



## INFORMATION NOTE ON THE RESULTS OF THE COMPLETENESS CHECKS

30 June - 23 October 2010

(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 each of the two stages (completeness check and information & reporting check) that cover the secretariat's initial assessment of the submission. One aim of these new procedures was to provide greater transparency regarding the secretariat's assessment of project submissions. As such, the procedures request that the secretariat make the results of the completeness checks publicly available by publishing them on the UNFCCC CDM website.
2. The tables below provide information on the results of the completeness and information & reporting checks for those projects that did not pass the checks. Tables 1 and 2 provide information for projects at the stage of request for registration with regard to the reasons for them not passing the completeness checks or information & reporting checks. Tables 3 and 4 provide information for projects at the stage of request for issuance with regard to the reasons for them not passing the completeness checks or information & reporting checks.
3. The secretariat will be publishing information on the results of the completeness and information & reporting checks regularly (e.g. quarterly) as information notes in future as well.



Table 1

Registration		Stage 1: Completeness Check		
#	Project #	Project	DOE	Reasons
1	2929	SDIC Xiyang Huangyanhui CMM to Power Generation Project	DNV-CUK	<p><b>Request for registration form:</b> The DOE is requested to include all relevant sectoral scopes in the registration request form and the validation report.</p> <p><b>Invalid LoA:</b> The PP/ DOE is requested to submit a valid letter of approval for the host country as part of the document is partially erased.</p>
2	2939	Project of treatment and swine's manure utilization at Ecobio Carbon – Swine Culture N° 1	DNV-CUK	<p><b>Expired meth:</b> The PA applies the methodology that has expired.</p> <p><b>Incorrect template:</b> The PDD does not use the correct template.</p> <p><b>No geo- coordinates:</b> Neither geo coordinates nor file containing geo coordinates is uploaded in the view page.</p>
3	2974	China Dalinjiang Hydropower Project	TÜV Nord	<p><b>Wrong spreadsheet:</b> The spreadsheet (cell C18 of "cash flow without CERs") presents an IRR value which is not consistent with the PDD and Validation Report; further, the last sheet "cash flow with CERs" contains errors.</p> <p><b>Registration request form:</b> It is not clear if the registration request form dated 12 Oct 2009 corresponds to the final submission, as required by EB48 Annex 60 paragraph 10e).</p> <p><b>Site visit:</b> It is not clear from the Validation Report whether a site visit was conducted. If not, proofer justification should be provided.</p> <p><b>Inconsistency:</b> The investment cost , O&amp;M costs and IRR are different between the PDD submitted for validation and the PDD submitted for registration, while the Validation Report does not indicate that any CAR or CR were raised.</p>
4	2993	China Niaoerchao Hydropower Project	ERM-CVS	<p><b>Blank pages in PDD:</b> the PDD submitted for request for registration contains pages that can not be read.</p>
5	3029	China Changtanhe Hydropower Project	RWTUV	<p><b>MoC:</b> The Party from the Annex 1 Country in the MoC is reported to be UK, which is found to be inconsistent with the Party from the Annex 1 Country reported in the other documents.</p>
6	3033	24 MW Kut Hydro Power Project	DNV-CUK	<p><b>Expired meth:</b> The PA applies a methodology that has expired.</p> <p><b>MoC:</b> No party mentioned in the Annex 1 of the MoC.</p>
7	3099	Jilin Jiutai 25MW Biomass Power Plant Project	DNV-CUK	<p><b>Expired meth:</b> The project activity applies a methodology that has expired.</p> <p><b>GSP:</b> The DOE's website containing PDD for GSP can not be accessed.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p><b>MoC:</b> The MoC submitted for request for registration is not in the correct order.</p> <p><b>Geo coordinates:</b> The file uploaded describing project location does not contain information on geo coordinates.</p>
8	3206	Aberdare Range/ Mt. Kenya Small Scale Reforestation Initiative - Kamae-Kipipiri Small Scale A/R Project	JACO	<p><b>PDD:</b> Section A.1. of the CDM-SSC-AR-PDD should contain the version number and the date of the document as per page 6 of guideline for completing the simplified project design document for small scale A/R and the form for submission on methodologies for small-scale A/R CDM project activities (version 04).</p> <p><b>LoA:</b> Project name in the Kenyan LoA does not match the project name in the PDD and validation report documents.</p> <p><b>Blank page:</b> Page 29 of the validation report is left blank.</p> <p><b>Protected spreadsheet:</b> One of the spreadsheet submitted (Appendix 3 - No.2 Winrock - Sampling Calculator PDD1 Kamae-Kipipiri (1) ) is protected. Please provide unprotected version of the spreadsheet either by e-mail or by file upload.</p>
9	3237	Barro Blanco Hydroelectric Power Plant Project	AENOR	<p><b>Spreadsheet:</b> The financial analysis spreadsheet (as mentioned in validation report page 27) was not submitted by the DOE.</p>
10	3286	Energy efficiency improvement Project of CSS sugar mill	BVQI	<p><b>Version of the PDD:</b> According to the validation report page 6 “The validation findings presented in this report relate to the project as described in the PDD version 6 dated June 03, 2010”; however, the version of the PDD submitted is #5 and is dated 5 May 2010. Therefore, please upload the correct version of the PDD.</p> <p><b>Inconsistencies:</b> There are some inconsistencies related to the starting date of the project activity (7 October 2008 - date of the first equipment purchase order) in the validation report, specifically: CAR 5 mentions that the “date of the first equipment purchase order (the new turbo generator of 25 MW)” is 8 October 2008, and on page 58 it is mentioned that the project starting date is 1 November 2010, which is in line with the “CDM Glossary of terms”. Please revise.</p>
11	3370	Amman Ghabawi Landfill Gas to Energy Project	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>Reproducible spreadsheet:</b> The appendixes 1, 2 and 3 uploaded in the project view page are not accessible. The PP/ DOE are requested provide reproducible spreadsheet for the: a) CERs calculation including all relevant assumptions and parameters; b) IRR calculation spreadsheet that can be reproduced; and c) any other relevant data presented in a transparent manner. In doing so please refer to the VVM v.1.1 paragraphs 17 and 18 and the EB 41, Annex 45, sections</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>8 and 9.</p> <p><b>Meth:</b> The DOE/PP are advised to update the methodology version.</p> <p><b>Geo coordinates</b> The DOE is requested to include the geo-coordinates on the project view page.</p>
12	3394	Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Yingde Conch Cement Company Limited	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>MoC:</b> Section 2 of the MoC "Nomination of Focal Points" has the entity name blank. Also, the template in section 2 has been changed since bottom of page 1 is missing and page 2 includes a Party name which is not in line with the original template.</p> <p><b>Geo coordinates</b> in view page are missing.</p>
13	3397	Yunnan Province, Tengchong County, XiShanHe Hydropower Station Project	DNV-CUK	<p><b>MoC:</b> Please notice that the MoC letter indicates two different authorised signatories for two different scopes (a and b) for the same focal point entity (ICF - International Clean Fund LLC Lewes Mendrisio Branch). This is not in line with EB 45, Annex 59 guidance ("Procedures for modalities of communication between project participants and the Executive Board" version 01).</p>
14	3407	Shanxi Yuncheng 25MW Biomass Power Plant Project	DNV-CUK	<p><b>Expired meth:</b> The PDD applies a version of methodology that has expired.</p>
15	3422	1.728 MW, Bundled Photovoltaic power plant in KOMIPO	Korean Standards Association	<p><b>LOA:</b> The LoA submitted for registration does not appear to correspond to the project activity as it mentions different PP and different project title. Please clarify.</p> <p><b>MoC:</b> The Modalities of Communication are found to be incomplete as the name of the PP in the Section 2, the name of the PP in the Annex 1 and the Party in the Annex 1 are blank.</p> <p><b>Not english docs:</b> Please provide spreadsheet having been translated to English or containing translation in English.</p> <p><b>PPs:</b> The PDD submitted for GSP indicates two PPs, while the PDD submitted for registration indicates only 1 PP. The EB at its 30th Meeting (paragraph 41) agreed that where a project participant listed in the PDD published at validation is not included in the PDD submitted for registration, the DOE shall provide a letter from the withdrawn project participant confirming its voluntary withdrawal from the proposed project activity, and address this issue in its validation report.</p> <p><b>The geo coordinates</b> of the project location in the project view page are found to be inconsistent with the geo coordinates in the PDD and validation report. Please clarify.</p>
16	3422	1.728 MW, Bundled Photovoltaic power plant in KOMIPO	Korean Standard	<p><b>Expired meth:</b> The PA applies the version of methodology that has expired.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

			s Associati on	
				<b>The geo coordinates</b> of the project location in the project view page are found to be inconsistent with the geo coordinates in the PDD and validation report. Please note that the geo coordinates in the PDD and VR are in minutes and seconds format, therefore they have to be converted to decimal format prior to uploading them to the view page.
17	3424	Bataan 2020 12.5 MW Power Rice Hull Cogeneration Project	BVCH	<b>Expired meth:</b> The project activity uses a methodology that was expired at the time of resubmission in June 2010. <b>The CDM reg form</b> should hold the date of the latest submission, rather than initial submission. <b>PPs</b> The project view page lists Ecosecurities as project participant of both the Host country and Annex 1 party.
18	3437	Zhejiang Tonglu Bipu Hydropower Station	RWTUV	<b>The proof of payment</b> is not uploaded yet.  <b>Reporting:</b> The start date of the project activity in the PDD for GSP is found to be different with the start date in the PDD submitted for registration without any CAR or CL raised.
19	3438	Hegang Coal Industry (Group) Co., Ltd. Coalmine Methane Utilization Project	DNV-CUK	<b>Sectoral scopes:</b> The DOE is requested to include all relevant sectoral scopes in the registration request form and the validation report.  <b>Geo coordinate:</b> The DOE is requested to provide project site geo coordinate on the project view page
20	3463	SANIA fuel switching from natural gas to renewable biomass Project	DNV-CUK	<b>MoC:</b> The Modalities of Communication are found to be incomplete as the Party of the first PP in the Annex 1 is blank.  <b>The geo coordinates</b> of the project location in the project view page are found to be inconsistent with the geo coordinates in the PDD and validation report. Please clarify.
21	3469	Datang Chifeng Danianzi Wind Power Project	DNV-CUK	<b>The registration request form</b> link is incorrect, it does not open this document but instead it opens a clarification for methodology ACM0007.  <b>MoC:</b> The order of the pages in the scanned MoC form submitted is not correct, please rearrange.  <b>Language:</b> The first spreadsheet of the file "Appendix 1-EF 3469" is written in Chinese language and not in english language.  <b>Language:</b> The Cell T3 of spreadsheet "Cash flow" file "Appendix 2-IRR 3469" is written in Chinese language and not in english language.
22	3474	Ranteballa Small-Scale Hydroelectric Power Project	DNV-CUK	<b>Spreadsheet:</b> The PP/DOE are requested to provide the IRR calculation <b>spreadsheet</b> that can be reproduced. In doing so please refer to the VVM v.1.1 paragraphs 17 and 18 and the EB 41, Annex 45, sections 8 and 9.



## CDM – Executive Board

23	3485	Biomass gasifier for thermal energy generation by Beach Minerals Company Private Ltd.	TUEV-SUED	<p>No <b>geo coordinates</b> appear in the project view page.</p> <p>The amount of <b>emissions reduction</b> in the PDD for GSP is found to be different with the one in the PDD submitted for registration without any CAR or CL raised.</p>
24	3490	Inner Mongolia Yihewusu Phase II 49.5 MW Wind Power Project	KFQ	<p><b>Spreadsheet:</b> The PP/DOE are requested to provide the IRR calculation spreadsheet that can be reproduced. In doing so please refer to the VVM v.1.1 paragraphs 17 and 18 and the EB51 annex 48, version 03.1 section 8.</p>
25	3500	Waste gas for power generation in Shenmu County Tongdeli Coal Chemical Industry Co., Ltd	ERM-CVS	<p><b>Project Title</b> Page 2 of the Validation Report refers to the project title as “Project Title: Helanshan Phase V 40.5MW Wind-farm Project” . As this is not the project title, please clarify and submit documents for the project activity “ Waste gas for power generation in Shenmu County Tongdeli Coal Chemical Industry Co., Ltd ”.</p>
26	3502	Gansu Sunan 6.3MW Sidalong Stage I Hydropower Project	Germanischer	<p><b>MoC:</b> List of project participants in annex I of the modalities of communication (MoC) contains an entity (Department of Climate Change, National Development and Reform Committee) that is not authorised as a project participant by the DNA of China. Please amend the MoC and other documents accordingly.</p> <p><b>Map</b> of the project site location in page 5 of the PDD is in Chinese. All submission must be translated into English. Please include the location map in English.</p>
27	3503	Hebei Shengyuan Xuandong Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>Reproducible spreadsheet</b> The PP/ DOE should provide reproducible spreadsheet for the investment analysis as per paragraphs 8, 9 and 17 of the Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis version 03.1 and VVM paragraph 17 as it is not clear how some of the input values to the investment analysis were calculated. For example, in sheet phase I parameter sources, it is not clear how the following values were derived among others: annual power generated and annual power supply (C63 and C69), City Construction &amp; Maintenance Tax and additional tax for education (C56 and 57) and coal saved (C70).</p> <p><b>CERs</b> The DOE is requested to verify the inconsistency in the emission reduction value from the value in the PDD for GSC (430,686 tCO<sub>2</sub>/yr) and the latest PDD submitted for request for registration (429.202 tCO<sub>2</sub>/yr) in section A.4.4 of each PDD as per paragraph 7b of EB 48, Annex 60.</p> <p><b>Geo coordinate</b> The DOE is requested to present the geo coordinate of the project site in the project view page.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

28	3517	Organoeste Dourados & Andradina Composting Project	RWTUV	<p><b>Spreadsheet:</b> The calculation of the emission reductions in the spreadsheet submitted is not in line with the calculation shown in the PDD. Please submit the correct spreadsheet.</p> <p><b>Language:</b> Appendix 2 ("Dourados CDM Consideration") is presented in non-English text. As English is the working language of the CDM Executive Board, please provide such document with English labeling or text.</p>
29	3518	Jembo II 24 MW Gas Fired Project	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>Spreadsheet:</b> Please provide a <b>spreadsheet</b> with the calculation of the levelized electricity generation cost for the baseline scenario alternatives. Please take into account that according to "Decision 3/CMP.1 "Modalities and procedures for a clean development mechanism as defined in Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol", Annex C, paragraph 6", information regarding baseline is not to be treated as confidential information.</p> <p>Please note that a non-confidential version of the <b>IRR calculation</b> for the proposed project activity should be made publically available.</p>
30	3554	Wind Power Project in Maharashtra by M/s L. B. Kunjir Engineers & Contractors	RINA	<p><b>Consistency</b> The DOE is requested to confirm the project IRR (without CDM benefits) as page 20 of the validation report shows 10.40% whereas the PDD (page 16) and the IRR calculation spreadsheet show a project IRR of 11.28%. This is a consistency issue as per EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 7b.</p> <p><b>Date of PDD:</b> The DOE/PP are requested to correct the date on the PDD submitted for registration (table on page 19) as: 1) the email from PP to CDM EB is shown as 06.01.09 while the reference document indicates 06.01.08, and 2) the notification confirmation email from the CDM EB to the PP is shown as 06.01.09 while the reference document indicates 06.01.08</p> <p><b>Certificates of the validation team members</b> The DOE/PP are requested to merge the four (4) certificates (included in the zipped file of the validation report) into one file in order to have one validation report document (we acknowledge that this issue was not raised/addressed for a similar case-project activity 3550).</p>
31	3599	Bajo Tuluá Minor Hydroelectric Power Plant	AENOR	<p><b>Version of the PDD:</b> The PDD submitted for registration (version 03.3) and for GSC (version 03.3) contains the same version number but the PDD submitted for registration has been updated, for example, the name of the project participants in page 6 (in the PDD submitted for registration) is updated to GAS NATURAL SDG from UNIÓN FENOSA</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>GENERACIÓN, S.A. in the PDD submitted for GSC. Please update the version number of the PDD submitted for registration.</p> <p><b>Spreadsheet</b> The Appendix 2 (spreadsheet - Build Margin Calculation Bajo Tulua) of the PDD submitted for registration contains link to another spreadsheet. Please either submit the linked spreadsheet as well or upload the spreadsheet (Build Margin Calculation Bajo Tulua) that does not contain any links to spreadsheets that are not submitted.</p> <p><b>Geo coordinates</b> Page 9 of the PDD submitted for registration does not indicate the format of the geo coordinates. Please provide the format of the geo coordinates.</p> <p><b>PDD template</b> The PDD submitted for registration provides emission reductions for all three crediting periods (21 years). Please provide the emission reductions for the first crediting period only. In addition, please use the annual average of estimated emission reductions consistently in all the documents, including the validation report. The validation report mentions different amount (41,430) of annual emission reductions than in the PDD submitted for registration (36,896). The annual average emission reductions should be calculated by dividing the total emission reduction over the first crediting period by the number of years in the first crediting period (7 years).</p> <p><b>Confidential docs</b> The “confidential PDD” should be uploaded as a “confidential PDD appendices”</p>
32	3683	Energy efficiency improvement in the Electric Arc Furnace	RWTUV	<p><b>MoC</b> The name of the project participant in section 2 of the Annex 1 of Modalities of Communication (MoC) form (F-CDM-MOC) is inconsistent with the name of the project participant as approved by the Host Country LoA, PDD and validation report. Please provide revised documentation showing consistent name in the Modalities of Communication form.</p> <p><b>Link</b> The link (<a href="http://www.energymanagertraining.com/eca2007/Award2007_CD/17IntegratedSteel/UshaMartinLimitedJamshedpur/Profile.pdf">http://www.energymanagertraining.com/eca2007/Award2007_CD/17IntegratedSteel/UshaMartinLimitedJamshedpur/Profile.pdf</a>) provided in page number 50 of the validation report cannot be open. Please provide the correct link.</p>
33	3706	Emissions reduction through partial substitution of fossil fuels with renewable plantation biomass and biomass residues in CEMEX Assiut Cement Plant	BVQI	<p><b>LoAs</b> Two letters of approval/authorization issued by UK's Designated National Authority have been submitted in two separate files. As per the Additional notes item 1 of the Registration - Completeness Check list, letters of approval issued by the same country shall be merged in one file. Please provide one file with the two letters merged.</p>
34	3710	6 MW Wind Power Project in Tamil Nadu by REI Agro Limited	BVQI	<p><b>Spreadsheet:</b> The provided spreadsheet on investment analysis is not fully readable.</p>





## CDM – Executive Board

35	3715	Bionersis LFG project Colombia 3 (Villavicencio)	SQS	<p><b>LoAs</b> The letters of approval/authorization issued by Colombia's Designated National Authority are presented in non-English text. As English is the working language of the CDM Executive Board, please provide full English translations of the mentioned letters.</p> <p><b>Links</b> Some links in the PDD cannot be accessed/ opened, e.g. <a href="http://www.superservicios.gov.co/home/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=bcd04c23-976c-4244-9ed5-1685b66824fe&amp;groupId=10122">http://www.superservicios.gov.co/home/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=bcd04c23-976c-4244-9ed5-1685b66824fe&amp;groupId=10122</a> and <a href="https://basedoc.superservicios.gov.co/basedoc/resoluciones.shtml?x=64810">https://basedoc.superservicios.gov.co/basedoc/resoluciones.shtml?x=64810</a>, provided in page number 90 and 12, respectively. Please update all the links of the PDD.</p> <p><b>Geographical coordinates</b> in the project view page of the project activity are not in accordance with the geo-coordinated provided in the PDD and in the validation report.</p>
36	3726	Partial substitution of fossil fuels with biomass at Semen Gresik cement plant in Tuban	ERM-CVS	<p><b>LoAs</b> The Letters of Approval/Authorization issued by the respective Host Party should appear in the respective section of the web page. Currently the letter of approval issued by Indonesia and UK both appear at the 'Host Parties' section, whereas the section as 'Other Parties Involved' is blank. The section as 'Host Parties' shows letter of approval from Indonesia and the letter of authorization from UK.</p> <p><b>MoC</b> All the sections of the Modalities of communication has to be filled out and it should also indicate the date.</p> <p><b>Spreadsheet</b> Appendix 1-SCC Semen Gresik CER Calc spreadsheet is protected. Please provide a non-protected version.</p>
37	3744	Guangxi Liuzhou Iron and Steel (Group) Company Blast Furnace Gas Utilization for Power Generation Project	ERM-CVS	<p><b>LoA</b> Letters of approval and authorization from non-annex I party (China) have not been uploaded in the project view page.</p> <p><b>MoC</b> Modalities of Communication form submitted has not been dated.</p>
38	3751	Mimosa Coal Mine Methane Project	DNV-CUK	<p><b>Sectoral scope</b> The DOE is requested to include all relevant sectoral scopes in the registration request form and the validation report.</p> <p><b>PDD</b> One of the tables presented in page 60 of the PDD is missing part of the table.</p>
39	3752	China Resources Huilai Xian'an Wind Power Project	RWTUV	<p><b>Date of PDD</b> The date of the PDD uploaded is different from the date of PDD that the validation report is based on.</p> <p>Geo-coordinates provided in the validation report and seen at the project-specific page are different from the ones provided in the project design document.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

40	3771	La Mora Hydroelectric Project	AENOR	<p><b>LoA</b> The DOE has not validated the voluntary participation as required by paragraph 45(b) of the CDM Validation and Verification Manual (version 01.2) as:a) The letter of approval/authorization issued by the Designated National Authority of the State of Nicaragua does not contain a statement on the approval of voluntary participation in the proposed CDM project activity;b) The validation report does not specify how the voluntary participation was validated.</p> <p><b>Language</b> The map provided in page number 4 of the PDD is not in English text. As English is the working language of the CDM Executive Board, please provide the full PDD in English.</p> <p><b>Link</b> Some links in the PDD cannot be opened, e.g.  <a href="http://www.ine.gob.ni/DCA/reglamentos/decreto%2076-2006.pdf">http://www.ine.gob.ni/DCA/reglamentos/decreto%2076-2006.pdf</a> and  <a href="http://www.ine.gob.ni/DCA/reglamentos/decreto%2076-2006.pdf">http://www.ine.gob.ni/DCA/reglamentos/decreto%2076-2006.pdf</a>, provided in page number 35 and 36, respectively. Please update all the links of the PDD.</p> <p><b>Geo coordinates</b> The PDD and the validation report provide Cartesian coordinates while the view page of the project activity provides Geographic coordinates. Please provide coordinates by applying the same coordinate system.</p>
41	3816	Guanaquitas 9.74 MW Hydroelectric project	ICONTEC	<p><b>PDD format</b> The PDD submitted upon the request for registration is not in a valid format (i.e. it is a Word document; with tracked changes). Please submit the corresponding clean version of the PDF file.</p> <p><b>Language</b> The investment analysis submitted is not in english. Please refer to EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 9 (c).</p> <p><b>MoC</b> Annex 1 is missing in the "Modalities of Communication (MoC)" form which was submitted. Please refer to EB 45, Annex 59.</p> <p><b>Expired meth</b> In line with EB 48, Annex 60, paragraphs 13 and 14, and since the request was submitted one day prior to the expiration date of grace period for the referred methodology, please resubmit the documents (addressing the mentioned points above) applying the latest version of the applicable methodology.</p>
42	3826	Grid-connected Electricity Generation from Biomass at Buayai Bio Power.	BVQI	<p><b>LoA</b> from Host Party cannot be opened.</p> <p><b>LoA</b> from Annex 1 country was uploaded under the field for Host Country.</p> <p><b>PPs</b> The names of the PPs in the Registration Request form are missing.</p> <p><b>Geo coordinates</b> Neither geo coordinates nor file containing goe coordinates is uploaded in the view page.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p><b>PPs</b> In the view page, the PP from Annex 1 country is put under the host country and no Annex 1 country appears in the view page.</p> <p><b>CERs</b> The VR does not report the amount of the emission reductions.</p>
43	3830	Guayacán Hydroelectric Project	SGS-UKL	<p><b>Replicable spreadsheets</b> In accordance with the Board's request at its 26th meeting that DOEs "...ensure that detailed information on the demonstration of additionality and the determination of baselines, including related calculations, be either integrated in PDDs or submitted as annexes to PDDs", please provide fully replicable spreadsheets showing all calculations used in the investment analysis.</p> <p><b>Blank page</b> Please also note that page 43 of the PDD is blank.</p>
44	3869	BRT Lines 1-5 EDOMEX, Mexico	SQS	<p><b>Language</b> Appendixes 1 to 25 uploaded in the project view page are not in English. English is the working language of the UNFCCC secretariat. Therefore, all documents submitted should be in English.</p>



Table 2

Registration		Stage 2: Information & Reporting Check		
#	Project #	Project	DOE	Reasons
1	1646	Chengbu Miao Minority Autonomous County Liuma 6.4MW Hydro Power Station Project	DNV	<p><b>Real and continuing action 101 (b) and 103 (c):</b> The Validation Report states that the "contract with Enecore Carbon as CDM consultant company" is dated 2 July 2007, while the PDD mentions that the "Project owner signed with CDM consultant company" is on 28 February 2008. The DOE is requested to clarify this inconsistency and further validate the real and continuing actions taken to secure the CDM status in line with the VVM paragraphs 101 (b) and 103 (c).</p> <p><b>Validation of input values para. 110 (a) and (b):</b> The DOE is requested to further validate the effective coefficient (i.e., 0.8), the transmission losses (i.e., 3%) and power consumption (i.e., 1%) applied in the investment analysis, in line with the requirements of the VVM paragraphs 110 (a) and (b).</p>
2	3054	Henan Xinxiang 24MW Biomass based Cogeneration Project	TÜV Nord	<p><b>Project description:</b> The VR does not contain information on how the heat users have been validated.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> The justification of the exclusion of alternative P5 and P6 appears to be incomplete as the DOE concluded that the alternatives are not economical, but there is no investment analysis provided.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> The VR lacks information on how the DOE validated the statement from the PP that there is no other type of biomass around the project site, in order to justify the exclusion of alternative P10 and H9.</p> <p><b>Additionality:</b> The PDD mentions that there might be additional heat users apart from the 7 factories with which the PP established heat supply agreements. Information on the potential revenue from this additional heat users was missing.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> The demonstration of utilized biomass and available biomass in the region is incomplete. The PDD mentions that there are 5 types of stalk used but it does not demonstrate the utilization and availability of each type of stalk.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> The monitoring of quantity of available biomass residues in the region is incomplete. The methodology requires the monitoring of each type of biomass.</p>
3	3062	Biomass based thermal energy generation by M/s Priyadarshini Sahakari Soot Girni Ltd. at Shirpur in Maharashtra	ERM CVS	<p><b>Inconsistency:</b> The PP and DOE are requested to amend the reference to AMS.I.D, version 15 in the PDD pages 21 and 31 and Validation Report page 2.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p><b>Monitoring:</b> The PDD states that the “quantity of heat energy produced from the project activity thermopac is calculated monthly by using the parameters V thermic fluid, (Volumetric flow rate of thermic fluid pumped) dthermic fluid, CP thermic fluid and &amp;#8710;T, thermic fluid , the first three of which are not monitored and the last one is monitored). For ex-post monitoring purpose the value derived as above is crosschecked by using the method described in para 31 (d) of methodology.” The DOE is requested to validate how this approach is in line with the applied methodology, which requires the direct measurement of flow, as per paragraph 31.b.ii). Moreover, the DOE is requested to clarify how it has closed CL 33(c), in line with the VVM 1.01 requirements, paragraphs 38 and 39.</p>
4	3125	Biogas Recovery at Ulu Kanchong Palm Oil Mill	TÜV Nord	<p><b>Validation of input values paragraph 110:</b> Further information is required on the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis at the time of the investment decision in line with paragraph 110 of VVM version 1.1, in particular, total investment, biomass price, annual O&amp;M cost, electricity tariff, and man power cost.</p>
5	3159	Jinxiu Fengmuao Hydro Power Project	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>PPs names:</b> The PP's from China is Jinxiu Fengmuao Electric Power Development Co.,Ltd, however the Meeting to decide to proceed with CDM (IRL 17) was conducted by Jinxiu Yao Nationality Autonomous County Fengmuao Hydropower Co., Ltd. Purchase contracts (IRL 13 and IRL 14) also referred to this entity's name instead of PP's name. Please clarify.</p> <p><b>Link:</b> The link to IRL 61 appears to be broken, and the link to IRL 39 and IRL 64 does not lead to the same title as stated in the VR.</p> <p><b>Spreadsheet:</b> The results of the investment analysis cannot be reproduced, as when re-calculated, the IRRs for sensitivity analysis do not result in the same values as the ones mentioned in the PDD (VVM 110 c). Please note that if the tariff in sheet &lt;Summary&gt; cell D34 changes by +10%, the IRR appearing in sheet &lt;Summary&gt; cell I6 is different from the IRR mentioned in the PDD.</p> <p><b>Registration Request form:</b> The Registration Request form does not correspond to the final submission.</p>
6	3165	Hainan Gezhen Hydropower Project	TÜV Nord	<p><b>MoC:</b> The MoC mentioned that the party which authorizes the participation for Standard Bank Plc is Denmark, while the other documents state Netherlands.</p> <p><b>Registration request form:</b> No title mentioned in the Registration request form.</p> <p><b>Registration request form:</b> The registration request form does not appear to correspond to the final submission.</p> <p><b>Additionality:</b> Since the project activity is a part of the Multipurpose Hydraulic Project, the VR has to provide information whether the Multipurpose Hydraulic Project is developed by the same PP as the project activity and</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>whether there will be revenue from this project.</p> <p><b>Validation of input values:</b> The VR has not explained one component in the investment cost, which is 'Apportionment of shared common investment of Gezhen Multipurpose Hydraulic Project' as stated in page 73 and whether the component is relevant to the project activity.</p> <p><b>Validation of input values:</b> The VR report has not described how the power generation has been crosschecked in line with the VVM version 01.1 paragraph 112 c, as it appears that the DOE only relied on the information from the PDR.</p>
7	3197	Aguan biogas recovery from Palm Oil Mill Effluent (POME) ponds and biogas utilisation - Exportadora del Atlántico, Aguan/Honduras	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>LoA:</b> The DOE should include the procedures taken to confirm the authenticity of the LoAs in the validation report as required in the VVM paragraph 49 (c).</p> <p><b>Sensitivity analysis:</b> The DOE shall validate the sensitivity analysis which has been demonstrated in the PDD and the spreadsheet of IRR calculation, in line with VVM paragraph 110 (e).</p> <p><b>Inconsistent amount of CERs:</b> The amount of CERs applied in the spreadsheet of IRR calculation is inconsistent in the one of the PDD and the spreadsheet of emission reduction calculation. The DOE shall validate the correctness of the calculation in the spreadsheet in line with VVM paragraph 110.</p> <p><b>Consistency:</b> The project IRR is 6.6% in the PDD page 17, which is different from the project IRR (7.7%) applied in other documents including the validation report, the IRR calculation report and other parts of the PDD.</p>
8	3228	Huadian Xinjiang Xiaocaohu Second Wind Farm Phase I Project	BVCH	<p><b>Spreadsheet:</b> BVC has validated and submitted an IRR spreadsheet where the electricity tariff has been discounted by 17%, which actually corresponds to VAT for equipment cost, as opposed to applying 8.5%</p>
9	3233	Argos CO2 Offset Project, through reforestation activities for commercial use	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>PDD:</b> The PDD does not show the input values of the investment analysis.</p> <p><b>CAR 16</b> was not properly closed as the inputs values of the financial analysis were not listed in the PDD.</p> <p><b>Registration form:</b> The registration form does not correspond to the final submission.</p>
10	3281	Siam Cement (Lampang) Waste Heat Power Generation Project (LP Project)	BVCH	<p><b>Validation of the input values para 114 (a), (c):</b> The VR, p16 states that "The main part of total static investment in the FSR had been crosschecked with the already signed Supply and engineering contracts /5/of key equipments by the validation team, and found that the total contract value is close to the one estimated in the FSR, therefore, the assumptions for the total investment is reasonable;". Please provide further details on the validation of the static investment, Electricity unit price, Kiln Utilization factor,</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>WHG Utilization factor, Machinery cost as per VVM 1.2, para 114 (a), (c).</p> <p><b>Geo-coordinates:</b> Please input the geo-coordinates on the project view page.</p>
11	3282	Inner Mongolia Shangdu Jiqingliang 49.5MW Wind Power Project	BVCH	<p><b>Validation of the input values paragraph 112 (c):</b> The DOE shall further substantiate the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in accordance with paragraph 112 (c) of VVM v1.1, in particular, total investment, annual O&amp;M cost (each element should be substantiated separately), interest expense, and depreciation (specially "depreciation year" and calculation of depreciation).</p>
12	3305	Gansu Zhouqu Lijie Hydropower Station Project	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>LoA:</b> Please revise the validation report (page 10) in order to show the correct date of issuance of the LoA from UK. In addition, please note that the link to the list of projects approved by the "Department of Energy and Climate Change" used by the DOE to double check the UK approval and cited in the validation report (page 10) cannot be opened.</p> <p><b>Geo coordinates:</b> Please upload the project's geo coordinates in the project activity view page.</p> <p><b>Prior consideration:</b> The DOE should further explain why the "CDM development contract of Kanfeng station project" signed on June 17, 2004 can be considered a suitable evidence of the prior consideration of the CDM for this specific project activity in line with the VVM para 100 (a). Moreover, the DOE should clarify the discrepancies related to the date in which the ERPA was signed between the validation report (August 2005) and the PDD (December 2007).</p> <p><b>Input values:</b> The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how the net electricity has been calculated as per the requirements of the VVM para. 109. In addition, considering that the project was operational at the time of validation, the DOE should explain why the actual power supply was not crosschecked against the sales invoices.</p> <p><b>Input values:</b> The DOE should confirm whether the electricity tariff used in the investment analysis is the same as the one in the PDR. If not, the DOE should indicate which was the electricity tariff used in the PDR and how it was determined, considering that the DPR was used as the basis for investment decision.</p> <p><b>Investment analysis:</b> The DOE should explain how the investment analysis conducted complies with the requirements of EB 41 Annex 45 Paragraph 7.</p> <p><b>Input values:</b> the DOE should provide a validation opinion on the suitability of the O&amp;M costs, residual value, loan interest rate and depreciation in line with the VVM para. 109.</p> <p><b>Investment analysis:</b> The DOE should provide further evidence that the plant stopped construction in October 2004. In doing so, the DOE should also clarify which were the</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>expenditures already committed at that time.</p> <p><b>Sensitivity analysis:</b> The DOE should validate why the variations in the parameters that would make the IRR reach the benchmark are not likely to occur in line with the VVM para. 109 (e).</p> <p><b>Barrier:</b> The DOE should provide a validation opinion on the "barrier due to the limited access to financial resources" identified in the PDD as per the requirements of the VVM para 113 to 116.</p>
13	3347	Caruquia 9.76 MW Hydroelectric project	ICONTEC	<p><b>Geo coordinates:</b> The DOE/PP is requested to provide clear and readable map showing the geographical project location.</p> <p><b>Starting date:</b> the DOE is requested to confirm the project starting date as page 19 of the validation report considers August 2006 whereas the PDD (section C.1.1) considers the starting date of April 2008.</p> <p><b>Starting date and prior consideration:</b> The DOE shall confirm which evidence/documents they have validated to support the project starting date and prior consideration.</p> <p><b>Inconsistency:</b> The DOE shall correct the inconsistency in the emission reduction as the project view page shows 20,157 tCO<sub>2</sub>e per year while the validation report (pg 8) and the PDD (pg 8) show 20,127 tCO<sub>2</sub>e per year.</p> <p><b>Spreadsheet:</b> The DOE is requested to provide the spreadsheet used for IRR calculation; in doing so please ensure that the spreadsheet is in accessible (unprotected) format.</p> <p><b>Input values:</b> The DOE/PP are requested to include in the PDD and VR the input values used for the IRR calculation, in particular the total investment costs, O&amp;M costs, plant load factor, and the electricity tariff (price of electricity to the grid).</p>
14	3366	Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Xing'an Conch Cement Company Limited	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>Input values:</b> The DOE shall further substantiate the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in line with the paragraph 112 (c) of VVM v1.1, in particular, electricity tariff, total investment, O&amp;M cost, auxiliary consumption, interest rate, tax and additional surcharges, etc.</p> <p><b>Fcap:</b> The DOE shall substantiate the validation of fcap calculation.</p> <p><b>Common practice:</b> The DOE shall further substantiate the identification of the similar projects in line with the paragraph 118 - 120 of VVM v1.1, in particular, why common practice analysis has been limited to low temperature WHR technology and dry-process cement production lines. The DOE shall further clarify the difference between: (i) the low temperature WHR technology and other WHR technologies; and (ii) dry-process cement production line and other cement production lines.</p> <p><b>Common practice:</b> The DOE shall further clarify the essential distinction between the finance background of the project activity and that of the projects that have been financed by Joint venture Companies in line with the paragraph 118 - 120 of VVM v1.1.</p>





## CDM – Executive Board

				<p><b>Monitoring plan:</b> The DOE shall further clarify if the monitoring plan consists all monitoring parameters required as per the ACM0012 v3, in particular, why Qwcm,h, NCVWCM,y, twcm,h, &amp;#951;Project plant,j are not monitored.</p> <p><b>Baseline determination:</b> The DOE shall further substantiate that the waste heat utilized in the project activity was released into the atmosphere in the absence of the project activity at existing facility with detailed information in line with the applicability criteria of the methodology.</p>
15	3368	Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Baimashan Conch Cement Company Limited	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>Validation of the investment costs:</b> The VR, states "The total investment costs have been compared to "Reference Document on Best Available Techniques in the Cement and Lime Manufacturing Industries" (IRL 60). The assumed investment costs (RMB/MW) of the proposed project activity are even lower than the costs assumed in the reference document. Hence the audit team confirms that the assumptions taken are conservative. "Please provide details of the values compared against and further please provide validation opinion as per VVM (EB 51, Annex 3), paragraph 112 (c) and VVM, para 113 (a).</p> <p><b>Validation of the load factor:</b> The VR states "The project participant assumes that the project is operating for 320 days/ year. That indicates that the proposed project is out of operation for 45 days/ year. Considering the need for operational and maintenance work and emergency shut downs, the audit team considers the applied value appropriate. "Please provide details of how the load factor has been validated.</p> <p><b>Geo coordinates-</b> Please input the geocoordinates on the project view page.</p>
16	3376	Yunnan Maguan Huabazi Hydropower Station	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>Meth:</b> The DOE has not resubmitted the project activity before the validity period of ACM0002 version 09. Therefore, the project activity should be re-validated using latest available version of the methodology.</p>
17	3396	Chau Thon Hydropower Project	KEMCO	<p><b>Common practice:</b> Further details in the PDD and Validation Report regarding the common practice should be provided in accordance with the requirements of step 4 of the additionality tool, i.e. similar project activities should be described and the differences between each of these activities and the project should be clearly indicated.</p>
18	3441	Biomass power project by Sri Jyoti Renewable Energy Pvt Ltd	DNV	<p><b>Input values:</b> Further substantiation is required on how the DOE has validated the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis to be in line with paragraph 111 of VVM version 01, in particular: working capital, O&amp;M cost and its 5% escalation, 5% escalation in fuel cost, administrative cost and its 5% escalation, cost of personnel and its 5% escalation, spares and its 5% escalation, and the exclusion of any residual value in the investment analysis. Please notice that while tariff has an increase of 2% the other items</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>increase in 5%, this has a significant impact on the investment analysis.</p> <p><b>Input values:</b> Further substantiation is required on how DOE has validated the exclusion of any land value after the 20 years investment period.</p> <p><b>Input values:</b> Further substantiation is required on how DOE has validated the conservativeness of the 80%, 90% PLF for the first 2 years of operation.</p> <p><b>Baseline assumptions:</b> Please include the validated NCV for each type of biomass in validation report.</p> <p><b>Crediting period:</b> Please notice that in view page the first crediting period is only 6 years (01 Jun 10 - 31 May 16)</p>
19	3459	Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Beiliu Conch Cement Company Limited	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>Prior consideration:</b> The DOE shall provide clear validation opinion regarding whether the project complies with the requirement of EB49, Annex 22, in line with VVM v 01.1, para. 103 (c).</p> <p><b>Fcap:</b> The spreadsheet of emission factor and Fcap calculation should be provided.</p>
20	3461	Rio Amoyá Run-of-River Hydro Project	ICONTEC	<p><b>PPs:</b> The DOE is requested to clarify the project participants and their country of authorization. In doing so, please keep consistency in the information of each project participant; whether it is a host party or the other party, which country it is authorized by. In addition, please upload the LoAs in appropriate section of the project interface. In doing so please refer to EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 7(b).</p> <p><b>Host country LoA</b> uploaded only contains a letter to acknowledge the change in the project title and does not contain the original letter of authorization. With the letter, please upload the original letter authorizing the host party project participant of its participation in the project in one file as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraphs 8 (c),(d).</p> <p><b>Project title:</b> The project name in the PDD for GSC, Hydroelectric Project of the Amoya River, matches neither the title originally authorized nor the name mentioned in the letter acknowledging change from Amoya Environmental Service to Rio Amoya Run-of River Hydro Project. Please verify that it is the same project activity as the one submitted for request for registration as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 7(b).</p> <p>The <b>spreadsheet</b> of the financial assessment submitted contains Spanish language. All document should be presented in English as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 9 (c).</p> <p><b>Location map:</b> Page 4 of the PDD submitted for registration is missing a project location map. Please include the location map as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 7 (c).</p>
21	3462	Bangkok Kamphaeng Saen East: Landfill Gas to Electricity Project	SGS-UKL	<p><b>LoAs:</b> Please merge the LoAs of "Other Parties Involved" as the requirement is that each party is listed only once on the project view page.</p>
22	3462	Bangkok Kamphaeng Saen East: Landfill Gas to Electricity	SGS	<p><b>LoA:</b> Authenticity of LoA-The DOE should include the procedures taken to confirm the</p>



		Project		<p>authenticity of the LoAs in the validation report as required in the VVM (version 1.1) paragraph 49 (c).</p> <p><b>Baseline identification</b>-The DOE should provide further evidence on how it has considered the elimination of the alternatives to the baseline scenario suitable in line with the VVM (version 1.1) paragraphs 82 - 84.</p> <p><b>References incomplete</b>-The DOE should provide a further description (e.g. date, parties involved) of all references used as evidence during the validation process, especially for references 19, 27 to 50.</p> <p><b>Barriers analysis-access to capital</b>-The DOE shall further clarify the lack of access to capital as: (a) it does not directly relate to the project participants, "Bangkok Greenpower Co., Ltd." and "PS Natural Energy Co., Ltd" , and (b) "Central Waste Water Development Company" received 25% of a loan and this is not the project participant. In doing so, please refer to EB50, Annex 13 paragraph 4 and VVM, paragraph 116.</p> <p><b>Additionality</b>: Please clearly explain the structures of all the parties involved and their participation with the project activity. For example the documents and evidences provided are not clear on:a) why the 25% of the loan was granted to a company that is not a project participant (Central Waste Water Development Company) and what was the total amount of the loan.b) the date and parties involved in the loan agreement ("Facility agreement") between "Central Waste Water Development Company" and ISCCP Investment Platform Ltd.;c) the description of the contracts signed for the transference of gas rights between "Group 15" and "GR-Tech Co. Ltd.", and between "GR-Tech Co. Ltd." and "Central Waste Water Development Company", taking in account that Group 15 and Central Waste Water Development Company is not a project participant.</p> <p><b>Grid emission factor</b>-The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how the calculation of the grid emission factor is in compliance with the requirements of the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" in line with the VVM (version 1.1) paragraph 89.</p> <p><b>Monitoring plan</b>-The PP/DOE should confirm that the methane fraction (wCH<sub>4</sub>,y) of the landfill gas and LFG flow will be measured on same basis (either wet or dry), according to the ACM0001 version 11 (pages 9 and 19). Otherwise, the PP/DOE should clarify a standard approach to convert the flow on wet basis to dry basis will be correctly followed.</p>
23	3464	Exploitation of the biogas from Controlled Landfill in Solid Waste Management Central - CTRS / BR.040	SGS	<p><b>Project description</b>: The DOE shall further validate the project description and provide its validation opinion regarding the accuracy and completeness of the project description, in particular the volume of the waste intake, the lifetime of the landfill site and the estimates of the installation, in line with VVM v 01.1,</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>para.64(b).</p> <p><b>LoA:</b> The DOE shall confirm that the receipt of the LoA is the only change that has been made to the version referred to, in line with VVM v 01.1, para. 50(b).</p> <p><b>Baseline alternatives:</b> The DOE should validate the elimination of plausible baseline alternatives of P1 - P6 which have been elaborated in the PDD, page 16, in line with VVM v01.1, para.82.</p>
24	3472	Shanxi Shuangliang Cement Company LTD. 4.5MW Waste Heat for Power Generation Project	CQC	<p><b>Input values:</b> The DOE is requested to substantiate how it has validated the suitability of the input values, in particular : The suitability of 7200 hours annual operational time, rate of power consumption, total static investment and O&amp;M cost.</p> <p><b>Missing spreadsheet:</b> the DOE is requested to submit all the spreadsheet used to calculate the emission reductions.</p>
25	3476	Hebei Chengde Weichang Yudaokou Pasture 150MW Wind Farm Project	BVCH	<p><b>Input values:</b> The DOE is requested to further validate the investment analysis input values, in particular, the net power generation, total investment, and annual O&amp;M costs in line with VVM paragraph 112 (c). In doing so please provide details of: a) similar project activities with which comparisons were done; and b) findings and results of any crosschecks done.</p>
26	3477	Shenzhen Dongbu LNG Power Generation Project	DNV	<p><b>Spreadsheet:</b> The DOE should submit the spreadsheet used by the PP to calculate the levelized cost of generation, in line with VVM v1.1 paragraph 91 and Decision 3/CMP.1 “Modalities and procedures for a clean development mechanism as defined in Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol”, Annex C, paragraph 6. In addition, the DOE should validate the assumptions and input values for levelized cost of generation in line with VVM v1.1 paragraphs 109 and 110.</p> <p><b>Baseline alternatives:</b> The DOE should clarify the means of validation applied to confirm the exclusion of the alternative “Power generation with fuel oil”. Please clarify the relevance of document “/54” mentioned in the Document Reference List; in line with VVM v1.1 paragraph 86.</p> <p><b>Starting date:</b> The DOE should clarify the inconsistencies in respect to: a) signing of equipment purchase (“March 6, 2003” or “March 3, 2003”); and b) approval of FSR (“July 13, 2004” or “July 23, 2004”); as some inconsistencies were found in the Validation Report.</p> <p><b>CL 45:</b> The DOE should further clarify the resolution to CL45 in line with VVM v1.1 paragraph 39 (i.e. the DOE should explain the means of validation applied to close this CL).</p>
27	3480	Hanyang Municipal Solid Waste Incineration for Energy Generation Project in Haining City	SGS	<p><b>Baseline selection:</b> The DOE shall further substantiate the elimination of disposal of the waste at a landfill where landfill gas captured is flared (M2) in line with section II (baseline methodology) of AM0025 v11.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE shall further substantiate the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in line with paragraph</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				112 (c) of VVM v1.1, in particular, annual O&M cost (each element of the annual O&M cost should be validated separately), tipping fee, education tax, and city build tax.
28	3481	Tongchuan Shengwei Cement 15MW Waste Heat Recovery as Power Project	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>Input values:</b> The DOE should clarify how it has validated the input values to the investment analysis in line with VVM v1.1 paragraphs 110 and 113, in particular the electricity tariff, the total investment cost and the residual value applied.</p> <p><b>Sensitivity analysis:</b> The DOE should clarify how it has validated the sensitivity analysis in line with VVM v1.1 paragraph 110 (e).</p> <p><b>Investment analysis:</b> The DOE should clarify how it has validated the investment analysis in line with VVM v1.1 paragraph 112 (a) and (b), taking into account that the FSR document refers to a capacity of 7.5MW ("7.5 MW Pure Low Temperature Waste Heat Power Generation Project of Tongchuan Shengwei Building Materials Co., Ltd"), whereas the proposed project activity consists of 15MW for power generation.</p> <p><b>Common practice</b> In respect to the common practice analysis, the DOE should note that investment decision actually occurs when financial commitments are made, so it is not appropriate to refer to "investment decision" date in 2006 (which is related to the evidence regarding the prior consideration of CDM). In line with VVM v1.1 paragraph 119 and 120, the DOE should further validate the common practice analysis considering similar projects that might have been implemented during 2007.</p> <p><b>CAR 8,</b> The DOE should further clarify the resolution to CAR 8, in line with VVM v1.1 paragraph 39, as the information contained in the Validation Report in response to the CAR does not seem to address the Request raised by the DOE.</p>
29	3483	Bangkok Kamphaeng Saen West: Landfill Gas to Electricity Project	SGS	<p><b>Merge LoAs:</b> As this project has more than one PP authorized by the same Party, we would appreciate if you could combine the LoA files and upload them as one continuous pdf document under the same Party in the relevant section of the registration form (i.e., instead of choosing "Add a Party", please choose "Add a participant" under United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and ensure that all LoAs are combined into one pdf when uploaded. This ensures that statistics involving Parties in the CDM database are accurate.</p> <p><b>LoAs:</b> The DOE should include the procedures taken to confirm the authenticity of the LoAs in the validation report as required in the VVM (version 1.1) paragraph 49 (c).</p> <p><b>Baseline selection:</b> The DOE should provide further evidence on how it has considered the elimination of the alternatives to the baseline scenario suitable in line with the VVM (version 1.1) para. 82 - 84.</p> <p><b>Sources of evidence:</b> The DOE should provide a further description (e.g. date, parties involved) of all references used as evidence</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>during the validation process, especially for references 27, 28, 33 to 38, 43 and 51 to 53.</p> <p><b>Barrier:</b> The DOE shall further clarify the lack of access to capital as: (a) it does not directly relate to the project participants “Zenith Green Energy Co., Ltd.” and “Progress Energy Co., Ltd.”, and (b) “Acme Energy Development Company” received 25% of a loan and this is not the project participant. In doing so, please refer to EB50, Annex 13 paragraph 4 and VVM, paragraph 116.</p>
30	3486	Goiandira, Pedra do Garrafão, Pirapetinga and Sítio Grande Small Hydropower Plants Project Activity	SGS	<p><b>Benchmark:</b> The DOE is requested to validate the parameters used to calculate WACC, the benchmark for the investment analysis. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.1 paragraph 111.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE is requested to further validate the input values to the investment analysis, in particular, the plant load factor, the annual net power export, the electricity tariff, the total investment and the O&amp;M costs in line with VVM paragraphs 110 and 112. For the validation of the plant load factor, please refer to VVM paragraph 109. In doing so, please provide a list of the input values validated in the validation report.</p> <p><b>The PP/DOE are requested to provide a reproducible spreadsheet</b> for the WACC calculation and the investment analysis as some cells in the spreadsheet provided are not traceable. In doing so, please refer to paragraph 8 of the Guidance on the Assessment of Investment Analysis version 3. In addition, all information in the spreadsheet should be provided in English.</p> <p><b>Monitoring</b> It should be clarified in section B.7. of the PDD whether the power import from the grid is monitored to determine the net power export to the grid.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> Each plant should have individual monitoring parameters for the monitoring of the power generation, the net power export, the capacity and the area.</p>
31	3487	CDM Project Paragominas	SGS	<p><b>Baseline scenario:</b> The VR does not describe the steps taken to cross-check the information given in the PDD regarding the baseline scenario, as per VVM version 1.1 para 87. Further, the Validation Protocol highlights the possibility that the wood residues be sent to charcoal kilns.</p> <p><b>Baseline assumptions:</b> The DOE did not validate the determination of MCF according to the methodology para 22.</p>
32	3488	Inner-Mongolian Mengniu Aoya Biogas Power Project (1.36MW)	DNV	<p><b>Input values:</b> The DOE is requested to validate the input values, in particular the investment cost, O&amp;M costs and net power generated as it is not clear how they were verified. In doing so please refer to VVM v1.1 paragraphs 110 and 112 c.</p> <p><b>Monitoring plan:</b> The PP/DOE are requested to include the monitoring plan and validation opinion for the Nitrogen concentrations and COD in waste water/sludge disposed in line with the methodology requirements (ACM0010, page 24)) as the validation report (page 77)</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>mentions that the effluent from the lagoon and digester will be used to irrigate the nearby farmlands.</p> <p>The PP is requested to include <b>QA/QC procedures</b> for the monitored parameters in section B.7 of the PDD</p>
33	3491	Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Fusui Xinning Conch Cement Company Limited	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>Input values:</b> The DOE shall further substantiate the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in line with the paragraph 112 (c) of VVM v1.1, in particular, electricity tariff, total investment, O&amp;M cost, auxiliary consumption, interest rate, tax and additional surcharges, etc.</p> <p><b>Fcap</b> The DOE shall substantiate the validation of fcap calculation.</p> <p><b>Common practice</b> The DOE shall further substantiate the identification of the similar projects in line with the paragraph 118 - 120 of VVM v1.1, in particular, why common practice analysis has been limited to low temperature WHR technology implemented in dry-process cement production lines. The DOE shall further clarify the difference between: (i) the low temperature WHR technology and other WHR technologies; and (ii) dry-process cement production line and other cement production lines.</p> <p><b>Common practice</b> The DOE shall further clarify the essential distinction between the finance background of the project activity and that of the projects that have been financed by Joint venture Companies in line with the paragraph 118 - 120 of VVM v1.1.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> The DOE shall further clarify if the monitoring plan consists all monitoring parameters required as per the ACM0012 v3, in particular, why <math>Q_{wcm,h}</math>, <math>NCV_{WCM,y}</math>, <math>tw_{cm,h}</math>, &amp;#951;Project plant,j are not monitored.</p> <p><b>Baseline selection:</b> The PP/DOE shall further substantiate that the waste heat utilized in the project activity was released into the atmosphere in the absence of the project activity at existing facility with detailed information in line with the applicability criteria of the methodology.</p>
34	3495	West Kalimantan Biomass Co-Generation Project	TÜV Nord	<p><b>Input values:</b> The VR does not contain information on how the input values to the investment analysis have been validated, in particular: (1) biomass cost; (2) miscellaneous cost of coal fired cogen plant; (3) water treatment plant for coal fired boiler; (4) diesel price; (5) auxiliary diesel consumption in the project activity, and its consistency (650,250 liter/year in the spreadsheet, and 205,880 (for transport) and 30,084 (onsite consumption) in the PDD); (6) the cost for genset overhaul in the baseline and project activity, given that genset overhaul is another alternative to the project activity (Scenario B); (7) the exclusion of annual O&amp;M cost incurred in scenario B; (8) higher diesel cost in the construction period for project activity compared to the baseline scenario (Scenario C); (9) the exclusion of salvage value in Scenario B.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p><b>Investment analysis:</b> The DOE has not justified that the discount factor used in the investment analysis is in line with the guidance.</p> <p><b>The monitoring</b> of moisture content which is required by the methodology is missing.</p> <p><b>Start date:</b> The DOE has not demonstrated that the start date is the earliest date of real action.</p> <p><b>CAR B18</b> was not properly closed as the concern raised by the DOE, whether the use of interest rate as the discount factor is in line with the EB guidance, has not been addressed as the PP only responded that it is in line with the method stipulated by the Central Bank of Indonesia.</p> <p><b>CL A4</b> was not properly closed given that the PDD has not indicated whether the PP is a private or public entity.</p> <p><b>Inconsistency</b> in the information on pre-treatment system, where the spreadsheet mentions that diesel will be used for that purpose, while the PDD page 51 mentions that the power will be used.<sup>9</sup></p> <p><b>The MoC</b> indicates 2 PPs while the other documents indicate only one. Please clarify. Annex 5 of the PDD is <b>blank</b>.</p>
35	3498	Waste Gas for Power Generation in Fugu County Yuchao Coal Electricity Chemical Industry Co., Ltd.	ERM CVS	<p><b>Input values:</b> The DOE shall further substantiate the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in line with the paragraph 112 (c) of VVM v1.1, in particular, plant load factor, total investment, O&amp;M cost, auxiliary consumption, income tax, surtax, etc</p> <p><b>Fcap</b> The DOE shall substantiate the validation of fcap calculation.</p> <p><b>Monitoring plan</b> The DOE shall further clarify if the monitoring plan consists all monitoring parameters required as per the ACM0012 v3.2, in particular, why <math>Q_{wcm,h}</math>, <math>NCV_{WCM,y}</math>, <math>tw_{cm,h}</math>, &amp;#951;Project plant,j are not monitored.</p> <p><b>Baseline alternatives:</b> The DOE shall further substantiate the exclusion of: (i) waste energy is sold as an energy source (W3), in particular, how it has confirmed that waste gas neither can be used to meet residential energy demand nor have a price; and (ii) a portion of the waste gas produced at the facility is captured and used for captive electricity generation (W5) and captive electricity generation using waste energy (P7), in particular, how W5 and P7 have been eliminated due to a condition applied for another alternative (all electricity generated in the project activity should be exported to the grid company as per the Electricity supplying Intent Agreement between the project participant and the electricity supplying company) given that this particular condition may not apply for W5 and P7.</p> <p><b>Baseline</b> The DOE shall further substantiate how the project participant makes sure that amount of waste gas used in the baseline will remain unaffected by the implementation of the project activity.</p>
36	3506	Zhangping Hongshi Cement	DNV	<p><b>Baseline selection:</b> The DOE should further</p>





		<b>Waste Heat Recovery Project</b>	<p>clarify how it has validated that the exhaust gas from the SP boiler can meet the waste heat demand to preheat raw material and fuel in the project scenario. Further the PP and the DOE shall provide the waste heat demand for preheating raw materials and fuel in the baseline and project scenarios.</p> <p><b>Baseline scenario</b> The DOE should further substantiate the applicability of the methodology, in particular, how it has validated that waste heat is used in the baseline scenario within the energy balance boundary of the clinker making process in line with AM0024 v2.1. For both the baseline and the project activity, the specific fuel consumption of the clinker line per unit output of clinker should be provided.</p> <p><b>Baseline scenario</b> The DOE should further substantiate the identification of the technically feasible alternatives in line with step 1 of identification of the baseline scenario of AM0024 v2.1, in particular, identification of the alternatives that normally use for waste heat in the cement production process in the local context, which would be replaced by the project activity.</p> <p><b>Baseline scenario</b> The DOE should further substantiate on the validation of the current electricity supply and demand baseline in line with step 1, Identification of the baseline scenario of AM0024 v2.1, in particular, why the electricity demand of the cement works (ECEMENT) has not been included in the Project Design Document for at least two years prior to the start date of the project activity.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE should further substantiate the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in line with the paragraph 112 (c) of VVM v1.1, in particular, life time of the project activity, total investment, annual O&amp;M cost, and auxiliary consumption.</p> <p><b>Common practice analysis</b> The DOE should further substantiate the identification of the similar projects in line with the paragraph 118 - 120 of VVM v1.1, in particular, why common practice analysis has been limited to low temperature power generation systems implemented in advanced CP lines. The DOE shall further clarify the difference between: (i) the advanced CP lines and other cement production lines; and (ii) low temperature power generation systems and other power generation systems.</p> <p><b>Monitoring plan</b> The DOE should further substantiate whether the monitoring plan includes all monitoring parameters as required by the monitoring methodology, AM0024 v2.1, in particular, PE<sub>y</sub>, COE<sub>fuel,y</sub>, OXID<sub>fuel</sub>, EIB, FB, Oclinker,B, EIP<sub>y</sub>, etc.</p>
--	--	------------------------------------	---



## CDM – Executive Board

37	3519	Inner Mongolia Wudaogou III Wind Power Project	DNV	Further details regarding the <b>common practice</b> should be provided in accordance with the requirements of step 4 of the additionality tool, i.e. similar project activities should be described and the differences between each of these activities and the project should be clearly indicated (both in the PDD and VR).
38	3522	Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Xuancheng Conch Cement Company Limited	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>Input values</b> Lack of validation of the input values to the investment analysis in line with the paragraph 112 (c) of VVM v1.1, in particular, electricity tariff, total investment, O&amp;M cost, auxiliary consumption, interest rate, tax and additional surcharges, etc.</p> <p><b>Fcap</b> Lack of validation of fcap calculation.</p> <p><b>Common practice</b> Lack of validation of the identification of the similar projects in line with the paragraph 118 - 120 of VVM v1.1, in particular, why common practice analysis has been limited to low temperature WHR technology implemented in dry-process cement production lines. The DOE shall further clarify the difference between: (i) the low temperature WHR technology and other WHR technologies; and (ii) dry-process cement production line and other cement production lines.</p> <p><b>Monitoring plan</b> No clarification if the monitoring plan consists all monitoring parameters required as per the ACM0012 v3, in particular, why <math>Q_{wcm,h}</math>, <math>NCV_{WCM,y}</math>, <math>tw_{cm,h}</math>, &amp;#951;Project plant,j are not monitored.</p>
39	3526	Inner Mongolia Hailisu Phase I Wind Farm Project	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>Input values:</b> The DOE is requested to further validate the amount of net power export to the grid as it is not clear how it validated the difference in the power generation (102,465 MWh) and the net export (100,415.7 MWh). In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.1 paragraph 110 a.</p> <p><b>Common practice</b> The DOE is requested to further validate the common practice analysis in line with VVM version 1.1 paragraph 119 b. In doing so, please provide the list of projects considered in the assessment and explain the credibility of the source of the information.</p> <p><b>Monitoring</b> The PP/ DOE are requested to clarify if the monitoring of the net power export accounts for both power export to the grid and power import from the grid. Such information should be added to section B.7. of the PDD.</p> <p><b>Geo-coordinate</b> of the project site should be provided in the project view page.</p>
40	3532	Song Chung Hydropower Project	TÜV Nord	<p><b>Spreadsheets</b> The PP/DOE are requested to submit the investment analysis and "Return on Equity" spreadsheets with readable formulas, in line with the requirements of EB 51 annex 58 paragraph 8.</p> <p><b>Monitoring</b> The PP/DOE are requested to clarify if the description of the parameter "Electricity supplied by the national grid to the proposed hydropower plant in year y" will be calculated by subtracting <math>E_{Gy,import,110kV}</math> and <math>E_{Gy,import,35kV}</math> from <math>E_{Gy,export}</math>; as described in Section B.7.1 of the PDD.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

41	3534	Inner Mongolia Tongliao Baolongshan 49.5MW Wind Power Project	TUEV Rheinland	<p><b>Baseline assumption</b> The PP/ DOE are requested to apply emission factor calculated based on the most recent data available at the commencement of the second GSC (15 May 2008).</p> <p><b>Input values:</b> The DOE is requested to further validate the annual O&amp;M costs in line with VVM version 1.1 paragraphs 110 and 112 c. In doing so, please provide the validation on the composition of the O&amp;M costs.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE is requested to further validate the annual power generation and the PLF in line with VVM version 1.1 paragraphs 110 and 112 c. For the validation of PLF, please refer to EB 48 Annex 11 paragraph 3.</p>
42	3536	Beijing Yanqing Low Wind-speed Pilot Windpower Project	TUEV Rheinland	<p><b>Spreadsheet:</b> The IRR in the PDD and the spreadsheet is -3.95% while it is 3.82% in the Validation Report. Please clarify the inconsistency.</p>
43	3542	Sichuan Guang'an Caishandong Coal Mine CMM Power Generation Project	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>Input values</b> The DOE is requested to clarify how it validated the VAT rate of 17%, the plant load factor, net power export to the grid, quantity of the heat recovered and the heat price. In addition, the DOE is requested to explain how the heat recovery is accounted for in the IRR calculation. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.1 paragraphs 110 and 112. For the validation of the plant load factor, please refer to VVM version 1.1 paragraph 109. Please present the input values validated in the validation report.</p> <p><b>CL17</b> The DOE is requested to explain how the clarification request 17 regarding the ex-ante calculation of emission reduction in page A-42 of the validation report was resolved.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> The pre-mining CMM and post-mining CMM should be monitored individually as per ACM 0008 version 6 page 41-42.</p> <p><b>Geo-coordinate</b> Please provide geo-coordinate of the project site on the project view page.</p>
44	3545	Yanapampa Hydroelectric Power Plant	AENOR	<p><b>MoC:</b> DEUMAN S.L as a project participant of the project activity has withdrew according to the validation report. But this company is still included as a focal point in the MOC.</p> <p><b>MoC:</b> The date of submission in the MOC is blank.</p> <p><b>Spreadsheet</b> The DOE shall provide the IRR calculation spreadsheet mentioned in CAR 3, in line with EB48 Annex 60, 8(g)and 9(b).</p>
45	3547	Yunnan Luquan Hayi River 4th and 5th Level Hydropower Stations	CEC	<p><b>Benchmark</b> The DOE should further substantiate the suitability of the applied benchmark in line with step 2 of the Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality, in particular, how the DOE has validated that the benchmark of 10% can be applied for the project activity which has installed capacity higher than 25 MW.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE should further substantiate the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis for each project separately in line with paragraph 112 (c ) of VVM v1.1, in particular, electricity efficient factor, line loss rate, and total investment.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p><b>Common practice</b> The DOE should further substantiate the common practice analysis in line with the paragraph 120 of VVM v1.1, in particular, assessment of essential distinctions between the proposed CDM project activity and the other similar activities.</p>
46	3548	Xiangtang xia 10 MW Hydropower Project in Qinghai Province, the People's Republic of China	DNV	<p><b>Input values</b> The DOE is requested to further validate the input values to the investment analysis, in particular, the plant load factor, the annual net power export, the difference in the amount of power exported and generated, the total investment and the O&amp;M costs in line with VVM paragraphs 110 and 112. For the validation of the plant load factor, please refer to VVM paragraph 109. In doing so, please provide a list of the input values validated in the validation report. Please merge two sets of letter of Approval from the donor country into one file.</p>
47	3552	Dak Rung 1 Hydropower Project	DNV	<p><b>Input values</b> The PP/ DOE are requested to include the assumption made for the investment analysis in the PDD. In addition, the DOE is requested to further validate the input values to the investment analysis, in particular, the annual net power export, the total investment, the O&amp;M costs and the electricity tariff in line with VVM paragraphs 110 and 112. For the validation of the plant load factor, please refer to VVM paragraph 109. In doing so, please provide a list of the input values validated in the validation report.</p> <p><b>Reproducible spreadsheet</b> The PP/DOE are requested to provide a reproducible spreadsheet for the investment analysis as some cells in the spreadsheet provided are not traceable. For example, it is not clear what row 9 and 14 in sheet "Npv w-o cers - 6MW" of Appendix 3, which are used in the net operating profit after tax, indicates as row 9 does not contain any information and cell K14 and L14 do not contain equation while M14 multiplies the "interest expense" with the corporate tax rate. Furthermore, it is not clear how the values in the "parameter" sheet are derived, for example, the estimated power generation, the interest expense, the resource tax among others. In doing so, please refer to paragraph 8 of the Guidance on the Assessment of Investment Analysis version 3.</p> <p><b>Benchmark</b> The DOE is requested to clarify the suitability of the equation and the parameters used in the WACC calculation, in particular, how the tax is considered in the benchmark. In doing so, please refer to paragraph 5 of the Guidance on the Assessment of Investment Analysis version 3.</p> <p><b>Expired meth</b> The PP/DOE are advised to update the version of the methodology as AMS-I.D version 13 expiry dates was 30 March 2010.</p>
48	3553	Grid Connected Wind Electricity Generation Project in Karnataka	RINA	<p><b>Prior consideration</b> The DOE shall further substantiate how it has validated that the CDM benefits were considered necessary in the decision to undertake the project as a proposed CDM project activity in line with</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>paragraphs 97-103 of VVM, in particular, consideration of the CDM benefits for 1.25 MW wind power plant.</p> <p><b>Monitoring plan</b> shall include the monitoring of relevant parameters for each project in the bundle separately as per the monitoring methodology.</p> <p><b>Certificates of the validation team members</b> should be added to validation report and submit single validation report which includes all the information.</p>
49	3557	Ngoi Hut 1 Hydropower Project	DNV	<p><b>CL3</b> According to the spreadsheet submitted, the IRR reaches the benchmark with a variation of -10% in the total investment, and a +10% variation in the tariff and electricity generation. However, the VR, CL3 has been closed as "The sensitivity analysis conducted on investment, generation and tariff shows that the benchmark is not reached at 10% variation, as stipulated by Decision NO.709 QD-NLDK." Please submit consistent references throughout.</p>
50	3560	Hunan Dongkou Small-scale Hydropower Bundled Project of China	TUEV-SUED	<p><b>The Bundle Form</b> submitted for the request for registration appears to correspond to the PDD uploaded for GSC. Please clarify.</p> <p><b>Consistency</b> The date of the construction contract for the 4th plant is reported as 07/07/2007. However, the validation report ref no. 81 mentions it as 07/03/2007. Please clarify.</p>
51	3570	Alto Tuluá Minor Hydroelectric Power Plant	AENOR	<p><b>CDM prior consideration</b> The PDD shall include a timetable indicating all the relevant information regarding the development of the project itself and the main events related to the CDM development of the project.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE is requested to validate in detail the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis at the time of investment decision. In doing so, each main parameter involved in the IRR calculation shall be assessed against information pertaining to the project itself or, if not available, based on relevant host country information. Please note that since an investment comparison analysis is used in PDD, the DOE shall validate separately the suitability of input values for both scenarios (fuel-fired power plant and the proposed project activity).</p> <p><b>Benchmark</b> The DOE is requested to provide the spreadsheets used to calculate the benchmark (12.59%).</p> <p><b>Common practice</b> The DOE shall substantiate why the common practice analysis has been limited to a 10-20 MW capacity when the project activity has 20 MW as indicated in the PDD. The DOE shall also indicate on which ground the 10 hydroelectric power plants built until 2003 are left out of the common practice analysis.</p>
52	3580	Silau-2 small hydro power plant in North Sumatera Province, Indonesia	BVCH	<p><b>Barrier:</b> The PDD page 11 states: "The project participant has indicated the project activity suffered from investment barrier and barrier due to prevailing practice". However, the barrier due to prevailing practice is not</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>discussed in the PDD nor in the Validation Report.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE is requested to validate the following input values used in the investment analysis: (a) operating expenses and electricity generation in line with the requirements of the VVM v.1.01 paragraphs 110 (a) and; (b) plant load factor, in line with the requirements of EB 48 Annex 11.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> According to the information presented in the PDD Sections B.7.1 and B.7.2, it is not clear if/how the project participant will measure the net electricity exported to the grid.</p>
53	3581	Sichuan Lengshuikou 12.1 MW Small-Scale Bundled Hydropower Project	DNV	<p><b>SSC-Bundle form</b> The PP/DOE are requested to submit the corresponding SSC-Bundle form .</p> <p><b>Spreadsheet</b> The PP/DOE are requested to submit the investment analysis spreadsheet for Stage 1, as the one submitted contains information regarding Stage 3.</p> <p><b>Consistency</b> For stage 2, the investment analysis spreadsheet indicates a value for the “fixed asset investment” of 14,797,700 RMB while the PDD states a figure of 15,297,700 RMB. Please kindly clarify and submit consistent references throughout.</p> <p><b>Consistency</b> For stage 3, the investment analysis spreadsheet indicates a value for the “fixed asset investment” of 19,469,400 RMB while the PDD states a figure of 19,669,400 RMB. Please kindly clarify and submit consistent references throughout.</p> <p><b>Additionality</b> The PP/DOE are requested to submit the corresponding investment and sensitivity analyses for the “aggregated” or “combined” assessment.</p>
54	3585	Grid-connected Electricity Generation from Biomass at Advance Biopower	BVCH	<p><b>Baseline:</b> The DOE is requested to validate the competing use of biomass as per the General guidance on leakage in biomass project activities (Version 03). In doing so, it should also assess the baseline of the biomass residue, e.g., how the biomass waste / residues was being handled.</p> <p><b>Barrier:</b> The DOE is requested to further validate the technological barrier in line with the requirements of VVM paragraph 116 (a).</p> <p><b>Input values</b> It is not clear how the DOE validated the calculation of the net electricity generated by the renewable unit, as the capacity used in the formula is 8MW while the capacity of the plant has been validated as 9.5MW.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE is requested to further validate the “net electricity generated” used in the investment analysis, in line with the requirements of VVM paragraph 110 (a).</p>
55	3586	3 MW Wind Power Project by Jalaram Ceramics at Bhachau in Kutch, Gujarat	DNV	<p><b>Input values</b> The DOE is requested to clarify the sources of the input values applied to the investment analysis in line with paragraph 6 of the latest guideline on the assessment of investment analysis as some of the parameters are referred to the PDR completed in 2005 while others are referred to more recent sources, in particular, the power price and the</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>total investment. For the total investment, please clarify if there is a difference in the cost proposed by NEG Micon (India) Pvt Ltd. at the time of the investment decision and the offer made by Vestas India.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE is requested to clarify the inclusion of the cost of financing in the IRR calculation. In doing so, please refer to paragraph 9 of the latest guideline on the assessment of investment analysis.</p> <p><b>Benchmark</b> DOE is requested to explain the suitability of applying CAPM (capital asset pricing model) while the project is financed 75% by debt and 25% equity. In doing so, please refer to paragraphs 12 to 15 of the latest guidance on the assessment of investment analysis.</p> <p><b>Benchmark</b> The DOE is requested to clarify the applied risk free return rate as in the PDD it is indicated as 5.96% while it is 5.94% in the validation report.</p> <p><b>Baseline assumption</b> The DOE is requested to clarify the difference in the grid emission factor in the PDD submitted for GSC (0.89 tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh) and the value in the PDD submitted for request for registration (0.9 tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh).</p> <p><b>Monitoring</b> The PP/ DOE are requested to clarify if the monitoring of the net power export accounts for both power export to the grid and power import from the grid. Such information should be added to section B.7. of the PDD.</p>
56	3592	Hubei Xishan & Fengjiawan 14.1MW Small-scale Hydro Power Bundle Project	TUEV Rheinland	<p><b>Input values</b> The DOE shall further substantiate the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis for each project separately in line with paragraph 112 (c ) of VVM v1.1, in particular, total investment, depreciation, tax on city building, tax on education, etc</p> <p><b>Starting date</b> The DOE shall further substantiate the suitability of the assumed starting dates of the project activity, 02/11/2005 (Xishan Project) and 15/11/2006 (Fengjiawan Project), given that the development rights of the Xishan and Fengjiawan Projects have been obtained 25/08/2003 and 9/02/2006 respectively.</p> <p><b>Baseline assumption</b> In page 37 of the PDD, it is mentioned that the emission factors of South China Power Grid have been taken in calculating the emission reduction whereas the other pages of the PDD and the validation report have indicated that the emission factors of Central China Power Grid have been taken in calculating the emission reduction. Please clarify this inconsistency.</p>
57	3596	Huaneng Wuchuan Lihanliang Phase I Wind Farm Project	BVCH	<p><b>Common practice</b> Further details regarding the common practice should be provided in accordance with the requirements of step 4 of the additionality tool, i.e. similar project activities should be described and the differences between each of these activities and the project should be clearly indicated.</p> <p><b>Geo-coordinates</b> Please input the geo-coordinates on the project view page.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

58	3602	Energy Efficiency measure at Grasim, Kotputli.	SGS	<p><b>Project description</b> The DOE shall provide clear validation opinion regarding the accuracy and completeness of the project description, in line with VVM v 01.1, para. 64 (b).</p> <p><b>Authenticity of the LoA</b> The DOE shall provide validation opinion regarding the authenticity of the LoA, in line with VVM v 01.1, para. 49 (c).</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE should further validate the suitability of input values used in the calculation of the WACC, in particular the risk premium, the risk free rate and the cost of debt, in line with VVM v 01.1, para. 110 (a)-(c).</p> <p><b>Baseline alternative</b> The DOE should further substantiate how the baseline alternative 2) has been excluded, in line with VVM v01.1, para. 82.</p>
59	3622	Biogas Plant at United Plantations Berhad, UIE Palm Oil Mill	DNV	<p><b>Barrier analysis</b> The VR does not contain an overall determination of the credibility of the barrier analysis presented, as highlighted in the validation protocol page A-16.</p> <p><b>Baseline and monitoring</b> The DOE has not determined if the baseline and monitoring methodologies are correctly applied, in particular paragraph 17 and 36 of the methodology regarding respectively the use of historical data and the measurement of biogas temperature and pressure.</p>
60	3623	Shuangpai County Yongjiang Cascade Hydropower Project, Hunan, P.R. China	CEC	<p><b>MoC:</b> Two focal points were appointed with the sole role for all the authority.</p> <p><b>Project description:</b> The VR does not contain the DOE's opinion of the accuracy and completeness of the project description.</p> <p><b>Project boundary</b> The VR has not described how the validation of the project boundary has been carried out.</p>
61	3628	4.8MW Qingfeng Small Hydropower Project, Shengzhou, China	BVCH	<p><b>Input values:</b> The DOE is requested to further validate the following input parameters to the investment analysis in line with VVM version 1.1 paragraph 112 c: the static investment, the O&amp;M costs, the PLF and the effective electricity coefficient. In doing so, please clearly indicate the values validated.</p> <p><b>Baseline assumption:</b> The DOE is requested to validate the source of data and the date of publication of the source used to calculate the grid emission factor. In doing so, please clarify whether it is a set of data that was the most recent at the commencement of GSC.</p>
62	3629	Factory energy efficiency improvement in ceramic Kiln fuel usage in Indonesia	LRQA	<p><b>Inconsistencies</b> The DOE should revise the inconsistencies related to the emission reductions between the validation report/PDD (6,789) and the project view page (6,897).</p> <p><b>Baseline assumption</b> The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on the remaining operational lifetime considered for the afterburners in line with the "Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment" EB50, Annex 15.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis, including complete references and sources, in line with the requirements of the VVM para.</p>





## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>110.</p> <p><b>Barrier</b> The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on the technological barrier and the barrier due to the prevailing practice in line with the VVM para 115 and 116. In doing so, the DOE should provide information on the level of technology risk, the extent of penetration of RTO systems in the country/region; and whether there are industrial processes with similar or comparable technologies to the project activity that have replaced conventional after burner systems by RTO systems in the country/region.</p> <p><b>Baseline assumption</b> The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on the appropriateness of the historical fuel consumption calculated for the afterburners of KILNs 1, 2 and 3, in line with the requirements of the VVM para. 83.</p>
63	3639	KDC MILL 1 AND MILL 2 BIOGAS PROJECT	SIRIM	<p><b>Input values</b> The validation report does not describe how the input values to the investment analysis are appropriate, particularly: (a) diesel quantity saved, which is assumed to be due to 80% displacement of 921,315 Litres of diesel/year without justification; (b) lower diesel price of 1.70 MYR/L in comparison to last 10 years historical price of 2.6 MYR/L (PDD, p22); (c) biomass quantity sales price (130 MYR/ ton); (d) investment cost and its break-up; and (e) inflation of 3% as is only applied to maintenance cost and salaries and not on other parameters.</p> <p><b>Sensitivity analysis</b> The sensitivity analysis has not been carried out on other critical parameters such as quantity of diesel saved and biomass sold and the DOE has not justified the exclusion.</p> <p><b>Applicability</b> The DOE has not validated the applicability of the methodology and compliance to paragraph 5 of AMS-I.A v13, as the capacity of the existing biomass power plant (VR, p A-33) is not mentioned and the DOE has not confirmed whether the total capacity of renewable electricity generation is within the limit of 15 MW.</p> <p><b>Inconsistency:</b> The DOE (p14) confirms that 80% of the diesel will be displaced and the diesel savings in the spread sheets are calculated accordingly, which is contradicting the PDD (p36) where 100% of the diesel consumed is used to determine ex-ante forecast of emission reductions.</p> <p><b>Input values:</b> The DOE has not validated the residual lifetime of the existing diesel generator sets and therefore it is not clear if the existing diesel generator sets would be replaced prior to the expiry of the crediting period.</p> <p><b>Monitoring plan</b> The monitoring plan in the PDD does not mention monitoring of specific fuel consumption of biomass, including biogas, and the validation report and the PDD does not describe how the requirements of paragraph 16 and 19 of AMS-I.A v13 is complied.</p> <p><b>Inconsistently</b> The capacity of biogas engine</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				generator is inconsistently mentioned in the document. E.g. PDD mentions it as 1.5 MW whereas the validation report (page A-5) mentions it to be 2 MW.
64	3642	Wind Power based electricity generation project in India by DLF Home Developers Limited	BVCH	<p><b>Input values</b> The validation report does not sufficiently describe how they have considered that the input values are appropriate, in particular the: (a) fixed electricity tariff as other similar project in the region applies annual escalation on tariff (project No. 3533) and the DOE has not confirmed the tariff on the basis of PPA; (b) application of annual escalation on O&amp;M cost only and not on other input values; and (c) applied income tax as other similar projects (project No. 2947) applies tax holiday for first 10 years. In validating this, the DOE is requested to crosscheck the input values as required by paragraphs 110 (b) and (c) of VVM (version 1.1), given that the project was already commissioned at the time of validation.</p> <p><b>Sensitivity analysis</b> The validation report does not describe the sensitivity analysis for the project in Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu corresponding to the final capacity (67.5 MW) and the initial capacity (106.5 MW), particularly for the investment cost and the tariff. The validation report (page 24) mentions that only PLF and O&amp;M cost were considered for sensitivity analysis because the Tariff is expected to remain constant for Rajasthan. However, the DOE has not justified this. In validating this the DOE should describe the impact of variations in all the critical parameters (PLF, Tariff, investment cost and O&amp;M cost) corresponding to both the initial and current capacity covering both sites at Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu or justify the exclusion.</p> <p><b>Common practice analysis</b> In validating common practice analysis, the validation report does not describe how the selected criteria to determine similar projects in the region is appropriate, given that projects implemented prior to 2001 are not considered. The validation report does not describe how they have concluded that the project is not a common practice, given that no details are provided on the common practice analysis for the project site in Rajasthan and CAR 17 has been closed inappropriately.</p>
65	3643	Proactiva Tlalnepantla Landfill Gas to Energy project	TUEV Rheinland	<p><b>Benchmark</b> The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark of 16.06%; risk free cost of 7.49% and 8.57%, in line with VVM version 1.1 paragraph 111.</p> <p><b>IRR</b> The DOE is requested to report whether the IRR is calculated as before tax or post tax, whether it is project or equity IRR. In doing so, please refer to the latest guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis paragraphs 5 and 11.</p>



				<p><b>Input values</b> The DOE is requested to report the input values used in the investment analysis such as the capital investment, the O&amp;M costs, the net power export, the power sales price, the cost of heat, amount of heat displaced among other values that impact the cash flow in line with VVM version 1.1 paragraph 110 and 112 (c). This should include the values used in the IRR calculation.</p> <p><b>Source of evidence</b> The DOE is requested to report the source and the date of the reference, "pre-feasibility report". In doing so, please refer to the latest guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis paragraph 6.</p> <p><b>Baseline assumption:</b> The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the ex-ante emission reduction calculation, in particular, the validation of the parameters used such as methane destruction efficiency among others. In doing so, please refer to ACM 0001 version 9, tool to determine methane emissions avoided from disposal of waste at a solid waste disposal site, and tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane.</p> <p><b>Monitoring plan</b> The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the monitoring plan, in particular, if all parameters which are required to be monitored by AMC 0001 ver9, the latest tools to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption and determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane including the amount of organic waste, the fraction of each waste type disposed and methane destruction efficiency of each destruction equipment employed by the project activity. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.1 paragraph 123 (a), ACM 0001 version 9, tool to determine methane emissions avoided from disposal of waste at a solid waste disposal site, and tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane.</p> <p><b>Project description</b> The DOE is requested to clarify the project description; if the landfill is still accepting waste or it is a closed landfill. Please also include the exact location of the project site in the validation report. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.1 paragraph 64.</p>
66	3649	Sungsan Wind Power Project	KEMCO	<p><b>MoC</b> Please kindly submit a dated MoC.</p> <p><b>Curriculum vitae</b> Please kindly submit the curriculum vitae of Hoon-Goo Lee (verifier), as it is not annexed in the Validation Report.</p> <p><b>IRR calculation</b> The DOE did not confirm in its Validation Report: (a) the results of the IRR calculation with and without CDM revenues; (b) the figure of the tariff applied in the investment analysis and (c); the figures of the emission factors calculated. Moreover, the PDD mentions a tariff of 76 won/kWh while the investment analysis uses a value of 76.17.</p> <p><b>Input values:</b> In the submitted PDD, the value of O&amp;M cost including tax is 1,269 million won while the value in investment analysis is 2.5%</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>of the total investment. Please submit consistent references throughout. Moreover the DOE is requested to further validate the O&amp;M costs in line with the requirements of the VVM v1.01, paragraphs 110 (a) and (d).</p> <p><b>Baseline assumption:</b> The DOE should further validate the sources used in order to calculate the grid emission factor, as the VR refers to 2006 IPCC Guidelines while the PDD to IPCC 1996 Revised Guideline and Annex 3 of the PDD mentions that Statistics of Electric Power in KOREA from year 2008 has been used.</p> <p><b>Crediting period</b> The PP and DOE are requested to confirm that the crediting period will not start prior to the date of registration.</p> <p><b>Common practice</b> The DOE is requested to further validate the common practice analysis, in line with the VVM v.1.01 requirements, paragraphs 119 (b) and (c) and 120 (b) and (c), as it is not clear which projects are similar to the proposed one and the essential distinctions between them and the proposed project activity.</p>
67	3656	Bionersis LFG projects Colombia 4 (Cucuta & Manizales)	SQS	<p><b>LoA:</b> The DOE is requested to explain the involvement of UK in the project activity as the LoA of UK is mentioned in page 7 of the validation report while UK LoA is not uploaded and the involvement of UK is not mentioned either in the PDD, the project view page or any other submitted documents.</p> <p><b>Input values:</b> The DOE is requested to clarify how it validated the investment analysis as the parameters validated do not correspond to the parameters listed in page 10 of the PDD submitted for request for registration. The DOE should also clarify why the revenue from power generation is mentioned in the validation report while the project activity flares all collected LFG. In addition, the DOE should clarify why the project cost breakdown in the PDD submitted for GSC (page 9) differs from the one in the PDD submitted for request for registration (page 10).</p> <p><b>Geo-coordinates</b> The PP/ DOE are requested to revise the geo-coordinates on the project view page as it does not match the PDD and the validation report;(8°01'1",72°30'56") should be (8.017, 72.516) and (5°04'52", 75°30'22") should be (5.081,75.506) when expressed in decimal form.</p>
68	3666	Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Anhui Digang Conch Cement Company Limited	DNV	<p><b>Spreadsheets</b> The DOE has submitted two investment analysis spreadsheets with two different IRR values for the same project (15.17% and 15.09%). Please clarify.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE should indicate how it has validated each one of the input values used to calculate the benchmark and that these values are available at the time of investment decision. The answer shall be in line with VVM version 1.1 paragraph 111. Also, the benchmark calculation spreadsheet should be provided.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

69	3669	Rodeio Bonito Small Hydro Power Project	DNV	<p><b>LoA</b> The DOE should include the procedures taken to confirm the authenticity of the LoAs in the validation report as required in the VVM paragraph 49 (c).</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on the input values to the investment analysis, including detailed information on the evidence used to crosscheck their suitability in line with the VVM para. 110.</p> <p><b>Sensitivity analysis</b> The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on why the variations in the parameters that would make the IRR reach the benchmark, in particular, the total investment and the electricity tariff, are not likely to occur in line with the VVM para. 110 (e).</p> <p><b>Barriers:</b> The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on the “other barriers” considered for the project activity in line with the VVM para.116 and the “Attachment A to Appendix B of the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities”.</p>
70	3670	CECIC HKC Gansu Changma Wind Power project	TUEV Rheinland	<p><b>Investment analysis</b> The PDD section C.1.1 indicates that the project will commence operating in January 2010 and the project starting date is defined by the PP, and validated by the DOE, to be 19 May 2008 which is the equipment purchase date. It can be seen that the period of time between the starting date of the project activity (May 2008) and the date when the project starts operating (January 2010) is less than two years (1 year 8 months) and 2 years 4 months until it has its full capacity installed (September 2010). The DOE should indicate how it has validated that in the investment analysis the project begins to partially produce electricity in year 3 and fully produce electricity only in year 4 and onwards.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE should indicate how it has validated the suitability of input values to the investment analysis, in particular: (i) the O&amp;M cost, the O&amp;M composition and, if applicable, its economies of scale; (ii) O&amp;M increase through the investment analysis period when the other values remain fixed; and (iii) zero residual value.</p>
71	3687	Sichuan Shuanghekou 18MW Hydropower Project	TUEV Rheinland	<p><b>Common practice</b> The DOE has not substantially validated the common practice analysis in line with VVM v 01.1, para. 120 (c), in particular: a) Why the project activity has higher investment costs than other non-CDM projects of the region (Shazui Hydro Project and Niujiaowan Level 3 Hydro Project);b) Why the IRR of the Tongkou Hydro Project is 18%, whereas the project activity is lower.</p> <p><b>Starting date of the first crediting period</b> In the Section C.2.1.1 of the PDD (page 30) it is not mentioned that the starting date of the first crediting period will be from the date of registration.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

72	3700	13.75 MW wind power project in Davangere, Karnataka, India.	SGS	<p><b>Input values</b> The Validation Report page 13 states that the project cost has been checked with the proposals from the equipment supplier which was available at the time of conceptualization of the project activity and also the purchase order. Please provide more details on the values of project cost validated as per VVM 1.1., paragraph 113 (a) and (c). Also provide details on the O &amp; M costs and other input values to the investment analysis.</p>
73	3705	Combustion of biomass residue for process steam generation in the manufacture of soluble coffee, replacing fuel oil, at CIA. IGUAÇU DE CAFÉ SOLÚVEL	BVCH	<p><b>Lack of technical competence:</b> Section 3.4 Project description, section 3.5 Baseline and monitoring methodology and section 3.7 Monitoring Plan of Validation Report should be an independent assessment of the DOE instead of a copy paste of the PDD.</p> <p><b>Baseline</b> The DOE should indicate how it has validated the amount of coffee sludge and &amp;#951;BL, Thermal used in the baseline scenario.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE should indicate how it has validated the suitability of the biomass price, O&amp;M cost, the cost savings due to the fuel switch and the total investment at the time of investment decision. Also, the suitability and conservativeness of zero residual value should be substantiated.</p> <p><b>CERs</b> The DOE should indicate how it has validated that project emissions due to consumption of electric power does not need to be considered. Please notice that the VR indicates in page 22 that the "O&amp;M cost... consist of variable costs (related to electricity consumption of the boiler) and fixed costs (such as labour, electricity...)".</p> <p><b>Baseline</b> The DOE should indicate how it has validated if there is a surplus of the biomass in the region of the project activity which is not utilized at least 25% larger than the quantity of biomass that is utilized. The answer should be in line with the "General guidance on leakage in biomass project activities" (Version 03) paragraph 18 guidance.</p> <p><b>Monitoring Plan</b> The DOE should indicate how it has validated the suitability of the Monitoring Plan. Also, it should indicate the validated NCV and the proportion of each type of biomass to be used.</p>
74	3716	Beijing Deqingyuan Chicken Farm 2.4MW Biogas Power Project	DNV	<p><b>Inconsistencies:</b> The DOE/PP are requested to verify the digester designed volume as the PDD (page 5) shows a volume of 2150 m3 per unit while validation report (page 11) shows a design volume of 18,000 m3. In doing so the DOE shall specify the manure retention time as the validation report (page 10) mentions a retention time of 17 days which is below one (1) month as per the methodology requirement.</p> <p><b>Source of evidence</b> The DOE shall provide the correct reference for the validation of the retention time as the reference (/38/) given on validation report (page 11) refers to tariff issues.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE/PP are requested to</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>clarify if cost savings due to avoided electricity are to be included in the investment analysis as the PDD (page 2) mentions that electricity consumed on site will be sourced from the proposed project while appendix 2 (Financial sheet) shows that all generated electricity will be exported to the grid.</p> <p><b>Start date</b> The DOE/PP shall clarify the validation start date as PDD (page 16) shows February 2008 while the validation report (page 18) shows December 2007.</p> <p><b>Monitoring</b> The DOE/PP is requested to clarify the source of the digester feedstock for the project activity as PDD (page 55) mentions swine while PDD (page 2) mentions chicken. In doing so please give further details on how the livestock population and weight will be monitored.</p> <p><b>Monitoring</b> The PP/DOE are requested to include the Nitrogen concentrations and COD in waste water/sludge disposed in the monitoring plan as requested per the methodology (ACM0010 ver. 5, page 24).</p>
75	3717	Bumi Sawindo Permai Co-Composting Project	TÜV Nord	<p><b>Project starting date</b> The DOE is requested to clearly indicate in the body of the validation report the project starting date and the prior considerations explaining how it validated the evidence in line with VVM version 1.1 paragraph 103.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE is requested to provide information on how it validated the investment analysis including the assumptions and the resulting IRR value in line with VVM version 1.1 paragraph 113.</p> <p><b>Baseline assumption</b> The DOE is requested to clearly indicate and provide validation opinions on the key parameters used in the ex-ante emission reduction calculation such as the fraction of methane captured (f), methane conversion factor (MCF), oxidation factor (OX), fraction of degradable organic carbon (DOC), decay rate (k), fuel consumption (FC), fuel emission factor (EF<sub>fuel</sub>) among others in line with VVM version 1.1 paragraph 91.</p> <p><b>Monitoring</b> The DOE is requested to provide information on how it validated that all monitoring parameters required by the methodology are included in section B.7.1 of the PDD in line with VVM version 1.1 paragraph 123.</p> <p><b>Change in CERs</b> The DOE is requested to provide explanations on the change in the emission reduction in the PDD submitted for request for registration (31,450 tCO<sub>2</sub>/year) to the value in the final PDD (27,550 tCO<sub>2</sub>/year).</p>
76	3719	Sungai Kerling Hydropower Plant	TÜV Nord	<p><b>MoC</b> The MoC contains two alternate authorised signatories, while EB 45 Annex 59, paragraphs 4 and 5 requires only one. Please clarify.</p> <p><b>Spreadsheet</b> The spreadsheet submitted of the investment analysis does not contain readable formulas and unprotected cells, as per EB 51 Annex 58 paragraph 8.</p> <p><b>Baseline and monitoring</b> The Validation Report, page 40 mentions that: "The project</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>participant has considered the back-up power for the project activity which is imported from the Grid. At any time when electricity is imported from the grid, the amount imported will be deducted from the “two way” electricity meter. Therefore, the annual electricity exported to the grid (which is used to determine the emission reduction) is compensated.” However, the PDD does not contain information regarding the electricity imports. Please clarify.</p>
77	3730	12.82 MW Bundled Small Hydropower Project in Qiandongnan Autonomous Region, Guizhou Province, P. R. China	JACO	<p><b>Input values</b> The DOE has indicated that in the case of the four (4) projects the FSR has been the basis for the investment. Nevertheless, in the case of the Jinping Sandengkan project the FSR was finalized in April 2006 which is five (5) months after the starting date, and in the case of the Wawadong project the FSR was finalized in July 2006 which is more than one year after the starting date. Therefore the DOE is requested to further substantiate how it has validated the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis for these two projects. The answer shall be in line with VVM v 1.1 paragraph 112.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> In the case of the Sancendong project the FSR was finalized in December 2004, nevertheless the investment decision was made in March 2006 which is 1 year 3 months after. Therefore the DOE is requested to further substantiate how it has validated the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis. The answer shall be in line with VVM v 1.1 paragraph 112 (a).</p> <p><b>Input values</b> In the case of the four (4) proposed project activities the DOE should further substantiate how it has validated the total investment. The validation of these values shall be in line with VVM paragraph 110 (a,b and c)</p> <p><b>Change in assumptions</b> For the Cengong Sancendong project, the DOE is requested to include in the validation report a more detailed explanation on the different input values assumed in the investment analysis of the PDD submitted for registration compared to those assumed in the investment analysis of the PDD published for validation, please notice that for this project, the IRR in the PDD-GSC is 7.30% and the PDD for Registration is 5.67%. In doing so, an explanation on the impact of those changes in the IRR calculation should be provided.</p> <p><b>Inconsistency</b> The validation report should properly indicate the number of ER validated. Please notice that the PDD mentions 33,869 tCO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions and the validation reports mentions two different values : 36,252 tCO<sub>2</sub> and 33,864 tCO<sub>2</sub>.</p>
78	3732	Fujian Ningde Sanjianxi Hydropower Project	JCI	<p><b>Starting date</b> The PDD page 3 indicates “The power house of the existing facility... was torn down in 2004 to make room for the construction of the proposed project activity”. Further clarity is needed on how the DOE has validated the starting date of the project activity</p>





## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>to be in line with the CDM Glossary of Terms.</p> <p><b>Baseline</b> For baseline electricity calculation (EGBL, retrofit, y) the PDD uses 1999-2003 data which is considered to be the most recent available data. Further clarity is needed on how the DOE has validated that this is the most suitable historical data for a project activity whose starting date is indicated to be 16 March 2006.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE should indicate how it has validated the applicability of: (i) social charges as pension cost as part of the investment analysis; (ii) the item "other cost"; (iii) the item "extra employees taken over from the old power station" and the difference with the item "labor cost and welfare" in the investment analysis spreadsheet.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE should indicate how the compensation cost (6000 MWh/year x 0.28 RMB/kWh) without any cost associate to the production of that electricity is considered to be conservative.</p>
79	3737	T.H. Pellet Wastewater Treatment and Heat and Electricity Generation in Nakhon Ratchasima, Thailand	JCI	<p><b>Input values</b> The DOE should further validate the suitability of input values and the calculation applied in the investment analysis in line with VVM (v01.1), para. 110, including O&amp;M cost components and income tax calculation.</p> <p><b>Baseline assumptions</b> The DOE should further validate the suitability of the assumptions and data used in the calculation of grid emission factor, in line with VVM (01.1) para. 86 (c) and Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, including the calculation of Operate Margin and Building Margin and the vintage of data used.</p> <p><b>Inconsistency</b> The DOE should confirm when the project activity was web hosted for global stakeholder's consultation considering the inconsistency of the date between the validation report (01/09/2008) and the UNFCCC website (26/09/2008).</p> <p><b>Geo-coordinates</b> The DOE should provide the geo-coordinates on the project view page.</p>
80	3753	10 MW Biomass Based Power Plant at Indra Powergen Private Limited	TUEV Rheinland	<p><b>Source of evidence</b> The DOE is requested to clearly reference the background materials in line with VVM version 1.1 paragraph 18 b. In doing so please indicate the dates when the documents: such as rice husks supplier quotations, bank sanction letter, chartered accountant report, recommendations from State Electricity Regulatory Board, change of company name were issued.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE is requested to clarify inconsistencies in the project IRR calculation input values, in particular, the validation report (page 32) indicate O&amp;M costs of 12.4 million INR, 3.3% of the project cost (372 million INR), while the IRR calculation assumes 4%. In doing so please refer to VVM 1.1 paragraph 18 c.</p> <p><b>Monitoring plan</b> The DOE is requested to report if they have confirmed whether the monitoring plan clearly describes the means of</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				monitoring, in particular, how the electricity generated from coal will be monitored in line with AMS-I.D version 15. In doing so please refer to VVM ver. 1.1 paragraph 122 a (ii).
81	3759	Methane Recovery Project of Jiangsu Lianhai Bioengineering Co., Ltd.	JCI	<p><b>Alternative scenarios</b> The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how “Step 1: Identification of alternative scenarios” of the applicable methodology has been complied with, in particular, a) the documented evidence used to confirm bullet (a), i.e. design specifications of lagoons; and b) whether the “Theories and designs of wastewater treatment” can be considered literature which applies to the particular industry or the particular type of waste water of the proposed project activity in line with the requirements of bullet (c).</p> <p><b>Baseline</b> The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how the expert from the design institute; which conducted the FSR for this project activity, qualifies as an “independent” wastewater expert in line with the requirements of the methodology.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE should provide a validation opinion on the coal cost in line with the market price as per the requirements of the VVM (version 01.1) para.110(b), and the reason why the investment cost includes the cost of the pre-treatment and the post treatment ponds, considering that they are necessary for both the baseline and project scenarios.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE should provide details on the evidence used to confirm the suitability of the biogas treatment cost, operational cost, insurance cost, electricity cost, administration cost, water cost and land lease cost. In doing so, the DOE should clarify the following evidence in the document list: 16, 19, 20 to 27. Further, the DOE should provide a validation opinion on the “amount of coal saved by biogas utilization” in line with the VVM (version 01.1) para. 110(b).</p> <p><b>Common practice</b> The DOE should indicate the source of evidence used to confirm the common practice analysis in line with the VVM (version 01.1) para. 120 (c).</p> <p><b>CL 19</b> The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how the closure of CL 19 has been deemed satisfactory in line with the VVM (version 01.1) para. 38, given that the annual labour cost validated by the DOE is 30,000RMB/y/person and the spreadsheet uses a value of 40,000RMB/y/person. Moreover, the DOE should provide a validation opinion on the suitability of the number of employees assumed for the operation of project activity.</p>
82	3775	Low Pressure Gas Recovery Project of Shandong Weifang Hongrun Petrochemical Auxiliary Co., Ltd., China	JCI	<p><b>Input values</b> The Validation Report lacks information on the sale of the recovered gas.</p> <p><b>Baseline</b> The DOE did not validate each applicability condition of the methodology.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The Validation Report lacks</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>information on how the other manufacturing fee, other managing fee and repair rate were validated, and how those input values are appropriate and applicable to the specific project activity.</p> <p><b>The common practice</b> analysis has only considered CDM projects.</p>
83	3776	Low Pressure Gas Recovery Project of Shandong Changyi Petrochemical Co., Ltd., China	JCI	<p><b>Input values</b> The Validation Report lacks information on the sale of the recovered gas.</p> <p><b>Baseline</b> The DOE did not validate each applicability condition of the methodology.</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The Validation Report lacks information on how the other manufacturing fee, other managing fee and repair rate were validated, and how those input values are appropriate and applicable to the specific project activity.</p> <p><b>The common practice</b> analysis has only considered CDM projects.</p>
84	3793	Pindó Biomass Energy Generation from Forest Biomass	DNV	<p><b>Meth:</b> The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how para 6 of methodology AMS-I.C has been complied with, in particular, the requirement related to the contract between the supplier and consumer(s) for the energy generated by the project activity, specifying that only the facility generating the energy can claim emission reductions from the energy displaced.</p> <p><b>Benchmark</b> The DOE should provide a validation opinion on the suitability of the benchmark selected in line with EB-51, Annex 58, para 12 and VVM (version 01.1) para 111 (a) .</p> <p><b>Input values</b> The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on: a) investment cost, b) O&amp;M costs, c) electricity toll costs, d) biomass costs, e) purchase price of electricity, f) electricity tariff; and g) price of steam as per the requirements of the VVM (version 01.1) para.110 (a) to (c) and para. 33. In doing so, the DOE should clearly describe the source of evidence used to crosscheck the values assumed in the IRR calculation, including their applicability to the specific project activity. Moreover, the DOE should provide a validation opinion on the value assumed for the “other expenditures” and “insurance expenses” in line with the VVM (version 01.1) para. 110 (a).</p> <p><b>Barriers</b> The DOE should provide a validation opinion on the barriers due to the prevailing practice in line with the VVM (version 01.1) para. 116 and the “Attachment A to the Appendix B of the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities” in particular, the DOE should explain whether there are activities with similar or comparable technologies to the project activity that have installed similar technologies (including the ones that use other types of biomass) in the country/region and how the application of such technologies differs from that of the project activity.</p> <p><b>CL3</b> The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how the closure of CL3 has been</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>deemed satisfactory in line with the VVM (version 01.1) para. 38, considering that the PDD and other sections of the validation report mention that the project starting date is 01/01/2011.</p> <p><b>Monitoring plan</b> The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how the monitoring plan is in line with para. 33 of the methodology AMS-I.C, given that only the amount of forest residues will be directly monitored. The DOE should also provide a validation opinion on how para 28 of methodology AMS III-E has been complied with, considering that annual report prepared by the PP will only describe the common practice of forest residues (as described in the validation report page A-63).</p> <p><b>Language</b> Please note that the last sheet of the spreadsheet submitted is not in English.</p>
85	3807	Guangxi Tianlin County Weimi Hydropower Station	TÜV Nord	<p><b>LoA</b> The LoA from China cannot be accessed/viewed, as it appears as a damaged file. Please kindly submit a readable file.</p> <p><b>Real and continuing actions</b> The DOE is requested to validate the real and continuing actions taken to secure the CDM status of the project in parallel with its implementation, in line with the requirements of EB49 Annex 22 paragraphs 6 (b), 7, 8 and 9. The DOE's validation is not complete, as the gap between documented evidence is more than 2 years, given that training activities or local DRC approval letters cannot be considered as real actions to secure the CDM status, in line with the requirements of EB49 Annex 22 paragraph 6 (b).</p>
86	3813	Wind Power Project in Porbandar district, Gujarat, India by M/s Venkatalaxmi Renewable Energy Pvt. Ltd.	SIRIM	<p><b>Inconsistencies</b> There are inconsistencies in the values reported for the equity IRR in the Validation Report (i.e., 11.59% and 12.25% in page 14 and 11.56% in page 19).</p> <p><b>Baseline assumption:</b> The DOE should validate the baseline emission factor used in the PDD, as the figure has not been mentioned in the Validation Report, in line with the requirements of the VVM v.1.01 paragraphs 90 and 91(c).</p>



Table 3

Issuance		Stage 1: Completeness Check		
#	Project #	Project	DOE	Reason
1	0542	AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX06-..., 01 Oct 07 - 31 Jul 08	DNV	The excel spreadsheet "outage reduction calcs.xls" hasn't been submitted.
2	0115	GHG emission reduction by thermal o..., 01 Apr 09 - 30 Jun 09	SGS	Some tables in the monitoring report are not fully presented.
3	0194	Jepirachi Wind Power Project, 01 Jan 08 - 31 Dec 08	DNV	Annex 1 of the monitoring report (Guideline for the estimation of the emission factor) is not available.  The spreadsheet for emission reductions calculation is not provided.  The explanation in the spreadsheet for OM calculation is not in English.  The emission reductions achieved in the monitoring period are shown as 14,708.88 in page 11 of monitoring report, which is lower than the emission reductions claimed by the project when rounded.
4	0330	Manal, Chandni and Timbi Small Hydr..., 01 Jun 08 - 31 Jan 09	TÜV SÜD	The amount of ERs is not correct on page 5 of the monitoring report  The version of the Monitoring Report submitted with the request for issuance is version 5, dated 26/12/2010. However, the Verification Report makes several references of a final version 04, dated 21/11/2009 (i.e., pages 9, 12 and 13). The DOE is also requested to include the final version of the monitoring report assessed and submitted with the request for issuance in Annex 2: Information Reference List.
5	0194	Jepirachi Wind Power Project, 01 Aug 06 - 31 Dec 07	DNV	Annex 1 of the monitoring report (Guideline for the estimation of the emission factor) is not available.  The spreadsheet for emission reductions calculation is not provided.  The explanation in the spreadsheets for OM calculation is not English.  Baseline emission and emission reduction for 2006, presented in the table in page 11 of the monitoring report, are not correctly calculated.
6	1441	Tianji Group Line 3 N2O Abatement P..., 03 Sep 08 - 30 Dec 08	DNV	The monitoring report does not include information on calibration of monitoring equipments (including e.g. number of meters, meter location, and calibration dates, etc.)
7		0388 Fujian Zhangpu Liuaao 30.6 MW Wind P..., 28 May 08 - 27 May 09	SGS	The version of the methodology is not indicated in the certification report and verification report.



## CDM – Executive Board

8		2018 Baihubao 33.75MW Wind Power Generat..., 23 Jan 09 - 30 Nov 09	SGS	The table in page 5 of the verification and certification report indicates that the monitoring period starts from 13/01/2009 while the actual monitoring period starts from 23/01/2009.
9		1758 Fuel Switching Project of the Aqaba..., 01 Nov 09 - 31 Jan 10	DNV	<p>One of the signatures in the verification/certification report is dated prior to the finalization of the report.</p> <p>The verification/certification report indicates that the DOE has reviewed the "Clarification to the methodology AM0018, version 1 AM_CLA_0058" in page 3. However, the clarification AM_CLA0058 is not related to AM0018.</p>
10	0892	Yangquan Coal Mine Methane (CMM) Ut..., 01 Aug 09 - 31 Dec 09	DNV	The date of signature of the verification/certification report (23 March 2010) is prior to the date of finalization of the verification/certification report (29 March 2010) and the monitoring report (26 March 2010).
11	0902	Yangquan Coal Mine Methane Advanced..., 01 Oct 08 - 31 Dec 09	DNV	The date of signature of the verification/certification report (23 March 2010) is prior to the date of finalization of the verification/certification report (29 March 2010) and the monitoring report (26 March 2010).
12	0798	Zámbiza Landfill Gas Project, 01 Jan 08 - 30 Apr 09	SGS	The Verification and Certification Report provides some tables in items 3.4 and 3.5 comparing the amount of ERs in different versions of the monitoring report. However, it's not clear whether the columns providing the results in the revised monitoring reports reflects the amount verified in the latest version of the monitoring report (i.e. version 06, dated 17/12/2009). For example, the table in item 3.5 (page 18/39) illustrates that the Net ERs in the monitoring report version 2 are 15,217 tCO <sub>2</sub> e, whereas the project is requesting the issuance of 15,196 tCO <sub>2</sub> e.
13	2414	SF6 Switch at Dead Sea Magnesium, 15 Jun 09 - 31 Dec 09	DNV	<p>The monitoring period starts on 15/06/09, however in emission reductions spreadsheet no data is reported for 15/06/09, what is inconsistent with the monitoring report which indicates the same results for data recorded since 15/06/09 (day included);</p> <p>The verification and certification report refer to methodology ACM0065 v.2.1 in several sections of the documents while it does not correspond to the methodology applied by the project activity.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

14	2318	<b>BRASCARBON Methane Recovery Project, 16 Mar 09 - 16 Aug 09</b>	<b>DNV</b>	<p>The Monitoring Report makes reference (page 13) of a registered PDD – Brascarbon Methane Recovery Project BCA – BRA – 01 Version 5 – 26 May 2008, whereas the registered PDD is version 05a dated 04 March 2009;</p> <p>The Verification and Certification Report describes a background document /13/ as the PDD Version 4.0 of 04 March 2009, whereas the registered PDD is version 05a of 04 March 2009.</p>
15	0290	<b>Youngduk Wind Park Project, 01 Jan 09 - 31 Dec 09</b>	<b>JACO</b>	The equipment calibration information is not reported in the monitoring report revision 1 dated 19 January 2010.
16	0210	<b>San Carlos Bagasse Cogeneration Pro..., 01 Jan 07 - 28 Dec 08</b>	<b>BVCH</b>	There is an inconsistency in the monitoring period dates throughout different documents, as the Request for Issuance form states that the present monitoring period covers until 28 Dec 2008, the same as the verification report (Pg9), but the monitoring report, spreadsheet and certification report states that the end of the present monitoring period is on 31 Dec 2008. Please correct the inconsistency.
17	0673	<b>Darajat Unit III Geothermal Project, 01 Sep 07 - 01 Nov 08</b>	<b>DNV</b>	Dates are inconsistent: The Monitoring Report Revision 3 is dated 08 April 2010 however the Verification & Certification Report Revision 02 is dated 12 March 2010.
18	0116	<b>N2O Emission Reduction in Paulinia, ..., 16 Feb 10 - 21 Mar 10</b>	<b>ERM CVS</b>	The submitted spreadsheet shall not be protected. In the submitted CER calculation spreadsheet titled "Workbook Confidential", there are data worksheets (e.g. AV_HNO3, AV_Emission) that are protected.
19	1583	<b>Huayang Dier Line 1 N2O Abatement Project, 04 May 08 - 20 May 09</b>	<b>ERM CVS</b>	<p>The monitoring report indicates that the crediting period is [27 May 2008 - 03 May 2015] in page 3 while the actual crediting period is [04 May 2008 to 03 May 2015].</p> <p>The monitoring report does not contain the information about calibration dates.</p> <p>The certification statement indicates that the monitoring period verified is [04 May 2008 – 20 May 30, 2009].</p>
20	0604	<b>Candelaria Hydroelectric Project, 01 Feb 08 - 31 May 09</b>	<b>AENOR</b>	<p>As required by Annex 68 to EB48 9b, the spreadsheet supplied should be in an accessible format while the submitted spreadsheet is protected.</p> <p>As required by Annex 68 to EB48 9e, the DOE should ensure that cross-referencing and versioning within and between the documents is correct and accurate, while only Version 1 of the Monitoring Report was uploaded although the Verification Report refers to modified/improved MR Version 2 (p.2 of VR refers to final version 2 and p.37 of VR also refers to a modified MR).</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				The last version of the PDD is Version 7, dated 7/9/2006 whereas the uploaded MR refers to PDD, Version 2, also with the date of 7/9/2006.
21	0678	Nakoda WHR CDM Project, 01 Aug 08 - 30 Jun 09	TÜV Nord	According to Annex 68 to EB48 report, all documents submitted with the request for issuance must be complete and consistent. However, the verification report refers to Monitoring Report version 3 while the submitted final version number is 5.
22	1604	Guangxi Xiafu Hydro Power Project, 26 Oct 08 - 25 May 09	JACO	As per EB48 Annex 68 para 9b, no assessable(unprotected)s spreadsheet was provided.
23	1021	13.4 MW bundled wind power project ..., 02 Jan 08 - 01 Jan 10	DNV	<p>The monitoring period mentioned in the CER calculation spreadsheet, is not consistent with the information provided elsewhere in the spreadsheet and the other submissions.</p> <p>The calibration dates of the meters at the Indan Energy facility are not consistent between the monitoring report and the validation report.</p>
24	1949	(r) 29.7 MW Wind Power project in Karna..., 01 Aug 09 - 31 Dec 09	BVCH	As per the VVM para. 189 c, the monitoring report should contain a comparison of the actual CERs claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the PDD. Please include the information in the monitoring report.
25	2382	Jiangsu Qishuyan Natural Gas Based ..., 09 Nov 09 - 31 Mar 10	DNV	Inconsistency regarding verification site visit dates. On Page 5 of the Verification/Certification Report, it is stated that the "on-site verification was conducted on 27 April 2010. On Page 6 of the same report it is stated that the DNV performed site visits on 27 April 2009. We would kindly request your exact correction on this.
26	0001	(r) Project for GHG emission reduction ..., 01 Sep 09 - 30 Nov 09	DNV	The monitoring report submitted with the request for issuance is dated 02/12/2009 and does not have a version number, while the verification report makes reference to a monitoring report version 02 dated 03/05/2010.
27	2307	Federal Intertrade Pengyang Solar C..., 27 Mar 09 - 31 Oct 09	TUEV Rheinland	The signed form indicates that the project documentation provided by project participants is NOT in accordance with the requirements of the registered CDM project design document and relevant provisions of decisions COP/COP/MOP and their annexes (para. 62 (a) of CDM M&P).





## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>The monitoring period indicated in the monitoring report, verification report and certification report (02/04/2009 to 31/10/2009) is not consistent with the monitoring period indicated in the signed form (27/03/2009 to 31/10/2009). It should be noted that the first monitoring period should start from the start date of the crediting period (27/03/2009).</p> <p>The crediting period indicated in the monitoring report, verification report and certification report (02/04/2009 to 26/03/2019) is not consistent with the registered crediting period (27/03/2009 to 26/03/2019).</p> <p>It is also noted that the certification report is titled as "verification report". The submitted documentation contains the certificate statement, however, it is recommended to clearly indicate that the submitted documentation is a certification report in its title.</p>
28	1596	Guangxi Bajiengkou Hydropower Project, 26 Oct 08 - 25 May 09	JACO	Form F-CDM-Reg refers to another project and not UNFCCC project 1596.
29	1535	Changwa 10 MW Small-scale Hydro Project, 09 Jul 08 - 31 Aug 09	TUEV Rheinland	<p>The Verification report and certification statement makes reference to a monitoring report version 02 dated 14/12/2009, while the verification report submitted with the request for issuance is version 03, dated 31/03/2010</p> <p>The date of the verification report (22/03/2010) is prior to the date of the version of the monitoring report submitted with the request for issuance (31/03/2010).</p>
30	2121	China Hunan Yuzitang Small Hydropow..., 31 Mar 09 - 29 Mar 10	TÜV Nord	Annex 68 of EB48 para 9 (f) requires that the monitoring periods throughout the documentation are consistent. However, the request for issuance form has a monitoring period from 31 March 2009 to 29 March 2010 while the monitoring report, spreadsheet, verification and certification report have a monitoring period from 31 March 2009 to 13 April 2010.
31	0728	Eurus Wind Farm, 01 Jul 09 - 30 Sep 09	TÜV Nord	Paragraph 7 (a) of EB48 - Annex 68 requires that all documents submitted with the request for issuance must be mutually consistent. However, the version of the monitoring report described in the header of the pages (version 05) is not consistent with the version of the document itself (version 06)



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>Paragraph 10 (b) (iii) of EB48 - Annex 68 requires that the spreadsheet calculation of emission reductions contains explanation with regard to application of formulae, however the file submitted contains the lines "Emission Reductions Verified (tCO<sub>2</sub>)" and "Emission Reductions Issued (tCO<sub>2</sub>)" without making a clear distinction between them and without clearly indicating the amount of ERs verified during the given monitoring period and for which issuance is being requested.</p>
32	2554	Doña Juana landfill gas-to-energy project, 22 Sep 09 - 15 Dec 09	DNV	<p>The Verification Report makes reference to several versions of the monitoring report, without clearly specifying which was the last version of the document assessed by the DOE. For example, on page 2/49 it makes reference to a Monitoring Report version 2 dated in 03 March 2010; on page 8/49 it makes reference to a monitoring report version 3 dated 31 March 2010; on page 10/49 it makes reference to a version 04 dated 29 April 2010;</p> <p>The Certification Statement makes reference to a "monitoring report dated 03 March 2010" and a monitoring report "version 3 issued on 31 March 2010", while the monitoring report submitted with the request for issuance is version 04 dated 29/04/2010;</p> <p>Most of the annexes provided in the monitoring report are not in English. The PP might choose to exclude it or to provide the proper translation. Additionally, the picture provided on page 17 is not in English.</p>
33	0232	Shandong Dongyue HFC23 Decompositio..., 01 Jan 10 - 31 Mar 10	SGS	<p>The latest version of the monitoring report (version 2 dated 05/05/10, which is mentioned in the verification report ) was not submitted.</p>
34	1462	ISL Waste Heat Recovery Project, In..., 01 Jan 09 - 31 Aug 09	TUEV Rheinland	<p>Paragraph 7 (b) of EB48 - Annex 68 requires that all documents submitted with the request for issuance must be mutually consistent. However, the version of the PDD (version 10, dated 30/10/2009) is not consistent with the version of the PDD stated in Monitoring Report, Verification Report and Certification Statement, which is version 9 dated 25/06/2008.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

35	1601	<b>Fujian Jiangle Gaotang Hydropower Project, 16 Jan 09 - 27 Sep 09</b>	<b>JACO</b>	<p>Paragraph 8 (b) and 10 (b) (iii) of EB48 - Annex 68 requires that the spreadsheet contains calculation of emission reductions and that it contains explanation with regard to application of formulae, however the file submitted does not provide a clear amount of ERs verified during the given monitoring period and for which issuance is being requested.</p> <p>Paragraph 9 (d) of EB -Annex 68 requires that all documents are in English or contain a full translation of relevant sections into English in cases where the DOE considers the provision of the original document to be necessary for the purposes of transparency;</p>
36		<b>0728 Eurus Wind Farm, 01 Oct 09 - 31 Dec 09</b>	<b>TÜV Nord</b>	<p>Paragraph 10 (b) (iii) of EB48 - Annex 68 requires that the spreadsheet calculation of emission reductions contains explanation with regard to application of formulae, however the file submitted contains the lines "Emission Reductions Verified (tCO2)" and "Emission Reductions Issued (tCO2)" without making a clear distinction between them and without clearly indicating the amount of ERs verified during the given monitoring period and for which issuance is being requested.</p>
37		<b>1612 Shijiazhuang Jinshi N2O Abatement Project, 09 Sep 09 - 23 Feb 10</b>	<b>DNV</b>	<p>As per para 8(b) and 9(b) of EB guidelines on completeness check of requests for issuance (EB 48, Annex 68), a spreadsheet containing the emission reduction calculation is not submitted in an assessable (unprotected) format. The DOE is requested to re-submit the documents under section 'Confidential Documents' in a "zip" file.</p>
38	0222	<b>Gangwon Wind Park Project, 01 Jan 09 - 31 Dec 09</b>	<b>JACO</b>	<p>Paragraphs 8 (b) of EB48 - Annex 68 require that the spreadsheet contains emission reduction calculation and that calculation of emission reductions and paragraph and 10 (b) (iii) requires that the spreadsheet contains explanation with regard to application of formulae and however the file submitted contains only calculations of losses, without indicating and/or calculating clearly the amount of CERs for which issuance is being requested.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				Paragraph 7 (a) of EB48 - Annex 68 requires that all documents submitted with the request for issuance must be mutually consistent. However, the crediting period stated in the introduction part of the monitoring report is not consistent with the actual fixed crediting period. Also, please note that the version of the monitoring report (dated 15.01.2010), mentioned under category 1 documents in the verification report is not consistent with the version 2.2 of the monitoring report.
39	1886	Gansu Zhouqu County Hujia'ai Hydroproject, 07 Apr 09 - 31 Aug 09	TÜV Nord	Paragraph 7 (a) of EB48 - Annex 68 requires that all documents submitted with the request for issuance must be mutually consistent. Also, paragraph 10 (d) requires that the Certification Report clearly indicates the monitoring period under verification. However, the monitoring period dates on the verification and certification report (07 Apr 09 - 30 Aug 09) are not consistent with the actual monitoring period 07 Apr 09 - 31 Aug 09
40	1232	UHE Mascarenhas power upgrading project, 26 May 08 - 10 Oct 08	TÜV Nord	Paragraph 9. (d) of EB 48 Annex 68 requires that all documents are in English or contain a full translation of relevant sections into English, however, the Excel spreadsheet contains a section (Sheet May 2008) where no English translation was provided and therefore it is not possible to understand the purpose of why that information was presented in such a way.
41	0801	(r) Korea Water Resources Corporation, 01 Jun 08 - 31 May 09	KSA	Inconsistent date of final monitoring report. As required by annex 68 of EB48 report para 9 (e), the cross-referencing and versioning within and between the documents should be correct and accurate. However, the verification report stated that the final version of the monitoring report, that is also mentioned in the certification report, is the one dated on 18/02/2010. However, the final version of the monitoring report is dated on 09/07/2010 (revised version, which includes the comparison of CERs and calibration dates).

**CDM – Executive Board**

<b>42</b>	<b>0087</b>	<b>20 MW Kabini Hydro Electric Power Project, 01 May 07 - 31 Mar 10</b>	<b>BVCH</b>	Paragraph 7. (b) of EB 48 Annex 68 requires that all submitted documents are internally and mutually consistent; The verification opinion (the one submitted as a separate document, as well as the one in the Verification Report), states that the “BVC verified Project Monitoring Report version 2 for the monitoring period 01/05/2007 to 31/03/2010”, which is not consistent with the actual version of the monitoring report covering the above mentioned period, which is version 3.
-----------	-------------	---	-------------	---



## CDM – Executive Board

Table 4

Issuance		Stage 2: Info & Reporting Check		
#	Project #	Project	DOE	Reason
1	1320	Beijing Taiyanggong CCGT Trigenarat..., 22 Sep 09 - 27 Jan 10	DNV	The methodology requires the total fuel consumption to be monitored both at supplier and project end for cross-verification. However, the VR and the MR are not clear on whether the monitoring on the supplier side was done, which are the instruments specifications and whether any eventual maintenance/calibration occurred during the monitoring period.
2	2065	Guizhou Xingyi Laojiangdi Hydropowe..., 20 Apr 09 - 19 Oct 09	TÜV Nord	<p>The monitoring report does not report the dates of calibration;</p> <p>The monitoring report does not contain a comparison of the actual CERs claimed in the monitoring period with the estimated in the PDD.</p>
3	0665	AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX06-..., 17 Dec 06 - 31 Aug 08	DNV	<p>External data used and source related to CH4 density is not reported in MR.</p> <p>In case of flow meters is not clear if equipment have been calibrated by manufacture when installed, and the date of installation. Please provide clear information on meters calibration.</p> <p>The calibration frequency and dates for the portable manual CO2 analyser are not reported.</p> <p>The Landtec Biogas Check gas analyser calibration dates are not reported.</p> <p>Information of meters (i.e. number, location, etc) is missing in the submitted documentation.</p>
4	1774	Electricity generation from mustard..., 07 Oct 08 - 28 Feb 09	TÜV SÜD	The PDD stipulates that the main and backup electricity-meters are to be tested every half year, however the date of the last calibration presented in the Monitoring Report (section B.1.1) and in the Verification Report (IRL 16) is 26/07/2008. The PP/DOE are required to follow the guidance from EB52 - Annex 60.
5	0801	Korea Water Resources Corporation (...), 01 Jun 08 - 31 May 09	KSA	<p>The monitoring report does not contain the calibration dates</p> <p>The monitoring report does not contain the comparison of CERs</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

6	0151	Quimobásicos HFC Recovery and Decom..., 31 Aug 09 - 29 Sep 09	TÜV SÜD	The monitoring report submitted with the request for issuance must contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments as specified by the monitoring plan and applied methodology. However no information was provided in the monitoring report regarding how the frequency stipulated by the version of the methodology applied to the project was complied (i.e. all of the measurement instruments are to be recalibrated monthly per internationally accepted procedures, except for the HFC23 flow-meters).
7	0151	Quimobásicos HFC Recovery and Decom..., 30 Sep 09 - 30 Dec 09	TÜV SÜD	The monitoring report submitted with the request for issuance must contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments as specified by the monitoring plan and applied methodology. However no information was provided in the monitoring report regarding how the frequency stipulated by the version of the methodology applied to the project was complied (i.e. all of the measurement instruments are to be recalibrated monthly per internationally accepted procedures, except for the HFC23 flow-meters)
8	2257	Fosfertil Cubatão NAP4 Nitrous Oxid..., 21 Mar 09 - 28 Jul 09	TÜV SÜD	According to the requirement of section 10 (a) iv of Annex 68 to EB 48, the monitoring report should contain the information on calibration of the monitoring instruments as specified in the monitoring methodology and monitoring plan. However, the table in Annex 1 to the monitoring report does not contain all calibration dates that assure that all instruments were adequately calibrated for the monitoring period in consideration.
9	0812	BOG and COG Utilisation for Combine..., 17 Aug 09 - 13 Feb 10	DNV	<p>The Monitoring Report shall contain "Calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any), and emission reductions, including reference to formulae and methods used". However, the submitted Monitoring Report (page 8-9) only contains the reference to formulae used whereas the calculations are missing for baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage (if any), and emission reductions. See paragraph 10 vii.</p> <p>Paragraph 220 (d) of the VVM requires that the Verification Report provide the DOE's verification conclusions as to whether the project has been implemented in accordance with the PDD. However, this conclusion is missing in the Verification Report (page 4).</p> <p>Paragraph 199 of the VVM requires that the DOE shall verify the validated monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed CDM project activity, and the Verification Report shall provide a statement that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology. However, this is also missing in the Verification Report.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

10	1317	<b>PARAÍSO SMALL HYDROPOWER PLANT – PC..., 11 Feb 08 - 31 Dec 08</b>	<b>TÜV Nord</b>	<p>The monitoring report does not contain the required equipment calibration information, e.g. number of meters, meter location and calibration dates (the validity of calibration based on the reported calibration date, 03/11/2008, does not cover the entire monitoring period starting from 11 February 2008);</p> <p>VVM paragraph 205 requires that the verification report shall clearly state how the DOE verified the information flow from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting for each of the required parameters. However, the required information flow with regard to electricity data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting was missing in the verification report section 5.6 which merely provides a statement confirming that the generated electricity is monitored online with calibrated equipments by the power plants as well as by CCEE. The DOE shall clearly describe the above required information flow;</p> <p>CER calculation spreadsheet has not been submitted.</p>
11	1370	<b>Project for the Catalytic Reduction..., 02 Jun 08 - 04 Nov 08</b>	<b>DNV</b>	Information on calibration of monitoring instruments (including e.g. number of meters, meter location, calibration dates) covering the entire monitoring period shall be reported in the monitoring report and verified accordingly.
12	0797	<b>6 MW renewable energy project for a..., 25 Mar 07 - 24 Mar 09</b>	<b>DNV</b>	<p>Calibration information provided does not cover the entire reported period (in particular for the period from 25/03/07 to 03/04/07);</p> <p>Calibration dates reported for gross electricity meter are even missing or inconsistent when comparing the information reported in verification and monitoring report.</p>
13	0557	<b>Catalytic N2O Abatement Project in ..., 01 Sep 09 - 02 Jan 10</b>	<b>DNV</b>	There is a discrepancy between the calibration frequency described in the monitoring report and verification report. Monitoring report indicates 3 - 4 months while verification report indicates 3 month for line A & B. In case there is delay in the calibration, the DOE is requested to clarify how it verified the application of the calibration guideline (EB 52 Annex 60).
14	0545	<b>WITNESSING Durban Landfill-gas-to-electricity ..., 15 Dec 06 - 01 Nov 07</b>	<b>JCI</b>	<p>The spreadsheets attached to the monitoring report contain the CER calculations of only one month, instead of the monitoring period of over 10 months.</p> <p>The calibration information provided by the monitoring report covers the landfill gas meters only, but not the electricity meters, flare monitors and others.</p>





## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>The monitoring report does not contain the comparison of the actual emission reduction claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the registered PDD.</p> <p>The verification report indicates that the PDD Version 2007-11-20 was reviewed during the verification. However, the PDD Version 2007-11-20 does not exist on the UNFCCC website. The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency.</p>
15	1369	Project for the catalytic reduction..., 20 May 08 - 24 Mar 09	DNV	<p>For production plant N2, the hourly data for the 3rd campaign N2 02-08 and applicable for this monitoring period is missing in the spreadsheet provided ("1369_N2_monitoring data");</p> <p>Information on calibration of monitoring instruments (including e.g. number of meters, meter location, calibration dates) covering the entire monitoring period shall be reported in the monitoring report.</p>
16	0447	Generation of electricity from 6.25..., 01 Aug 06 - 31 Dec 08	SGS	<p>The Monitoring Report provides a table, on pages 10 and 11, which describes several electricity-meters. However, the role of these instruments and which is used for monitoring "EG loss 2" and "EG Net 6.25MW" is not clear. The DOE is also requested to include information regarding the role of these meters in the Verification Report.</p> <p>The monitoring report mentions that there is another electricity-meter upstream to the Mada substation which measures the electricity generation for all 7 WTGs (5 belonging to the project activity and 2 belonging to other project). According with the figure provided in the Monitoring Report page 8, this meter is located in a monitoring point prior to the common metering point at Mada Substation. The PP/DOE are required to clarify whether the location of this instrument is correct and, if the location is correct, how it can be assured that the common metering point does not monitor the values from the 2 extra WTGs.</p> <p>The PP/DOE shall clarify if the variation of calibration frequency between 8-14 months is extended to all electricity-meters or each meter has the frequency previously stipulated in the PPA. In case of delayed calibrations, guidance from EB52 - Annex 60 must be applied.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

17	0559	Generation of electricity from 4 MW..., 01 Oct 06 - 31 Dec 08	SGS	<p>The Monitoring Report (page 10 of 15) states that the calibration frequency for the main meters are of annual frequency. The Verification Report also states that the calibration interval is annual (page 10/28). However, according to the monitoring report (section 8), the calibration for main meter 04861310 did not comply with the above verified calibration interval since the first calibration was conducted on 06/04/2007 and the subsequent was carried out on 21/06/2008, according to the monitoring report. Clarification is required.</p> <p>Three main meter (meter serial number 24267, 105194 and 52028) replacements have taken place but the reasons were provided only for one of these replacements, i.e. meter 52028. Please provide the reasons for all of these meter replacements (e.g. in section 8 of the monitoring report).</p>
18	1441	Tianji Group Line 3 N2O Abatement P..., 31 Dec 08 - 17 Aug 09	DNV	<p>The monitoring report does not include information on calibration of monitoring equipments (including e.g. number of meters, meter location, and calibration dates, etc.) as required by EB 48 report Annex 68 para 10 (a)iv</p> <p>The monitoring report does not contain a comparison of the actual CERs claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the PDD, and explanation on any significant increase, as required by EB 48 report Annex 68 para 10 (a)viii</p>
19	1612	1612 Shijiazhuang Jinshi N2O Abatement P..., 27 Jun 08 - 13 Mar 09	DNV	<p>Information on calibration of monitoring instruments (including e.g. number of meters, meter location, and calibration dates) are missing in the monitoring report;</p> <p>VVM paragraph 205 requires that the verification report shall clearly state how the DOE verified the information flow from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting for each of the required parameters. However, the required information flow with regard to each of the required parameters was missing in the verification report;</p> <p>Project started full operation as from 28 August 2008.</p>
20	0421	AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-..., 01 Aug 08 - 30 Nov 09	DNV	<p>The monitoring report does not contain details on monitoring systems and procedures, as per EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a)ii;</p>
21	0422	AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-..., 01 Jul 09 - 31 Dec 09	DNV	<p>The sources of reference for the parameter 'Temperature and Rainfall' are inconsistent in the Monitoring and Verification Reports.</p>
22	0467	AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-..., 01 Jun 09 - 30 Nov 09	DNV	



## CDM – Executive Board

23	1527	Hongyan 8 MW Small-scale Hydro Proj..., 01 Jan 09 - 31 Dec 09	CEC	The monitoring report does not contain a comparison of the actual CERs claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the PDD.
24	1437	Tianji Group Line 2 N2O Abatement P..., 21 Sep 08 - 03 May 09	DNV	<p>The monitoring report incorrectly calculated the monitoring period from 21 Sep 08 to 03 May 09 to be 201 days.</p> <p>The verification report failed to draw the conclusion that monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan and that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.</p>
25	1615	Wind power project by GFL in Gudhep..., 31 Dec 08 - 28 Aug 09	DNV	<p>The monitoring report does not contain the calibration details of the meters for 10 wind turbines, of which the readings were used in apportioning among the individual wind turbines. Also, it is requested to clarify whether these 10 wind turbine are owned by the project participant or other project developers.</p> <p>The monitoring report does not contain the calibration details of the individual meters whose calibration validity covers the whole monitoring period. It is noted that the monitoring report states that the calibration frequency is annual and the date of calibration is 10/08/2008 while the monitoring period is up to 28/08/2009.</p> <p>There is inconsistency between the monitoring report and verification report regarding the calibration certificate dates. The monitoring report states that the certificate dates are 09/01/09 and 20/03/09 while the verification report states that they are 13/03/08 and 09/01/09. It is also requested why the test certificate date is considered, not testing date.</p> <p>The verification/certification report indicates that the date of first issue of the report is 7 December 2009 while the monitoring report published and reviewed is dated on 3 February 2010.</p>
26	0500	Efficient utilisation of waste heat..., 01 Jan 03 - 31 Mar 08	DNV	<p>The signed form does not contain the name of DOE representative.</p> <p>The certificate statement mentions the date of PDD as December 2005 while the verification report indicates that date of the PDD as 12 October 2006 (version3).</p> <p>The calibration details provided do not cover the whole monitoring period, starting from 01/01/2003.</p> <p>It is noted that the calibration frequency of the energy meter was more than 3 years which is not in line with the requirement of the general guidelines to SSC methodologies. Also, yearly calibration was not met for the other monitoring equipment. It is requested to clarify how the EB52 annex 60 is correctly applied in the case of the delayed calibration.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				The verification report does not confirm whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.
27	0751	Sanquhar and Delta Small Hydro Powe..., 01 May 07 - 31 Aug 09	DNV	According to EB48 Annex 68, 10 (a) iv, the monitoring report shall contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan.
28	2260	Methane capture and destruction on ..., 27 Feb 09 - 31 Jan 10	GLC	<p>According to EB48 Annex 68, 10 (a) iv, the monitoring report shall contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. However,</p> <p>The Gas Analyzer from Ready 2000 was put in operation on 4 October 2009 but the first calibration was done on 18 October 2009 and the result was that the reading was 1,1% more and therefore less conservative. However, the DOE considered that the error is "negligible (below a materiality level of 2%)". Please explain further why the calibration guidance was not applied.</p> <p>Please indicate the initial calibration dates for the temperature and pressure sensors valid from the starting date of the crediting period up to the time it was calibrated on 28 December 2009.</p> <p>The monitoring plan in Pg 45 specifies a calibration requirement for the electricity meters of once every three years, however, this was not reflected on Pg 10 of the monitoring report.</p> <p>According to EB48 Annex 68, the spreadsheets should be submitted in an assessable format, however, only the summary spreadsheet is assessable. Please send the other spreadsheets again.</p>
29	0120	AWMS GHG Mitigation Project MX05-B-..., 01 Apr 09 - 31 Oct 09	DNV	<p>According to EB 48 Annex 68 10 (a) vii, the monitoring report should contain calculations of baseline emissions, leakage (if any) and emission reductions, including reference to formula and methods used.</p> <p>Inconsistency on the leakage calculation: Pg 10 of the monitoring report states that the total electricity consumption for the monitoring period is of 181,163 kWh.</p>
30	0161	AWMS GHG Mitigation Project, MX05-B-..., 01 Apr 09 - 31 Oct 09	DNV	<p>According to EB 48 Annex 68 10 (a) vii, the monitoring report should contain calculations of baseline emissions, leakage (if any) and emission reductions, including reference to formula and methods used.</p> <p>Inconsistency of the emission factor: the PDD and verification report state that the emission factor applied for the emission reductions calculation is 0.523 tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh.</p> <p>Inconsistency on the leakage calculation: Pg 12 of the monitoring report states that the total electricity consumption for the monitoring period is of 341,226.42 kWh.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

31	0150	<b>AWMS GHG Mitigation Project, MX05-B..., 01 May 09 - 31 Oct 09</b>	<b>DNV</b>	<p>According to EB 48 Annex 68 10 (a) vii, the monitoring report should contain calculations of baseline emissions, leakage (if any) and emission reductions, including reference to formula and methods used. However it was noted that the leakage calculation and the emission factor are not consistent throughout the documentation:</p> <p>Inconsistency of the emission factor: the PDD and verification report state that the emission factor applied for the emission reductions calculation is 0.523 tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh. However the spreadsheet shows that the leakage was calculated using an emission factor of 0.719 tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh. Please correct the inconsistency.</p> <p>Inconsistency on the leakage calculation: Pg 10 of the monitoring report states that the total electricity consumption for the monitoring period is of 231837.1 kWh. However, the total electricity consumption used for the leakage calculation (spreadsheet and table D.5 of the monitoring report) is 168.6381 kWh. Please clarify the inconsistency.</p>
32	1614	<b>Pingdingshan Coal (Group) Co., Ltd., 29 Mar 09 - 31 Oct 09</b>	<b>CEC</b>	<p>According with EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii), the monitoring report must contain the “monitoring systems and procedures, including any quality assurance and quality control system employed by the project activity”. However, the monitoring report does not describe how each of the parameters were monitored (i.e. type and details of the instruments used)</p> <p>According with EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vi) the monitoring report must contain “information on calibration of monitoring instruments as specified by the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan”. However, the monitoring report only states that “the calibration verification results show that meters operate in accordance with the industry standards” without specifying whether the calibration of the instruments was made in accordance with the frequency stipulated in the monitoring plan.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

33	0200	Termoelétrica Santa Adélia Cogenera..., 01 Jan 08 - 31 Dec 08	TÜV Nord	As per Annex 68 of EB48, the verification report shall contain the information specified in the reporting requirements of the latest version of the "Validation and Verification Manual", that all corrective action and/or clarification requests have been closed and the means of their resolution has been documented, and that all Forward Action Requests (FAR) raised in the validation or previous verification are addressed. Regarding CL P3 (page 21, verification report), further information is required on how it was verified the application of the "guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements", Annex 60 of EB52.
34	1884	Guangdong Huizhou LNG Power Generat..., 22 Apr 09 - 31 Aug 09	DNV	<p>The monitoring report does not contain the monitoring parameter "Gas sources".</p> <p>The verification report does not contain how it verified the monitoring parameter "Gas sources".</p> <p>The verification report does not confirm whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.</p> <p>There is inconsistency regarding the on-site visit date in page 7 of the verification report (9 March 2010 and 9 March 2009).</p> <p>There is inconsistency regarding the accuracy of the diesel flow meter in page 12 of the verification report (1.0 and 0.2).</p>
35	0928	Methane recovery and effective use ..., 01 Nov 08 - 28 Feb 09	SGS	<p>The spreadsheet does not contain the formula of calculation in the spreadsheet cells.</p> <p>The calibration date of the gas analyzer (GA08680) is not consistent in the monitoring report (November 2008) and the verification report (23/10/2008).</p>
36	1859	China Fujian Putian LNG Generation ..., 14 Jan 09 - 27 Sep 09	BVCH	According with paragraph 10 (a)(i) of EB48 - Annex 68, the monitoring report must contain the implementation status of the project during the monitoring period under consideration. However, there is no clear statement on the status of the project under the monitoring period; moreover, the DOE confirmed, on its verification report, that the project was not fully implemented due to delays in the transportation and installation of 2 of the combined cycle blocks;



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>According with paragraph 10 (a)(iii) of EB48 - Annex 68, the monitoring report must contain all parameters required to be monitored and reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology. However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the monitoring report is not clear on whether the monitoring of the parameter FCf,y was conducted according with the requirements of the monitoring methodology and monitoring plan (i.e. monitoring at supplier and project end for cross-verification);</li> <li>- the monitoring report states that the parameter EFCO2 from the natural is sourced from the Chinese DNA whereas the monitoring plan states that this parameter would have been sourced from the fuel supplier;</li> </ul>
37	1436	Tianji Group Line 1 N2O Abatement P..., 10 Mar 08 - 17 Dec 08	DNV	<p>The Historic Baseline spreadsheet has not been provided; instead, Project Campaign 1 spreadsheet was submitted twice. Please provide the same.</p> <p>The calibrations stated in Table 4.5.1 of the monitoring report do not cover the entire project's period reported and verified (which includes the entire baseline campaign starting from 01/02/2007). Please clarify.</p> <p>The DOE should list each parameter required by the monitoring plan and state how it verified the information flow for the same.</p>
38	1612	Shijiazhuang Jinshi N2O Abatement P..., 14 Mar 09 - 08 Sep 09	DNV	<p>As per para 8(b) and 9(b) of EB guidelines on completeness check of requests for issuance (EB 48, Annex 68), a spreadsheet containing the emission reduction calculation is not submitted in an assessable (unprotected) format. The DOE is requested to re-submit the documents under section 'Confidential Documents' in a "zip" file.</p>
39	2486	Conversion of SF6 to the alternati..., 02 Jul 09 - 31 Dec 09	DNV	<p>VVM (paragraph 199) requires that the DOE shall verify that the validated monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed CDM project activity.</p> <p>Furthermore, paragraph 202 of VVM requires that the DOE shall provide a statement that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed project activity. However, the required statement is missing in the verification report.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

40	0490	(r) Catalytic N <sub>2</sub> O destruction project i..., 01 Oct 09 - 31 Dec 09	DNV	VVM Paragraph 198, 200, 202 require that the DOE shall verify that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the methodology and in particular, the DOE must provide a statement on that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed project activity. However, this verification statement is missing in your report. We kindly remind you that this is the second time your submission is rejected due to this issue.
41	0431	Puente Gallego Landfill gas recover..., 01 Jan 09 - 30 Jun 09	SGS	<p>The information on calibration of all monitoring equipments including e.g. number of meters, meter location and calibration dates have not been reported in the monitoring report as required.</p> <p>The submitted spreadsheet contains data for January and June 2009 only while CERs are being claimed for this monitoring period covering the period from January to June 2009. All data for the entire monitoring period should be submitted. Furthermore, the CER spreadsheet must present the CER calculation result with the formulae of calculation clearly shown in the spreadsheet. In the submitted spreadsheet, only final CER value is presented, e.g. cells like D10 and D11 etc.(under "summary sheet") are result cells which must be linked with the reported data through appropriate calculation formulae.</p>
42	0932	Energy Efficiency Measures At Paper..., 01 Jan 07 - 30 Jun 09	DNV	VVM (paragraph 199) requires that the DOE shall verify that the validated monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed CDM project activity. Furthermore, paragraph 202 of VVM requires that the DOE shall provide a statement that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed project activity. However, this statement is missing in the verification report.
43	0051	Cortecito and San Carlos Hydroelect..., 01 Sep 08 - 31 Jul 09	DNV	<p>According to Annex 68 to EB48 report, all documents submitted with the request for issuance must be complete and consistent. However, the Verification Report (page A-3) states that this is the first verification while this is in fact the second verification.</p> <p>Furthermore, VVM paragraph 220 requires that the DOE shall verify that the validated monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed CDM project activity. Paragraph 202 of the VVM also requires that the DOE must provide a statement that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed project activity. However, the report does not provide the required statement.</p>





## CDM – Executive Board

44	1300	155 MW Gas based combined cycle pow..., 26 Feb 08 - 30 Apr 09	SGS	<p>The calibration for the two natural gas consumption meters was delayed by 1-2 days in July 2009. The DOE shall clarify how the calibration guideline (EB 52 Annex 60) is applied.</p> <p>There is a discrepancy between the reported value and the verified value of the net electricity generation in Section 4 of the verification report.</p>
45	1636	Alto-Tietê landfill gas capture pro..., 25 Sep 08 - 04 Mar 09	SGS	The spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculations shown in the spreadsheet cells.
46	2756	Miyi Wantan Hydroelectric Project, 23 Nov 09 - 25 Mar 10	CEC	<p>Paragraph 7 (c) from EB48 - Annex 68 requires that all documents submitted must be internally and mutually consistent. However, the monitoring report states that the calibration frequency of the electricity-meters is annually, whereas the verification report states that the calibration is to be conducted every 5-years, in accordance with the standards of DL/T 448-2000. The PP/DOE are required to inform the correct calibration frequency in both documents and, if necessary, apply the guidance from EB52 - Annex 60 in case of delayed calibration.</p>
47	0823	Huadian Inner Mongolia Huitengxile ..., 01 Jul 09 - 30 Apr 10	DNV	VVM (paragraph 199) requires that the DOE shall verify that the validated monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed CDM project activity. Furthermore, paragraph 202 of VVM requires that the DOE shall provide a statement that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed project activity. However, this statement is missing in the verification report.
48	1436	Tianji Group Line 1 N2O Abatement P..., 18 Dec 08 - 27 Jul 09	DNV	<p>The verification report did not provide conclusions as to whether the proposed CDM project activity has been implemented in accordance with the PDD.</p> <p>The verification report did not provide conclusions as to whether monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered monitoring plan and whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.</p> <p>The verification report did not provide information on the calibration dates of the measuring instrument.</p> <p>There is a discrepancy between the nitric acid productions reported in the monitoring report and the verification report.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

49	0889	(r) RIMA Fuel Switch in Bocaiúva, 01 Feb 09 - 30 Nov 09	ICONTEC	<p>VVM (paragraph 199) require that the DOE shall verify that the validated monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed CDM project activity. Furthermore, the "Issuance information and reporting checklist" and paragraph 202 of VVM require that the DOE shall provide a statement that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed project activity. However, this statement is missing in the verification report.</p> <p>The "Issuance information and reporting checklist" and VVM paragraph 205 requires that the verification report shall list each parameter required by the monitoring plan and clearly state how the DOE verified the information flow from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting for each of the required parameters. However, the verification report 1) does not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan; 2) does not clearly state how the DOE verified the information flow (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting) for each of the required parameters.</p>
50	0542	(r) AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX06-..., 01 Oct 07 - 31 Jul 08	DNV	<p>The total number of CERs in the newly submitted spreadsheet (9764) is inconsistent the number indicated in the signed form (9763).</p> <p>In addition, VVM (paragraph 199) require that the DOE shall verify that the validated monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed CDM project activity. Furthermore, the "Issuance information and reporting checklist" and paragraph 202/220 of VVM require that the DOE shall provide a statement that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed project activity. However, this statement is missing in the verification report.</p>
51	0915	KM RE project, 28 Apr 08 - 27 Apr 09	DNV	<p>The recording frequency of some parameters (e.g. electricity generation) in the monitoring report is different from the monitoring plan.</p> <p>The locations and the corresponding parameters of the measuring instruments are not described in the monitoring plan. The calibration dates of weigh bridges are also missing.</p> <p>The verification report did not list each parameter required by the monitoring plan and state how the DOE verified the information flow for these parameters.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

52	0933	Jinan Landfill Gas to Energy Projec..., 01 May 08 - 28 Feb 09	SGS	<p>According with paragraph 10 (a) (iii) from EB48 - Annex 68, the monitoring report must contain all parameters required to be monitored and reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology. However, Monitoring Report does not contain information regarding whether the flare operated in accordance with the specifications prescribed by the manufacturer, as required by the monitoring methodology;</p> <p>According with paragraph 204 (b) from the VVM version 01.1, the DOE shall confirm that all parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied methodology and relevant CDM Executive Board decisions have been sufficiently monitored and updated as applicable. However, the DOE did not report whether the flare operated in accordance with the specifications prescribed by the manufacturer, as required by the monitoring methodology;</p> <p>The Verification Report states that a comprehensive flare efficiency determination was performed in April/2008, however the evidence assessed by the DOE is dated 25 Sept 2006. Additionally, there is no information in the Monitoring Report regarding this analysis;</p> <p>The notification of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD was approved on 09/04/2010, according with the message sent to the DOE and according with the date provided in the project's page at the CDM-UNFCCC web-site, however the Monitoring Report and the Verification Report makes several references with different dates;</p>
53	0744	Bundled Wind Power Projects in Sata..., 01 Apr 08 - 31 Mar 09	DNV	<p>The verification report didn't provide conclusions as to whether monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the registered monitoring plan and whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.</p>
54	0591	Shalivahana Non-Conventional Renewa..., 25 Jan 09 - 24 Jan 10	DNV	<p>Annex 68 to EB 48 and the "Issuance Information and Reporting Checklist" require that all parameters must be monitored and reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan. However, most of the required parameters are not reported at the intervals required by the registered monitoring plan, e.g. parameter D.3.1, D.3.2, ..., D.3.8.</p>



## CDM – Executive Board

				<p>VVM (paragraph 199) require that the DOE shall verify that the validated monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed CDM project activity. Furthermore, the "Issuance information and reporting checklist" and paragraph 202/220 of VVM require that the DOE shall provide a statement that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed project activity. However, this statement is missing in the verification report.</p> <p>The "Issuance information and reporting checklist" and VVM paragraph 205 requires that the verification report shall list each parameter required by the monitoring plan and clearly state how the DOE verified the information flow from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting for each of the required parameters. However, the list is missing for several required parameters, e.g. D3.2, D.3.4, D.3.5, ..., D3.7/3.8.</p>
55	1608	Anshan Iron and Steel Group Corpora..., 01 Apr 09 - 31 Dec 09	DNV	The verification report didn't provide conclusions as to whether monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered monitoring plan and whether the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied methodology.
56	0490	Catalytic N2O destruction project i..., 01 Jan 10 - 31 Mar 10	DNV	VVM Paragraph 198, 200, 202 require that the DOE shall verify that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the methodology and in particular, the DOE must provide a statement on that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed project activity. However, this verification statement is missing in your report. We kindly remind you that this is the second time your submission is rejected due to this issue.

-----

## History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision
01	11 November 2010	Further to EB54 paragraphs 57 & 73 and the new procedures adopted therein.
<b>Decision Class:</b> Ruling <b>Document Type:</b> Information Note <b>Business Function:</b> Registration, Issuance		