# INFORMATION NOTE ON THE RESULTS OF THE COMPLETENESS CHECKS

## 01 February 2011 - 30 April 2011

## (Version 01)

**1.** The Executive Board at its 54th 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. An Information Note on results of the two stages of completeness checks for request for registration and issuance covering the period from 30 June 2010 to 23 October 2010 was published in November 2010 at the UNFCCC CDM website[1], in which it was mentioned that the secretariat will be publishing the results of the completeness and information & reporting checks regularly (e.g. quarterly). Thus, an information note for the subsequent period (i.e. 24 October 2010 - 31 January 2011) was published in February 2011[2]. This Information Note covers the period from 01 February 2011 to 30 April 2011, and includes a total of 350 submissions for the completeness checks stage for registration and a total of 429 submissions for issuance. This total of submissions is represented by requests returned for corrections during completeness check stage and during information & reporting stage, and total of requests published within this reporting period.

**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 during request for registration and request for issuance. A detailed list containing all reasons for returning submissions is provided in Appendix 1.

**Table 1: Reasons for returning project submissions during completeness check stage**

| Category | Registration Occurrence | Issuance Occurrence |
|---|---|---|
| Incomplete submission | 27 | 1 |
| Incomplete information | 29 | 7 |
| Inconsistency | 4 | 26 |
| Other | 42 | 6 |
| ***Total occurrences*** | ***102*** | ***40*** |
| ***Number of requests returned to DOEs*** | ***65*** | ***40*** |

Table 1 above shows a summary of the reasons for which requests for registration and requests for issuances were returned for corrections during the completeness check stage.

[1] http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Notes/index.html.
[2] https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Notes/reg_note13.pdf

**Table 2: Reasons for returning project submissions during information & reporting check stage**

| Registration | | Issuance | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Category** | **Occurrence** | **Category** | **Occurrence** |
| Additionality | 73 | Inconsistency of information | 11 |
| Baseline methodology | 46 | Implementation status/physical features of project | 5 |
| Monitoring methodology | 16 | Monitored Parameters | 17 |
| LoA | 0 | Monitoring system and procedures | 3 |
| DOE's related issues | 2 | Calibration | 19 |
| Other | 11 | ER calculation | 7 |
| | | Comparison/increase of CERs | 2 |
| | | Other verification reporting requirement (Crosschecking, statement of compliance with meth/monitoring plan, etc.) | 3 |
| | | Other | 4 |
| ***Total*** | ***148*** | | ***71*** |
| ***Number of requests returned to DOEs*** | ***64*** | | ***39*** |

Table 2 above shows a summary of the reasons for which requests for registration and requests for issuances were returned for corrections during information & reporting stage. As suggested by the categories listed in Table 2, the reasons for returning project submissions are different between registration and issuance submissions. Separate reasons were therefore identified for registration and issuance.

**Table 3: Requests for registration returned to DOE**

| | **Total CC Requests** | **Returned During Completeness Check** | | **Total I&R Requests** | **Returned during I&R check** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **#** | **%** | | **#** | **%** |
| **BVCH** | 30 | 7 | 23% | 23 | 2 | 9% |
| **CEC** | 3 | 0 | 0% | 5 | 0 | 0% |
| **CQC** | 8 | 1 | 13% | 6 | 1 | 17% |
| **ICONTEC** | 9 | 8 | 89% | 4 | 2 | 50% |
| **Deloitte-TECO** | 4 | 2 | 50% | 3 | 1 | 33% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **DNV** | 63 | 6 | 10% | 49 | 12 | 24% |
| **ERM CVS** | 13 | 3 | 23% | 9 | 0 | 0% |
| **GLC** | 4 | 0 | 0% | 3 | 0 | 0% |
| **JACO** | 8 | 0 | 0% | 8 | 3 | 38% |
| **JCI** | 11 | 5 | 45% | 6 | 3 | 50% |
| **JMA** | 0 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| **JQA** | 1 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| **KEMCO** | 6 | 1 | 17% | 4 | 2 | 50% |
| **KECO** | 3 | 0 | 0% | 2 | 1 | 50% |
| **KFQ** | 6 | 1 | 17% | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| **Applus** | 2 | 1 | 50% | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| **LRQA** | 7 | 0 | 0% | 8 | 1 | 13% |
| **PJR CDM** | 1 | 1 | 100% | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| **RINA** | 9 | 3 | 33% | 5 | 3 | 60% |
| **SGS** | 46 | 4 | 9% | 27 | 8 | 30% |
| **SIRIM** | 10 | 4 | 40% | 5 | 4 | 80% |
| **AENOR** | 1 | 0 | 0% | 3 | 0 | 0% |
| **SQS** | 7 | 2 | 29% | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| **TÜV Nord** | 40 | 5 | 13% | 36 | 9 | 25% |
| **TUEV Rheinland** | 27 | 7 | 26% | 18 | 2 | 11% |
| **TÜV SÜD** | 31 | 4 | 13% | 19 | 8 | 42% |
| ***Total*** | ***350*** | ***65*** | | ***247*** | ***64*** | |

**Table 4: Requests for issuance returned to DOE**

| | **Total CC Requests** | **Returned During Completeness Check** | | **Total I&R Requests** | **Returned during I&R check** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **#** | **%** | | **#** | **%** |
| **AENOR** | 5 | 2 | 40% | 3 | 1 | 33% |
| **BVCH** | 46 | 6 | 13% | 47 | 1 | 2% |
| **CEC** | 7 | 0 | 0% | 7 | 0 | 0% |
| **CQC** | 3 | 0 | 0% | 3 | 0 | 0% |
| **Deloitte-TECO** | 2 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| **DNV** | 88 | 6 | 7% | 71 | 8 | 11% |
| **ERM CVS** | 13 | 0 | 0% | 13 | 1 | 8% |
| **GLC** | 2 | 0 | 0% | 2 | 0 | 0% |
| **ICONTEC** | 14 | 6 | 43% | 7 | 3 | 43% |
| **JACO** | 8 | 1 | 13% | 7 | 1 | 14% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **JCI** | 7 | 1 | 14% | 3 | 0 | 0% |
| **JQA** | 3 | 0 | 0% | 2 | 0 | 0% |
| **KFQ** | 3 | 0 | 0% | 2 | 1 | 50% |
| **KSA** | 2 | 0 | 0% | 2 | 1 | 50% |
| **LRQA** | 6 | 2 | 33% | 4 | 0 | 0% |
| **RINA** | 5 | 0 | 0% | 5 | 0 | 0% |
| **SGS** | 89 | 5 | 6% | 67 | 8 | 12% |
| **SIRIM** | 8 | 1 | 13% | 5 | 3 | 60% |
| **SQS** | 3 | 0 | 0% | 3 | 1 | 33% |
| **TUEV Rheinland** | 22 | 2 | 9% | 17 | 1 | 6% |
| **TÜV Nord** | 50 | 5 | 10% | 39 | 4 | 10% |
| **TÜV SÜD** | 43 | 3 | 7% | 37 | 5 | 14% |
| ***Total*** | ***429*** | ***40*** | | ***347*** | ***39*** | |

Tables 3 and 4 above provide a summary of the number of registration and issuance requests, broken down by DOE. The table shows the percentage of cases for each DOE that were returned for corrections at both stages. The details in terms of which projects, DOE and the reasons can be found in the detailed data that included in Appendix 1.

- - - - -

**History of the document**

| Version | Date | Nature of revision |
|---|---|---|
| 01 | 23 May 2011 | Further to EB54 Annex 35 paragraphs 10 & 12 and EB54 Annex 28 paragraphs 14 & 16. |
| **Decision Class**: Ruling<br>**Document Type**: Information Note<br>**Business Function**: Registration, Issuance | | |

Appendix 1

List of reasons for returning registration and issuance requests to DOEs during completeness check and information & reporting check stages.

**Table 1**

| Registration | | Stage 1: Completeness Check | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **#** | **Project #** | **Project** | **DOE** | **Reasons** |
| **1** | **4293** | **Carroll's Foods do Brasil & LOGICarbon – GHG Emission Reductions from Swine Manure Management System, Diamantino, MT, Brazil** | **BVCH** | **Incomplete information:** The party name in the Annex 1 of the Modalities of Communication is blank. |
| **2** | **4301** | **20.8 MW Grid connected wind electricity generation project at Dhule, Maharashtra** | **SIRIM** | **Incomplete information:** The PP/DOE is requested to amend the PDD submitted for request for registration as: a) the diagram in page 9 is not fitted in the page thus the complete diagram is not presented; b) some images in pahe 58-59 are overlapped thus some images is not presented in full view. |
| **3** | **3472** | **Shanxi Shuangliang Cement Company LTD. 4.5MW Waste Heat for Power Generation Project** | **CQC** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to move Edison Spa (Italy) from bilateral and multilateral fund section to other party involved section of the project view page as the project activity is not a bilateral and multilateral fund as clarified by the DOE. |
| **4** | **4326** | **Huaneng Tongliao Kezuozhongqi Dongbaiyin Wind Farm Project** | **DNV** | **Incomplete information:** Carbon Resource Management S.A. is nominated as focal point for joint authorities, however there is only one entity is listed in the Section 2 of the MoC "Nomination of Focal Points". |
| **5** | **4334** | **Grid connected electricity generation using natural gas by the Vemagiri Power Generation Ltd.** | **SIRIM** | **Incomplete information:** The DOE/PP is requested to resubmit Annexes 1-4 as some of the sheets included in these spreadsheets are not fully replicable. **Inconsistency:** The DOE/PP is requested to clarify the inconsistency related to the name of the project activity between the LOA and the rest of the documentation submitted. |
| **6** | **4045** | **Inner Mongolia Tongliao Zhalute Qi Beishala Wind Power Project** | **DNV** | **Inconsistency:** Inconsistency of start date between the Project Design Document and the Validation report. **Incomplete documentation:** The Modalities of Communication appoints two entities as focal point for sole role, however when a focal point entity is sole for all scopes, no other entity should be mentioned in the Modalities of Communication. **Incomplete information:** Duplicate copy of the Validation report is submitted as one document. |
| **7** | **4388** | **Gansu Guazhou Ganhekou No.3 Wind Power Plant Project** | **JCI** | **Incomplete documentation:** The DOE is requested to submit a complete Modalities of Communication, as Annex 1 of the submitted Modalities of Communication is missing. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **Inconsistency:** The Validation Report does not contain information on the starting date of the crediting period. Please also note that an additional file "project design document - CONFIDENTIAL" was uploaded in the project view page. |
| **8** | **4406** | **ERH – Biogas recovery, heat and electricity generation from effluents ponds in Honduras** | **RINA** | **Inconsistency:** Please include all relevant scopes in the request for registration form and also correct the scale.<br>**Inconsistency:** There are inconsistencies of methodology version between the Project Design Document, the Validation report and the project view page. The validation report uses the methodology AMS-I.C. ver. 17 where as the Project Design Document as well as the project view page use ver. 16. |
| **9** | **4424** | **Pirgua Landfill gas recovery and flaring** | **ICONTEC** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE/PP are requested to clarify the inconsistency in the project participants shown in the LoA from Colombia as this indicates two project participants while the PDD, p.5 and the VR, p.11 and p. 23 indicate three participants. Please note that the LoA must authorize each of the project participants involved in the proposed project activity. In doing so please refer to EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 10.c.<br>**Incomplete documentation:** The DOE/PP are requested to amend the MoC as Section 3 should be signed by each of the three project participant listed in Annex 1 of the MoC and also in the project view page. In doing so please refer to EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 10.d. |
| **10** | **4203** | **Inner Mongolia Bayannaoer Chuanjingsumu Wind Power Project** | **DNV** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify the party of the 'other parties participant' as Annex 1 of the Modalities of Communication shows United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland instead of France as mentioned in the Project Design Document, Registration request form, the Validation Report and the project view page. |
| **11** | **4359** | **Mare Chicose Landfill Gas Project** | **SQS** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify whether Rhizome Ltd. is also a project participant approved by the host country, considering that the LoA was issued only for Sotravic Limitee. |
| **12** | **4119** | **10.5 MW wind mill project of ICF in the state of Tamil Nadu** | **TÜV Nord** | **Inconsistency:** The PP/DOE are requested to include the Party name in the corresponding section of the Annex 1 of the Modalities of Communication. |
| **13** | **4389** | **Xinjiang Lasite Hydropower Project of China** | **Deloitte-TECO** | **Inconsistency:** The name of the project is mentioned in place of project participant from China in section 2, Annex 1 of MOC.<br>**Inconsistency:** The name of the Annex 1 Party that authorized the participation of Mitsubishi Corporation is missing in |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | section 2, Annex 1 of MOC.<br>**Incomplete information:** The geo-coordinates in project view page and PDD are not consistent. The geo-coordinates mentioned in PDD first need to convert into decimal format and upload in project view page. |
| **14** | **4201** | **LA CALERA BIODIGESTERS PROJECT** | **ICONTEC** | **Other:** The project activity applies expired methodology AMS-III.D. ver. 15 (Expired on: 09 Apr 10 01:59 ; Grace period ends/ended on: 09 Dec 10 00:59). Please refer to the guidance of EB 48 Annex 60 paragraphs 13 and 14. |
| **15** | **4302** | **SASSA Low Pressure Solar Water Heater Programme** | **JCI** | **Incomplete documentation:** Authorization document from the host party can not be found on the view page.<br>**Inconsistency:** On the view page, information about the authorized participants can not be found under the table of "host parties". |
| **16** | **4302** | **SASSA Low Pressure Solar Water Heater Programme** | **JCI** | **Inconsistency:** Please note that there are still inconsistencies related to the composition of project participants between the MoC, POA registration request form, Validation Report and project view page; in particular:<br>a) The project view page shows that the participants Standard Bank Plc and International Carbon Ltd were approved by South Africa; however the LoA was issued to Solar Academy of Sub Saharan Africa (Pty) Ltd.<br>The project view page also shows that UK is involved directly in the project, but this is not reflected in the LoAs from UK submitted.<br>Further, please note that the UK LoAs of Standard Bank Plc and International Carbon Ltd should be merged and that UK should therefore be mentioned only once in the project view page.<br>b) The POA Design Document shows that the participants are Solar Academy of Sub Saharan Africa (Pty) Ltd. (South Africa), and Standard Bank Plc and International Carbon Ltd (UK) , which is in line with the revised MoC submitted.<br>c) The PoA request registration form indicates that the participants are: Solar Academy of Sub Saharan Africa (Pty) Ltd., Standard Bank Plc and International Carbon Ltd (South Africa), and Standard Bank Plc (UK)<br>d) Finally, the validation report should clearly mention the composition of project participants. |
| **17** | **4324** | **MONTENEGRO LANDFILL GAS RECOVERY AND FLARING** | **ICONTEC** | **Inconsistency:** There are several inconsistencies in the reporting of the project participants; e,g:<br>The LoA from Germany and MoC indicate 2 project participants approved by Germany while the view page, registration request form, PDD, and VR mention only one; |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | The LoA from Colombia indicates 2 project participants while the view page, PDD and VR present 4 participants from Colombia;<br>The view page indicates a participant (SERVIGENERALES S.A. E.S.P ) which is not approved by any of the countries involved.<br>The MoC does not indicate OPTIM Consult S.A.S as a PP in Annex 1.<br>One of the PPs is referred to as OPTIM Consult Ltda. in the LoA from Colombia and VR but as OPTIM Consult S.A.S in the PDD, Registration request form and the project view page. The names should be consistently reported in all documents.<br>**Incomplete documentation:** The signatures appearing on pages 4-7-8 of the uploaded MoC are not legible.<br>The PP and DOE should refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60. |
| **18** | **4417** | **Ha Nang Hydropower Project** | **KEMCO** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE/PP is requested to clarify the inconsistency of the 'Other party involved' as the project view page and the Registration request form indicate "Swaziland" and the Project Design Document, Letter of Approval and Validation Report indicate "Switzerland". |
| **19** | **4423** | **MONTERIA LANDFILL GAS RECOVERY AND FLARING** | **ICONTEC** | **Inconsistency:** There are inconsistencies in the PPs name. The LoA from Colombia indicates two PP, while the PDD page 5, VR page 11 and page 24, Registration Form and project view page indicate three PPs from Colombia. The LoA from Germany indicates two PPs while the PDD page 5, VR page 11 and page 24, Registration From and project view page indicate one PP. Please refer to EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 10.c.<br>**Incomplete documentation:** The MoC is incomplete. Section 3 of the MoC is missing and the MoC has not listed the name of all the PPs. Please refer to EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 10.d. |
| **20** | **3816** | **Guanaquitas 9.74 MW Hydroelectric project** | **ICONTEC** | **Incomplete information:** The DOE shall resubmit a version of the confidential spreadsheet with all formulas readable and all relevant cells viewable and unprotected, and if the PP so wishes, upload a read-only or PDF copy in the public view page, in line with Guidance #8 of the Guidelines on the Assessment of Investment analysis, (ver.3.1, EB 51, Annex, 58.<br>**Incomplete information:** The DOE shall provide further clarification on how it has validated the input values in line with VVM v1.2 para 111 (a) and (b), in particular (a) the capital cost and O&M costs- the DOE shall provide further information on the data from the Mines |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | and Energy Ministry used for comparison, i.e., the range of values and pertinent information such as projects considered, capacity, location, etc.; and (b) the tariff - the link provided for the statistics on spot prices cannot be opened; the DOE should also provide information on how the spot prices are determined and why it is considered appropriate to use the average prices for 2007.<br>**Other:** The DOE shall clarify how it has validated the 15% ROE benchmark in line with VVM 1.2 para. 112 and the investment analysis guidance, EB 51, Annex 58, para. 13 and 14. In doing so the DOE shall provide more information on why it is considered appropriate to use the internal cost of equity in energy investments of the investment fund (Century Energy Corp). |
| **21** | **4346** | **1.8 MW Small Scale Wind Energy Project in Maharashtra-India by M/s Biotech Vision Care Pvt Ltd.** | **ERM CVS** | **Incomplete documentation:** The DOE is requested to include the name of the entity in section 2 p. 1(focal point) of the MoC.<br>**Inconsistency:** Sectoral scope is not mentioned in the Validation report.<br>**Incomplete information:** Please submit a reproducible spreadsheet for Appendix 2 - Financial spreadsheet. |
| **22** | **4098** | **Shanxi Herui Coal Mine Methane Power Generation Project** | **ERM CVS** | **Incomplete documentation:** The PP/DOE are requested to include the Party name in the corresponding section of the Annex 1 of the Modalities of Communication.<br>**Incomplete documentation:** The DOE is requested to indicate correct date of request for registration in the registration request form. |
| **23** | **4438** | **Energy Efficiency Improvement at Tamil Nadu Newsprint and Papers Limited** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Incomplete documentation:** The MoC form was not completely filled: Annex 1 does not include the name of the project participants and Party. |
| **24** | **4453** | **Dacaoba Hydropower Project in Mian County, Shaanxi Province, P.R.China** | **Applus** | **Incomplete documentation:** The DOE/PP is requested to submit the original LoA along with the English translation. Please refer to EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 8.c.<br>**Incomplete documentation:** The DOE/PP is requested to include the scope in the Registration form. Please refer to EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10.e. It is advised to submit the PDF format of the form. |
| **25** | **4364** | **50.4 MW wind power project by EN Renewable Energy Pvt. Ltd** | **RINA** | **Incomplete documentation:** The MoC is incomplete. Section 3 of the MoC is missing. Please refer to EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 10.d. |
| **26** | **4379** | **Hutama Green Energy Methane Capture and Utilization Project at Starch Tapioca Bandar Mataram, Central Lampung, Indonesia** | **TÜV Nord** | **Incomplete documentation:** Unclear definition of scopes of authority of focal point entities.Two focal point were appointed with the sole role for communication with secretariat and EB on matters related to registration and/or issuance. Please refer to EB 48 Annex |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 60 paragraph 10.d. |
| **27** | **4365** | **Hunan Xiaoshanyang Small Hydropower Project** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Incomplete information:** The party names in the corresponding section of the Annex 1 of the MoC are blank, and the MoC appears to be not in the correct order. |
| **28** | **4437** | **GREEN ENERGY TO GRID at Dhule, Maharashtra** | **BVCH** | **Incomplete documentation:** The PP/DOE is requested to provide a complete MoC as section 3 of the MoC and the party name in the corresponding section of the Annex 1 are blank. In doing so please refer to EB48, Annex 60, paragraph 10.d. |
| **29** | **4475** | **9.9 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Maharashtra by REI Agro Limited** | **BVCH** | **Incomplete documentation:** The DOE/PP are requested to submit a Validation Report. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 8.b. |
| **30** | **3310** | **Liaoning Nuhetu Wind Power Project** | **ERM CVS** | **Incomplete documentation:** The DOE is requested to include the Party name in the corresponding section of the Annex 1 of the Modalities of Communication. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 10.d. |
| **31** | **4497** | **Wind Energy Project in Tamilnadu by M/s Advik Hi-tech Pvt. Ltd.** | **RINA** | **Other:** VR pages 40, 42, A53-A57 are blank. Inconsisteny in file name Annex 1 versus file referred to in VR. |
| **32** | **4435** | **Jiangxi Laohutou Hydropower Project** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Inconsistency:** The name of the Host country participant is not consistent between the Modalities of Communication, Project Design Document, Registration Request Form, Validation Report and the LoA.<br>**Inconsistency:** The name of the Host country project participant in the Modalities of Communication (Ganzhou Weifengyi Power Resources Development Co., Ltd.) is not consistent with that of the Project Design Document, Registration Request Form, Validation Report and the LoA. |
| **33** | **4460** | **Avoided Methane Emissions Through Composting of EFB Biomass at PT Pinago Utama Sugihwaras Palm Oil Mill, Sumatera Selatan, Indonesia.** | **SIRIM** | **Incomplete information:** Please submit a reproducible spreadsheet for Appendix 2 - Financial Analysis in lline with the guidelines of EB 51, Annex 58 paragraph 8.<br>**Inconsistency:** There are inconsistencies of scopes between the Project Design Document, Validation Report, Request for Registration and the project view page.Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b.<br>**Inconsistency:** There are inconsistencies in the PPs name. The MoC and the LoA from Denmark indicate Ministry of Climate and Energy, Danish Energy Agency, while the PDD VR, Registration Form and project view page only indicate Ministry of Climate and Energy. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **34** | **4463** | **Metro Delhi, India** | **SQS** | **Other:** The DOE is requested to indicate the version of the methodology in the project view page. |
| **35** | **4478** | **Improved Cook Stoves CDM project of JSMBT** | **PJR CDM** | **Incomplete information:** The DOE is requested to include the sectoral scope in the Project Design Document and the Valiation Report.<br>**Incomplete documentation:** The DOE is requested to include the Party name in the corresponding section of the Annex 1 of the Modalities of Communication. |
| **36** | **3790** | **Quanzhou Liupu Hydropower Project** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Inconsistency:** Inconsistency of start date between the Project Design Document and the Validation report( page no 39 and the first bullet).<br>**Inconsistency:** The DOE/PP are requested to clarify the inconsistency in the project participants in project veiw page and the PDD.The PDD, MoC and validation report indicate that the host party wishes to be considered as the project participant. However, the contact details of host party as project participants is missing from annex 1 of the PDD and the involvement of host party is shown indirect in the project veiw page.<br>**Inconsistency:** The vaidation report does not mention the sectoral scope of the project. |
| **37** | **4440** | **Inner Mongolia Tongliao Zhalute Qi Phase I North Wind Power Project** | **BVCH** | **Incomplete information:** The validation protocol on p. 83 of the validation report is incomplete. |
| **38** | **4531** | **Improving Rural Livelihoods Through Carbon Sequestration By Adopting Environment Friendly Technology based Agroforestry Practices** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Incomplete information:** The DOE/PP are requested to provide a readable format of Appendix 4 in the project view page in line with EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 9.b. |
| **39** | **0398** | **Ningxia Tianjing Shenzhou 30.6MW Wind-farm Project** | **BVCH** | **Incomplete documentation:** The Crediting Period Renewal form refers to a date in the future |
| **40** | **4398** | **Methane Recovery and Utilization CDM project in Zhongmou County Henan Province** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Incomplete information:** The DOE/PP is requested to submit the original LoA along with the English translation. Please refer to EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 8 c.<br>**Incomplete information:** The DOE/PP is requested to submit the documents included in the folder ¨Appendix 5 - Contract_Zhongmou.zip¨ containing a full translation of relevant sections into English. Please refer to EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 9 c. |
| **41** | **4533** | **Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions Through Super Critical Technology - Coastal Andhra Power Ltd** | **TÜV Nord** | **Incomplete information:** The spreadsheets submitted by the PP/DOE are not readable, e.g. cell B127-131 of Appendix 1 - 4533 ALTERNATIVE 1, cell B101-105 of Appendix 4 - 4533 ALTERNATIVE 4, cell B101-103 of Appendix 5 - 4533 ALTERNATIVE 5 and cell B93-97 of Appendix 6 - 4533 ALTERNATIVE 6. Please provide the spreadsheets that are readable and |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | reproducible. |
| **42** | **4552** | **Kinoya Sewerage Treatment Plant GHG Emission Reduction Project** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Inconsistency:** The LoA sates a PDD version 02.4 dated 17.03.10, while the PDD submitted is Version 03.4 dated 12 February 2011. |
| **43** | **4551** | **Za Hung Hydropower Project** | **BVCH** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE shall clarify the inconsistency in the methodology version applied. The validation report mentions ACM0002 ver. 11 while the PDD and project view page mention ver. 12.<br>**Inconsistency:** Please clarify the inconsistency in the involvement of the Parties, between project view page and section A.3 in the PDD. |
| **44** | **3836** | **Construction of Sumgayit Combined Cycle Power Plant** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Inconsistency:** There are inconsistencies in the Project title between the LoA, VR, MoC and the PDD. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b.<br>**Incomplete information:** Page 205 of the Validation Report is blank.<br>**Inconsistency:** Sectoral scope is not mentioned in the Validation report. |
| **45** | **4532** | **Biomass based power project of Rayapati Power Generation Private Limited** | **SGS** | **Incomplete documentation:** The DOE is requested to include the Party name in the corresponding section of the Annex 1 of the Modalities of Communication. In doing so please refer to EB48, Annex 60, paragraph 10.d. |
| **46** | **4324** | **MONTENEGRO LANDFILL GAS RECOVERY AND FLARING** | **ICONTEC** | **Incomplete documentation:** The DOE is requested to include the Party name in the corresponding section of the Annex 1 of the Modalities of Communication. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 10.d.<br>**Incomplete information:** Spreadsheet 'Baseline emission reduction calculation Montenegro project' (sheet 'Modelo' line 4 and 5) contains links to unknown sources. |
| **47** | **4423** | **MONTERIA LANDFILL GAS RECOVERY AND FLARING** | **ICONTEC** | **Incomplete information:** The DOE is requested to submit the LoA from Colombia containing English translation. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 9.c.<br>**Incomplete documentation:** The DOE is requested to submit a signed Registration request form. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 10.e.<br>**Incomplete documentation:** The DOE is requested to include the Party name in the corresponding section of the Annex 1 of the Modalities of |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Communication. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 10.d. |
| **48** | **4424** | **Pirgua Landfill gas recovery and flaring** | **ICONTEC** | **Incomplete information:** The DOE is requested to submit the LoA from Colombia containing English translation. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 9.c. |
| **49** | **4575** | **6.0 MW wind energy project in Karnataka, India** | **SGS** | **Incomplete information:** The PP/DOE are requested to upload the respective PDD to the project view page as requested by paragraph 8 (a) of EB 48 Annex 60 after correcting mistakes in PDD in particular page 9 is blank and the diagram in page 12 and 13 is incomplete. |
| **50** | **4555** | **Shaanxi Wenjing 48MW Hydropower Project** | **DNV** | **Inconsistency:** The Loa of UK dated 1 February 2011 refers to the draft Validation Report, dated 26 October 2010 and to the Project Design Document, version 02, dated 25 October 2010. However the PDD submitted is version 03, dated 01/03/2011 and the validation report rev.01 is dated 03/03/2011. Please submit consistent references as per EB48 Annex 60 paragraph 9 (d). |
| **51** | **4570** | **Sichuan Yanyuan Woluoqiao Hydropower Station Project** | **KFQ** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE/PP are requested to correct the inconsistency in the project participants from Switzerland. The project view page and the Registration request form mention a different project participant from Switzerland than other supporting documents ("Vitoa" x "Vitol"). |
| **52** | **3309** | **Sichuan Muchuan County Huogu Hydropower Project** | **ERM CVS** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE/PP is requested to clarify the inconsistency of the parties involved in the project activity. As per the LoA issued by China Annex 1 country is United Kingdom where as in other documents Annex 1 country is Netherlands.<br>**Inconsistency:** The DOE/PP is requested to clarify the incosistency in the project participant from China between the Chinese LoA and the rest of the documents submitted. |
| **53** | **4214** | **Wastewater Treatment with Biogas System (UASB) in a Starch Plant for Energy & Environment Conservation at Nakorn Ratchasima** | **SGS** | **Incomplete information:** The PP/DOE are requested to provide a reproducible spreadsheet for Appendix 1 as well as for Appendices 4 and 5 sheets FOREX May 03 and MLR May 03 as the cells in the spreadsheets provided are not traceable (they do not contain formulas, only typed numbers). In doing so, please refer to EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 9 b. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **54** | **4380** | **Hutama Green Energy Methane Capture and Utilization Project at Starch Tapioca Mesuji, Central Lampung, Indonesia** | **TÜV Nord** | **Incomplete documentation:** The Modalities of Communication appoints two entities as focal point for sole role, however when a focal point entity is sole for all scopes, no other entity should be mentioned in the Modalities of Communication. Please refer to EB 45, Annex 59, paragraph 6. |
| **55** | **4600** | **Qingyuan 44MW Hydropower Project** | **Deloitte-TECO** | **Incomplete documentation:** The Modalities of Communication appoints two entities as focal point for sole role, however when a focal point entity is sole for all scopes, no other entity should be mentioned in the Modalities of Communication. Please refer to EB 45, Annex 59, paragraph 6. |
| **56** | **4604** | **Hunan Houpi Bundled Small Hydropower Project** | **TÜV Nord** | **Incomplete information:** The DOE is requested to resubmit the evidence of CDM consideration Houpi and evidence of CDM consideration Zhonghe containing English translation. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 9.c. |
| **57** | **4556** | **Ningxia Mahuangshan Phase II 49.5MW Wind-farm Project** | **ERM CVS** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE/PP are requested to submit the correct Project Design Document for Global Stakeholder Process. The submitted document is for another project.<br>When resubmitting the documents, kindly ensure that global stakeholder issues are adequately explained, in particular whether the process is still valid, considering that the submitted documents referred to another project. |
| **58** | **4587** | **Penglai Daliuhang Wind Farm Project Phase I** | **DNV** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE/PP shall include the Office of National Coordination Committee on Climate Change, National Development and Reform Commission in the Validation Report and the Project Design Document as this is shown as a Project Participant in the Modalities of Communication. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraphs 7.b and 8.d.<br>**Inconsistency:** Sectoral scope is not mentioned in the Validation report. |
| **59** | **4603** | **Qinghai Province Xinghai County Moduo Hydropower Project** | **DNV** | **Incomplete information:** The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on additionality /baseline as additional appendicies to the PDDas requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60. |
| **60** | **4494** | **Anhui Yuelianghu and Liucunba Bundled Hydropower Project** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Incomplete documentation:** As per the Project Design Document and the Validation Report submitted it seems that the project activity is a bundle of two small scale projects. However the DOE has not submitted bundling form. Please clarify and revise the documents accordingly.<br>**Incomplete information:** The DOE is requested to resubmit Appendices 1 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | and 2 (Project starting date evidences and CDM consideration) containing English translation. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 9.c.<br>**Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency of the start date of the crediting period between the Project Design Document, Validation Report and the project view page. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b. |
| **61** | **4615** | **5 MW Solar PV Power Project in Sivagangai Village, Sivaganga District, Tamil Nadu** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Incomplete documentation:** The DOE is requested to include the Party name in the corresponding section of the Annex 1 of the Modalities of Communication. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 10.d. |
| **62** | **3992** | **Shuangyang Waste Heat Recovery and Power Generation Project in Jilin Yatai Cement Co., Ltd.** | **JCI** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency of dates and revision numbers between the PDD and the PDD confidential.<br>**Incomplete documentation:** The MoC uploaded in the view page is not in the correct order. In addition secretariat noticed that there are two MoCs sent via email by the DOE. Please upload the correct MoC.<br>**Inconsistency:** Sectoral scope is not mentioned in the Validation Report. |
| **63** | **4544** | **Nam Soi & Nam Cong Hydropower Project** | **SGS** | **Incomplete information:** The PP/DOE are requested to provide a reproducible spreadsheet for Appendix 2-VNEEC_Data EF from EVN_public as the cells in the spreadsheets provided are not traceable (they do not contain formulas, only typed numbers). In doing so, please refer to EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 9 b. |
| **64** | **4624** | **CLP Huanyu (Shandong) Biomass Heat and Power Generation Project** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Inconsistency:** The project´s web page states that the applied methodology is ACM0006 v. 11, while the submitted documentation refer to methodologies ACM0006 v.10.1 and ACM0002 v.11.<br>**Inconsistency:** The MoC refers to ¨Department of Climate Change, National Development and Reform Committee¨as project participant, while the request for registration form refers to ¨China¨ and the PDD Annex1 to ¨National Development and Reform Committee¨. |
| **65** | **4302** | **SASSA Low Pressure Solar Water Heater Programme** | **JCI** | **Incomplete documentation:** Please take off the South Africa authorization document from the view page as it has been combined with the Letter of Approval in one document. |

Table 2

| Registration | | Stage 2: Infromation & Reporting Check | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| # | Project # | Project | DOE | Reasons |
| 1 | 3271 | **Fujian Shaowu Jinwei Hydropower Project** | **JACO** | **Additionality:** The DOE mentions that "Continuing actions followed can also be confirmed by ref.6 -12 of the PDD Ver.04 /2/. Each steps were taken within the interval no longer than 2 years, which is in compliance with the guide line of EB49 Annex 22." However, the documents reviewed by the DOE should be transparently listed in the validation report in line with the VVM paragraph 102 (b), including dates and sources.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how it has confirmed that the values from the FSR (March 2004), which have been the basis of the decision to proceed with the investment in the project, were applicable at the time of investment decision (November 2006), in line with VVM paragraph 113 (c). In addition, the DOE shall transparently report and provide the details of the evidence used to cross-check the suitability of the total investment and loan interest rate.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE should include the details of the evidence used to validate the common practice analysis in the validation report as per the requirements of the VVM paragraph 121.<br>**Other:** Please note that the request for registration form is wrongly dated. |
| 2 | 3368 | **Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Baimashan Conch Cement Company Limited** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Additionality:** The DoE is requested to provide the calculation sheet including formulae used to calculate internal benchmark (WACC) in line with requirements of EB 48 Annex 60 para 8(g) and 9(b).<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The PDD and VR mentioned that the electricity supplied by the project activity and electricity imported by the project activity from the grid will be measured continuosly.But the parameter for electricity import from grid is not enlisted in the table under B.7.1 section of the PDD. |
| 3 | 3459 | **Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Beiliu Conch Cement Company Limited** | **TÜV SÜD** | **DOE's related issues:** The DOE has failed to submit the Fcap calculation spreadsheet which was one of the reasons this project was found to be incomplete:"...and Fcap calculation should be provided.". In the e-mail of 16 March 2011 the DOE has submitted other information (related to WACC calculation) instead of the requested information. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4** | **3669** | **Rodeio Bonito Small Hydro Power Project** | **DNV** | **Baseline methodology:** The amount of the electricity supplied to the grid 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. |
| **5** | **3730** | **12.82 MW Bundled Small Hydropower Project in Qiandongnan Autonomous Region, Guizhou Province, P. R. China** | **JACO** | **Additionality:** The DOE should provide a validation opinion on the sensitivity analysis presented in the PDD in line with the VVM paragraph 111 (e). |
| **6** | **3772** | **Energy efficiency through heat recovery at Vadodara Manufacturing Complex of IPCL** | **DNV** | **Additionality:** The DOE has not provided a clear description of the project activity that provides the reader with a clear understanding of the precise nature of the project activity and the technical aspects of its implementation in line with paragraphs 58-64 of VVM v1.2, in particular: (i) when the modification for the furnace in the industrial facility (Naphtha Cracker plant) has been initiated and completed; and (ii) whether there is any other equipment revamped in the industrial facility in addition to the furnace.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE has explained that the waste energy was released to the atmosphere in the absence of the project activity using the by the process plant manufacture's original design specification. However, the DOE has not provided the quantity and energy content of the waste energy produced for the rated plant capacity or unit of product produced in line with AMS III Q v3.<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The DOE has not explained why metering the amount of energy contained in the waste heat, which is required to be monitored as per paragraph 18 (b) of AMS III Q v3, has not been included in the monitoring plan. |
| **7** | **3807** | **Guangxi Tianlin County Weimi Hydropower Station** | **TÜV Nord** | **Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to validate the applicability of the methodology. In doing so, the DOE shall clarify whether the project activity involves capacity addition as mentioned in PDD page 7 or not.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE shall provide its validation opinion on the common practice in line with VVM (v01.1), para.120, in particular the essential distinction between the project activity and two similar projects observed in the PDD.<br>**Additionality:** The Preliminary Design Report (PDR) was dated December 2004 as reported in the validation report, page 39, whereas the PDD mentioned the PDR was completed in August 2004. Please clarify the inconsistency.<br>**Additionality:** There is no validation on |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | residual value applied in the investment analysis. |
| **8** | **3843** | **Muong Kim Hydropower Project** | **TÜV Nord** | **Baseline methodology:** The DOE has not explained how it has validated the accuracy and completeness of the project description given that the project is a bundle of smaller projects as mentioned on page 34, 35, 67 and 85 of validation report whereas it is mentioned that the project is a large scale project activity;<br>**Other:** MoC is not complete, i.e. the section "party that authorizes participation" is empty;<br>**Additionality:** The DOE has not provided details regarding the assessment of common practice analysis, in particular how it has undertaken an assessment of the existence of similar projects and how the DOE has assessed the essential distinctions between the proposed CDM project activity and any similar projects that are widely observed and commonly carried out; |
| **9** | **4009** | **Pure-low Temperature Waste Heat Recovery for Power Generation in Chifeng Yuanhang Cement Co., Ltd.** | **DNV** | **Additionality:** The DOE should indicate how it has validated the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis, in particular: (a) the grid reserve capacity expense. In answering this question the DOE should indicate if a similar or equivalent fee was paid by the PP before the implementation of the proposed project activity, (b) whether after the implementation of the proposed project actitiy the cement plant still imports electricity from the grid; (c) the O&M cost and its composition; (c) the item "low consupmtion and other expenses".<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE should indicate how it has validated the elimination of the Method-1 (3 years historical data) for fcap calculation when, as indicated in validation report page 12, the first production line has been in operation since November 2004. |
| **10** | **3472** | **Shanxi Shuangliang Cement Company LTD. 4.5MW Waste Heat for Power Generation Project** | **CQC** | **Other:** The DOE is requested to move Edison Spa (Italy) from bilateral and multilateral fund section to other party involved section of Project View Page as the project activity is not a bilateral and multilateral fund as clarified by the DOE. |
| **11** | **4010** | **Pure-low Temperature Waste Heat Recovery for Power Generation (10MW) in Hunan Liuyang Cement Co., Ltd. of Zhaoshan Xinxing Group (ZSLY)** | **DNV** | **Baseline methodology:** The DOE has not explained how it has validated that each applicability condition of the methodology ACM0012 version 3.2 is fulfilled by the project activity, in particular the demonstration of use of waste energy in absence of CDM project activity. |
| **12** | **4108** | **Swine Farm Methane Capture and Combustion** | **SGS** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall clarify how it has validated the investment |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Project IDES20091** | | barrier and whether a simple cost analysis should have been applied, in line with the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (EB 39, Annex 10) and if so, to provide the documentation of the costs. The DOE shall clarify whether the PDD claims prevailing practice barrier. The VR presents an assessment to "common practice analysis". |
| **13** | **4119** | **10.5 MW wind mill project of ICF in the state of Tamil Nadu** | **TÜV Nord** | **Additionality:** The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on the validity of the tariff and wheeling charges at the time of investment decision as per the requirements of EB 51, Annex 58 paragraph 6. Likewise, the DOE shall provide a validation opinion on the sensitivity analysis, in particular, why the variations to the main parameters that would make the IRR of the project reach the benchmark are not likely to occur, in line with paragraph 17 of EB 51, Annex 58 and paragraph 111 (e) of the VVM. |
| **14** | **4134** | **Swine Farm Methane Capture and Combustion/ Utilization Project IDES20091** | **SGS** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall clarify how it has validated the investment barrier and whether a simple cost analysis should have been applied, in line with the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (EB 39, Annex 10) and if so, to provide the documentation of the costs. The DOE shall clarify whether the PDD claims prevailing practice barrier. The VR presents an assessment to "common practice analysis". |
| **15** | **4143** | **Energy efficiency and fuel switch in Hubei Dongsen Wood Industry Co., Ltd** | **JCI** | **Monitoring methodology:** The PDD has not included the documentation of the specifications of the equipments replaced as per methodology page 2.<br>**Additionality:** The information on the potential saving from repair cost of existing equipments has not been provided. The value of crosschecking of each component in the O&M cost is missing. |
| **16** | **4200** | **Low Temperature Waste Heat Generating Project of Zaozhuang Sunnsy Cement Corporation Limited** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Baseline methodology:** According to paragraph 1 of AMS-III.Q v03, the methodology is applicable to the project activities that utilize waste gas/waste heat at the existing facilities. However, the DOE has not explained how the project complies with this requirement given that the project description lacks information on timelines for construction and operation of cement clinker.<br>**Baseline methodology:** Paragraph 9 (a) of AMS-III.Q v03 requires to estimate fcap according to the corresponding section of ACM0012. The PP has chosen case 2 of method 3, among the three methods mentioned in page no 24-26 of ACM0012, to estimate fcap. However, the DOE has |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | not explained why the PP has not chosen other two methods? In responding to this issue, the DOE should elaborate supporting evidences for elimination of methodological options to estimate fcap. In addition, please provide information on: (i) the quantity and energy content of the waste energy produced for the rated plant capacity/per unit of product produced; (ii) use of the waste heat to meet the internal energy demand of the clinker production lines; (iii) current practice in cement industry of using the waste heat to meet internal energy demand; (iv) total energy demand of the industrial facility; (v) specific energy consumption of the clinker production.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE has not explained the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in line with paragraph 111 of VVM v1.2, in particular, the equity, the loan, interest rate and depreciation period and rate. It is not clear how the DOE has closed the CAR#7 given that it has not explained the relevant evidences for the equity, the bank loan etc. |
| **17** | **4211** | **Manaus Landfill Gas Project** | **SGS** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall validate the input values to the investment analysis in line with VVM v1.2 paragraphs 111 (a), (b) and ( c) and 114 (a) and ( c). |
| **18** | **4228** | **Hebei Wuan Lancun Biogas Digester Project** | **DNV** | **Baseline methodology:** The DOE should provide a further description of the project activity, in particular, the amount, type, capacity and main manufacturers' specifications of the equipment to be installed and replaced during the project's implementation in line with the VVM (version 01.2) paragraph 58.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE should explain whether the cost of the biogas stoves is part of the total investment cost and validate its suitability in line with the VVM (version 01.2) paragraph 111. The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on the suitability of the O&M costs as per the requirements of the VVM (version 01.2) paragraph 111 (b).<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how paragraphs 6 and 16 of AMS-I.C (version 16) have been complied with. The DOE should provide a validation opinion on whether the calculation of the baseline emissions from fossil fuel displacement provided in the spreadsheet submitted is in line with paragraph 15 of AMS-I.C (version 16). The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how the calculation of leakage complies with paragraph 28 of |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | AMS-I.C (version 16).<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how the monitoring plan is in line with the requirements of AMS I.C paragraph 31 (d). |
| **19** | **4275** | **Guizhou Qingshuitang 9MW Hydro Project** | **SIRIM** | **Additionality:** The VR lacks information on the validation of the input values used in the investment analysis according to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 111, 113. |
| **20** | **4234** | **Hunan Shimen Zhongjundu Hydro Power Project** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Additionality:** The DOE is requested to report how it's validation on the input values to the investment analysis, in particular, the total investment cost and the difference between the gross power output (72,151 MWh/year) and the net output (72,006.9 MWh/year). In doing so please refer to VVM version 1.2 114 (a) and (c). The DOE is requested to report the validation findings of the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis as per VVM version 1.2 paragraph 113 c.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE is requested to clarify how it has considered the reference used for the common practice analysis adequate considering it covers capacity range of 25-50 MW while the scope of the analysis covers 15-50 MW. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 120. b. |
| **21** | **4249** | **Power generation by utilizing Blast Furnace Gas at Mukand Limited, Ginigera, Karnataka** | **LRQA** | **Baseline methodology:** The amount of emission reduction claimed in the PDD submitted for global stakeholder consultation indicated an annual emission reduction of 64,477 tCOe. The PDD submitted for registration indicates an annual emission reduction of 71,581 tCO2e. The DOE should indicate how it has validated the appropriateness of this increase of ERs from PDD-GSC to the PDD-Registration.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE has indicated that the levelized cost of electricity production for the baseline scenario (BFG) is 4.47 INR/kWh, 4.36 INR/kWh for coal alternative and 4.32 INR/kWh for electricity import alternative. Also, the levelized cost of electricity production considers 2893 tonnes/annum of "Furnace oil consumption during shut down period of Blast Furnace" for the BFG alternative (the proposed project). The DOE shall indicate how it has validated that the conservativeness of using Furnace Oil (FO) during shut down periods instead of electricity imports when, as indicated in the Validation Report, the PP used to import electricity from the grid in the baseline scenario and the levelized cost comparison indicates that electricity |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | import from the Indian Southern Regional grid is the most economical alternative.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE should indicate how it has validated the use of a 70% electricty generation factor in the first year of operations for the proposed project activity when the coal alternative uses a 100% electricity generation factor. For the coal alternative, the DOE should indicate how it has validated the suitability of input values to the levelized cost comparison, in particular the total investment cost and each one of its 3 main components (plant and machinery cost, civil cost, and other cost). For the proposed project alternative the DOE should indicate how it has considered a continuos annual increase of 14.8% in Furnace Oil price during 15 years a realistic and conservative assumption. |
| **22** | **4265** | **BAJ Tulang Bawang Factory tapioca starch wastewater biogas extraction and utilization project, Lampung Province, Republic of Indonesia** | **DNV** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall confirm the accuracy of the electricity consumption and electricity savings considered in the investment analysis in the event of a production increase, in line with VVM para 114. The DOE shall assess the impact of a variation of electricity consumption in the sensitivity analysis, in line with VV< para 111. The DOE shall confirm the consistency between the value of the maximum electricity generation of 39,899MWh/y (PDD p.40) and expected electrical energy generation of 5.308 MWe/hour (VR p.30), in line with VVM para 114. The DOE shall provide validation of the contingency costs included in the investment analysis., in line with VVM para 114. |
| **23** | **4281** | **Jingshi Hydropower Project, Huili County, Sichuan Province** | **JACO** | **Additionality:** The DOE is requested to correct the inconsistence in the project starting date as the validation report (page A-9) shows 10 November 2007 while other sections of the validation report (page 2) and the PDD (section C.1.1) indicate 02 July 2008. In doing so please refer to EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 7.b.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE is requested to report the validation of the IRR input values, in particular the total investment cost and the O&M costs, in line with VVM 1.2 paragraph 113.c. In doing so please provide details and findings of the comparison (Table 2, page 14) based on project activities in Sichuan province. 2.- The DOE is requested to provide reproducible sensitivity analysis spreadsheet in line with EB 51 Annex 58 paragraph 17. |
| **24** | **4285** | **Biogas Project at Prolific Yield Palm Oil Mill** | **DNV** | **Additionality:** The PDD does not report the input values used in the investment comparison analysis. 2.- |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | The validation on the input values used in the invesmtn analysis is not complete, as it is not clearly reported if all the input values used were applicable at the time of investment decision (for example values used for the burner cost sourced from a quotation dated 9 June 2010, palm kernel shells price from a quotation dated 2 June 2010).<br>**Baseline methodology:** It is not clear why project emissions from fossil fuel consumption have not been accounted for, in line with paragraph 27 (i) of AMS-III.H, ver.15 and given that, as per CL4 some fossil fuel is usedi n the project activity. 4.- The formula of the Methane content in the biogas in the year y (mass fraction) page 34 of the PDD is not consistent with formula 16 of AMS-III.H ver. 15 which requires the methane content of the biogas to be measured as volume fraction. 5.- the information in the Validation is not complete, as it does not validate the steps taken by the project participant to calculate the total methane destruction MDy.<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The monitoring plan is not complete as the quantity of fossil fuel used in the project activity should be monitored, in line with para 35 of AMS.III-H, ver 15. Moreover it is not clear how CL9 point c) has been closed. |
| **25** | **4289** | **Utilisation of the thermal energy of clinker cooler waste gas and pre-heater flue gas for power generation at a cement plant in Madhya Pradesh** | **DNV** | **Additionality:** The DOE has not explained how it has validated the suitability of the Plant Load Factor(PLF), in particular the inconsistency between the PLF of 80% mentioned on page 20 of the validation report and the calculated PLF of 54% which is based on the annual power generation of 71,000MWh and the installed capacity of 15 MW.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE has not explained how it has validated the accuracy and completeness of the project description, in particular the capacity of installed generators, the operation starting dates of two clinker production lines, whether those two clinker production lines are located in the same cement plant, whether those two set of waste heat power generation units operate independently and why the power generation capacity of the waste heat power generation unit driven by a turbine with installed capacity of 7.5 MW is not more than 6 MW. |
| **26** | **4295** | **Southern District Heating Network in Urumqi City** | **BVCH** | **Additionality:** The VR lacks information about the validation about validation on the following: (a) the amount of the electricity consumption; |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | (b) the amount of the water consumption; (c) other O&M expense; (d) management cost; (e) on the job training cost and trade union expense; (f) the crosschecking of the amount of the coal consumption; (g) information on the detail investment cost; (h) potential saving from not operating the existing boilers and from not having to purchase new equipments for the baseline scenario for the new buildings.<br>**Additionality:** The PDD page 25 mentions that it applies barrier analysis to demonstrate additionality. However, the VR page 28 mentions that barrier analysis is not used to demonstrate additionality. Please clarify. |
| **27** | **4298** | **Paysandú Clean Energy** | **ICONTEC** | **Additionality:** The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on the suitability of the project starting date selected (June 2008) in line with the CDM Glossary of Terms; given that the Steam Turbine and the Electric Generator arrived to the project site in November 2008 but the date when the purchase contract was signed was not provided.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on the suitability of the barriers in line with the requirements of the VVM (version 1.2) paragraphs 115-118, in particular:<br>a) Prevailing practice: the evidence used to confirm that the project is the first of its kind in Uruguay should be provided;<br>b) Other barriers: the DOE should provide evidence to confirm: i) the PP 's impossibility to trade the energy with other industries, and ii) the possibility of a zero spot price. The DOE should also provide an explanation on how the CDM is expected to overcome this barrier, especially as the DOE has also noted (VR, p. 26) that practically there have not been transactions in the spot market in the country and that, in practice, the spot prices are only indicative.<br>c) Technological Barrier: the source of evidence used to confirm that the project activity will implement a technological innovation in Uruguay by employing the gas producers (“gasógenos”) with forest biomass residues. In addition, a validation opinion should be provided on how this barrier will prevent the implementation of the project activity without CDM benefits and whether the additional investment for the new equipment to be installed due to the project activity implementation could have been assessed by means of an investment analysis in line with the VVM paragraph |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 116.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how paragraph 22 of methodology AMS-III.E version 16 has been complied with, in particular, the determination of the amount of waste prevented from disposal (i.e. the biomass which would have been dumped in a stockpile in the baseline situation and also would have remained in the stockpile fro a sufficient period of time to decay). In doing so, the DOE should clearly mention how the quantitative analysis has been carried out in line with the options prescribed in the methodology.<br>The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on how Leakage has been assessed in line with the "General guidelines about leakage in biomass Project activities"; specifically, paragraphs 17 and 18, considering that the competing uses for the biomass were not clearly explained in the validation report.<br>The DOE should indicate the methodological choices for the calculation of the EFEL,m,y, EFEL,k,y, EGm,y and EGk,y in line with the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system".<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The DOE should clarify the contradiction between the validation report and the PDD related to the Q,non-biomass parameter; considering that the validation report mentions that the monitoring plan should include the measurement of "Q,non-biomass" by sampling and the "distance for transporting the produced RDF/SB (km/truck)", but this is not consistent with the PDD. In addition, the DOE should provide a validation opinion on how paragraph 15 of AMS.III.E will be complied with during the implementation of the project activity. |
| **28** | **4302** | **Paysandú Clean Energy** | **ICONTEC** | **Other:** The DOE should revise the project view page in order to include methodology AMS-I.D. Moreover, the PP/DOE are requested to update the version of the methodology AMS-I.D used, given that version 15 is no longer valid. |
| **29** | **4301** | **20.8 MW Grid connected wind electricity generation project at Dhule, Maharashtra** | **SIRIM** | **Additionality:** The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the tariff of INR 2.34/kWh after the 14th year. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 114 (c). 2.- The DOE is requested to provide information on the details of all the parameters used to calculate the WACC benchmark, such as the choice of the stock index, |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | vintage and the period of the data used, beta value calculation, among others. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 112.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE is requested to provide information on the distinctive difference between the project activity and the similar project in the validation of common practice analysis. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 121 (c).<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The DOE is requested to clarify if the net power export is monitored separately for each sub project. If so, parameters should be listed separately for each sub-project in section B.7 of the PDD. |
| **30** | **4338** | **Thanh Thuy Hydropower Project** | **SQS** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall report how it has validated the input values in line with VVM v1.2 paragraphs 111 (a) and (c), 113 and 114 (a), in particular the assumed total project cost and electricity tariff.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE shall report how it has validated the barriers in line with VVM v1.2 paragraphs 115 and 117. It is not clear how the validation has complied with the mentioned requirements.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE shall report how it has validated the common practice analysis in line with VVM v1.2 paragraphs 120 (b) and (c) and 121 (b) and (c). |
| **31** | **4341** | **Inner Mongolia Chifeng Yikesong Wind Power Project** | **DNV** | **Additionality:** The DOE has not provided a validation opinion on the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in line with the paragraph 113 (c) of VVM v 1.2, in particular : a) interest expenses; and b) annual O&M cost (please provide the validation on the each element of the annual O&M cost). The calculation of interest expenses should be reported transparently, and provide the details of the evidence used to cross-check the suitability of the loan interest rate. |
| **32** | **4343** | **4.75 MW Bundled Wind Power Project by Associated Stone Industries (Kotah) Ltd** | **SGS** | **Additionality:** The VR lacks validation of the deration of the electricity generation. |
| **33** | **4346** | **1.8 MW Small Scale Wind Energy Project in Maharashtra-India by M/s Biotech Vision Care Pvt Ltd.** | **SIRIM** | **Baseline methodology:** The DOE shall explain how it has validated the accuracy and completeness of the project description given that the validation report page 9 mentions that the project activity comprises a bundle of three wind turbines and bundle form for small-scale CDM activities (CDM-SSC-Bundle) isnot submitted.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE shall verify the accuracy and suitability of the input values to investment analysis in line with the paragraph 111 (a) and (b), in particular : (i) investment cost; (ii) the annual O&M cost; (iii) escalation of |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | tariff; (iv) escalation of O&M cost; and (v) market return. The Validation report page 12 mentions that the market return ( for a period of 27.5 years) is 18.42% and the expected return of for the project acivity is 18.51% based on the CAPM, which are inconsistent with the values applied in the excel sheet and the PDD ( the market return : 18.25% and cost of equity/expected return : 18.42%). Please clarify. The PP has not performed a sensitivity analysis on O & M Cost, investment cost and tariff. As per CDM Investment guidance [EB 39, 41 & 51] the sensitivity has to be performed on all factors having a bearing of 20% or more on the capital cost / revenues.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE shall explain how it has validated the project activity's compliance with the requirements by EB 41, Annex 46 or EB48, Annex 61 as the project starting date is after 2 August 2008. |
| **34** | **4347** | **Gongba River Small Hydropower Project in Gansu Province** | **JCI** | **Monitoring methodology:** The DOE shall confirm that the parameters required by the methodology will be monitored for each individual site included in the bundling in separate. The PDD sections B.7.1 and B.7.2 shall be amended accordingly. |
| **35** | **4361** | **Istmeño Wind Farm** | **BVCH** | **Additionality:** The PDD and VR do not contian complete information on the sources of the input values used in the investment analysis (i.e., which sources have been used to define the input values in the investment analysis and which sources have been used only for the purpose of cross-checking), and on wether the values used were applicable at the time of investment decision. Moreover the dates of the following evidences: Power Purchse Agreement, ¨Best Practices for Wind Projects in Mexico¨ and third party report on PLF have not been reported. The information in the PDD and Validation Report regarding the sensitivity analysis is not consistent as: the PDD shows that the sensitivity analysis has been carried out for the O&M costs, port costs, total investment and electricity price while the Validation Report mentions the electricity price, total amount of investment, plant load factor and O&M. Moreover the PDD states that the benchmark is reached in the case that electricity costs increases in 10%, while the results show that the benchmark is not reached.<br>**Additionality:** The identification of alternatives to the project activity is not complete, as for example the construction and operation of a fossil fuel power plant delivering the same |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | outputs as the proposed project activity has not been discussed in the PDD, in line with the Tool for demonstration and assessment of additionality ver. 05.2.<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The PDD information on how the net electricity generated will be measured is not complete, as it is not clear if/how the electricity imports will be accounted for. Moreover the PDD does not include the parameter TEGy as required byt he methodology. |
| **36** | **4378** | **Biopower project at Charoensuk Starch Co. Ltd, Thailand** | **TÜV Nord** | **Additionality:** The DOE is requested to provide information on the input values to the investment analysis, in particular, the O&M cost of 12.75 million THB. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 111.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated each applicability condition of the applied methodology in line with VVM version 1.2 paragraph 76.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated each parameters applied to ex-ante emission reduction calculations in line with VVM version 1.2 paragraph 92. In particular, data and parameters used to calculate the baseline emission including the removal efficiency of the baseline treatment system. In doing so, please refer to paragraphs 15-25 of AMS-III.H. version 14.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to provide information on the choice of the flare efficiency. In doing so, please refer to the "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane". |
| **37** | **4392** | **Dak Hnol Hydropower Project** | **KEMCO** | **Additionality:** The VR lacks information on crosschecking of the investment cost and the O&M cost escalation.<br>**Additionality:** The VR lacks validation of project activity's applicability to the EB54 Annex 15.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The PDD mentions that the grid emission factor comes from the DNA, 2009. However, VR page 60 mentions that it comes from DNA, 26/03/2010. Please clarify. |
| **38** | **4397** | **LHSF RE Project** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to further explain the project description and boundary in the respective sections of the validation report. In particular, it shall clearly report the use of the heat component, the pre-project scenario (whether the existing plant will continue to be operating or not) and whether the sugar plant is part of the boundary. In doing so, please refer to VVM, v1.2, |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | paragraphs 63, 64 and 80.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE is requested to further report and validate the input values used to calculate the IRR and benchmark. For example; the table of key input values (VR, p21/22) shows as NA for PLF, income tax, and inflation rate; reports on the amount of bagasse residue usage and historical electricity consumption per year are missing; the parameters (such as market return, beta value if any, equity/debt ratio, period and source of data, etc.) used to calculate the WACC benchmark are also not included. In doing so please refer to VVM, v1.2, paragraphs 111, 112b, 114.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE is requested to further report the common practice analysis; in particular, it is not clear the essential differences (VR, p23) between the project activity and the other similar projects in the state. VVM, v1.2, paragraph 121. |
| **39** | **4419** | **Grid connected 156.1 MW Combined Cycle Power plant at Hazira, Gujarat** | **TÜV Nord** | **Additionality:** The DOE should quote the source of evidence used to confirm that the project activity is the first of its kind to operate without the benefit of the APM in line with the VVM para. 120 (c).<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on how future natural gas based power capacity additions, comparable in size to the project activity, are not constrained by the use of natural gas in the project activity as per the requirements of AM0029 version 03.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE should provide a validation opinion on: a) how the source of EFCO2,f,y (i.e., IPCC 2006 Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventory: Volume 2 Energy) is in line with the requirements of the applicable methodology, and b) the suitability of the efficiency of the baseline (ήBL = 34.4%) used in the calculation of the baseline emissions in line with the VVM para. 92 (c).<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The DOE should ensure that all the monitoring parameters required by the applicable methodology are included in the monitoring plan.<br>**Other:** The spreadsheets are not fully reproducible. 2.- The DOE should clarify whether a second phase has been planned/implemented for the proposed project, given that the PDD (page 40) mentions the following: "24/02/2005 - Project Proponent (PP) informs DNA that the capacity of the second phase of the project planned (phase I – 156MW, Phase II – 230MW) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | has been modified." |
| **40** | **4427** | **Yunnan Xinhe and Xingfu Expansion Hydropower Station Bundled Project** | **TÜV Nord** | **Baseline methodology:** As per paragraph 15 of applied methodology AMS-I.D v16, the point in time when the existing equipment would need to be replaced in the absence of the project activity (date) is required to be determined to calculate baseline emission. The DOE has not explained how it has valiadted DATE Baseline, capacity addition ( point in time when Xingfu 1st station would need to be replaced in the absence of Xingfu Expansion Statation). In addition, the PP shall include this parameter in table under B.6.2 of the PDD. |
| **41** | **4442** | **Wuhan Xinzhou Chenjiachong Sanitary Landfill LFG Power Generation Project** | **TÜV Nord** | **Additionality:** VR lacks information on crosschecking of the PLF in line with the VVM version 01.2 paragraph 111(b).<br>**Additionality:** VR lacks information on the source of evidence used to confirm the common practice analysis in line with the VVM version 01.2 paragraph 120(b).<br>**Baseline methodology:** VR lacks information on the parameters used for baseline emission calculation in line with the VVM version 01.2 paragraph 92. |
| **42** | **4388** | **Gansu Guazhou Ganhekou No.3 Wind Power Plant Project** | **JCI** | **Additionality:** VR lacks validation opinion on the VAT for power generation and equipment VAT refund. |
| **43** | **4457** | **Cogeneration of power and steam from Bioener S.A´s forestry waste** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Baseline methodology:** The PDD page 7, 14, 18 and 20 indicate the involvement of gasification process in the project activity. However, the VR page 17 mentions that there is no gasification in the project activity. Please clarify.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The VR has not reported the compliance of the PA with the: (a) paragraph 12 of the AMS-I.C. version 16 (i.e how the electricity and heat would be generated in the absence of the PA, for cogeneration case); and (b) paragraph 11 of the AMS-III.E. version 16 as no measures to avoid physical leakage has not been described.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The PDD and VR indicate the use of wood from forest thinning. However, the VR has not reported the baseline scenario of this type of biomass.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The VR has not reported the validation of the parameter "Weighted mean age of the wastes present in the SWDS prior to the project start" which appears in the spreadsheet. |
| **44** | **4477** | **Biomass based Steam Generation at Machhar Polymer Pvt. Limited, Dist-Baroda, (Gujarat), India** | **SGS** | **Additionality:** 1) The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the levelized cost calculation for the baseline scenario, in |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | particular:<br>a) the input values such as the investment cost, the O&M cost;<br>b) the efficiency of the heat generation equipment such as boilers; and<br>c) how the existing part and the added capacity of the baseline are considered in the calculation.<br>In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 111.<br>2) The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the sensitivity analysis, in particular, if all major parameters have been varied and the resulting levelized cost for both project and baseline scenario. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 111 (e).<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the baseline emission calculation. In doing so, please refer to AMS I.C version 18 paragraph 34, 36, 37. |
| **45** | **4275** | **Guizhou Qingshuitang 9MW Hydro Project** | **SIRIM** | **Additionality:** The VR lacks information on the validation of the input values used in the investment analysis according to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 111, 113. |
| **46** | **4507** | **Guangxi Qiaogong Hydropower Project** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Additionality:** The DOE should provide a validation opinion on the investment breakdown and electricity generation schedule in line with the VVM para. 111 (d), given that in the spreadsheet submitted the construction schedule is 6 years and electricity is generated from the 5th year, however, the construction contract is dated January 2007, the first and second turbines were commissioned in January 2009 (2 years later) and the last turbine in May 2010 (only 3.5 years later). The DOE should provide a validation opinion on why the variation to the main parameters that would make the IRR reach the benchmark are not likely to occur in line with the VVM para. 111 (e). The DOE should provide a validation opinion on the calculation of the ”financial interest” (`total costs&expense` sheet) in line with VVM para. 111 (d) given that the spreadsheet submitted only shows typed values.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on why three similar activities identified in the common practice analysis have lower investment unit cost than the proposed project activity in line with the VVM para. 121.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on the elimination of "Alternative 2: Construction of a fossil |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | fired power plant with an equivalent amount of installed capacity or annual electricity output".<br>**Other:** The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on the appropriateness of the local stakeholders process conducted in line with the VVM para. 129 and (c) and 130. |
| **47** | **4406** | **ERH – Biogas recovery, heat and electricity generation from effluents ponds in Honduras** | **RINA** | **Additionality:** The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on how the barriers claimed comply with the "Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers" EB 50 – Annex 13.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on why biodiesel was not considered as the baseline scenario for the thermal component as per the VVM (version 1.2) para. 81, in particular, for the existing Cleaver Brooks boiler considering that it is available on site.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE should provide a validation opinion on the suitability of the amount of heavy oil consumed in the baseline scenario in line with the VVM (version 1.2) para. 92 (c).<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on how the monitoring of the "Net quantity of thermal energy supplied by the project activity during the year y" is in line with the requirements of AMS-I.C. ver. 17. |
| **48** | **4389** | **Xinjiang Lasite Hydropower Project of China** | **Deloitte-TECO** | **Additionality:** The DOE has not explained how it has validated 2/08/2007 (date of the permission of construction) as the start date of the project activity in accordance with "the Glossary of CDM terms" and paragraph 99 of VVM v1.2. It seems that the project participant has already made a commitment for expenditure for the project activity on May 2007 (date of construction contract as per reference item no. 34 mentioned in page 33 of validation report), before the date of the permission of construction. Please clarify.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE has not explained on the suitability and applicability of some input values used in the investment analysis, in particular; the depreciable period, the residual value rate, depreciation rate, debt equity ratio, the income tax, VAT, additional sales tax, loan interest rate. In addition, the DOE should explain how it has validated the individual sub items of O&M cost (maintenance cost, the wages and welfare, other fee, material fee, water fee). |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **49** | **3459** | **Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Beiliu Conch Cement Company Limited** | **TÜV SÜD** | **DOE's related issues:** The uploaded file "Appendix 5-Enclosure 4.xla" is totally corrupted and not readable. Also, the uploaded file "Appendix 6-Enclosure 5.xla" is partially corrupted and only partially readable. |
| **50** | **4377** | **12.25 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in India** | **TÜV Nord** | **Other:** The PDD is incomplete, e.g. errors on page 13 and 14 of the PDD;<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The DOE has not explained how it has validated the compliance of the monitoring plan with the requirements of the paragraph 17 of methodology AMS I.D version 15 (valid from 30 Oct 09 to 10 Jun 10), in particular the measurement results shall be cross-checked with records for sold electricity; |
| **51** | **4384** | **Dak Doa Hydropower Project** | **KEMCO** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall further validate the suitability of input values applied in the investment analysis in line with VVM (v1.2), para.111, in particular 1)investment cost considering the DOE did not cross check it with those of similar cases or with contract value; 2)other input values including line loss, auxiliary consumption, insurance and salvage value.<br>**Other:** Please note that no bundling form has been submitted.<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how the monitoring plan ensures that the monitoring of the parameters is conducted for the two sub-projects separately. |
| **52** | **4486** | **Grid Connected Wind Power Project by Madurai Integrated Textile Park Limited** | **TÜV Nord** | **Additionality:** The spreadsheet submitted deducts the ¨wheeling charges paid to TNEB¨ of 5% from the electricity generated, however this input valu has not been validated by the DOE.<br>**Other:** The PDD refers to the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" Version -01.1¨. Please note that this version of the tool is no longer valid since version 2 has been published on October 2009. |
| **53** | **4492** | **Wastewater Treatment with Biogas System in Palm Oil Mill at Sikao, Trang, Thailand** | **SGS** | **Baseline methodology:** The grid emission factor figures stated in the PDD have not been reported in the Validation Report. Moreover it is not clear how CAR12 has been closed out as it states that ¨for ex-post the CEF will be recalculated every year¨ while the PDD states that the ex-ante option has been selected. |
| **54** | **4471** | **Power Generation by Methane from Hoggery in Yun'nan Minhong Bio-tech Industry Co., Ltd.** | **DNV** | **Additionality:** The validation of the net electricity generation (inlcuding the project internal consumption) and O&M costs is not complete as the values have not been cross-checked as per the VVM requirements para 111 (b).<br>**Baseline methodology:** As per AMS-III.D v.16 para. 2 c, the storage time of |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | the manure after removal from the animal barns, including transportation, should not exceed 5 days before being fed into the anaerobic digester. However the PDD page 12 point 9) states 45 days.<br>**Other:** Paragraph 5 of Section B.4 of the PDD contians errors in the sentences.<br>**Baseline methodology:** Page 25 of the Validation Report states that ¨ As the project will consume renewable energy from the utilization of biogas, no project emissions is foreseen in the ex-ante determination of proect emissions from this source, while there is no provision available to consume fossil fuels for the operation of the installed facilities (PEpower,y)¨, however page 14 states that project emissions will be accounted as diesel will be used for start up and back-up while the engines are not in operation.<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The monitoring plan is not complete as: (a) footnote 3 of AMS-III.D requires that the biogas and methane content measurements shall be on the same basis (wet or dry) and; (b) paragraph 32 of AMS-III.D reuquires the monitoring of the Fraction of manure handled in system i in year y (MS%i,y). |
| **55** | **4468** | **Factory energy efficiency improvement in deodorizer of ceramic kiln in Mexico** | **JMA** | **Baseline methodology:** The DOE did not explain how it has validated the baseline scenario identified as per the requirement of paragraph 8 of Methodology AMS II.D v12 and paragraph 19 of the General Guidance for SSC methodologies.<br>**Additionality:** Given the dates of the sources of some input values (e.g. "afterburner cost" and "natural gas price")are not clear, it is not clear whether all the input values for the financial analysis are applicable and available at the time of investment decision as per the requirement of paragraph 6 of the Guidelines of the Assessment of Investment analysis v3.1.<br>**Baseline methodology:** It is not clear how the applicability requirement of paragraph 4 of AMS II.D v12 has been validated. |
| **56** | **4472** | **7.5 MW Grid connected renewable electricity generation in Tiruvannamalai District, India** | **DNV** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall confirm the validation of the prior consideration of CDM in line with VVM v1.2 paragraph 102 (a). Please note that no precise dates were cited with respect to: a) the DPR being submitted when availing for the loan; b) original Board minutes ("June 2007").<br>**Additionality:** The DOE shall validate the input values to the investment analysis in line with VVM v1.2 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | paragraphs 111 (b) and 114 (a) and (c), in particular: (i) the auxiliary consumption assumed and whether the value assumed is project specific; (ii) biomass price and biomass fuel requirement (the DOE shall provide the means of validation applied in order to confirm the calculations presented in the spreadsheet); (iii) electricity tariff applied as suitable and appropriate to the proposed project activity. The DOE shall also confirm the IRR applying the tariff of 4.15 INR/kWh (9.44% is mentioned in the Validation Report).<br>**Additionality:** The DOE shall validate the barrier due to prevailing practice in line with VVM v1.2 paragraphs 115 (a), 117 (a) and 118.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE shall clarify how it has validated that there is no competing use of biomass in the region. It is not clear how it has assessed and validated the information presented in the Biomass "assessment report" (from April 2006) as appropriate, in line with VVM v1.2 paragraph 92 (d) The DOE shall validate the parameter "SFC" (specific fuel consumption) for coal, which is fixed ex-ante as 1kg/kWh, in line with VVM v1.2 paragraph 91. It is also not clear how the DOE has assessed the reference weblink provided as relevant or suitable to the proposed project activity (e.g. link provided mentions a range for GCV for coal from 4,000-7,000 Kcal/Kg). |
| **57** | **4396** | **Waste heat recovery at blast furnace of IISCO, SAIL** | **RINA** | **Baseline methodology:** The DOE has not reported appropriately the elimination of baseline alternative H5 (an existing or new renewable energy or other waste energy based boilers) and H8 (steam/process heat generation using waste heat, but with lower efficiency), in particular, how it has validated that either H5 and H8: i) have prohibitive barriers; or ii) are clearly economic unattractive as required by step 3 of identification of baseline scenarios of ACM0012 v3.2. |
| **58** | **4498** | **Triplay Amazonico Methane Avoidance Project** | **SGS** | **Additionality:** When validating the investment comparison analysis, the DOE (VR page 25) explained that what has been considered in the NVP calculation of the project situation is only the “incremetal power consumption”. However as per page 116 of the VR it seems that what has been considerd is the total power consumption as an input value to the NVP calculation. Please clarify the inconsistency.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The information on the compliance with the General Guidance on lekage in |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | biomass project activities (EB 47 Annex 28) is not reported in the PDD or Validation Report. |
| **59** | **4516** | **MNI Renewable Energy Plant** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Additionality:** How has the DOE validated that the EFB price is suitable for investment analysis purposes when the project description indicates that 5 different types of biomass will be used in the project scenario (MF, EFB, PKS, woodchips and sawdust). Please also notice that the biomass price should reflect the most realistic market value at the time of investment decision and sourced from independent third parties. Whether the item "additional cost for biomass compared to CHPP" which accounts for 54.5% of the CAPEX in the first year (and increases yearly) is suitable and in line with similar projects using the same or similar technology in the host country. The suitability of the decrease of MFO (medium fuel oil) price through the investment analysis period and appropriateness of using the US Energy Administration values for its calculation when the project is located in Malaysia. The suitability of applying the inflation rate only to the project outflow (costs) and not to the project income (savings). |
| **60** | **4480** | **Methane Recovery and Utilization at PT. Musim Mas Palm Oil Mill in Pangkalan Lesung, Riau Indonesia** | **DNV** | **Additionality:** PDD does not clearly indicate the sources (reference and dates) of the input values used in investment analysis, as well as the figure used for the O&M costs Moreover the unit used for electricity generation cost in PDD table page 14 is not clear (USD)is not consistent with the units reported in the Validation Report (i.e., USD/kWh). The PDD reports a figure for the total investment cost of 2.7 USD million while the VR refers to a value of 2.63 USD million. Please clarify. The DOE should report if the figure used for the O&M costs was applicable at the time of investment decision and include information on the cross-checking of this parameter.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The ambient temperature and the volumetric loading rate of Chemical Oxygen Demand figures are not reported in PDD. The PDD does not indicate the exact dates of the measurement campaign carried out to define the COD values.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The information in the Validation Report on how the DOE has validated that the baseline scenario for the project activity is the continuation of the power demand met by the biomass cogeneration plant and two diesel generating sets for back-up for the increased electricity generated by the project is not complete.For example, it |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | is not clear if there is surplus biomass to generate the incremental electricity and why other electricity generation alternatives have not been considered in the identification of the baseline scenario.<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The information in the PDD on how the monitoring of the amount of sludge treated and Amount of dry matter in the final sludge generated will be carried out is not complete, as it is not reported which instruments will be used. |
| **61** | **4396** | **Waste heat recovery at blast furnace of IISCO, SAIL** | **RINA** | **Additionality:** The DOE has not explained the appropriateness of internal document of SAIL(Annex-IV guidelines for formulation of investment proposal for appraisal) and of communication from IISCO Steel Plant to verify suitability of input values for investment analysis, in particular; i) expenses during construction; ii) contingency cost ; and iii) the calorific value of the coal. The DOE should determine the accuracy and suitability of these parameters as required by paragraph 111 (a) and (b) of VVM v1.2. The DOE should explain in detail the composition of annual operation and maintenance cost and validate these sub-items individually.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE should explain in detail why the project emissions have been considered zero for the proposed activity given that it is not clear whether the project: i) has combustion of auxiliary fuel to supplement waste heat; and ii) has consumption of electricity for cleaning of flue gases . The VR in page 29 states that the emission factor of coal has been considered fixed for entire crediting period. However, the monitoring methodology requires monitoring CO2 emission factor per unit of energy of the baseline fuel used in the facility in absence of the project activity. Please explain. |
| **62** | **4558** | **Pure-low temperature Waste Heat Recovery Project for power generation (23MW) in Sichuan E'sheng Cement Holding Co., Ltd.** | **KECO** | **Additionality:** The DOE should describe in detail how the parameters used in any financial calculations have been validated in accordance with paragraph 114 (a) of VVM v1.2, in particular; average capacity of power plant (18.6 MW). The PP has used average capacity of 18.6 MW to calculate annual electricity generation in the investment analysis although the rated capacity of the power plant is 23 MW.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE shall clearly describe in the validation report the steps taken and equations applied to calculate baseline emissions, complying with ACM0012 v3.2 baseline |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | and monitoring methodology, as per required by paragraph 92 of VVM v1.2, in particular; the calculation of fcap and theoretical recoverable energy from waste energy carrying medium. While addressing the issue, please provide detail calculation steps for theoretical recoverable energy value (130,200 MWh per year).<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The DOE shall assess the compliance of the monitoring plan with the approved methodology ACM0012 v3.2 in accordance with paragraph 123 (a) of VVM v1.2. The monitoring plan does not include monitoring of the electricity imported from the grid for auxiliary/internal consumption in the project activity. Please clarify. |
| **63** | **4202** | **Wastewater Treatment with Biogas System (AFFR) in a Starch Plant for Energy & Environment Conservation at Chachoengsao** | **SGS** | **Other:** The PDD mentions that the total ER are 157,620 tCO2, while the Validation Report and spreadsheet submitted state a figure of 157,617 tCO2, please clarify.<br>**Additionality:** The PDD should state all the parameters (figures) and references used for the investment analysis (such as O&M costs, rice husk cost, taxes).<br>**Baseline methodology:** The PP/DOE should explain why the grid emission factor has been calculated using data from year 2008 which was not available at the time of first PDD publication (29/12/2005). Moreover, the DOE should clarify why the Validation Report, page 31 states that project emissions due to electricity consumption have not been considered ex-ante while the spreadsheet submitted does consider them. |
| **64** | **4438** | **Energy Efficiency Improvement at Tamil Nadu Newsprint and Papers Limited** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Additionality:** In PDD page 47, it is indicated that "The composition and characteristics of non-wood (bagasse) based black liquor generated is different from that of the normal hardwood black liquor". However, there is no validation opinion on that argument in the validation report.<br>**Additionality:** VR lacks information on the corrosion risk indicated in PDD page 54. |

| Table 3 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Issuance | | Stage 1: Completeness Check | | | |
| # | PA # | Project | Monitoring Period | DOE | Reasons |
| 1 | 2585 | Fertinal Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project | 17/10/09 - 25/07/10 | ICONTEC | 1. The cover pages of the submitted calculation spreadsheets "Fertinal Baseline 2010" and "Fertinal First campaign ver 1.1" refer incorrectly to project activity 1784. The submitted request for issuance is for project activity 2585. Kindly also revise that the ER calculations clearly correspond to the request for issuance for project activity 2585.<br><br>2. The Verification Statement in the Verification Report page 33 (5.4 Opinion) refers to the monitoring period 17 Oct 09 - 25 Jul 25. Kindly note that the monitoring period is from 17 Oct 09 to 25 Jul 10.<br><br>3. The Certification Report refers to the monitoring period 17 Oct 09 - 25 Jul 25. Kindly note that the monitoring period is from 17 Oct 09 to 25 Jul 10. |
| 2 | 2088 | Hebei Yuxian Kongzhongcaoyuan 49.5MW Wind Farm Project | 25/06/09 - 24/06/10 | BVCH | As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. The figures in Column B, Table 3 in the Monitoring Report, are not consistent with those of the spreadsheet. Additionally the registered PDD , version 4, under References in the Verification Report is dated 05/08/2009, whereas the PDD version 4 is dated 05/08/2008. |
| 3 | 1859 | China Fujian Putian LNG Generation Project | 14/01/09 - 27/09/09 | BVCH | As per EB48 -- Annex 68 all documents must be mutually and internally consistent. The version of the Monitoring Report in the both Verification and Certification report is not consistent throughout the documents, whereas the version of the monitoring report has been defined as version 01 from 16 November, 2010.<br>(1a) Kindly clarify the statement given in page 6 of the Verification report "...and Monitoring Report (MR) version 02 /3/. And this report was updated to version 02 related to the Monitoring Report (MR) version 03 /4/ of this monitoring period dated 21/12/2010 after the completeness check comments.";<br>(1b) Revise the given version 03 of the Monitoring report in page 17 of the Verification report;<br>(1c) Revise the given versions 01 and 02 of the Monitoring report in page 31 of the Verification report in CAR 3 inserted in the "Table 3 Resolution of Corrective Action / Forward Action / Clarification Requests";<br>(2) The Certification Statement refers to Monitoring Report version 3 dated 21 December, 2010, which is not in |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | accordance with the version given in the Monitoring report version 01 from 16 November, 2010. |
| **4** | **0273** | **Vajra and Chaskaman small hydro projects of Vindhyachal Hydro Power Ltd., Maharashtra, India.** | **01/04/08 - 12/03/09** | **BVCH** | As per EB48 para 9 (e)requires that the cross-referencing and versioning, including number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents is correct and accurate; The signed form indicated the number of CERs as 16,516. In the Monitoring Report the number of claimed CERs is 16,508, and in the Spreadsheet 16,516. The total net electricity exported is also not consistent in these two documents. Further, the Verification Report states "CER issued totalize 16516 tons of CO2eq for the monitoring period" whereas in the Verification Opinion the number of CERs is 16,508 t CO2 equivalents. Certification report also states the number of CERs to be 16508.<br><br>The Verification Report, under references indicates Monitoring report, version 02 dated 22/07/2010. However Monitoring Report submitted with this request for Issuance is dated 26/08/2010. The signed form dates the MR as 17/9/2010. Kindly address these inconsistencies. Additionally, we kindly draw your attention to the Monitoring period on page 33 of the VR being referred to as 01/04/2008 to 18/03/2009. |
| **5** | **0337** | **WMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-07, Mato Grosso, Minas Gerais and Goiás, Brazil** | **01/09/09 - 28/02/10** | **DNV** | The verification report does not contain the information about the calibration dates. |
| **6** | **2193** | **Gansu Yumen Sanshilijingzi Wind Power Project** | **30/12/09 - 28/06/10** | **SGS** | The Verification and Certification Statement contains no signature |
| **7** | **2167** | **Shimenkai Hydropower Project** | **26/09/2009- 25/07/2010** | **BVQI** | Incorrect registration date in the Verification Report page 5 (26 Feb 09). This project was registered on 25 Feb 09. |
| **8** | **0555** | **Kanfeng 15 MW Hydropower Station Project, Min County, Dingxi City Prefecture, Gansu province, China** | **01/01/07 - 29/03/10** | **JACO** | "As per EB 48 Annex 68 para 10 (e), the request for issuance form does NOT contain the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs) for the given monitoring period." |
| **9** | **1015** | **25.70 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Udumalpet, Tamilnadu** | **24/06/05 - 31/12/07** | **TÜV NORD** | In our email sent to you on 13/01/2011, we explained the requirement for the need to withdraw the re-submission of Request for Issuance of PA1015 in order to change the Monitoring period dates in our system. This request for withdrawal, however, has not been made, and again as we explained in our email 'CDM EB 41 Meeting report, |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | paragraph 78 states: The Board decided to allow DOEs to request a change in the dates of a monitoring period undergoing verification, provided the change is the result of the corrective action request raised by the DOE during the verification process. In this sense, changes in the dates of the monitoring period shall be formally requested and processed BEFORE a request for issuance is submitted.'<br>We stated in our email that we will consider your clarification provided through the email sent on 10/01/2001 as a formal request for changes in the Monitoring period, therefore we will also inform you when the changes in our system are made in order for you to re-submit. |
| **10** | **0545** | **Durban Landfill-gas-to-electricity project** | **15/12/06 - 01/11/07** | **JCI** | 1.- As per EB48 para 9 (e), cross-referencing and versioning within and between the documents must be correct and accurate. There is no mention of the Project Reference Number (0545) neither in the Monitoring Report nor in the Verification Report. Please indicate this reference in the documents.<br><br>2.- As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. The starting date of the monitoring period is 15 December 2006. However, the date provided on page 15 of the Verification Report indicates 16 December 2006. This is not consistent.<br><br>Additionally, the header on pages 13/14/15 of the Monitoring Report refers to an old version of the MR (January 2009 instead of November 2010). Please address these inconsistencies. |
| **11** | **1082** | **7.85 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Southern India** | **14/07/07-01/08/08** | **TÜV NORD** | The amount of ERs calculated in the Excel Spreadsheet is inconsistent with the amount of ERs claimed in the Monitoring Report, Verification Report and Certification Report. |
| **12** | **1421** | **8.5 MW wind power project in Chitradurga district in Karnataka by Jindal Aluminium Ltd.** | **16/07/08 - 31/03/09** | **BVCH** | The amount of emission reductions in the signed form (8,234) is not consistent with the amount of emission reductions in the other documentation (8,233). |
| **13** | **2467** | **Landfill Gas Recovery and Utilization at Bukit Tagar Sanitary Landfill, Hulu Selangor in Malaysia** | **28/07/2009-28/02/10** | **TÜV Nord** | As per EB 48 Annex 68, Paragraph 9 (e) requires that the number of CERs within and between the documents is correct and accurate. However, the signed form indicates the number of CERs as 42,767, but the amount of CERs claimed in VR/CR and calculation table is 42,002. Please address these inconsistencies. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **14** | **1438** | **Hubei Hefeng Yanzi Town Baishun Village Taohuashan Hydropower Station** | **18/02/08 - 25/06/ 09** | **TÜV SÜD** | As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, in the submitted Verification report, on pages 1, 3, 8, and 10 the version of the Final Monitoring report is indicated as 06 from 14/09/10 or "Final revised Monitoring report (Fourth version).This is not in consistency with the Monitoring Report submitted: Version 09 from 18/01/11. Furthermore, under References, Annex 2: Information Reference List, there is no reference to the Monitoring Report (including date and version) verified by the DOE.<br><br>Please note that the submitted form for request for issuance was not updated in the re-submission of the request for issuance. The form was dated 29/09/10, this date refers to the first submission for this request for issuance.<br><br>Kindly submit the revised document. Please keep in mind that a new signed form must be also submitted with the updated date. |
| **15** | **1153** | **Methane recovery and utilisation project at United Plantations Berhad, Jendarata Palm Oil Mill, Malaysia** | **08/11/07 - 30/04/09** | **TÜV SÜD** | EB49, Annex 69, paragraph 9 (e) requires that the number of CER, within and between documents is correct and accurate. However, baseline emissions and project emissions values in the Monitoring Report/Excel spreadsheet are not consistent with those in the Verification Statement of VR/CR. |
| **16** | **0411** | **AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-04, Paraná, Santa Catarina, and Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil** | **01/12/09 - 31/05/10** | **DNV** | As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, the revised monitoring report V.3 is dated 5 January, 2011 whereas in the verification and certification reports refer to the date 5 January 2010. (eg. Coverpage, pages 4, 5, 13 and 14. Please revise throughout the documents the date of the monitoring report). Kindly address this inconsistency. |
| **17** | **1900** | **Duerping Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project** | **27/04/10 - 26/10/10** | **LRQA** | Both the Verification and Certification reports mention (on pg 12) the monitoring period to be from 29/04/2010 - 26/10/2010. This is inconsistent with the actual monitoring period. |
| **18** | **2585** | **Fertinal Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project** | **17/10/09 - 25/07/10** | **ICONTEC** | As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent.<br>1. However, the submitted signed form refers to the monitoring period 17 Oct 09 - 18 May 10.<br>2. The submitted revised Monitoring refers to version Ver 1.4 02/02/11, however the documentation submitted refers to Version 1.3. Kindly address this inconsistency throughout the submitted documentation: Verification and Certification report, Signed form, etc. |
| **19** | **1498** | **Baji River Stage I 10MW Run-of-river Hydropower Project** | **10/08/09 - 13/10/10** | **SGS** | The Signed Request for Issuance corresponds to Project 0795 Tugela Mill Fuel Switching Project, instead of PA 1498 for which the request for issuance was |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | submitted. |
| **20** | **2621** | **Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment, Project AIN07-W-05, Sumatera Utara, Indonesia** | **12/11/09 - 30/06/10** | **DNV** | The date of the Verification and Certification Report ( 25 January 2010) is prior to the one of the submitted Monitoring Report (12 January 2011). |
| **21** | **1534** | **AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR07-S-34, Bahia, Espirito Santo, Minas Gerais, and Sao Paulo, Brazil** | **10/04/08 - 31/05/10** | **DNV** | As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, in the submitted Verification and Certification report, on pages 3, 12, 13, the date of the revised Monitoring report is indicated as 07/01/11.This is not in consistency with the Monitoring Report submitted dated 07/02/11.<br>Kindly submit the revised document. Please keep in mind that a new signed form must be also submitted with the updated date. |
| **22** | **2585** | **Fertinal Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project** | **17/10/09 - 25/07/10** | **ICONTEC** | As per EB 48-Annex 68-para 9 (a), the spreadsheet submitted with the request for issuance must be supplied in an assessable (unprotected) format, however in the "Fertinal First campaign 2010.xlsx" it's not possible to unhide some cells and the columns on the sheet "Hourly data" do not have a title;<br><br>As per EB 48-Annex 68-para 9 (f), the monitoring period throughout the documentation must be consistent, however it's noted that the monitoring period under verification goes from 17/10/2009 - 18/05/2010, while the monitoring period in the verification and monitoring reports make several references of a monitoring period from 17/10/2009 - 25/07/2010<br><br>Additionally, the PP might correct the methodology version number on section E.4 from the Monitoring Report |
| **23** | **1899** | **Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment, Project AIN07-W-01, Sumatera Utara (North Sumatera), Indonesia** | **01/0310 - 31/12/10** | **SIRIM** | The submitted documentation, including Monitoring Report, Verification and Certification Report, and Calculation spreadsheets correspond to the Monitoring Period 3 December 2008 – 28 February 2010 instead of 01 Mar 10 - 31 Dec 10 as indicated on the Signed Form. The CER number in the signed form also corresponds to the first request for issuance. |
| **24** | **0327** | **Lohgarh, Chakbhai and Sidhana Mini Hydroelectric Projects** | **01/07/08 - 31/03/10** | **TÜV Rheinland** | As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, section E.1 of the Monitoring Report contains a table of baseline emission calculation, which values are inconsistent with the values of the same table in the spreadsheet document (ER_Lohgarh ). For example, the inconsistency noted in the Net Saleable Energy value, which is used to determine the baseline emissions. Kindly address this consistency issue. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **25** | **0256** | **Jilin Tongyu Huaneng 100.5MW Wind Power Project** | **25/11/07 - 22/02/09** | **TÜV SÜD** | The Certificate Report and the Verification Statement states that the verifier confirms that the monitoring plan in the Monitoring report (version no 05, dated 04-08-2010) is as per the PDD and monitoring plan approved by the EB; However, the submitted final Monitoring Report is version 06 and is dated 25/02/2011. Additionally, under information reference list Monitoring Report version 06 is dated 25/02/2010. Kindly address these inconsistencies |
| **26** | **1428** | **Monomeros Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project** | **25/03/09 - 03/05/10** | **ICONTEC** | The version of the submitted Monitoring Report is Version 03 from March 9, 2011, however the Verification, Certification Report, the signed form and self the Monitoring Report show different versions and dates of the submitted Monitoring report:<br>- The signed form refers to Version 02<br>- The Monitoring Report refers to Version 03 dated 5 March, 2010<br>- The Verification Report refers to Version 02 in pages 11 and 33<br>- The Certification Report refers to Version 02 dated 22 December, 2010<br><br>The Verification and Certification reports are dated 31 December, 2010. However, due to the updated version of the Monitoring Report to 03 dated March 9, 2011, please note that the date of both Verification and Certification reports should be updated accordingly. |
| **27** | **2554** | **Doña Juana landfill gas-to-energy project** | **22/09/09 - 15/12/09** | **DNV** | (1). Monitoring report indicates project emission due to electricity import (p.23) and emission reductions cover the period up to 13/12/2009, while spreadsheet indicates period up to 15/12/2009, and the verification report does not contain any information about how and until what period the project emission due to electricity import has been calculated.<br>(2). Site visit dates are indicated inconsistently in the verification report: p.5 states 11-15 January 2010, while p. 7 states 12-15 January 2010.<br>(3). Date of registered PDD referred to in the verification report is indicated inconsistently: p.12 states 10 Sept 2009, p.5 states 22 Sept 2009. |
| **28** | **2347** | **150 MW grid connected Wind Power based electricity generation project in Gujarat, India** | **18/06/09 - 24/02/10** | **TÜV NORD** | The monitoring report (final version) date in the Verification Report is 28/06/10 (pg. 2) while the monitoring report submitted as final version is dated 08/03/11. |
| **29** | **0798** | **Zámbiza Landfill Gas Project** | **01/05/09 - 30/11/10** | **SGS** | (1) The raw data sheets submitted refer to a monitoring report version 01, October 15th 2010 (Cell B9), while the monitoring report submitted for the request for issuance is named as version 05, dated as 02/02/2011.<br>(2) Additionally, the raw data sheet for September 2009 submitted is named as "v.2" while, inside of the sheet, the file is indicated as "Spreadsheet version: 01" (cell B12) |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | (3) The mean values presented in the Summary CER sheet of LFGflare,y (column B), wCH4,y (Column C), and Net ERy (Column G) are not possible to track the mean values calculated in the raw data sheets submitted - it refers to a "C" file. However even when checked manually, inconsistency is found - for example, the mean value for wCH4,y in raw data for June 2009 (cell C43224) is inconsistent with value reported in the summary sheet (cell C18)), and the same inconsistency for wCH4,y of June 2010, etc. Please submit the summary sheet where those values are possible to be tracked from the raw data sheets and confirmed to be consistent. |
| **30** | **0889** | **RIMA Fuel Switch in Bocaiúva** | **01/02/09-30/11/09** | **ICONTEC** | The Verification Report (11/02/2011) and the Certification Report(13/10/2010)are dated before the final Monitoring Report(24/02/2011) submitted with this request for issuance. In addition the Verification Statement and Certification Report refer to Monitoring Report version 01 and not to the final MR which is version 02 and dated 24/02/2011. We would also kindly draw your attention to the misspelling of the monitoring period on page 21 in the verification statement where the reporting period is given as 01/02/2009 - 11/30/2009. |
| **31** | **1144** | **Tambun LPG Associated Gas Recovery and Utilization Project** | **16/01/10 - 31/05/10** | **TÜV NORD** | According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e),cross-referencing and versioning within and between the documents must be correct and accurate. First page of MR indicates Monitoring Report to be version 3, dated 03/02/2011. The third page of the same document indicates Monitoring Report to be Version 02 dated 02/11/2010. The front page of the CER calculation spreadsheet refers to MR version 01 dated 02/08/2010. The Verification Report shows that CARs have been addressed in MR ver.2. In addition page 40 of the VR lists PDD as version 4.3 dated 2009-11-30 however, version 4.3 was updated on 6/11/2009 and accepted on 28/05/2010. |
| **32** | **1987** | **Sichuan Pingwu Xiannvbao Hydropower Station** | **24/12/09-20/10/10** | **DNV** | The revision date of the Verification Report is 07/03/2010. The Certification Statement in the Verification Report of this request for issuance is also signed on 07/03/2010. However, the Monitoring Report is dated on the 06/01/2011. |
| **33** | **0259** | **Trupan Biomass Power Plant in Chile** | **01/10/08-31/12/09** | **SGS** | According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e),cross-referencing and versioning within and between the documents must be correct and accurate. The Monitoring Report states that the emission factor is calculated using equation 10 of ACM0002 version 6 whereas the Verification Report states that ACM0002 version 4 is used to determine the emission factor. |
| **34** | **0267** | **MW Wind Power Project at Baramsar and Soda Mada, district Jaisalmer, Rajasthan,** | **02/07/06 - 01/09/08** | **SGS** | 1. The Monitoring Report, version 02, page 2, refers to registered PDD Version 02, however the updated Version of the PDD is Version 03 dated 02/01/2006 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **India** | | | 2. The signed form refers to Monitoring Report from 16/03/2011, however the last update of the Monitoring Report is from 11/10/2010<br>3. The Verification Report refers to the Monitoring Report version 02, dated 21/02/2009 in pages 17, 23 and 25. The date of the revised Monitoring Report is 11/10/2010<br>4. The Monitoring Report, pages 2 and 12 refers to a crediting period from 01/07/2003 to 01/07/2013. Please note that the correct crediting period for project 0267 is from 16 Jun 03 - 15 Jun 13 |
| **35** | **2585** | **Fertinal Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project** | **17/10/09-25/07/10** | **ICONTEC** | 1. The cover pages of the submitted calculation spreadsheets "Fertinal Baseline 2010" and "Fertinal First campaign ver 1.1" refer incorrectly to project activity 1784. The submitted request for issuance is for project activity 2585. Kindly also revise that the ER calculations clearly correspond to the request for issuance for project activity 2585.<br><br>2. The Verification Statement in the Verification Report page 33 (5.4 Opinion) refers to the monitoring period 17 Oct 09 - 25 Jul 25. Kindly note that the monitoring period is from 17 Oct 09 to 25 Jul 10.<br><br>3. The Certification Report refers to the monitoring period 17 Oct 09 - 25 Jul 25. Kindly note that the monitoring period is from 17 Oct 09 to 25 Jul 10. |
| **36** | **0172** | **Matanzas Hydroelectric Plant** | **01/01/09 - 28/06/09** | **AENOR** | According to EB48 Annex 68, paragraph 9(d) all documents must be in English or contain a full translation of relevant sections into English. The submitted spreadsheet contains sections in Spanish language. Kindly provide the spreadsheet in English. |
| **37** | **0174** | **SAN ISIDRO HYDROELECTRIC PLANT** | **01/0109 - 28/06/09** | **AENOR** | According to EB48 Annex 68, paragraph 9(d) all documents must be in English or contain a full translation of relevant sections into English. The submitted spreadsheet contains sections in Spanish language. Kindly provide the spreadsheet in English |
| **38** | **0327** | **Lohgarh, Chakbhai and Sidhana Mini Hydroelectric Projects** | **01/07/08 - 31/03/10** | **TUEV Rheinland** | According to EB48 Annex 68,paragraph 7(b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. Table E1, pg. 15 of the Monitoring Report, shows a table with baseline emission calculation, where the value of Net Saleable Energy (O=G-N) based on which baseline emissions<br>are determined is not consistent with the value of the Net Saleable Energy (O=G-N) in the Emission Reduction excel sheet document. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **39** | **2482** | **Sarbari-I small hydro project of DSL Hydrowatt Limited (DSLHL), Himachal Pradesh, India** | **27/0709 - 25/08/10** | **BVCH** | According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e),cross-referencing within and between the document must be correct and accurate. The submitted Verification Report and Certification Report are dated on 18.03.2011, whereas the submitted Monitoring Report under verification (version 05) is dated 21.03.2011, which is after the VR and CR. This is not in accordance with the logical sign-off dates, as the Certification Report states that Bureau Veritas Certification verified the Project Monitoring Report version 05. In addition, the VR under References Section, lists Final Monitoring Report version 05 dated 18/03/2011. |
| **40** | **0903** | **Patikari Hydro Electric Power Project in Distt-Mandi, Himachal Pradesh, India** | **02/01/10 - 01/01/11** | **LRQA** | The revised Monitoring Report has not been submitted. The Certification Report, page 12 is not dated.<br>Please note that the date of the revised Verification and Certification Report should also be updated once the above information is included. |

**Table 4**

| Issuance | | Stage 2: Information and Reporting Check | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **#** | **PA #** | **Project** | **Monitoring Period** | **DOE** | **Reasons** |
| **1** | **0801** | **Korea Water Resources Corporation (Kwater) small-sacle hydroelectric power plants project II** | **01/06/08-31/05/09** | **KSA** | Scope: The verification report does not contain information on how the DOE verified the calibration of monitored equipments with the calibration requirements (EB52/Annex 60 para (8) and/or EB55 Annex 35 in case of small scale methodology as per VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii)).<br><br>Issue: The monitoring report stated that calibration for meter SN6063962 (Dalbang)) was carried out on 26/05/2009, after the start date of commercial operation of Dalbang plant (12/02/2007). However, the verification report does not contain information on how the DOE verified that the calibration of meter SN6063962 meets the calibration requirements defined in the monitoring plan or guidance (EB52/Annex 60 para (8) and/or EB55 Annex 35 in case of small scale methodology) and if it is valid for the entire monitoring period. |
| **2** | **2680** | **Gansu Yumen Diwopu Wind Power Project** | **24/02/10-29/04/10** | **ERM** | Scope: The monitoring report does not contain default values/external data used in the calculation of emission reductions (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (v)).<br><br>Issue: Section D.1 of the Monitoring |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Report is missing (Data and parameters determined at registration and not monitored during the monitoring period, including default values and factors). Please add this section and fill it accordingly. Additionally: Page 6 of the Monitoring Report is not legible. Please modify accordingly. |
| **3** | **2444** | **ADFEC 10 MW Solar Power Plant** | **08/06/09 - 01/07/10** | **TÜV NORD** | Scope: The information on calibration of monitoring instruments reported is not in accordance with the specified by the monitoring methodology/ monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).<br><br>Issue: The monitoring plan indicates that the calibration frequency of the electricity meters is once in a year. However, the monitoring report indicates that the calibration frequency of the electricity meters is every three years. It is requested to clarify the inconsistency and how Annex 60 of EB 52 is correctly applied. |
| **4** | **1208** | **Superior Hog Farms Methane Recovery** | **07/07/07 - 31/12/09** | **SQS** | Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv))<br><br>Issue: The monitoring report states that the meters used for the calculation of emission reduction are duly calibrated by accredited agencies, using applicable national standards. However, the calibration dates and the calibration frequency, as stipulated by the national standard, are missing. |
| **5** | **1208** | **Superior Hog Farms Methane Recovery** | **07/07/07 - 31/12/09** | **SQS** | Scope: The monitoring report does not contain default values/external data used in the calculation of emission reductions (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (v)).<br><br>Issue: The default parameters listed in the monitoring report were the methane density and the methane GWP. However, the parameters used to determine ex-ante ERs according with paragraph 6 (b) from the methodology were not provided. |
| **6** | **1208** | **Superior Hog Farms Methane Recovery** | **07/07/07 - 31/12/09** | **SQS** | Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the formulae for BE and/or PE and/or L (when applicable) and emission reductions calculations, including reference to formulae and methods used (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (vii)).<br><br>Issue: Annex A from the monitoring report provides a summary of the |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | calculation based on the monitored values. However, the methodology requires, on paragraph 6 (a) and (b), that the lowest value between ERs monitored and calculated ex-ante using the amount of the waste or raw material that would decay anaerobically in the absence of the project activity must be adopted and the monitoring report does not provide such comparison. Additionally, the report does not present how the ex-ante calculation was conducted. |
| **7** | **1208** | **Superior Hog Farms Methane Recovery** | **07/07/07 - 31/12/09** | **SQS** | Scope: The Verification Report does not provide a conclusion on whether the calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage have been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan and the applied methodology (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (c)).<br><br>Issue: Section 3.4 from the Verification Report states that ERs calculations have been done correctly as defined in the registered CDM SSC PDD, the additional tools and as described in the monitoring plan. However, the methodology requires, on paragraphs 6 (a) and (b), that the lowest value between ERs monitored and calculated ex-ante using the amount of the waste or raw material that would decay anaerobically in the absence of the project activity must be adopted and the DOE did not verify how such comparison was made. |
| **8** | **1227** | **Yuyao Electricity Generation Project using Natural Gas** | **01/07/09 - 30/09/10** | **BVCH** | Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).<br><br>Issue: The PDD states that the calibration frequency of the electricity meters should be performed as per national standards and rules (page 39 of the PDD).The Monitoring Report describes that the meters were re-calibrated yearly and includes only the last calibration performed on September 28, 2010. The verification report states that the last calibration was done in 2006 with validity till 2011 with no reference to yearly calibration. . The PP/DOE shall clearly present the requirements with regard to the industrial and/or national standards as per the PDD requirement. |
| **9** | **0122** | **Agua Fresca Multipurpose and** | **01/01/09 - 31/12/09** | **ICONTEC** | Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **environmental services project** | | | of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).<br><br>Issue: In response to the previous Information and Reporting Check rejection, the PP informed in the monitoring report that "there is no need for calibration of the power gauges for the first 2 years, after the initial installation. Once the 2 year period is over, there will be an annual calibration of the gauges". However, the Monitoring Report does not provide the installation date of the meters to check the conformity with such frequency and does not provide additional details on the monitoring instruments according with EB54 - Annex 35 "Issuance information and reporting checklist". |
| **10** | **1428** | **Monomeros Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project** | **25/03/09 - 03/05/10** | **ICONTEC** | Scope/issue: The monitoring report does not provide the implementation status of the project (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (i)). |
| **11** | **1428** | **Monomeros Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project** | **25/03/09 - 03/05/10** | **ICONTEC** | Scope/issue: The monitoring report does not contain a comparison of the actual emission reduction claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the registered PDD (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (viii)). |
| **12** | **1163** | **AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-28, Santa Catarina, Brazil** | **01/02/08 - 30/11/09** | **DNV** | Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br><br>Issue: There is a discrepancy between the figures in the MR and the spreadsheet for the flare efficiency. Table D.3 in the Monitoring Report shows that the flare efficiency at the 29442 site was measured on 06/05/09 as 99.78%. The spreadsheet records the period from 06/05/09 with a flare efficiency of 99.97%. |
| **13** | **0554** | **Luertai 12.2 MW Hydropower Station Project, Lintan County, Gannan Autonomous Tibetan Prefecture, Gansu province, China** | **01/06/08 - 29/03/10** | **JACO** | Scope: The information on calibration of monitoring instruments reported is not in accordance with the specified by the monitoring methodology/ monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).<br><br>Issue: The monitoring plan indicates that the calibration frequency of the electricity meters is once in a year. However, the monitoring report indicates M1 and M2 had delayed calibration on 2008,therefore the DOE is requested to clarify how it verified that EB52 annex 60 was correctly applied. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **14** | **1139** | **Bagasse based Cogeneration Project at Pudukkottai Tamil Nadu, India** | **14/09/07 - 30/09/08** | **TÜV SÜD** | Scope I: The monitoring report does not contain the monitored parameters reported at the interval required by the monitoring plan / applied methodology (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iii)).<br><br>Issue: The net quantity of heat generated from firing biomass in the project plant is to be monitored and calculated from the measured values of steam flow and enthalpy, steam pressure and steam temperature data from the plant and is determined based on the difference of the enthalpy of the steam generated minus the enthalpy of the feed water and any condensate return. However the monitoring report (page 35) indicates only the final value obtained for the monitoring period (1986437.38 GJ; which is the same value as applied in the registered PDD), and no further calculation details and explanation is provided either in the monitoring report or in the excel spreadsheet. |
| **15** | **1139** | **Bagasse based Cogeneration Project at Pudukkottai Tamil Nadu, India** | **14/09/07 - 30/09/08** | **TÜV SÜD** | Scope II: The Verification Report does not contain an assessment on whether appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and other reference values have been correctly applied (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (e)).<br><br>Issue: The Verification Report does not contain an assessment on whether appropriate CO2 emission factors for fossil fuel (EFCO2,FF, i) have been correctly applied (e.g. assessment on the most conservative value between national and IPCC latest data). |
| **16** | **1139** | **Bagasse based Cogeneration Project at Pudukkottai Tamil Nadu, India** | **14/09/07 - 30/09/08** | **TÜV SÜD** | Scope III: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the formulae of calculation (whenever possible) EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (ii).<br><br>Issue: The monthly values of biomass moisture indicated in the CER spreadsheet (in "Daily Fuel Data" sheet) are not calculated numbers (as an average of the daily values) as per procedure of monitoring plan; instead they are shown as typed numbers and no explanations are provided in the spreadsheet. |
| **17** | **1139** | **Bagasse based Cogeneration Project at Pudukkottai Tamil** | **14/09/07 - 30/09/08** | **TÜV SÜD** | Scope IV: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)). |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Nadu, India** | | | Issue 1: In relation to the parameter EFCO2,FF, I, the verification protocol indicates that IPCC default values for fuels are used (page 58) however the monitoring report and page 16 of the verification report indicate that in case of lignite, the CO2 emission factor is based on India's National Communication to the UNFCCC and in case of coal and diesel oil, default values as per latest IPCC guidelines are used.<br><br>Issue 2: The value reported in the monitoring report for moisture content of purchased bagasse (51.2%) is inconsistent with the value reported in the CER spreadsheet (50.6%). |
| **18** | **2877** | **Yunnan Sinanjiang Hydropower Project** | **24/02/10 - 25/07/10** | **DNV** | Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not provide explanation on application of formulae EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii).<br><br>Issue: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not provide explanation on the application of formulae " electricity amount = (end reading – initial reading)*make ratio *10"whereas the rationale to multiply by 10 is not explained, eg. Sheet 1 Cell I7. |
| **19** | **1856** | **Wind power project by HZL in Gujarat** | **25/07/09 - 31/03/10** | **DNV** | Scope: The monitoring report does not contain all parameters required to be monitored as per the monitoring plan/applied methodology (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iii)).<br><br>Issue: Two parameters EGy,Export & EGy,Import have not been reported as per the monitoring plan. |
| **20** | **1856** | **Wind power project by HZL in Gujarat** | **25/07/09 - 31/03/10** | **DNV** | Scope: 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 these parameters including the values in the monitoring reports. (VVM v.1.2. paragraph 206)<br><br>Issue: The parameters EGWEG and EGVCB have not been reported and verified in the verification report. |
| **21** | **0499** | **Destruction of HFC-23 at refrigerant (HCFC-22) manufacturing facility of Chemplast Sanmar Ltd** | **16/02/10 - 30/06/10** | **SGS** | Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br><br>Issue: The calibration dates for meter 99003C20000 & |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 99003D20000 are inconsistent between MR & CER spread sheet (calibration details worksheet) |
| **22** | **0499** | **Destruction of HFC-23 at refrigerant (HCFC-22) manufacturing facility of Chemplast Sanmar Ltd** | **16/02/10 - 30/06/10** | **SGS** | Scope: 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 these parameters including the values in the monitoring reports (VVM 1.2. para 206).<br><br>Issue: The verification report has not reported two parameters F_ NaOH, electricity, y, and F_ Na2SO3 electricity y. |
| **23** | **1031** | **Rio Taquesi Hydroelectric Power Project** | **01/07/08 - 30/06/09** | **SGS** | Scope: The verification report does not contain correct information on how the DOE verified the calibration of monitored equipments with the calibration requirements (EB52/Annex 60).<br><br>Issue: The DOE is requested to clarify how the calibration of the electricity meters was valid during the whole monitoring period considering that calibration date (17th September 2008) was after the start of the monitoring period (1st July 2008). |
| **24** | **1509** | **Biogas energy plant from palm oil mill effluent** | **01/01/09 - 31/12/09** | **ICONTEC** | Scope I: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the values of monitored parameters (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (i)).<br><br>Issue: Tflare is a required parameter but the monitored data have not been reported. |
| **25** | **1509** | **Biogas energy plant from palm oil mill effluent** | **01/01/09 - 31/12/09** | **ICONTEC** | Scope II: The Verification Report does not assess whether all parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied methodology and relevant CDM Executive Board decisions have been sufficiently monitored and updated as applicable (VVM v.1.2 para 205)<br><br>Issue: The DOE did not describe how it verified the flare efficiency since it depends on the monitored results of Tflare whereas the monitored data of this parameter have not been reported as required. |
| **26** | **1754** | **Visakhapatnam (India) OSRAM CFL distribution CDM Project** | **12/02/09 - 31/03/10** | **TÜV NORD** | Scope: 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 these parameters including the values in |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | the monitoring reports (VVM v.1.2 para 206)<br><br>Issue: The verification report(p67 - p 99)does not contain the information flow on the parameter of nm,d,v (Number of meter that provide a valid value during the monitoring interval). |
| **27** | **0247** | **Replacement of Fossil Fuel by Palm Kernel Shell Biomass in the production of Portland Cement** | **01/01/06 - 31/12/09** | **SIRIM QAS** | Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).<br><br>Issue: The Monitoring Report does not contain information on the calibrations of instruments including number of meters, meter location and calibration dates. |
| **28** | **2181** | **Methane Capture and On-site Power Generation Project at Syarikat Cahaya Muda Perak (Oil Mill) Sdn. Bhd. In Tapah, Perak, Malaysia** | **01/06/09 - 31/12/09** | **SIRIM QAS** | Scope I: The monitoring report does not contain monitoring systems and procedures (including any quality assurance and quality control system employed by the project activity) (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii)).<br><br>Issue: The monitoring report does not contain any description regarding monitoring systems and procedures and any description regarding quality assurance and quality control system employed by the project activity. |
| **29** | **2181** | **Methane Capture and On-site Power Generation Project at Syarikat Cahaya Muda Perak (Oil Mill) Sdn. Bhd. In Tapah, Perak, Malaysia** | **01/06/09 - 31/12/09** | **SIRIM QAS** | Scope II: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).<br><br>Issue: The monitoring report does not contain information on calibration of monitoring instruments. |
| **30** | **2181** | **Methane Capture and On-site Power Generation Project at Syarikat Cahaya Muda Perak (Oil Mill) Sdn. Bhd. In Tapah, Perak, Malaysia** | **01/06/09 - 31/12/09** | **SIRIM QAS** | Scope III: The monitoring report does not contain a comparison of the actual emission reduction claimed in the monitoring period with the estimate in the registered PDD (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (viii)).<br><br>Issue: 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. |
| **31** | **1040** | **Korat Waste To Energy** | **17/06/07 - 25/07/09** | **TÜV SÜD** | Scope I: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the values of monitored parameters (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (i)). |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Issue: The registered monitoring plan (page 37 of the PDD) requires on-site testing of biogas calorific value but the CER data spreadsheet contains only a calculation result in column D of worksheet "processed data". It is noted that the biogas NCV value in the PDD was based on the 2006 IPCC default value for the NCV of biogas, which is 0.0504 TJ/tonne, and assuming a 65% concentration of methane in the biogas. According to the PDD (page28), the actual concentration of methane in the biogas will be metered during the operation of the project. The submitted data spreadsheet does not contain the required data results for parameter " biogas calorific value" from on-site testing which is required by the monitoring plan. |
| **32** | **1040** | **Korat Waste To Energy** | **17/06/07 - 25/07/09** | **TÜV SÜD** | Scope II: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not provide explanation on application of formulae EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii).<br><br>Issue: Under column D of worksheet "Processed Data" in the submitted CER spreadsheet, a formula was used to calculate the NCV of biogas. The rationale of the formula was not explained including the application of the figure 35846 in the equation. |
| **33** | **1040** | **Korat Waste To Energy** | **17/06/07 - 25/07/09** | **TÜV SÜD** | Scope II: The Verification Report does not provide an assessment on how CARs and CLs were closed-out (VVM v.1.2 para 221 (f)).<br><br>Issue: The following information provided on page A-109 of the Verification Report (VR) appears to show inconsistent data against those in the CER spreadsheet. For instance, WW input value is 4417m3/d (VR) whereas a calculated result based on the submitted spreadsheet appears to be 4422m3/d. Similar inconsistencies exist in other values: WW output: 4466 m3/d (VR) and 4471m3/d (based on raw data); electricity: 10527kWh/y (VR) and 10518 kWh/y based on raw data; etc. The DOE shall provide a detailed assessment on how it closed out the clarification request based on the PP response. |
| **34** | **3440** | **Point of Use Abatement Device to Reduce SF6 emissions in LCD Manufacturing** | **01/08/10-30/09/10** | **TÜV SÜD** | Scope I: Monitoring Report contains all parameters required to be monitored and reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Operations in the Republic of Korea (South Korea)** | | | (EB 48 -Annex 68 paragraph (a) (iii)) / the spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions contain the values of monitored parameters (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (i)).<br><br>Issue: The monitoring report/the spreadsheet does not contain the values of monitored parameters Md,in; Md,out; Bws,in; Bws,out, Ms,in; Ms,out;Ps,in; Ps,out; Ts,in; Ts,out; Vs,in; Vs,out; Pavg,in; Pavg,out; Q,in and Q,out. |
| **35** | **3440** | **Point of Use Abatement Device to Reduce SF6 emissions in LCD Manufacturing Operations in the Republic of Korea (South Korea)** | **01/08/10-30/09/10** | **TÜV SÜD** | Scope II: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not provide explanation on application of formulae EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii).<br><br>Issue: The spreadsheet does not show how the calculations of ESF6,in and ESF6,out have been done. |
| **36** | **2852** | **Yunnan Saizhu Hydropower Project** | **12/04/10 - 30/09/10** | **KFQ** | Scope: The Verification Report does not provide an explanation on the implementation status of the project (VVM v.1.2 para 198).<br><br>Issue: The PDD page 33 states that "A connection with identical ammeters to the grid shown in Figure 6 will be built as backup. These two ammeters (M1', M3') function the same when the main connection (left one) is unavailable, thus the measurements of it on EGy,in and EGy,out are identical for the emission reduction calculation." However, the monitoring report does not make any reference to meters M1' and M3' in the monitoring system description and the DOE also did not assess the reasons for those meters not being installed. |
| **37** | **1636** | **Alto-Tietê landfill gas capture project** | **25/09/08 - 04/03/09** | **SGS** | Scope I: The verification report does not contain information on how the DOE verified the calibration of monitored equipments with the calibration requirements (EB52/Annex 60 para (8)) as per VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii).<br><br>Issue: The verification report does not contain an assessment on whether the electricity meter used to monitor the parameter ELimp (total amount of electricity imported to meet project requirement) has been calibrated as per EB52/Annex 60 para (8). Additionally the verification report shall clearly indicate whether this has been verified for all required metering equipment (e.g. flow meter). |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **38** | **1636** | **Alto-Tietê landfill gas capture project** | **25/09/08 - 04/03/09** | **SGS** | Scope II: The verification report does not assess whether all parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied methodology and relevant CDM Executive Board decisions have been sufficiently monitored and updated as applicable (VVM v.1.2 para 205).<br><br>Issue 1: The verification report does not state how the DOE verified the methane composition profile measurement to be done once per year (including calculations involved and conclusions) as indicated in the revised monitoring plan (associated with clarification AM_CLA_0047).<br>Issue 2: The verification report does assess whether the same basis (dry or wet) has been considered for measurements of fvi,h (volumetric fraction of component i in the residual gas in the hour h) and FVRG,h (volumetric flow rate of the residual gas) as required by the Tool.<br>Issue 3: The verification report does not indicate the date when the data for ex-post calculation of the emission factor has been accessed and does not assess whether the emission factor has been updated as per EB decision of EB51 paragraph 9 as applicable. Additionally the verification report does not indicate how the reported emission factor has been crosschecked with the data available at the reference link indicated, considering that the reference does not shows the calculation of the final reported emission factor. |
| **39** | **1636** | **Alto-Tietê landfill gas capture project** | **25/09/08 - 04/03/09** | **SGS** | Scope III: The verification report does not provide an assessment on how CARs and CLs were closed-out (VVM v.1.2 para 221 (f)).<br><br>Issue: In the verification report the CAR #2 has been raised regarding the indication of Flare Efficiency (FE) as 100% in the internal system when the equipment AG-02 (gas analyzer) "was not working" as observed by the DOE in the site visit, however in the CAR closure it is not explained why the spreadsheet shows FE as 100% when -13<fvCH4,FG,h <0 & tO2 measurement is normal (<21%), and shows FE as 90% when fvCH4,FG,h <-13, indicating that for the measurements where these assumptions (90% and 100%) are applied, no AG02 failure was declared. Additionally the verification report does not state how these |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | ranges reported by PP have been crosschecked and how the assumptions, in particular FE as 100%, were verified in accordance with the applied methodology and associated Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane. The DOE shall provide a detailed assessment on how it closed out the CAR#2 based on the information provided by PP. |
| **40** | **1161** | **AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-26, Minas Gerais, Brazil** | **01/02/08 - 31/05/10** | **DNV** | Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the formulae for BE and/or PE and/or L (when applicable) and emission reductions calculations, including reference to formulae and methods used (EB48/Annex 68 para 10 (a)(vii)).<br><br>Issue: The results presented on Section E.4 do not follow from the equations presented on Section E.2, as the ex-post procedures and equations for estimating baseline emissions are not presented on the latter. |
| **41** | **1161** | **AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-26, Minas Gerais, Brazil** | **01/02/08 - 31/05/10** | **DNV** | Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br><br>Issue: Pages 8 and 10 of the VR state that the required accuracy of the gas analyzers is not indicated in the PDD (both for determining CH4 content in the biogas and the exhaust gas). However, this is indeed indicated on the monitoring plan within the registered PDD (+/- 0.5% and +/-1%, respectively; PDD, page 20). |
| **42** | **2417** | **Chile: Lircay Run-Of-River Project** | **04/08/09 - 31/12/09** | **AENOR** | Scope I: The monitoring report does not contain all parameters required to be monitored as per the monitoring plan/applied methodology (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iii)).<br><br>Issue: The monitoring report Page 31 states: “All relevant parameters required to obtain the Project´s Emission Reduction have been duly monitored and registered in the above tables. However, some deviations have been found between the parameters written in the registered Projects PDD and the relevant parameters required by AM0026 (version 3) methodology and the latest “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system” (version 2).” However, it is noted that the following parameters as required to be monitored by the registered monitoring plan were not |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | provided: COEFii, y ,: CO2 emission factor of each plant by fuel type used, taking into account the carbon content of the fuels used by relevant power sources i and percent of oxidation of fuel in year y, CEFi : Carbon emission factor of fuel used in the ith plant of the Build Margin cohort and SFCBM,i : Specific fuel consumption of the ith electricity generation plant). |
| **43** | **2417** | **Chile: Lircay Run-Of-River Project** | **04/08/09 - 31/12/09** | **AENOR** | Scope II: The verification report does not 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 these parameters including the values in the monitoring reports (VVM 1.2. para 206)<br><br>Issue: The following parameters are required by the registered monitoring plan to be monitored. However, the DOE has not provided information on how it verified the information flow for these parameters: COEFii, y ,: CO2 emission factor of each plant by fuel type used, taking into account the carbon content of the fuels used by relevant power sources i and percent of oxidation of fuel in year y, CEFi : Carbon emission factor of fuel used in the ith plant of the Build Margin cohort and SFCBM,i : Specific fuel consumption of the ith electricity generation plant). |
| **44** | **2417** | **Chile: Lircay Run-Of-River Project** | **04/08/09 - 31/12/09** | **AENOR** | Scope III: The monitoring report does not provide the implementation status of the project (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (i)).<br><br>Issue: The monitoring report does not provide information about the installed turbine capacity. |
| **45** | **2417** | **Chile: Lircay Run-Of-River Project** | **04/08/09 - 31/12/09** | **AENOR** | Scope IV: The Verification Report does not inform whether all physical features of the project are in place (VVM v.1.2 para 196).<br><br>Issue: The DOE shall provide findings and conclusions as to whether the proposed CDM project activity has been implemented in accordance with the PDD. However, the monitoring report page 4 (footnote) states: “Some small differences have resulted from the project actual implementation compared to the project design as compared to the CDM PDD project description. However, no changes on the estimated annual generation are foreseen due to this minor |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | changes." The DOE shall provide information to confirm the reported differences as observed against the description of the project implementation in the PDD. |
| **46** | **2673** | **BAJ Gunung Agung Factory tapioca starch wastewater biogas extraction and utilization project, Lampung Province, Republic of Indonesia** | **04/10/09 - 31/03/10** | **DNV** | Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br><br>Issue 1: For the monitored parameter, Methane concentration in biogas fed to the flare (F CH4, flare), the verification report states that the manufacturer did not provide information on the accuracy of the gas analyzer. However, the monitoring report (page 9) indicates the accuracy as 5%. This is not mutually consistent.<br><br>Issue 2: For the monitored parameter, F CH4, flare, the verification report states that the calibration certificate (Ref: 067CE10) dated 24 May 2010 was provided to the verification team. However the monitoring report (page 9) indicates the latest calibration date as 2 May 2010. The DOE is requested to clarify which is the correct date of calibration.<br><br>Issue 3: For the monitored parameter, F CH4, generator, the verification report states that the calibration certificate (Ref: 063CE10) dated 24 May 2010 was provided to the verification team. However the monitoring report (page 10) indicates the latest calibration date as 12 May 2010. The DOE is requested to clarify which is the correct date of calibration.<br><br>Issue 4: For the monitored parameters,CODy,ww, untreated and CODy treated, the verification report states that the calibration certificate (Ref: #076CE10) dated 24 May 2010 was provided to the verification team. However the monitoring report (page 10) indicates the latest calibration date as 12 May 2010. The DOE is requested to clarify which is the correct date of calibration. |
| **47** | **1899** | **Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment, Project AIN07-W-01, Sumatera Utara (North Sumatera), Indonesia** | **03/12/08 - 28/02/10** | **SIRIM QAS** | Scope I: The Verification Report does not provide an explanation on the implementation status of the project (VVM v.1.2 para 198).<br><br>Issue 1: The verification report does not indicate how the DOE verified the implementation status, in |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | particular the date that the system became operational as indicated in the monitoring report (24th September 2008). Additionally the PDD states that "optional polishing ponds are used as backup only", and its status is not discussed in verification report.<br><br>Issue 2: The verification report indicates that the DOE confirmed that the project has been implemented as per PDD. Considering that the PDD does not provide specific information of equipments (e.g. such as capacity, manufacture of flare, generators, etc), for completeness, the DOE is requested to provide how it verified the physical features/detailed information regarding the technology of equipments installed. |
| **48** | **1899** | **Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment, Project AIN07-W-01, Sumatera Utara (North Sumatera), Indonesia** | **03/12/08 - 28/02/10** | **SIRIM QAS** | Scope II: The monitoring report does not contain monitoring systems and procedures (including any quality assurance and quality control system employed by the project activity) (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (ii)).<br><br>Issue 1: The monitoring system (e.g. as illustrated in Figure 1 of monitoring report) does not include all physical features/monitoring systems of the project activity (e.g. 2 flares, use of electricity from biomass and boiler and diesel generator, etc) and where the measurements are taken (e.g. flow meter and gas analyser monitoring points in relation to the 2 flares locations, COD measuring points, electricity meter, etc).<br><br>Issue 2: The monitoring report does not contain monitoring system and procedures to obtain FFB production data, used to calculate Qy,ww (Volume of wastewater treated in the year y), including any applicable quality assurance/quality control system employed such as calibration.<br><br>Issue 3: Issue: As per monitoring plan, CODy,ww,untreated and CODy,ww,treated will be recorded semi-annually via third party sampling and analysis, and COD analysis of wastewater samples will be conducted in accordance to analysis equipment manufacturer's specifications and will include blank and calibration standards, however no detailed information on sampling |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | and quality assurance of analysis has been provided in the monitoring report related to COD analysis. |
| **49** | **1899** | **Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment, Project AIN07-W-01, Sumatera Utara (North Sumatera), Indonesia** | **03/12/08 - 28/02/10** | **SIRIM QAS** | Scope III: The monitoring report does not contain the monitored parameters reported at the interval required by the monitoring plan / applied methodology (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iii)).<br>Issue: As per monitoring plan, the effluent conversion factor analysis conducted by a third party and used to calculate Qy,ww (Volume of wastewater treated in the year y) is done on an annual basis however the monitoring report does not contain the date when this analysis has been conducted. |
| **50** | **1899** | **Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment, Project AIN07-W-01, Sumatera Utara (North Sumatera), Indonesia** | **03/12/08 - 28/02/10** | **SIRIM QAS** | Scope IV: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br>Issue: The verification report states in page A-9 that "CODy,ww,treated = COD out from Anaerobic pond 2, before final discharge" however in page 11 of the verification report is stated "The verification team confirmed that samples were taken at the outlet from the covered anaerobic lagoon". Considering the Anaerobic Lagoon 2 as illustrated in page 41 of the PDD has not yet been covered in this monitoring period as confirmed by the DOE, this inconsistency shall be clarified. |
| **51** | **1899** | **Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment, Project AIN07-W-01, Sumatera Utara (North Sumatera), Indonesia** | **03/12/08 - 28/02/10** | **SIRIM QAS** | Scope V: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv))<br>Issue 1: The monitoring report does not inform which portable gas analyzer has been used in which analysis conducted to determine MCbiogas, hence is not possible to confirm that the dates of calibrations given in Section D1 cover the monitoring period/have not been delayed.<br>Issue 2: The monitoring report (Table D1) indicates the dates of installation of flow meters however the dates of calibration are not provided.<br>Issue 3: The monitoring report does not contain calibration information related to the electricity meter used to record readings of the KWh generation, located at the mill power house (as indicated in page 14 of the verification report). |
| **52** | **1899** | **Methane Recovery in Wastewater** | **03/12/08 - 28/02/10** | **SIRIM QAS** | Scope VI: The Verification Report does not assess whether all |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Treatment, Project AIN07-W-01, Sumatera Utara (North Sumatera), Indonesia** | | | parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied methodology and relevant CDM Executive Board decisions have been sufficiently monitored and updated as applicable (VVM v.1.2 para 205)<br>Issue: Regarding the MCbiogas monitored by gas analyzers, the PDD states that 5 readings will be taken during analysis and if the reading is greater than 10% points difference from previous reading, appropriate maintenance actions are initiated. The verification report does not indicate how this was verified. |
| **53** | **1899** | **Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment, Project AIN07-W-01, Sumatera Utara (North Sumatera), Indonesia** | **03/12/08 - 28/02/10** | **SIRIM QAS** | Scope VII: The verification report does not contain information on how the DOE verified the calibration of monitored equipments with the calibration requirements (EB52/Annex 60 para (8) / EB55 Annex 35 as per VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii))<br>Issue 1: The monitoring plan states that the gas analyzers are calibrated in accordance with the manufacturer specifications, however the verification report does not clearly inform whether the DOE confirmed that the frequency of calibration of the 4 instruments used (2 different calibration frequencies) are as per manufacture recommendation.<br>Issue 2: The monitoring plan states that all flare monitoring equipment will be operated and calibrated according to manufacturer's specifications, however the verification report does not clearly inform whether the DOE confirmed that the frequency of calibration for thermocouples (1 year from installation date) is as per manufacture recommendation.<br>Issue 3: The monitoring plan states that the flow meters will be calibrated according to manufacturer's specifications however the verification report does not clearly inform whether the DOE confirmed that the frequency of calibration of flow meters indicated as every 18 months from the date of installation of meters is as per manufacture recommendation. Additionally, the due dates for some flow meters used in the monitoring period indicated in the monitoring report shows a calibration frequency of less than 18 months (e.g. Flare 1, flow meter S/N 276816 is calibrated on 29/03/2007, installed on 09/05/2009 and calibration due date indicated in monitoring report is 08/11/2009, etc), which is |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | inconsistent with the frequency of 18 months after installation date indicated by the DOE.<br>Issue 4: The verification report does not indicate whether the DOE verified the calibration information of the electricity meter used to record readings of the KWh generation, located at the mill power house (as indicated in page 14 of the verification report). |
| **54** | **1899** | **Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment, Project AIN07-W-01, Sumatera Utara (North Sumatera), Indonesia** | **03/12/08 - 28/02/10** | **SIRIM QAS** | Scope VIII: The Verification Report does not indicate how the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (b)).<br>Issue: The monitoring report/CER spreadsheet indicates that the emission factor for diesel generator system (0.8 kgCO2/kWh) is used as per AMS-ID v.13 while the verification report (page 13) indicates that the same is in accordance to the requirement specified in paragraph 7 of AMS-III.H version 7, when project activity applies AMS-III.H version 6, and that the DOE verified the value against AMS I.D version 15, as indicated in page 15 of the verification report. It is not clear how the DOE verified the value in relation to the values provided by methodology AMS-ID v.13 as reported by project participants, in particular because the table indicated in such methodology with diesel emission factors shows different values which depends on factors not reported as confirmed by the DOE. |
| **55** | **1762** | **Wind Electricity Generation Project** | **04/12/08 - 10/03/10** | **TÜV-Rheinland** | Scope: The verification report does not have a statement on whether the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 203).<br><br>Issue: The registered monitoring plan (page 22 of the PDD) requires that "The meters at the substation will be two-way meters and will be in the custody of TNEB. Since the readings will be taken at the point of supply of power to the grid, the transmission and distribution losses and the minimum reactive power consumption will already been taken into account. The quantity of net electricity supplied will be cross-verified from the invoice raised on TNEB by the project proponent." However, no information was provided as to how the above-mentioned requirements (use of |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | measurements from the two-way meters at the substation) had been complied with. |
| **56** | **1364** | **N2O abatement project at nitric acid plant No. 11 at African Explosives Ltd. (AEL), South Africa** | **08/02/08 - 23/05/09** | **DNV** | Scope I: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).<br><br>Issue: The Monitoring Report does not provide complete information on calibration of monitoring instruments covering the period of the baseline campaign (20 Jul 06 - 18 Feb 07). |
| **57** | **1364** | **N2O abatement project at nitric acid plant No. 11 at African Explosives Ltd. (AEL), South Africa** | **08/02/08 - 23/05/09** | **DNV** | Scope II: The verification report does not contain information on how the DOE verified the calibration of monitoring equipments with the calibration requirements (EB52 Annex 60).<br><br>Issue: The Monitoring Report sets a frequency for AST Tests of one year. However, the dates of AST Tests, as reported in the Monitoring Report, show a frequency which is longer than one year. It is also observed that the calibration frequency reported in Annex C of the Verification Report for VSG, TSG, and PSG (i.e. seven months) is not consistent with the corresponding frequency(ies) reported in the monitoring report. |
| **58** | **0499** | **Destruction of HFC-23 at refrigerant (HCFC-22) manufacturing facility of Chemplast Sanmar Ltd** | **01/07/10 - 30/09/10** | **SGS** | Scope I: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br><br>Issue 1: The calibration date for Gas Chromatography is inconsistent between the monitoring report (30 July 2010) and verification report/CER spreadsheet (31 July 2010).<br><br>Issue 2: The value for Q_HFC23,y (capped as per EB39, Annex 8) is not consistent with between the verification report (15.955 MT) and the monitoring report/CER spreadsheet (14.4733 MT). |
| **59** | **0499** | **Destruction of HFC-23 at refrigerant (HCFC-22) manufacturing facility of Chemplast Sanmar Ltd** | **01/07/10 - 30/09/10** | **SGS** | Scope II: The verification report does not 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 these parameters including the values in the monitoring reports (VVM 1.2. para 206).<br><br>Issue: The verification report does |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | not contain the information how it verified the reported parameters F_ HYDROGEN, electricity,y. |
| **60** | **1153** | **Methane recovery and utilisation project at United Plantations Berhad, Jendarata Palm Oil Mill, Malaysia** | **08/11/07 - 30/04/09** | **TÜV SÜD** | Scope I: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br>Issue 1: Calculation procedure for data HGBl,y is inconsistent in the verification report. Page A-40 of the verification report states that data is calculated based on the quantity of steam generated and the enthalpy, while page A-72 states that the thermal energy which could be provided by the captured methane is calculated by the methane content and the Calorific Value of methane and that the thermal energy the boiler is able to produce is calculated by the thermal energy potential of the captured methane and the efficiency of the boiler. Corresponding records have been checked.<br>Issue 2: The monitoring plan indicates that Operating hours of biogas-fired boiler, hboiler, refers to Data #9a (page 40), while the CER sheet indicates in sheet "9 Proj Emission Elect Consump" that Data #9a refers to operation hours from the Biomass boiler. The same inconsistency is found in Data #9b. Please indicate the relation of data for clarity.<br>Issue 3: Verification report states that Fdig is the same data as Fdig_out (page A-12), however while in page A-26 indicates that meter SIEMENS MAG8000 is used to record Fdig, page A-29 indicates that meter SIEMENS MAG6000 is used for Fdig_out. |
| **61** | **1153** | **Methane recovery and utilisation project at United Plantations Berhad, Jendarata Palm Oil Mill, Malaysia** | **08/11/07 - 30/04/09** | **TÜV SÜD** | Scope II: The verification report does not 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 these parameters including the values in the monitoring reports (VVM 1.2. para 206).<br>Issue 1: The verification report indicates that for the parameter CODa,in, the analysis of the sample is done by the lab technician and is also being done by external laboratory, however the DOE does not indicate which one of the data is the one reported in monitoring report/CER sheet and how data is processed (data flow).<br>Issue 2: It is not clear how DOE |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | verified the data flow for the reported data of Tlag P, since monthly average is required as per methodology and the verification reported states that the value is recorded by MMS on a daily basis and made into monthly reports. |
| **62** | **1113** | **Project for the catalytic reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia reactor of the nitric acid plant at Fertilizers & Chemicals Ltd., Haifa, Israel** | **11/05/09 - 27/09/10** | **DNV** | Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br><br>Issue 1: For the parameters NCSG, VSG, TSG and PSG, the monitoring report mentions the calibration frequency to be, 'annually by QAL 2/AST'. However the dates indicated for the calibrations conducted during AST are 17-18 Feb 09 and for QAL 2 are 07-09 Mar 10. The information provided in the monitoring report is not consistent.<br><br>Issue 2: For the parameter NAP, the monitoring report mentions the calibration frequency of the flow meter to be, 36 months. The date of last calibration is indicated as 23 Jul 09. The monitoring period is from 11 May 09 - 27 Sep 09. The calibration does not cover the monitoring period prior to 23 Jul 09, therefore the information is not consistent.<br><br>Issue 3: In the spreadsheet, ' 1113 CER Sheet', the worksheet 'BL_NAP', indicates the date and time when CLn for the campaign R 73 (29 Jun 10 - 27 Sep 10) was reached during the baseline, to be 31/03/07 17:00. However in the same worksheet, the date and time corresponding to the baseline NAP is 16/04/07 (Cell A55). The PP is requested to clarify this inconsistency in information. |
| **63** | **0369** | **8.5 MW Biomass based Power Project** | **15/08/08-14/03/09** | **SGS** | Scope: The verification report does not have a statement on whether the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with registered or the accepted revised monitoring plan (VVM v.1.2 para 203).<br><br>Issue: No information is provided to confirm that the calibration of meter M5 has been conducted as per the monitoring plan requirement (to be conducted by the CSEB). |
| **64** | **1369** | **Project for the catalytic reduction of N2O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia reactor of the N1 & N2** | **20/05/08 - 24/03/09** | **DNV** | Scope: The verification report does not contain an assessment on how the DOE verified the calibration delay of monitoring equipments against the requirements of EB52, Annex 60 (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii)). |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **nitric acid plants at Haifa Chemicals Ltd., Israel** | | | Issue: The PP did not elaborate, and the DOE did not verify, the treatment of delayed calibration of the Coriolis flow meter that is used to measure the parameter NAP (Nitric acid mass flow) for both plants N1 and N2. The meter has to be calibrated yearly as per the monitoring plan. Hence, the PP/ DOE is requested to provide the exact installation date (XX/08/07) of the meter and the adjustment thereof, due to the delayed calibration for plants N1 (delay: 01/01/09 to 15/06/09) and N2 (XX/08/08 to 09/11/08) applicable to this monitoring period. |
| **65** | **1373** | **Beijing No.3 Thermal Power Plant Gas-Steam Combined Cycle Project Using Natural Gas** | **01/04/09-30/11/09** | **TÜV NORD** | Scope: The verification report does not contain information on how the DOE verified the calibration of monitored equipments with the calibration requirements (EB52/Annex 60 para (8) as per VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii)).<br><br>Issue: The Verification Report does not include information on how the calibration of meters M1 to M4 has been conducted as per the monitoring plan (i.e., frequency every three months as per page 54 of the monitoring plan). In addition, the Verification Report does not include information on how the calibration of meters M5 and M6 has been conducted as per the monitoring plan (i.e., regular calibration and testing to ensure accuracy and good operation condition in accordance with stipulation of the meter supplier as per page 47 of the monitoring plan). |
| **66** | **0115** | **GHG emission reduction by thermal oxidation of HFC23 at refrigerant (HCFC-22) manufacturing facility of SRF ltd.** | **01/07/09-30/06/10** | **SGS** | Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br><br>Issue: The monitoring report (p26) states that the calibration of the meters F40/5390-1003, 64076/919/5304 and153602/941-1408 is valid until 21/06/2011. However, the verification report (p14) states that it is valid until 21/07/2010. Please clarify this inconsistency. In addition, please correct the amount of ERs in section E.4 p37 and in section E.5 p38 of the monitoring report as the comma is not at the right place. |
| **67** | **1015** | **25.70 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Udumalpet, Tamilnadu** | **24/06/05 - 12/11/07** | **TÜV NORD** | Scope: The information on calibration of monitoring instruments reported is not in accordance with the specified by the monitoring methodology/ monitoring plan (EB48 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv))./ Scope 2: The verification report does not contain an assessment on how the DOE verified the calibration delay of monitoring equipments against the requirements of EB52, Annex60 (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii)).<br><br>Issue: As per page 67 of the verification report the DOE has stated that "all the installed energy meters for all the WTGs were calibrated before the crediting period start date." However, WTG#574 and WTG #425 were calibrated only after the start of the monitoring period (25.10.2007 and 09.10.2005 respectively) and these delays have not been considered as per guidance of EB52 - Annex 60. |
| **68** | **1636** | **Alto-Tietê landfill gas capture project** | **05/03/09 - 31/05/10** | **SGS** | Scope: The verification report does not contain information on how the DOE verified the calibration of monitored equipments with the calibration requirements as per VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii).<br><br>Issue: The verification report does not contain an assessment on whether the electricity meter used which monitors the parameter ELimp (total amount of electricity imported to meet project requirement) has been correctly calibrated as per the monitoring plan (as per the utility company's requirement). |
| **69** | **1636** | **Alto-Tietê landfill gas capture project** | **05/03/09 - 31/05/10** | **SGS** | Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br><br>Issue: The monitoring report, in page 25, states: "During the monitoring period, the gas analyzer AG-02 went out of work, as registered in the operation workbook. In periods when all other monitored parameters were registered and the flaring system operated according to manufacturer's specifications, a flare efficiency of 90% was assumed, according to STEP 6 of the "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane"". However, in page 6 it states that: "During the monitoring period, the gas analyzer AG-02 was continuously on-line during the operation of the landfill gas capturing and flaring system, over the entire monitoring period. This instrument was occasionally off-line during maintenance or calibration activities, but, in these situations, the flaring |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | system was not operating and no ERs were claimed". |
| **70** | **1887** | **Huainan Panyi and Xieqiao Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project** | **24/11/09 - 23/11/10** | **TÜV SÜD** | Scope: The monitoring report does not contain all parameters required to be monitored as per the monitoring plan/applied methodology (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iii)).<br><br>Issue: Monitoring report (p2) states that "The emissions reductions achieved in Xieqiao coal mine are not claimed in this monitoring period because of the unstable gas supply" and Verification report (p10) states that "According to the project owner, the gas quality of the Xieqiao coal mine was not stable during the given monitoring period, hence the power generation was not continuously running".<br>However, the parameters that are required to be monitored to calculate the Emission Reductions from the Xieqiao coal mine were not provided by the project participant and then not verified by the DOE. |
| **71** | **1289** | **Fuel switchover from higher carbon intensive fuels to Natural Gas (NG) at Indian Farmers Fertiliser Cooperative Ltd (IFFCO) in Phulpur Village, Allahabad, Uttar Pradesh by M/s Indian Farmers Fertiliser Cooperative Ltd (IFFCO)** | **01/04/09 - 31/03/10** | **SGS** | Scope: The Verification Report does not indicate how the information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources (VVM v.1.2 para 208 (b)).<br><br>Issue: The applicable methodology requires that parameter FF project,i,y (Quantity of natural gas combusted in the element process i during the year y) "should be crosschecked by an annual energy balance that is based on purchased quantities and stock changes. Where the purchased fuel invoices can be identified specifically for the CDM project, the metered fuel consumption quantities should also be crosschecked with available purchase invoices from the financial records". However, the PP/DOE did not provide information regarding the cross-checking procedure. |