseline emission calculation does not include the correction factor. The DOE is requested to clarify this inconsistency.
101	2243	Reduction of N <sub>2</sub> O emissions at shop#25, production line #1 at "Navoiazot" plant	14/09/2010 to 07/01/2011	TÜV SÜD	ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))	Issue: The DOE is requested to clarify how it determined that the calculation of EF <sub>ma</sub> has been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document, considering that the previous project campaign emission factor has not yet been approved.
102	2243	Reduction of N <sub>2</sub> O emissions at shop#25, production line #1 at "Navoiazot" plant	12/05/2010 to 13/09/2010	TÜV SÜD	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM	Issue: Information should be provided as to why the latest AST was carried out in 03-07/08/2010 which is more than one year since the earlier AST was undertaken in 07-11/07/2009 whereas AST should be undertaken on an annual basis as required by



## CDM – Executive Board

						v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	EN14181 specified by the methodology.
103	0880	AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX06-S-53, Sonora, México	01/02/2010 to 28/02/2011	DNV	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The DOE is requested to describe how the sludge removed is disposed, in line with the provisions included in the registered PDD (p. 42).
					ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))	Issue: The DOE should provide a validation opinion on the formula used for the determination of CH <sub>4</sub> density as a function of average temperature.
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The DOE should provide a validation opinion regarding the actual average annual population of each animal type in comparison to the one described in the PDD, in order to assess the relevance of the ex-ante estimate of emission reductions included therein.
104	1219	Coronel landfill gas capture project	01/08/2009 to 31/05/2011	SGS	ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).	Issue: The CER sheet provided does not contain the recorded data of methane concentration of landfill gas and traceable calculations to obtain the final reported values.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analysis. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))	Issue: The verification report does not provide an assessment on how the DOE crosschecked and verified the flare operation in relation to other recorded parameters. The CER sheet (CERs 2009 - 2010 - 2011) indicates that on 16.11.10 and 11.01.11 there was no electricity consumed by the project (in column "aggregated EGy") while values of aggregated LFG have been reported for these days ("LFGtotal, y / LFGflared, y) and the flare was operational on 16.11.10 as indicated in sheet "Input 2009 -2010 -2011".





## CDM – Executive Board

					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)	Issue: A clarification request (CL 4) was raised by the DOE because inconsistencies were found between the recorded temperature and the temperature operational range of the flare. Project participant has indicated that for 11.01.2011 there was no value reported due to an electrical problem occurred on site which caused a shut down in the flare and the DOE confirmed that on this day the flare was not operational. However the CER sheet ("CERs 2009 - 2010 - 2011") indicates that emission reductions are being accounted for 11.01.2011, and the close out of the findings does not provide further explanations.
105	2141	CYY Biopower Wastewater treatment plant including biogas reuse for thermal oil replacement and electricity generation Project, Thailand	25/03/2009 to 02/08/2009	RINA	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: i) ID1: The calibration frequency for the instrument is annually as stated in page 7 of the monitoring report, whereas it is stated every 3 years in the verification report. ii) ID 5: The calibration frequency for the instrument is annually as stated in page 10 of the monitoring report, whereas it is stated as every 2 years in the verification report. iii) ID9: The DOE has not provided a validation opinion on how it has considered that the calibration frequency for the instrument has been met, as it is stated that annual calibration shall be performed, and the reported calibration dates are 18/04/2008 and 17/09/2009. iv) ID10: The DOE has not provided a validation opinion on how it has considered that the calibration frequency for the instrument has been met, as it is stated that annual calibration shall be performed, and the reported calibration dates are on 18/04/2008 and 07/09/2009 (for one flow meter); 21/04/2008 and 07/09/2009 (for the other flow meter). v) ID11: The calibration frequency required for the instrument is annually as stated in page 14 of the monitoring report, whereas it is stated as every 2 years as stated in the verification report.
106	2465	Ganey Hadas Landfill Gas to Renewable Electricity project	13/07/2009 to 30/06/2010	TÜV Rheinland	Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the implementation status of the project (including a brief description of the installed technology and/or equipments, relevant dates of project activity e.g. date of construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) during the monitoring period under consideration. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (i) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The monitoring report does not contain information on relevant dates for the project activity as construction, start of operation of the project and each of the two flares installed.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring parameter "Regulatory requirements relating to landfill gas projects" is not reported in the monitoring report and assessed by the DOE.



## CDM – Executive Board

				Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The parameters FVRG,h, fvi,h, Flare efficiency in hour h are listed in the verification protocol however an assessment on how the DOE confirmed the reported values is not provided. For parameter Flare efficiency in hour h, the DOE is requested to indicate whether it has confirmed the use of default values of flare efficiency in relation to the applied Tool requirements, as reported in the monitoring report for the mentioned parameter. In addition, for the monitoring parameter "temperature in the exhaust gas of the flare", the verification report does not contain an assessment on any excessively high temperature at the sampling point (above 700 °C) as referred in the monitoring plan.
				Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The CER sheet shows monitored values of pressure and temperature of the landfill gas reported every 30 minutes however the verification report does not indicate how the DOE verified the recording frequency of both monitoring parameters.
				Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The verification report does not provide an assessment on how it confirmed the calibration frequencies reported in the monitoring report for all meters (except for electricity meter and gas analyzers) as per EB 52 Annex 60 (Para 8), applied methodology and monitoring plan.
				Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The verification report states that Modcon System Ltd. calibrates the gas analyzers according the manufacturer requirement every three months and that calibrations complied with applied methodology and Tool. However, based on the three months frequency required by manufacture, the calibrations conducted on 15/04/2010 and 22/07/2010 for meters GA 1, FA 1 and FA 2 indicate a delay in relation to the previous calibrations. Although for meter GA 1 the excel sheet in "Ganey Hadas Adjusted" shows that errors were applied to the recorded values during the monitoring period, the delay and the assessment of correctness of error applied by project participants were not included in the verification report. Additionally, the calibration delay and application of error for meters FA 1 and FA 2 are not assessed by the DOE in the verification report. In relation to pressure and temperature meters of landfill gas and thermocouples TT2 and TT3, the calibration date reported is 05/01/09 and the calibration frequency stated in monitoring



## CDM – Executive Board

						recorded data as per EB 52 Annex 60.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	<p>Scope: The verification report does not describe the implementation status of the project. (For project activities that consist of more than one site, the report shall clearly describe the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site. For CDM project activities with phased implementation, the report shall state the progress of the proposed CDM project activity achieved in each phase under verification). (VVM v.1.2 para 198 (a)).</p> <p>Issue: The verification report states that "The project began the installation and testing of the flares from March 2009, but started regular operation in May 2009" while the monitoring report indicates that flare 2 only started to work regularly on 11.10.2009. Please clearly indicate in the verification report how the DOE confirmed the dates when the operation started for each one of the flares installed.</p>
107	1267	Puclaro Hydroelectric Power Plant	01/05/2008 to 31/12/2008	TÜV SÜD	Calibration	<p>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) &amp; EB 54 Annex 34)</p> <p>Issue: The monitoring report does not provide information on calibration frequency and accuracy of the electricity meters.</p>
					Calibration	<p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) &amp; EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: The verification report has not provided information on calibration frequency and accuracy of electricity meters.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

108	0428	AWMS GHG Mitigation Project MX06-B-19, Sonora, México	01/06/2009 to 30/04/2010	DNV	ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).	Issue: The DOE submitted 2 files with the request for issuance - one containing the values of monitored parameters and calculation of ERs and another containing the 95% confidence level calculation. However, no explanation was provided on why the values of CH <sub>4</sub> between the files are different - for example, for site 24242 CH <sub>4</sub> values metered in June were equal to 69.4% (parameters and ERs calculation file) and 70.9% (confidence level file).
109	2943	N <sub>2</sub> O reduction project at the WNA I nitric acid plant of Deepak Fertilisers & Petrochemicals Corporation Ltd. ("Deepak"), India	09/04/2010 to 14/09/2010	DNV	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: The spreadsheet do not contain all the parameters required to be monitored during historical campaigns. The historic data used to determine the permitted range of operation should be provided in full.
110	1859	China Fujian Putian LNG Generation Project	14/01/2009 to 27/09/2009	BVCH	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: Further clarification is required on how the DOE applied para 4 of annex 60 of EB 52 to the delayed calibration of "the flow meters" as the revised monitoring plan requires the monitoring of annual quantity of NG consumed from NG flow meter reading at the project boundary, the verification report (p14) and monitoring report (p 10) stated "the flow meters not exceed 1% of full-scale rating" and the DOE accepted the use of 0.34% for the calculation of the project emissions.
111	2310	Reduction of N <sub>2</sub> O emissions at "Ferganaazot" plant	09/04/2010 to 24/11/2010	TÜV SÜD	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: The spreadsheet do not contain all the parameters required to be monitored during historical campaigns. The historic data used to determine the permitted range of operation should be provided in full.
112	1171	Project for the catalytic reduction of N <sub>2</sub> O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia reactor of the No. 9 nitric acid plant at African Explosives Ltd ("AEL"), South Africa	05/11/2007 to 10/02/2008	DNV	Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the implementation status of the project (including a brief description of the installed technology and/or equipments, relevant dates of project activity e.g. date of construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) during the monitoring period under consideration. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (i) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The PP is requested to provide information about AMS downtime during baseline campaign and if there was AMS downtime, how it was handled as per AM0034 requirements.
					Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report (Annex 3, page 1 and 2) state that QAL2 test is valid until 2011 whereas it is also stated in Annex 3, page 3 that this test is valid until 2013. The PP is requested to clarify this inconsistency. The PP is also requested to provide the exact dates of the QAL2 test.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The verification report (page 25) states that the QAL2 test is valid until 2011 whereas it is also stated page C-4 that the same QAL2 test is valid until 2013. The DOE is requested to clarify this inconsistency.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The monitoring report and the verification reports state that the baseline campaign was carried out from 05.07.07 to 06.11.07 but that the QAL2 test lasted from 07.02.2008 to 13.02.2008. Information related to the dates and result of the QAL2 test under EN14181 that is relevant to the baseline campaign should be reported.
113	2643	ID08-WWP-10, Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment, West Sumatera, Indonesia	12/11/2009 to 31/01/2011	DNV	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The calibration details for the monitoring equipments are available in section B.1.2 of the MR along with meter number, calibration due date and location. However, the actual calibration date for monitoring equipments is not mentioned in the MR.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not describe the reasons for the phased-implementation delay and/or does not present the expected implementation dates. (VVM v.1.2 para 198 (a)).	Issue: There are 2 anaerobic lagoons and the project participant had planned to cover both the anaerobic lagoons during the first crediting period however, currently one anaerobic lagoon has been covered.
114	0925	EnviroServ Chloorkop Landfill Gas Recovery Project.	01/01/2009 to 31/12/2009	ERM CVS	ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).	Issue: The spreadsheet does not display: - the formulae used to calculate the emission reductions in the months of January (Flare 2) and from June to December; and - the days when the average CH <sub>4</sub> concentration was reduced due to the results of the gas analyzer calibration.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)	Issue: The DOE has not provided the complete assessment of the issue raised under CL 19b) which was closed although the PP did not explain how excessive temperatures (above 1,300 C) were dealt with. Such temperatures are observed in the spreadsheet on several days, e.g. 27 Nov (flare 2); 1 Dec (flare 2); 7-8 Dec (flare 1); etc.
115	1343	Xiaoshan Power Plant's NG Power Generation Project of Zhejiang Southeast Electric Power Co.,	01/01/2011 to 30/06/2011	BVCH	ER Calculation	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any), and/or emission reductions, including reference to formulae and methods used. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii))	Issue: The Annex I of the MR, on page 24 mentions emission factor for natural gas of 26,100 kgCO <sub>2</sub> /TJ. However on page 25 it is mentioned as 37,300 kgCO <sub>2</sub> /TJ. Furthermore, the emission reduction spreadsheet considers it as 54,300 tCO <sub>2</sub> /TJ (equal to 54,300,000 kgCO <sub>2</sub> /TJ).



## CDM – Executive Board

		Ltd.			Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The PDD requires to use supplier-provided data, local data, country-specific values, that order of preference for parameter EFCO2 natural gas. The calculation adopts value from IPCC 2006. There is no information how value from IPCC2006 complies with this.
116	1153	Methane recovery and utilisation project at United Plantations Berhad, Jendarata Palm Oil Mill, Malaysia	01/05/2009 to 31/01/2011	TÜV SÜD	Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The parameter CEFBI,therm (CO2 emissions intensity for thermal energy generation) is reported as 75.5 t CO2/TJ in the monitoring report and emission reductions calculations but as 77.37 in the registered PDD and verification report.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)	Issue: The parameters CODc,dig-out (data #11, COD concentration in discharged effluent from digester) and CODa,out (data #3, COD concentration of the effluent that leaves the lagoon) are presented as having the same average value over the monitoring period (i.e. 17.74 kg/m3) which would result in no project emissions being accounted for. The verification report (CR 16) mentions that erroneous measurements of these 2 parameters were observed in May 2010 and Jan 2011 but this is reflected in the ER spreadsheet only in January 2011.
117	1126	7.5 MW biomass plants using agricultural waste Limited	01/10/2009 to 27/05/2011	DNV	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: the emergency procedures and line diagram are not included in section C of the monitoring report.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)	Issue: The PDD (page 6) states that the Dindigul plant is located in the coordinates: Latitude:10° 42' 35" N & Longitude: 78° 5' 42" E while the monitoring report (page 3) states that the plant is located in Latitude: 10° 17' 33.97" N & Longitude: 77° 52' 6.60" E. Further, regarding the Pattukottai plant, the PDD states that it is located at 10.43° N 79.32° E while the monitoring report states it is located at Latitude: 10° 24' 10.48" N & Longitude: 79° 15' 06.89" E. However, the DOE makes no reference to the difference in the location coordinates for the two plants



## CDM – Executive Board

118	4224	Fuel Switching from Mazout to Natural Gas in Misr Fine Spinning & Weaving and Misr Beida Dyers at Kafr El Dawar	01/02/2011 to 30/06/2011	GLC	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: the DOE shall clearly report the maximum permissible error applicable to: 1) ABB gas turbine meter from 1 Feb 2011 to 19 April 2011, 2) Siemens steam pressure meter from 1 Feb 2011 to 27 April 2011, and 3) Siemens steam temperature meter from 1 Feb 2011 to 17 April 2011 in line with footnote 2 of EB52 Annex 60. In doing so, the DOE shall also explain how the error was applied to the emission reductions calculation in the submitted spreadsheet in line with the applicable guideline.
119	0505	Methane recovery and power generation in a distillery plant	01/10/2008 to 31/03/2009	SGS	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: Appendix 12 provides the calibration dates for all monitoring instruments. However, the calibration frequency of the meters were not reported (in doing so, the guidance from EB52 - Annex 60 must be taken into account when neither the monitoring methodology nor the monitoring plan stipulate the calibration frequency).
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The DOE explained that the gas sent to flares did not need to be monitored because the revised PDD was approved on 21/01/2011 and the monitoring plan is mandatory from the approval date. However, it is not clear if the gas-flow monitored during the period corresponds to the total gas collected (and sent to the bioler and to the flare) or only the gas sent to the bioler.
120	0081	LOS ALGARROBOS HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT (PANAMA)	01/01/2008 to 31/12/2010	ICONTEC	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: 1. The DOE is requested to clarify how it has verified the calibration frequency of the energy meter and the validity of the calibration tests performed by the calibration agency. Also, the MR shall contain all the calibration details in line with EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34. 2. Please clarify the internal procedures on the calibrations performed as referred on page 15 of the verification report.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Implementation Status/physical features of project	<p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)</p>	<p>Issue:</p> <p>1. The DOE shall clarify how the following changes from the registered PDD have been considered as closed in CL1 and CL 3 in accordance with para 197 of VVM version 1.2:</p> <p>a) Increase of plant's installed capacity from 9.73 MW to 9.85 MW and turbine capacity from 2*4.68 to 2*4.925</p> <p>b) Modification in length of transmission line from 11 km to 13.3 km (ref. page 12 of verification report).</p> <p>c) Change in project participant's name from EDEMET and EDECHI to Energia y Servicios de Panama S.A. (ESEPSA)</p> <p>2. The DOE shall clarify whether the EDECHI distribution system is part of the grid or not to which Caldera electrical substation is connected (i.e. electricity was exported to the EDICHI distribution system from April 2009 to October 2009).</p>
121	2938	Power Prospect 9.9MW Rice Husk Power Plant	25/02/2010 to 31/08/2010	JQA	ER Calculation	<p>Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) &amp; 221 (h))</p>	<p>Issue: the Verification Report does not contain a clear statement that formula used for calculating project emission and leakage are in accordance with that in the approved methodology and the registered PDD.</p>
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	<p>Scope: The verification report does not describe the implementation status of the project. (For project activities that consist of more than one site, the report shall clearly describe the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site. For CDM project activities with phased implementation, the report shall state the progress of the proposed CDM project activity achieved in each phase under verification). (VVM v.1.2 para 198 (a)).</p>	<p>Issue 1: The facilities for supplying electricity to PICL have not yet been installed. Additional information is required on how the DOE verified that the installation of the facilities supplying electricity to PICL it is only delayed and it has not been canceled.</p> <p>Issue 2: Rice husk is transferred from neighbor NLRM by trucks and not by conveyor belt as described in the registered PDD. Additional information is required on the implementation and operation status of the conveyor belt.</p>
122	0194	Jepirachi Wind Power Project	01/01/2009 to 30/01/2011	ICONTEC	Other verification reporting requirement	<p>Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)</p>	<p>Issue: The DOE shall clarify whether the Social Management Report issued on 30/03/2010 covering the period from 28/05/2008 to 30/03/2010 was verified or not to close FAR 01 raised in the previous monitoring period.</p>





## CDM – Executive Board

					Calibration	<p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) &amp; EB 52 Annex 60)</p>	<p>Issue:</p> <p>1. The DOE shall report the calibration frequency of the energy meter, validity of the calibration tests performed by the calibration agency and conclude whether the calibration will cover the whole monitoring period in line with para 184 (ii) of VVM version 1.2. In doing so, the DOE shall clarify:</p> <p>a) Mismatch in serial numbers of the energy meters mentioned in the MR and verification report as compared to the verification report of previous monitoring period.</p> <p>2. Further, the DOE shall clarify which are main and/or back up meters out of six meters listed in the verification report (pg 17 and 18) and their application with regards to the measurement of net electricity supplied to the grid.</p> <p>b) Mismatch in second calibration date as mentioned in MR and verification report for the meters ION 8300 PS-0511A080-01, ION 8300 PS-0511A081-01, ION 8300 PS-0511A082-01 and ION 8300 PS-0511A083-01</p>
123	1859	China Fujian Putian LNG Generation Project	28/09/2009 to 27/03/2010	BVCH	Calibration	<p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) &amp; EB 52 Annex 60)</p>	<p>Issue: Further clarification is required on how the DOE applied para 4 of annex 60 of EB 52 to the delayed calibration of “the flow meters” as the revised monitoring plan requires the monitoring of annual quantity of NG consumed from NG flow meter reading at the project boundary, the verification report (p14) and monitoring report (p 10) indicate “the flow meters not exceed 1% of full-scale rating”, and the DOE accepted the use of 0.34% for the calculation of the project emissions.</p>
124	1344	Zhejiang Provincial Energy Group Zhenhai Natural Gas Power Generation Co., Ltd.'s NG Power Generation Project	01/01/2011 to 30/06/2011	BVCH	Monitored Parameters	<p>Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)</p>	<p>Issue: The Verification Report page 12 mentions that parameter EFCO<sub>2</sub>, natural gas, y is obtained from IPCC 2006. However, the Monitoring Report page 11 mentions that it was measured and sourced from the gas supplier. If the parameter was sourced from IPCC 2006, the Verification Report lacks information on why the preferred source as per applied methodology was not used.</p>
125	2925	Wind based renewable energy project in Gujarat	13/02/2010 to 31/12/2010	DNV	ER Calculation	<p>Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) &amp; 221 (h))</p>	<p>Issue: The monitoring report (p.14) states that one main meter (GJU04175) had error observed of 0.336% while the DOE (Verification report p.9) verified that the accuracy class of this meter is 0.2s as per the monitoring plan. Further information is required on how the DOE assessed the calibration result against the accuracy class as it did not provide any verification on this issue.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

126	2417	Chile: Lircay Run-Of-River Project	01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010	TÜV NORD	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))	Issue: The DOE is requested to provide information i) on the exact correlation between the dry hydrological conditions and the higher dispatch of diesel and coal power plants justifying the 14% increase in operating margin emission factor, EFOM, and ii) regarding the capacity additions for the year 2010 to justify the 92% increase in the build margin emission factor, EFBM
127	2417	Chile: Lircay Run-Of-River Project	04/08/2009 to 31/12/2009	AENOR	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: The OM EF spreadsheet does not allow changing the date. When the "DATE fin" button is pressed and the page displays the message with "error 1004" and the program is closed. The error seems to be due to the error of macro calculation of the submitted spreadsheet.
128	3250	Hubei Province Zigui County Guanyintang Hydropower Station	25/09/2010 to 16/09/2011	CEPREI	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The monitoring plan requires that the "Area of the reservoir measured in the surface of water, after the implementation of the project activity, when the reservoir is full" is to be measured annually. However the monitoring report and the verification report do not provide any information on when the measurement was done. Further it is not clear how the DOE verified the reservoir surface area as the letter referred by the DOE was not included in the references.
129	0956	Demand side energy efficiency projects at RIL-PG.	04/05/2007 to 31/05/2009	TÜV NORD	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The registered PDD page 35 mentions that to establish the weighted average of the emission factor in CPP, some parameters including Power Generation in Gas Turbine and Fuel Consumption in Gas Turbine, will be monitored. However, these two parameters are missing from the monitoring report.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The VR has not provided any information with regard to parameters Power Generation in Gas Turbine and Fuel Consumption in Gas Turbine that are required to be monitored as per registered PDD page 35.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)	Issue: (a) The calculation of EF gas turbine has been provided in response to CAR E3, however, it is not clear why the EF calculation considers HRSG in it. The reason the power from the GT was used was because the STG was not operating. The flowchart in the PDD page 16 shows that HRSG only supplies steam to STG. Furthermore, the Verification Report has not provided any information with regard to the shut down of STG outside the above mentioned period (Sep-Nov 2008) that is stated in the monitoring report, including how the power was met during that period;
130	1899	Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment,	01/03/2010 to 31/12/2010	SIRIM	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency,	Issue 1: Page 10 of the MR includes a weight bridge which is used to measure the quantity of FFB produced (used to calculate



## CDM – Executive Board

		Project AIN07-W-01, Sumatera Utara (North Sumatera), Indonesia				relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	the volume of wastewater generated as per the monitoring plan). Page 10 also states that the calibration certificates are minimum annually. There is no information on the calibration of this weight bridge. Issue 2: The MR page 19 states that the Effluent Conversion Factor was verified from measurement at the project site using portable equipment to record the flowrate. However there is no information on the calibration of this instrument. Issue 3: Pages 26 and 27 of the Monitoring Plan state that the COD analysis of wastewater samples will be conducted by a third party in accordance with equipment manufacturer's specifications and will include blank and calibration standards. However there is no information on the calibration of the instruments used. Issue 4: Calibration of the data logger NI: for data logger serial number 1343CC7 the validity date of the last calibration was on 24/02/10. There has been a calibration delay from 01/03/10 until 8 June 2010 (when it was replaced by a new unit, calibrated on 03/05/10), however the monitoring report or the spreadsheet do not clearly specify how conservative approach has been adopted in line with EB52 Annex60.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60).	Issue: The verification report page 21 states that for the "data logger" the values have been corrected during 01/03 until 08/06 because of the calibration delay. However, there is no information on which values have been corrected and how they have been corrected in the verification report.
131	0466	AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-08, Paraná and Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil	01/10/2007 to 31/05/2010	DNV	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan. (VVM v.1.2 para 206 & 221(d))	Issue: The revised monitoring plan Section D.4. states that the "Accuracy of the flow meters utilized exceeds 99 percent across the entire measured rate curve with an uncertainty range of less than + 1 percent" and regarding the methane gas analyzer, that "The equipment and test procedures will provide an accuracy with a + 1&#8260;2 percent uncertainty range". However, the verification report does not indicate if this has been complied with.
132	2554	Doña Juana landfill gas-to-energy project	01/10/2010 to 30/06/2011	ICONTEC	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: Annex 2 provides the calibration dates and frequency for all relevant monitoring instruments. However, It was identified that several instruments were calibrated beyond the yearly frequency and no assessment on how the delayed calibrations were addressed as per EB52 - Annex 60 was provided.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue 1: The "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane" states that the measuring point of methane and oxyge concentration in the exhaust gas shall be in the upper section of the flare (80% of total flare height), but the Verification Report does not indicate the exact sampling point. Issue 2: The "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane" states that "An excessively high temperature at the sampling point (above 700°C) may be an indication that the flare is not being adequately operated or that its capacity is not adequate to the actual flow". It was identified, in the calculation spreadsheet, that the temperature of the exhaust gas is generally above 700°C and no assessment was provided on whether it indicates that the flare is being operated outside of its capacity.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: It was identified that several instruments were callibrated beyond the yearly frequency and no assessment on how the delayed calibrations were addressed was provided.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not describe the reasons for the phased-implementation delay and/or does not present the expected implementation dates. (VVM v.1.2 para 198 (a)).	Issue: The Verification Report provides proper explanations on the reasons for delaying the delivery of landfill gas to brick factories and for the leachate treatment plant, however an expected date to the start of Phases 3 and 4 should also has been reported.
133	1369	Project for the catalytic reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia reactor of the N1 & N2 nitric acid plants at Haifa Chemicals Ltd., Israel	20/05/2008 to 24/03/2009	DNV	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The methodology indicates that the baseline campaign is the most recent campaign preceding the start of the project activity. However, it is noted that for N1 plant, baseline campaign was selected from 01/11/2006 to 19/04/2007 whereas there were one additional campaign between baseline and project campaigns without N2O abatement catalyst, and for N2 plant, baseline campaign was selected from 16/11/2006 to 27/01/2007 whereas there were two additional campaigns between baseline and project campaigns without N2O abatement catalyst. Information is required on the operating and N2O emissions data and emission factors of the immediate campaigns prior to the project campaigns.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The methodology indicates that the baseline campaign is the most recent campaign preceding the start of the project activity. However, it is noted that for N1 plant, baseline campaign was selected from 01/11/2006 to 19/04/2007 whereas there were one additional campaign between baseline and project campaigns without N2O abatement catalyst, and for N2 plant, baseline campaign was selected from 16/11/2006 to 27/01/2007 whereas there were two additional campaigns between baseline and project campaigns without N2O abatement catalyst. Information is required on the operating and N2O emissions data and emission factors of the immediate campaigns prior to the project campaigns.
134	2307	Federal Intertrade Pengyang Solar Cooker Project	01/05/2010 to 31/10/2010	TÜV Rheinland	Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)	Issue 1: The DOE has not reported how it has assessed that the project participant was able to visit 17,000 householders in a period of 30 days with 6 people in a geographical area of 1,365 Km2 resulting in 100% of solar cookers properly working since the starting date of the crediting period. Issue 2: The DOE used the accumulated operating hours data (309 samples) in order to determine the number of on-site sample size for another parameter (the number of solar cookers operating). Additional information is required on how the DOE has determined the sample size for its own on-site check of the number of solar cookers operational as per EB65 Annex 2 paragraph 24 guidance.
135	1151	KSPCL Waste Heat to Power project, India	01/04/2010 to 31/08/2011	DNV	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))	Issue: The verification report indicates that it is "not applicable" to cross check the reported data with other available data for many monitored parameters such as EGGEN, EGAux, FCi,j,y, EFCO2,i,y ... The DOE shall document how it has cross-checked monitored parameters in accordance with VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b).
136	2801	N2O abatement in MP Nitric Acid plants at Rashtriya Chemicals & Fertilizers Limited, India	04/09/2010 to 30/11/2010	TÜV NORD	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	The DOE is requested to clarify if the determination of N2O concentration in the stack gas, NCSG, was conservative as the verification report (check box; page 61) indicates that this was incorrectly done.
137	1171	Project for the catalytic reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia reactor of the No. 9	11/02/2008 to 04/08/2009	DNV	Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the implementation status of the project (including a brief description of the installed technology and/or equipments, relevant dates of project activity e.g. date of construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) during the monitoring period under consideration. (EB48 - Annex	Issue: The PP is requested to provide information on the events and incidents related to the production and/or monitoring (such as plant shutdown, AMS down time) during baseline campaign and project campaigns. If there were any plant and AMS downtime, information should be provided on how it was handled as per AM0034 requirements.



## CDM – Executive Board

nitric acid plant at African Explosives Ltd (“AEL”), South Africa				68 paragraph 10 (a) (i) & EB 54 Annex 34).	
	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report (page 3) states that the baseline campaign was carried out from 05.09.07 to 06.11.07 but that the QAL2 test lasted from 07.02.2008 to 13.02.2008 ( Annex 3 of the monitoring report). Information related to the dates and result of the QAL2 test under EN14181 that is relevant to the baseline campaign should be reported.		
	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The table on page 20 of the verification report states the value for baseline campaign period applicable to project campaign 2 and 3 in column 3; and in column 4 the recalculated value for project campaign 3 whereas the value for project campaign 4 is not mentioned in the table.		
	ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))	Issue: Information related to the calculation of EF <sub>ma</sub> in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document should be reported, considering that the previous project campaign emission factor has not yet been approved by the EB.		
	Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The reported values for AFR <sub>max</sub> (Maximum Ammonia Gas flow rate to the ammonia oxidation reactor ) in different documents are as follow : 3,877 tNH <sub>3</sub> /h on page 5 Annex 1 of the monitoring report, 3,877 t/h on page 19 of the monitoring report, 3877 tNH <sub>3</sub> /h on page 11 of the verification report and 3.877 tNH <sub>3</sub> /h in calculation sheet. Please rectify the inconsistency on the reported values for AFR <sub>max</sub> .		
	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The monitoring report and the verification reports state that the baseline campaign was carried out from 05.09.07 to 06.11.07 but that the QAL2 test lasted from 07.02.2008 to 13.02.2008. Verified and reported information related to the dates and result of the QAL2 test under EN14181 that is relevant to the baseline campaign should be presented.		
	Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2	Issue: The DOE is requested to provide information on the events and incidents related to the production and/or monitoring (such as plant shutdown, AMS down time) during baseline campaign and project campaigns. If there were any plant and AMS downtime, information must be reported as to how it was handled as per AM0034 requirements.		



## CDM – Executive Board

						para 196)	
138	0867	Kim Loong Methane Recovery for Onsite Utilization Project at Kota Tinggi, Johor, Malaysia.	01/02/2009 to 31/12/2010	SIRIM	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report and verification report do not provide calibration details of pressure transmitter and temperature sensor used for measurement of normalized flow of biogas generated. The calibration details are required to ensure that these equipments had valid calibration for entire monitoring period.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The monitoring report and verification report do not provide calibration details of pressure transmitter and temperature sensor used for measurement of normalized flow of biogas generated. The calibration details are required to ensure that these equipments had valid calibration for entire monitoring period.
139	2029	Pan Ocean Gas Utilization Project	01/05/2011 to 31/07/2011	ERM CVS	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan. (VVM v.1.2 para 206 & 221(d))	Issue: The DOE shall clarify the change in the maximum flow rate of the flow meters (FT-503D, FT-503E, FT-001, FT-002, FT-003) reported in the monitoring report and validation report, in comparison to the values reported for the last monitoring period.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The DOE shall clarify whether the calibration dates (for parameter VBdry gas,y, VA1,y, VA2,y, VA3,y, wcarbon dry gas,B,y and m condensate,B,y) cover the whole monitoring period starting from 01/05/2011 to 31/07/2011, given that the calibration dates (26/05/2011 and 05/07/2011) reported in the monitoring report do not cover the whole monitoring period.
140	1120	Jiaozishan Landfill Gas Recovery and Utilisation Project	01/11/2008 to 28/02/2011	DNV	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report does not contain information on whether the instrument used to monitor the temperature of the exhaust gas was replaced or calibrated within the frequency specified by the "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane".
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology.	Issue: The monitoring plan makes reference to the "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane" to describe how the parameter "Project emissions from flaring of the residual gas stream in year y" will be monitored. However, the spreadsheet does not contain the values of the relevant parameters from the tool needed to determine the flare efficiency. Additionally, the monitoring plan does not describe how these parameters are monitored.



## CDM – Executive Board

					ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).	Issue: The spreadsheet submitted only indicates the values of "Project emission from flaring of the residual gas stream", without explaining how it was calculated.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The monitoring plan makes reference to the "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane" on the monitoring of the parameter "PEflare, y", however the verification report does not explain how the necessary parameters used to calculate "PEflare, y" were monitored (this is also missing in the monitoring plan).
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The verification report does not contain an assessment on whether the instrument used to monitor the temperature of the exhaust gas was replaced or calibrated within the frequency specified by the "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane". In doing so, the DOE shall also verify the compliance with EB52 - Annex 60 in case of delayed calibration/replacement.
141	2186	Monterrey II LFG to Energy Project	23/11/2009 to 31/12/2010	AENOR	ER Calculation	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any), and/or emission reductions, including reference to formulae and methods used. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii))	Issue: The monitoring report / spreadsheet do not contain the calculations of PEflare, MDflared and MDelectricity.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report / spreadsheet do not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology	Issue: The monitoring report / spreadsheet do not contain monitoring parameters fvCH4,FG,h (Concentration of methane in the exhaust gas of the flare), Tflare (Temperature in the exhaust gas of the flare) and Operation hours of the energy plant.
142	1405	CEMEX Costa Rica: Use of biomass residues in Colorado cement plant	01/07/2009 to 30/06/2010	TÜV NORD	Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the implementation status of the project (including a brief description of the installed technology and/or equipments, relevant dates of project activity e.g. date of construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) during the monitoring period under consideration. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (i) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The monitoring report does not contain the implementation status (e.g. date of construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) of the project activity inline with the requirement of EB48, Annex 68, paragraph 10(a)(i) and EB54 Annex 34.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan. (VVM v.1.2 para 206 & 221(d))	Issue: The DOE is requested to clarify how the measurement of alternative fuels consumption other than rice husk is in line with the approved revised monitoring plan and applied methodology given that the fuel consumption is calculated using a formula given in the MR (page 14).





## CDM – Executive Board

					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The emission factor of the residual fuel oil in the approved revised monitoring plan is 73.33 tCO <sub>2</sub> /TJ but different residual oil (mixed oil and automotive oil) with the emission factors (73.33 tCO <sub>2</sub> /TJ and 85.0 tCO <sub>2</sub> /TJ) are used in the emission reduction calculation.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The calibration frequency of Entrance Scale (C-601-29-002) and Exit Scale (C-601-29-001) used to measure the parameter QAF and CTAF is inconsistent in page 15 and 23 of MR.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The DOE is requested to explain how it has verified the compliance of EB52, Annex 60 for the delay in the calibration of the measuring equipment Calciner Meter (C-205-45-001) for the period 17/08/09-20/08/09 (4 days), 01/12/09-06/12/09 (6 days), 05/02/09-10/02/10 (6 days); Kiln meter (C-205-45-002) for the period 01/04/10-30/04/10 (30 days) and Humidity scale (C-501-10-031) for the period 11/03/10-16/03/10 (6 days).
143	1370	Project for the Catalytic Reduction of N <sub>2</sub> O Emissions with a Secondary Catalyst Inside the Ammonia Reactor of the N <sub>4</sub> Nitric Acid Plant at Haifa Chemicals Ltd., Israel.	01/03/2010 to 03/05/2010	DNV	Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain emission factors, IPCC default values, and/or other reference values used in the calculation of emission reductions. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (v)).	Issue: The reported value for AFR <sub>max</sub> (Maximum Ammonia Gas flow rate to the ammonia oxidation reactor) in the monitoring report (page 14) is 2008 tNH <sub>3</sub> /h whereas 2008 kg NH <sub>3</sub> /h in calculation sheet. Please rectify the inconsistency on the reported values for AFR <sub>max</sub> .
					ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))	Issue: Information related to the calculation of EF <sub>ma</sub> in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document should be reported, considering that the previous project campaign emission factor (3rd request for issuance) has not yet been approved by the EB.
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The DOE must report all the data and parameters used in emission calculation, including verified default values, factors, assumptions and baseline campaign related data.
					Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and/or that the project participant has implemented	Issue: The DOE is requested to provide verified information on the events and incidents related to the production and/or monitoring (such as plant shutdown, AMS down time) during the project campaign. If there were any plant and AMS



## CDM – Executive Board

						and operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD or the approved revised PDD. (VVM v.1.2 para 196)	downtime, information should be provided on how it was handled as per AM0034 requirements.
144	1987	Sichuan Pingwu Xiannvbaio Hydropower Station	21/10/2010 to 20/10/2011	DNV	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: As per the Verification Report (p 7), from 21 October 2010 to 20 November 2010, the values used for the monitoring of EGs,y was done by the meter M2. However the monitoring report (p11) indicates that the values used come from the reading of the meter M1. The project participant is requested to clarify this inconsistency.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: As per the Verification Report (p 7), from 21 October 2010 to 20 November 2010, the values used for the monitoring of EGs,y was done by the meter M2. However the excel sheet provided indicates that the values used come from the reading of the meter M1. The project participant is requested to clarify this inconsistency.
145	1405	CEMEX Costa Rica: Use of biomass residues in Colorado cement plant	01/07/2010 to 30/06/2011	TÜV NORD	Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the implementation status of the project (including a brief description of the installed technology and/or equipments, relevant dates of project activity e.g. date of construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) during the monitoring period under consideration. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (i) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The monitoring report does not contain the implementation status (e.g. date of construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) of the project activity inline with the requirement of EB48, Annex 68, paragraph 10(a)(i) and EB54 Annex 34.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan. (VVM v.1.2 para 206 & 221(d))	Issue: The DOE is requested to clarify how the measurement of alternative fuels consumption other than rice husk is in line with the approved revised monitoring plan and applied methodology given that the fuel consumption is calculated using a formula given in the MR (page 14).
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The emission factor of the residual fuel oil in the approved revised monitoring plan is 73.33 tCO <sub>2</sub> /TJ but different residual oil (mixed and automotive oil) with the emission factors (73.33 tCO <sub>2</sub> /TJ and 85.0 tCO <sub>2</sub> /TJ) are used in the emission reduction calculation.
146	0501	Bentong Biomass Energy Plant in Malaysia	01/01/2008 to 30/06/2009	BVCH	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The calibration dates provided in the Monitoring Report for the flow meter (3/11/2008) and the weighting instrument (31/10/2008) don't cover the entire monitoring period.



## CDM – Executive Board

					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue 1: The monitoring report (page 34) states that the emissions from avoiding methane from decaying EFB are calculated as 33,297 tCO <sub>2</sub> e for 2008 as this is the first year that EFB is removed from wastes accumulating since 2003. The Verification Report does not provide information on how it assessed that the EFB is being accumulated since year 2003. Issue 2: The verification report does not contain information on how the DOE determined that the assumptions applied in the calculation of Baseline Emissions from EFB are correct. Particularly, the input parameters used for the FOD model, such as the yearly values of the amount of EFB which decay is avoided through controlled combustion.
147	1021	13.4 MW bundled wind power project in Chithradurga, Karnataka	02/01/2010 to 01/01/2011	DNV	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The monitoring report does not include a description of the quality control system, organisational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel and a diagram showing all the relevant monitoring points.
					ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).	Issue: the spreadsheet contains typed values for 'transmission loss'.
					ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).	Issue: No explanation in regard to increasing imports by 115%.
148	1027	Transalloys Manganese Alloy Smelter Energy Efficiency Project	01/03/2010 to 30/04/2011	ERM CVS	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)	Issue: The Verification Report (p.21) states that "For periods where weekly platform scale calibration records were not available the maximum permissible error of 2.5% was deducted in accordance with EB52 Annex 60 /30/. CAR2 was closed.". However, it is not clear how this CAR was closed as: (1) the monitoring report does not contain calibration dates of the measuring instruments as per EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34; and (2) the spreadsheet does not show how " the maximum permissible error of 2.5% " was applied for the period.



## CDM – Executive Board

149	2687	Pakarab Fertiliser Co-generation Power Project	21/12/2009 to 31/05/2010	DNV	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not state that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan. (VVM v.1.2 para 206 & 221(d))	Issue: The monitoring plan requires the measurement of the Cogeneration system electricity output (CEO) while the monitoring report indicates that this parameter is calculated. Further information is required how the DOE verifies the monitoring of CEO as per the monitoring plan.
150	1075	Guangzhou Xingfeng Landfill Gas Recovery and Electricity Generation CDM Project	01/04/2009 to 31/01/2011	TÜV SÜD	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report / spreadsheet do not contain the values of wCH <sub>4</sub> (methane fraction in the landfill gas).
					ER Calculation	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any), and/or emission reductions, including reference to formulae and methods used. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii))	Issue: The monitoring report / spreadsheet do not contain calculations MDproject,y (the amount of methane destroyed / combusted during the year).
151	3042	Dehydration and incineration of sewage sludge in Singapore	13/09/2010 to 30/04/2011	JACO	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: the parameter "DT <sub>i,y</sub> - Average additional distance travelled compared to the baseline" is not monitored annually as per registered monitored plan and applied methodology, but it is treated as fixed parameter in section D.1 of the monitoring report.
					Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: the Monitoring Report does not contain information on date of calibration/accuracy check and validity of the monitoring instruments.
					Monitored Parameters	Scope: The verification report does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: the Verification Report does not list the parameter "DT <sub>i,y</sub> - Average additional distance travelled compared to the baseline" which is to be monitored according to the registered monitoring plan.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: the Verification Report does not contain information on whether the validity of the calibrations available for the monitoring instruments cover the whole monitoring period. Furthermore, the Verification Report does not contain clear information about the availability and validity of calibrations for the instruments used for monitoring the stack gas volume flow rate.
152	0069	Nubarashen Landfill Gas Capture and Power Generation Project in Yerevan	01/04/2010 to 31/07/2011	JCI	Implementation Status/physical features of project	Scope: The verification report does not describe the reasons for the phased-implementation delay and/or does not present the expected implementation dates. (VVM v.1.2 para 198 (a)).	Issue: the Verification Report explains, on page 13, that the GEG was not yet installed and it is expected to be examined in a later phase. However, no explanations were provided on the reasons for the delay in the implementation of the engine.



## CDM – Executive Board

153	3339	Leak Reduction in Above Ground Gas Distribution Equipment in the Gas Distribution Network UzTransgaz-Markazgaz (UzTG)	27/11/2010 to 30/09/2011	TÜV Rheinland	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report should contain information on calibration of all Hi-Flow Samplers used for measurement of leak rate; in particular dates, validity and result of and person/entity responsible for calibration of each Hi-Flow Sampler.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))	Issue: The DOE is requested to provide information on how the 121 sample points were randomly selected for the field inspection and desk review analysis, i.e. the method used to randomly select the 121 sample points out of the 22748 repaired leaks.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The DOE is requested to provide verified information on calibration of all Hi-Flow Samplers used for measurement of leak rate; in particular dates, validity and result of and person/entity responsible for calibration of each Hi-Flow Sampler.
154	2076	Univanich Lamthap POME Biogas Project	01/04/2009 to 31/12/2010	SIRIM	Comparison/increase of CERs	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a comparison of the actual CERs claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the PDD, and/or explanation on any significant increase. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (viii)).	Issue: The DOE shall provide information whether the increase in the ratio of waste water to fresh fruit bunches that explains the increased amount of emission reductions claimed (Section E.5 and E.6 of the MR) was unexpected and temporary.
					Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The DOE shall provide more information how it confirmed that the readings of the flow meter(FI65) used for measuring biogas sent to the engine between the commissioning and date of factory calibration (i.e. 18/04/2009 to 25/04/2009) are correct.
155	1428	Monomeros Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project	04/05/2010 to 12/05/2011	ICONTEC	Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The PP/DOE are to requested to i) report the baseline emission factor,EFBL, before and after the recalculation for both baseline and project scenarios, ii) provide details of the data (values, dates ) on the five historical campaigns used to determine the historical campaign length, CLnormal , and iii) provide the value of the plant design capacity used to compare the NAP used to calculate the emissions reductions.



## CDM – Executive Board

156	0918	Energas Varadero Conversion from Open Cycle to Combined Cycle Project	01/07/2008 to 31/12/2010	SGS	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)	Issue: The CAR 12 questioned the inconsistencies between the values for parameter PGy in the spreadsheet and in the internal record. The CAR 14 also questioned the inconsistencies between the values for parameter PGy in the spreadsheet and in the sales receipts. The CAR 12 was closed as the values of the parameter are now consistent with the monthly report. However, CAR 14 was also closed as the values of the parameter are now consistent with the sales receipts. It is not clear with which one the values of the parameter are consistent. Furthermore, the DOE has not explained the reason why the values of the parameter should follow the monthly report or the sales receipts.
157	0862	Allain Duhanan Hydroelectric Project (ADHP)	01/06/2010 to 31/05/2011	TÜV NORD	Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not indicate that the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analyses. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (a) and (b))	Issue: The DOE has not provided information on how it has verified and crosschecked the diesel consumption in the Diesel Generator.
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The DOE has not justified the parameters used in the calculation of the project emissions, which are NCV, density, emission factor and oxidation factor of diesel.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The Verification Report has not provided assessment on the delayed calibration for meter 150688/9-2108 used to measure electricity import (first calibrated on 13/11/2010 while the monitoring period started on 01/06/2010)
158	1180	BHL Thanabhwawan Project	04/05/2008 to 03/05/2010	TÜV NORD	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain all parameters required to be monitored and/or reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology?	Issue: The spreadsheet does not contain the values of the following parameters to be monitored and reported at the intervals required by the approved revised monitoring plan: i) BFy -Quantity of bagasse combusted in the power plant during the year; ii) Cane - Quantity of cane crushed in the sugar plant during the year; iii) Juice - Quantity of cane juice generated crushed in the sugar plant during the year; iv) Bagasse saving - Quantity of bagasse saved in the power plant during the year
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2	Issue: The DOE has not determined whether the value of the parameter "EGhistoric - Three year average net electricity generation" as input in the emission reduction calculation is justified and correctly applied.



## CDM – Executive Board

						para 208 (d) & (e))	
159	2943	N2O reduction project at the WNA I nitric acid plant of Deepak Fertilisers & Petrochemicals Corporation Ltd. ("Deepak"), India	09/04/2010 to 14/09/2010	DNV	Calibration	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments (frequency, relevant dates of calibration and/or validity) as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv) & EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The monitoring report does not contain any information on calibration of monitoring instruments used during the baseline campaign. The project participant is requested to provide such information.
					ER Calculation	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any), and/or emission reductions, including reference to formula and methods used. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii))	Issue: The monitoring report does not contain reference to the formula used to correct VSG to take care of the difference in the values of the stack diameter. The project participant is requested to provide information on the rationale together with a formula describing the correction.
					ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).	Issue: The spreadsheet does not contain any explanation with regards to the formula used to correct the values of NAP and VSG for the historical campaigns, the baseline campaign and the project campaigns. The project participant is requested to add the relevant information.
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: As per the monitoring report, the calibration of the instruments used to monitor oxidation temperature, pressure, ammonia flow rate and air flow rate does not cover the period between 7 September 2010 and 14 September 2010. However, the verification report (section 3.7) refers to a delay that would have occurred during the historical campaign, between 7 September 2009 and 15 September 2009. The DOE is requested to clarify this inconsistency.
					Other verification reporting requirement	Scope: The verification report does not contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs and/or provide an assessment and close out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued. (VVM v.1.2 para 192, 194)	Issue: In the verification report, the answer to CL2 does not provide any information on the rationale and on how the correction factor is used to correct the values of VSGBC and VSG. The DOE is requested to provide the relevant information.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The verification report (page 13) states that the impact of the delayed calibration is explained in section 3.6. However section 3.6 does not contain the information. Information about the delay is in section 3.7. The DOE is requested to revise this inconsistency.
160	3238	Wind power generation by Shree Naman Developers Ltd.	17/07/2010 to 01/04/2011	TÜV NORD	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The DOE is requested to provide further information on how it has verified the results of the delayed calibration test, in order to demonstrate that those errors in the measuring equipment are not higher than the maximum permissible error (0.2%) of the installed meters as per EB52 Annex 60 paragraph 4 a) b)
161	1907	KCP Waste Heat	19/11/2008 to	DNV	ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of	Issue: The DOE explains that CER volume for the monitoring



## CDM – Executive Board

Recovery Project in a Cement Plant by The KCP Limited (Cement Unit), India	31/03/2010		calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).	period has been reduced by 3 tCO <sub>2</sub> e (12 957 to 12 954 tCO <sub>2</sub> e) from that reported/stated in the version 1 of the monitoring report due to adjustment in the electricity generation data to account the discounting due to delay in calibration of energy meters. However, it is not clear how the PP applied the discount since the CERs calculation spreadsheet doesn't include an explanation concerning this matter.
		Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	<p>Issue (a): The DOE has verified the calibration of two energy meters for each auxiliary consumption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) T.G. House auxiliary consumption: Meter APH 9947 and Meter APH09949;</li> <li>(ii) Cooling tower auxiliary consumption: Meter APB 99999 and Meter APB99998;</li> <li>(iii) Boiler house auxiliary consumption: Meter APB 09948 and Meter APH09950.</li> </ul> <p>However, it is not clear how the DOE has checked of the above monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the selected methodology, as per the paragraph 184 (b) (v) of the VVM ver 2.1, in particular, it is not clear the nature and quantity of auxiliary consumption sources existed during the monitoring period and if those sources have been consuming energy simultaneously. Please, provide a description of the auxiliary consumption sources for each parameter (house auxiliary consumption, cooling tower auxiliary consumption and boiler house auxiliary consumption, etc) and the monitoring arrangement for those sources.</p> <p>Issue (b): The DOE states that the solid flow meters for Annual energy (fuel) and Annual production of clinker have been calibrated as per the KCP's quality management system procedure. The DOE has provided a verification of the last calibration (16 March 2010). Since the calibration frequency of solid flow meters is once in 3 months accordingly with KCP's quality management system procedure, please provide details about the verification of the solid flow meters calibration dates for the whole monitoring period.</p>





## CDM – Executive Board

					Calibration	<p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) &amp; EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: The DOE describes calibration delays for next parameters: (i) Gross electricity generation; (ii) Cooling tower auxiliary consumption; (iii) Boiler house auxiliary consumption. On this regard the DOE has raised the CAR 3 that includes the calibration delays for Boiler 1 &amp; 2 auxiliary meter and Gross energy generation meter. Also, the DOE explains that the generation is to be discounted as per the "Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements". However, it is not clear how the PP applied the discount and if it has been applied also to the measures of the Cooling tower auxiliary consumption. So, the DOE is requested to clarify:</p> <p>(i) which approach has been adopted in the calculation of emission reductions calculation accordingly with the paragraph 4. EB 52 report, annex 60 "Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements"</p> <p>(ii) how has verified the use of a discount to the measure of each meter with a calibration delay.</p>
162	0500	Efficient utilisation of waste heat and natural gas at Dahej complex of GACL	01/01/2003 to 31/03/2008	DNV	Calibration	<p>Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment of the compliance with EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements' for the calibration delay. (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) &amp; EB 52 Annex 60)</p> <p>Issue: The DOE has checked the monitoring equipment and calibration records of the meters and it was found that there was delay in calibration in some of the monitoring equipment for the current monitoring period. The DOE explains that the maximum correction factor has been applied for the monitoring parameters for delay in calibration in the emission reduction calculation. It is mentioned that this procedure is in line with the "General guidelines to SSC methodologies" and "Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirement". However, it is not clear how the DOE has verified the appropriateness of the maximum correction factor applied for each delayed measured value. It is since: (i) the DOE has verified that the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, (ii) the DOE does not provide details about the verification of error identified during delayed calibration, and (iii) the DOE has simply mentioned that the monitoring equipment represent "good monitoring practise" and provide accuracies for the monitoring equipment. Please provide details about how the DOE has verified that the maximum permissible error of all the measuring instruments are specified by the respective manufacturers as their technical specification, as per the EB 52 Annex 60 'Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements'. In doing so, please include the corrections applied</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

							to the delayed measured values in the emission reduction spreadsheet.
163	0504	Wastewater treatment using a Thermophilic Anaerobic Digestor at an ethanol plant in the Philippines	30/06/2008 to 30/06/2010	LRQA	ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))	Issue: In particular, the verification report does not provide an assessment on why: (a) in the calculation of the baseline emissions the volume of biogas used in the heating equipment has been calculated as the volume of biogas entering the boiler, and does not include the volumes of biogas of stack gases 1, 2 and 3 entering the coal fired boilers and; (b) emissions from flaring have not been accounted for.
					Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: In particular, no validation opinion is provided for the calibration requirements of the spectrophotometer used for determining COD concentration of waste flows from and into the outlet.
164	0508	Onyx Alexandria Landfill Gas Capture and Flaring Project	01/02/2010 to 30/04/2011	TÜV SÜD	Monitored Parameters	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the values of the monitored parameters. (EB 54 Annex 34)	Issue: The values of the amount of landfill gas captured at Borg el Arab have not been reported (in Monitoring Report and spreadsheet submitted) as per the Monitoring Plan page 23.
					ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).	Issue: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulas used to calculate the parameter "tCO <sub>2</sub> " in flares 1 and 2 in "BEA datalogger (11-2010)".
165	2794	Bionersis landfill project in Pasto, Colombia	01/10/2010 to 09/11/2011	CRA	Calibration	Scope: The verification report does not provide an assessment on whether the calibration of measuring equipments was conducted at a frequency specified in applied monitoring methodology or EB guidance if applicable, and/or the monitoring plan? (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii) & EB 52 Annex 60)	Issue: The DOE should specify how it has verified compliance of the calibration frequency for the electricity consumption metering equipment with EB61, Annex 21 paragraph 17 (c), which specifies: "(c) Measuring equipment should be certified to national or IEC standards and calibrated according to the national standards and reference points or IEC standards and recalibrated at appropriate intervals according to manufacturer specifications, but at least once in three years;"
166	2943	N <sub>2</sub> O reduction project at the WNA I nitric acid plant of Deepak Fertilisers & Petrochemicals	15/09/2010 to 26/05/2011	DNV	Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain emission factors, IPCC default values, and/or other reference values used in the calculation of emission reductions. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (v)).	Issue: The DOE/PP are requested to correct the inconsistencies in the reported dates when the AMS system was on downtime as the information provided on the monitoring report (page 6) appears to contradict that mentioned in the verification report (section 3.5.5)



## CDM – Executive Board

		Corporation Ltd. ("Deepak"), India			ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain explanation with regard to application of formulae in the spreadsheet. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii)).	Issue: The DOE/PP are requested to report in the spreadsheet on how the correction factors were applied to the VSG, NCSG and NAP parameters used for calculating the project emission factor.
					Reference values/assumptions	Scope: The verification report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations have been justified and/or emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (d) & (e))	Issue: The DOE is requested to clarify if the baseline emission factor, EFBL, was recalculated as the monitoring report (page 36) mentions that the value was not recalculated and it appears that the baseline campaign length, CLBL (23,890 tHNO <sub>3</sub> ), was greater than the historical campaign length, CLnormal (17,335 tHNO <sub>3</sub> ). In doing so please report the value of the EFBL before and after the recalculation.
167	3307	Pingtou 180MW Hydropower Project in Sichuan Province	01/05/2011 to 25/08/2011	TÜV NORD	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the information flow for the listed parameters. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)	Issue: The DOE should clarify why the amount of diesel consumption reported in the Monitoring report and verification report (8.7kg) is different than the diesel consumption reported in the spreadsheet of emission reduction calculation (9.8kg).
168	1861	Sonna mini hydel scheme in Karnataka State, India.	04/08/2010 to 31/07/2011	DNV	ER Calculation	Scope: The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation that are shown in the spreadsheet cells whenever possible. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii)).	Issue: The formulae for Gross Electricity Exported (Column H) values is missing.
					ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))	Issue: The DOE is asked to clarify how delayed calibration of grid electricity export/import meter has been accounted for throughout the period from 02/04/11 to 31/07/11 in the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet.
169	0115	GHG emission reduction by thermal oxidation of HFC 23 at refrigerant (HCFC-22) manufacturing facility of SRF Ltd	01/10/2011 to 31/12/2011	SGS	ER Calculation	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any), and/or emission reductions, including reference to formulae and methods used. (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii))	Issue: Information is required on how the PP has determined the value for QHFC23,g,n,y (Quantity of HFC-23 generated in the monitoring period of n of year y) used for accounting eligible HFC-23 as per EB 39 Annex 8 Para 6a.
					ER Calculation	Scope: The verification report does not provide a conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved and/or determine that calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage as appropriate have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document. (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c) & 221 (h))	Issue: Information is required on how the DOE has validated the value for QHFC23,g,n,y (Quantity of HFC-23 generated in the monitoring period of n of year y) used for accounting eligible HFC-23 as per EB 39 Annex 8 Para 6a.



## CDM – Executive Board

170	3707	SF6 recycling project of North China Grid	29/11/2010 to 30/06/2011	BVCH	Monitoring systems and procedures	Scope: The monitoring report does not contain a description of the monitoring systems, quality assurance and/or quality control system employed by the project activity, data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, emergency procedures for the monitoring system, and/or line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points). (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii) & EB 54 Annex 34).	Issue: The PP/DOE are requested to provide the detailed reasons for the estimated SF6 inventory decreases following the template outlined in the in the monitoring plan (Annex 4 of the registered PDD) and required by the methodology (Table on page 9).
-----	------	---	--------------------------	------	-----------------------------------	---	--