# INFORMATION NOTE ON THE RESULTS OF THE COMPLETENESS CHECKS

## 01 May 2011 - 30 June 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 the two stages of assessement; completeness check and information & reporting check; that cover the Secretariat's initial assessment of submissions. An Information Note on the results of the two stages for requests for registration and issuance covering the period from 30 June 2010 to 23 October 2010 was published in November 2010 on the UNFCCC CDM website[1]. According to the note, the Secretariat will publish results of its assessments on a regular basis. Thereafter two information notes for the subsequent periods; 24 October 2010 - 31 January 2011 and 01 February 2011 - 30 April 2011; were published in February 2011 and May 2011, respectively. This Information Note covers the period from 01 May 2011 - 30 June 2011, and includes 190 requests processed under completeness check for registration and likewise 322 requests for issuance. The total number of submissions during this reporting period is represented by; requests returned to DOEs as incomplete during the completeness check stage and information & reporting check stage, and the number of published requests, both for registration and issuance.

**2.** The tables below provide information on the requests for registration and issuance that were returned as incomplete during this reporting period. A detailed list compiling the reasons for returning requests is furnished in Appendix 1 to the Information Note.

Table 1 below comprises a summary of the reasons for which requests for registration and requests for issuance were returned during the completeness check stage.

**Table 1: Reasons for returning requests during completeness check (CC)**

| Category | Registration Occurrence | Issuance Occurrence |
|---|---|---|
| Incomplete submission | 16 | 1 |
| Incomplete information | 9 | 2 |
| Inconsistency | 32 | 19 |
| Other | 0 | 5 |
| ***Total*** | ***57*** | ***27*** |
| ***Number of requests returned to DOEs*** | ***32*** | ***27*** |

[1] http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Notes/index.html.

Table 2 below comprises a summary of the reasons for which requests for registration and requests for issuance were returned during the information & reporting check stage. Since the categories for returning requests are different for registration and issuance, they have been listed separately.

**Table 2: Reasons for returning requests during information & reporting check (I&RC)**

| Registration | | Issuance | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Category** | **Occurrence** | **Category** | **Occurrence** |
| Additionality | 42 | Inconsistency of information | 11 |
| Baseline methodology | 37 | Implementation status/physical features of project | 4 |
| Monitoring methodology | 9 | Monitored Parameters | 10 |
| LoA | 0 | Monitoring system and procedures | 3 |
| DOE related issues | 2 | Calibration | 22 |
| Other | 11 | Emission Reduction calculation | 6 |
| | | Default value/external data | 2 |
| | | Other verification reporting requirements (Assessment of CARs/CLs/FARs, Crosschecking with other sources, and statement of compliance with methodology/monitoring plan) | 4 |
| | | Other | 1 |
| ***Total*** | ***101*** | | ***63*** |
| ***Number of requests returned to DOEs*** | ***46*** | | ***26*** |

Tables 3 and 4 below comprise a DOE-wise break-up of the requests for registration and issuance along with the data for percentage of requests that were incomplete during each stage. For more information on the reasons for incompleteness, please refer to Appendix 1.

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

| | **Requests processed under CC** | **Incomplete during CC** | | **Requests processed under I&R check** | **Incomplete during I&RC** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **#** | **%** | | **#** | **%** |
| **BVCH** | 15 | 2 | 13% | 13 | 3 | 23% |
| **CEC** | 4 | 1 | 25% | 3 | 1 | 33% |
| **CQC** | 1 | 0 | 0% | 2 | 0 | 0% |
| **ICONTEC** | 5 | 2 | 40% | 3 | 2 | 67% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Deloitte-TECO** | 2 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| **DNV** | 29 | 2 | 7% | 34 | 3 | 9% |
| **ERM CVS** | 8 | 1 | 13% | 9 | 0 | 0% |
| **GLC** | 4 | 1 | 25% | 2 | 0 | 0% |
| **JACO** | 2 | 0 | 0% | 3 | 2 | 67% |
| **JCI** | 6 | 1 | 17% | 6 | 1 | 17% |
| **JQA** | 1 | 0 | 0% | 4 | 0 | 0% |
| **KEMCO** | 1 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| **KECO** | 1 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| **KFQ** | 6 | 1 | 17% | 6 | 0 | 0% |
| **LRQA** | 6 | 1 | 17% | 7 | 2 | 29% |
| **PJR CDM** | 2 | 0 | 0% | 2 | 0 | 0% |
| **RINA** | 7 | 1 | 14% | 7 | 2 | 29% |
| **SGS** | 2 | 0 | 0% | 18 | 10 | 56% |
| **SIRIM** | 7 | 2 | 29% | 4 | 0 | 0% |
| **AENOR** | 4 | 0 | 0% | 4 | 0 | 0% |
| **SQS** | 2 | 0 | 0% | 4 | 4 | 100% |
| **TÜV Nord** | 20 | 5 | 25% | 15 | 4 | 27% |
| **TUEV Rheinland** | 29 | 4 | 14% | 25 | 5 | 20% |
| **TÜV SÜD** | 26 | 8 | 31% | 24 | 7 | 29% |
| **KSA** | 0 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| ***Total*** | **190** | **32** | | **199** | **46** | |

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

| | **Requests processed under CC** | **Returned During CC** | | **Requests processed under I&RC** | **Returned during I&RC** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **#** | **%** | | **#** | **%** |
| **AENOR** | 4 | 0 | 0% | 3 | 0 | 0% |
| **BVCH** | 47 | 3 | 6% | 32 | 2 | 6% |
| **CEC** | 10 | 1 | 10% | 5 | 1 | 20% |
| **CQC** | 4 | 1 | 25% | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| **Deloitte-TECO** | 5 | 1 | 20% | 4 | 0 | 0% |
| **DNV** | 57 | 2 | 4% | 60 | 4 | 7% |
| **ERM CVS** | 13 | 0 | 0% | 12 | 1 | 8% |
| **GLC** | 5 | 0 | 0% | 5 | 1 | 20% |
| **ICONTEC** | 4 | 0 | 0% | 4 | 1 | 25% |
| **JACO** | 3 | 1 | 33% | 2 | 0 | 0% |
| **JCI** | 3 | 0 | 0% | 5 | 1 | 20% |
| **JQA** | 3 | 0 | 0% | 4 | 0 | 0% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **KEMCO** | 2 | 0 | 0% | 2 | 0 | 0% |
| **KFQ** | 2 | 0 | 0% | 2 | 1 | 50% |
| **KSA** | 1 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| **LRQA** | 12 | 1 | 8% | 11 | 2 | 18% |
| **RINA** | 2 | 1 | 50% | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| **SGS** | 45 | 2 | 4% | 46 | 4 | 9% |
| **SIRIM** | 0 | 0 | 0% | 2 | 0 | 0% |
| **SQS** | 2 | 0 | 0% | 2 | 0 | 0% |
| **TUEV Rheinland** | 15 | 3 | 20% | 13 | 1 | 8% |
| **TÜV Nord** | 41 | 8 | 20% | 27 | 5 | 19% |
| **TÜV SÜD** | 42 | 3 | 7% | 33 | 2 | 6% |
| **Total** | **322** | **27** | | **276** | **26** | |

- - - - -

**History of the document**

| Version | Date | Nature of revision |
|---|---|---|
| 01 | 21 July 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

Reasons for returning requests for registration and issuance during completeness check and information & reporting check stages

**Table 1**

| Registration | | Stage 1: Completeness Check | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **#** | **PA** | **Project Title** | **DOE** | **Reasons** |
| **1** | **4622** | **Henan Taiyangshi 5MW Cement Waste Heat Recovery Project** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to address inconsistency accordingly as per EB 48, Annex 60, and paragraph 7 (b), in particular: the name of participant is inconsistent in the following documents: the registration request form mentioned "Henan Taiyangshi 5MW Cement Waste Heat Recovery Project" as a project participant from host country China. **Incomplete information:** The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on additionality as additional appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60. Please note that the file "Appendix 4- CDM consideration Henan Taiyangshi" could not be opened. **Incomplete information:** Following document contains blank pages: Page 52 and 48 of the Project Design Document. |
| **2** | **4658** | **Hongkou 200MW Hydropower Project in Fujian Province** | **ERM CVS** | **Inconsistency:** The persons enlisted in Annex 1 of the MoC should sign section 3 of the MoC. The DOE shall refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 10.d. |
| **3** | **4611** | **Avoided emissions from biomass wastes through use as feed stock in pulp and paper Kunak, Sabah production i.e. Eko Pulp and Paper Project** | **DNV** | **Incomplete documentation:** The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on additionality as additional appendicies to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.Please note that financial analysis spreadsheets are not provided. |
| **4** | **4652** | **"6.65 MW Wind Energy Generation by M/s GTN Enterprises Limited" at Ganapathypalayam in Coimbatore, Radhapuram, Kvalakuruchi in Tirunelveli and Govindapuram in Erode district, Tamilnadu.** | **SIRIM** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency of project title. Please notice that the title in the MoC is different from the title used in the rest of the documents submitted. The DOE shall refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b. |
| **5** | **4582** | **Yongchang Chemical N2O Abatement Project** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency of the start date between the Project Design Document p. 54 and the Validation Report p. 19. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b. **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency of the Chinese Project Participant name between the Chinese LoA and the rest of the |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | documents submitted. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b. |
| **6** | **4655** | **Gansu Jiuquan Kaiyuan Cascade Hydropower Stations Bundle Project** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Incomplete information:** The DOE is requested to provide a corresponding validation report in line with EB48 Annex 60 paragraph 7.c. as the validation report submitted for registration appears to be incomplete. |
| **7** | **4322** | **UPOIC Wastewater Treatment for Energy Generation, Krabi** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE/PP are requested to clarify the inconsistency in the project participant and the party between the Validation Report (Thailand: United Palm Oil Industry PCL; Sweden: Carbon Asset Management Sweden AB) and the rest of the documents submitted (Thailand: United Palm Oil Industry PCL). Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b.<br>**Incomplete information:** The DOE/PP are requested to resubmit Appendix 8-Enclosure 7 containing English translation. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 9.c.<br>**Inconsistency:** There are inconsistencies of scopes between the Validation Report, Request for Registration, the project view page (Scope 1 and 13) and Project Design Document (Scope 13). Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b. |
| **8** | **4379** | **Hutama Green Energy Methane Capture and Utilization Project at Starch Tapioca Bandar Mataram, Central Lampung, Indonesia** | **TÜV Nord** | **Incomplete information:** The spreadsheets provided do not contain formula, and the IRR calculation result of the spreadsheet "4379 IRR Calculation (public)" on the project view page is different from that of the spreadsheet "2011-01-18 HGE Bandar Mataram Biogas_IRR Cal_final" provided on 21/01/2011.<br>**Incomplete information:** Errors on page 27, 39, 41, 42, 45, 46 and 47 of the PDD version 01.4. |
| **9** | **4665** | **N2O Abatement Project of Capro Corporation** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency of the project title between the LoA (N2O Abatement Project of Capro Corporation , South Korea) and the rest of the documents submitted (N2O Abatement Project of Capro Corporation). Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b.<br>**Incomplete informaion:** Please submit a reproducible spreadsheet for Appendix 1 - Enclosure in Iline with the guidelines of EB 51, Annex 58 paragraph 8.<br>**Inconsistency:** Activity scale is not mentioned in the Validation Report. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **10** | **4423** | **MONTERIA LANDFILL GAS RECOVERY AND FLARING** | **ICONTEC** | **Incomplete documentation:** The Modalities of Communication are found incomplete as the party name for the PP EnBW Energie Baden-Württemberg AG is blank. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 10.d. |
| **11** | **4590** | **Sichuan Kangding Sandaoqiao Hydropower Station** | **TÜV SÜD** | **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:** Please include the start date of the crediting period in the Validation Report.<br>**Incomplete information:** Page 87 of the validation report is blank. Please also confirm whether there is any information missing in pages 82 and 86 of the validation report. |
| **12** | **4681** | **Sanhe Power Generation Co., Ltd. No.1 & No.2 Power Unit Retrofit for District Heating Project** | **TÜV Nord** | **Incomplete information:** The validation report contains blank page (page 61)<br>**Inconsistency:** MOC is incomplete, given that as stated on page one of the MOC the entity "EnBW Trading GmbH" is nominated as the focal point solely for all the authorities, whereas on page two of the MOC the entity "Sanhe Power Generation Co., Ltd." is also nominated as focal point |
| **13** | **4697** | **Sichuan Guoru Hydropower Project** | **KFQ** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency of the host party project participant between the Validation Report (Danba Donggu Hydropower Development Co., Ltd) and the rest of the documents submitted (Danba Donggu River Hydropower Development Co., Ltd). Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b.<br>**Incomplete documentation:** Please submit a reproducible spreadsheet for Appendix 1 - IRR in line with the guidelines of EB 51, Annex 58 paragraph 8. |
| **14** | **4640** | **Methane Gas Capture and Fuel Switching at Compañía Argentina de Levaduras S.A.I.C. Plant Project** | **ICONTEC** | **Incomplete documentation:** The LoA from Netherlands does not mention the ratification of Kyoto protocol and voluntary participation as required by paragraph 45 of the VVM ver. 1.2<br>**Inconsistency:** The Registration request form is wrongly dated.<br>**Incomplete information:** The DOE is requested to submit the Factor emision spread sheet in English. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 9.c. |
| **15** | **4703** | **Vinh Son 5 Hydropower Project** | **BVCH** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency of the host party project participant between the Registration request form and the project view page (Vinh Son Investment Joint Stock and Energy and Environment Consultancy) and the rest of the documents submitted (Vinh Son |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Investment Joint Stock Company and Energy and Environment Consultancy Joint Stock Company). Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b.<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. |
| **16** | **4676** | **Malagone SHP CDM Project, Minas Gerais, Brazil (JUN1122)** | **RINA** | **Inconsistency:** Emission Reduction is inconsistently reported between the Project Design Document, project view page (29,125) and the Validation Report (27,552). Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7b.<br>**Inconsistency:** Please clarify the inconsistency of the date of the crediting period between the Project Design Document, the Validation Report and the project view page. |
| **17** | **4744** | **BRT Zhengzhou, China** | **GLC** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify in the validation report the change in the amount of emission reductions accordingly as per EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 7 (b). Section A.4.4 of PDD version 1.1 submitted for request registration indicates annual average emission reductions to be 204,715 tCO2/year while section A.4.4 of PDD version 1.0 submitted for global stakeholder consultation indicates it to be 176,940 tCO2/year.<br>**Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project starting date as per EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 7 (b) as section C.1.1 of PDD version 1.0 and 1.1 indicates the project starting date as 1 February 2009 while the validation report page 34 indicates it as 2 February 2009. |
| **18** | **4732** | **Shenmu County Xiangrong Coal Chemical Industry Co., Ltd. 25 MW Semi-coke Waste Gas Power Generation Project** | **LRQA** | **Incomplete information:** The DOE is requested to provide the spreadsheets with the calculations used to estimate the fcap value. |
| **19** | **4758** | **Mashan Wastewater Treatment Project** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Incomplete documentation:** The DOE is requested to clarify the party of the 'other parties participant' as Annex 1 of the Modalities of Communication shows Republic of Ireland instead of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland as mentioned in the Project Design Document, Registration request form, the Validation Report, the LoA and the project view page.<br>**Incomplete information:** The PP/ DOE are requested to provide unprotected (reproducible) version of the spreadsheet for the assessment of the investment analysis as required by Guidance 8 of EB 51 Annex 58. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **20** | **3960** | **Nanjiangkou Small Hydropower Project in Yu'nan County, Guangdong Province, China** | **CEC** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency of project title between the MoC (Nanjiangkou Small Hydropower Project on Luoding River in Guangdong Province, China) and the rest of the documents submitted (Nanjiangkou Small Hydropower Project in Yu'nan County, Guangdong Province, China). Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b. |
| **21** | **4666** | **Hunan Jinqiao 7MW Cascade Small Hydropower Project** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency of scopes between the project view page (Scope 1) and Request for Registration FORM (Scope 4). Please also include the sectoral scope in the Project Design Document and the Valiation Report (EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b).<br>**Inconsistency:** Please clarify the inconsistency of the date of the crediting period between the Project Design Document, the Validation Report and the project view page. |
| **22** | **4775** | **CECIC Taiyangshan Grid-connected Solar PV Power Generation Phase 1 Project** | **BVCH** | **Inconsistency:** The view page is not consistent with Project Design Document, Modalities of Communication, Validation Report and Registration request form with regard to the project participant from Annex 1 party and the Letter of Approval from Sweden is uploaded as authorization from the Chinese side. |
| **23** | **4728** | **The Capture and Utilisation of Methane at the GFI Mining South Africa owned Beatrix Mine in South Africa** | **TÜV Nord** | **Incomplete documentation:** The DOE is requested to upload the respective PDD as well as the CER-Calculation to the project view page as requested by paragraph 8 (a) & (g) of EB 48 Annex 60. |
| **24** | **4286** | **Xuzhou Zhonglian Cement 18MW Waste Heat Recovery as Power Project** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Inconsistency:** There are inconsistencies related to the project data among the documents submitted. The DOE is requested to address these inconsistency accordingly as per EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 9 (d). As per the validation report , the first version (V01) and final version (V12) of the PDD were released on 12/07/2007 and 01/09/2010 respectively where as the revision history in the PDD shows that first version (V01) and final version (V11) were released on 12/05/2007 and 29/07/2010. It is not clear which version of PDD ( V11 or V12) was final one. |
| **25** | **3495** | **West Kalimantan Biomass Co-Generation Project** | **TÜV Nord** | **Inconsistency:** The persons enlisted in Annex 1 of the MoC should sign section 3 of the MoC. The DOE shall refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 10.d |
| **26** | **4632** | **Burqin River Chonghuer Hydropower Project in Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region** | **JCI** | **Inconsistency:** The LoA from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland mentions that the letter of approval is issued on the basis of the draft Validation Report N0 JCI-CDM-VAL-10-030 Rev 01.2 dated 26 January 2011 while the document submitted for registration is the Validation Report JCI-VAL 10-030 Rev |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 01.3 dated 30 March 2011. Please clarify. While responding please refer to paragraph 50 of VVM version 1.2<br>**Incomplete information:** The DOE should provide all the investment analysis and sensitivity analysis calculations spreadsheets. |
| **27** | **4334** | **Grid connected electricity generation using natural gas by the Vemagiri Power Generation Ltd.** | **SIRIM** | **Incomplete information:** The DOE is requested to provide reproducible sensitivity analysis in Appendices 1-4. Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 9 b.<br>**Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency related to the name of the project activity between the LOA (Grid connected electricity generation using natural gas) and the rest of the documentation submitted (Grid connected electricity generation using natural gas by the Vemagiri Power Generation Ltd.). Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b.<br>**Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to address inconsistency accordingly as per EB 48, Annex 60, and paragraph 7 (b), in particular: The registration request form only indicate the project participant from India (Vemagiri Power Generation Ltd.) where as the rest of the documentation submitted indicate the participant from India and United Kingdom (BP Energy Asia Pte. Limited).<br>**Incomplete information:** Page 59 of the Project Design Document is blank. |
| **28** | **4622** | **Henan Taiyangshi 5MW Cement Waste Heat Recovery Project** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify inconsistency accordingly as per EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 7 (b), in particular: the name of project participant is inconsistent in the following documents: the registration request form mentioned “Henan Taiyangshi 5MW Cement Waste Heat Recovery Project” as a project participant from host country China where as other documents mention "Henan Province Taiyangshi Group Cement Co., Ltd. |
| **29** | **4787** | **Yunnan Yingjiang Xiangbai River Lushan Hydropower Station** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to clarify the inconsistency of the Chinese Project Participant name between the Chinese LoA (Yun'nan Province Yingjiang County Quanfa Hydropower Co.Ltd) and the rest of the documents submitted (Yingjiang Rongfa Hydropower Co., Ltd). Please refer to the guidelines on completeness checks of EB 48, Annex 60 paragraph 7.b. |
| **30** | **4818** | **24 MW Dummagudem Hydel project by SLS Power Corporation Limited** | **TÜV Nord** | **Inconsistency:** 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. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to address inconsistency accordingly as per EB 48, Annex 60, and paragraph 7 (b), in particular: the name of host party is inconsistent in the following documents: the validation report mentioned “MOEF” as the host party, where as it is "India" in all other documents submitted. |
| **31** | **4834** | **Akhfennir Wind Farm Project** | **DNV** | **Incomplete documentation:** The PP/ DOE are requested to provide a replicable version of the spreadsheet for the assessment of the investment analysis as required by Guidance 8 of EB 51 Annex 58. Please note that the PDF version of IRR calculation sheet is only submitted. |
| **32** | **4856** | **Abohar Branch Canal Based Small Hydropower** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project title accordingly as per EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 7 (b). Please note that the project title in MOC is different than in other submitted documents.<br>**Inconsistency:** The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per EB 48, Annex 60, paragraph 7 (b). The geo-coordinates of MHP Sudhar and MHP Gholian are not matching among the PDD, Validation Report and Project view page. |

**Table 2**

| Registration | Stage 2: Information & Reporting Check | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **#** | **PA** | **Project Title** | **DOE** | **Reasons** |
| **1** | **4324** | **MONTENEGRO LANDFILL GAS RECOVERY AND FLARING** | **ICONTEC** | **Baseline methodology:** The DOE shall validate parameters applied to calculate the baseline emission in line with VVM (v1.2), para.90, in particular MCF, oxidization factor, recovery rate, solid waste composition, the climatic conditions influencing the decay rates (Kj) for each waste, flare efficiency, grid emission factor and MDreg,y<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The DOE shall validate the compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodology in line with VVM (v1.2), para.123 (a). In doing so, 1) please remove GWP from parameters and data monitored in the PDD; 2) landfill gas and methane content measurements shall be on the same basis (wet or dry) and 3) electricity consumption should be included in the monitoring plan.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE shall provide validation opinion on the simple cost analysis described in the PDD, in particular the associated costs listed in the PDD.<br>**Other:** Party's name should be mentioned in Annex 1 of the MoC, under the entity named "EnBW Energie Baden-Württemberg AG". |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2** | **3345** | **Sichuan Leshan Ebian Ejingxiang Hydro Power Project** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Additionality:** The DOE is requested to provide information related to VVM para. 121(c) regarding the essential distinctions between the PA and other widely observed projects. |
| **3** | **4359** | **Mare Chicose Landfill Gas Project** | **SQS** | **Additionality:** The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on how the input values to the investment analysis have been validated in line with the VVM (version 1.2) paragraph 111, in particular, the electricity tariff, online availability of biogas, CAPEX and annual fixed costs. In doing so, the DOE should transparently report: a) how these values are suitable for the specific project; and b) how they were crosschecked against independent sources. The DOE should provide a validation opinion on why a salvage value was only considered for the electricity component of the project and how this value complies with paragraph 4 of the "Guidelines on the Assessment of Investment Analysis" (EB51, Annex 58) considering that the period of analysis is only 10 years. The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how the equity IRR calculated complies with paragraph 10 of the "Guidelines on the Assessment of Investment Analysis" (EB51, Annex 58).<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE should provide a validation opinion on the suitability of each baseline assumption selected in line with the VVM (version 1.2) paragraph 92. In doing so, methodological choices have to be transparently reported and justified. |
| **4** | **4475** | **9.9 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Maharashtra by REI Agro Limited** | **BVCH** | **DOE's related issue:** The DOE should explain how the PP has taken due account of all the comments received by the stakeholder "Sandy, cdmcrusader@gmail.com" in the Appendix B – Validation of Global Stakeholder Comments in line with the VVM (ver. 1.2) para. 129, given that the last question raised was omitted in such appendix.<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. |
| **5** | **4563** | **Methane recovery in wastewater treatment in Famailla fruit processing plant, Tucuman, Argentina** | **TÜV Nord** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall validated the technological and prevailing practice barriers in line with VVM v1.2 paragraphs 115 (a), 117 and 118.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE shall validate the assumptions and calculations applied in the baseline and project emissions, in line with VVM v1.2 paragraphs 92 and 93.<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The DOE shall validated the monitoring plan in line with VVM paragraphs 123 and 124. Please also clarify the nature and closure of FAR1 and |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | whether it is not considered to be a cdm requirement for registration, in line with VVM v1.2 paragraph 37. |
| **6** | **4542** | **CEMEX Dominicana: Alternative fuels and biomass project at San Pedro Cement Plant** | **SGS** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall provide a validation opinion on the suitability of input values in line with VVM (v1.2), para.111, in particular 1) the price of non-biomass alternative fuels considering no validation can be found from the validation report; and 2) the investment cost considering that the DOE has not cross checked the value with those of similar projects or independent sources.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE shall validate how identified baseline alternatives B2, B3, B4 and B5 have been eliminated in line with VVM (v1.2), para. 82 and 84.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE shall explain how CL22 can be considered closed in line with VVM (v1.2), para. 117 (a) , considering no independent evidence has been provided to support the establishment of this barrier ( the technical barrier relative to oxygen demand). |
| **7** | **4561** | **Mashad landfill gas to energy project** | **SGS** | **Baseline methodology:** The DOE shall validate the assumption of "30% cover area of the project activity installations on landfill site" in line with VVM v1.2 paragraph 91 and whether it should be monitored during project implementation. In addition, the DOE shall further confirm how it has assessed that this is not a deviation from the methodology, in line with VVM v1.2 paragraph 73. |
| **8** | **4545** | **Energy efficiency improvement project in the Blast Furnace operation at Maheshwary Ispat Limited** | **SGS** | **Additionality:** The DOE is requested to indicate how it has validated the suitability of the input values to the investment comparison analysis, in particular the project cost for the proposed project activity and the baseline alternative. The DOE shall crosscheck the information indicated in the PDD against similar projects using similar technologies in the same region.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE is requested to indicate how it has validated the continuing and real actions to secure CDM. In doing so, the DOE should indicate the names of the CDM consultans I,II and III indicated in page 22 of validation report and the name of the CDM consultant appointed on 26 July 2007; and whether it is the same consultant or these are different ones. |
| **9** | **4577** | **Ngoi Xan Hydropower Project** | **SGS** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall validated the input values applied in the investment analysis in line with VVM (v1.2), para.111 (a) - (c), in particular the investment costs applied for Ngoi Xan 1 and 2. In doing so, the DOE shall explain in detail how it has compared the investment costs with those of similar CDM projects or with contract value if it is available. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **10** | **4566** | **Bundled Landfill Gas Recovery Project in Indonesia** | **SGS** | **Additionality:** As per page 15 of the PDD, ¨ the connection to the grid is state to be an investment of 1500EUR (minimum) but can range to over 100,000EUR¨, however, the grid connection costs used in the investment analyses were: 417,000, 446,000 and 231,000EUR respectively. Please submit consistent references. Further it is not clear: (a) if the input values used to calculate the total investment related to the electricity generation where applicable at the time of invesment decision, as the PDD does not refer to the source used and the Validation Report page 16 refers to a Statement dated 4/01/2010. Further information on the suitability of applying an inflation rate to the total costs of 3% is required, as it is not clear why it has been only applied to the total costs while the electricity tariff remains fixed and in particular considering that as per the information in the validation Report page 23 the tariff in 2006 was 0.038EUR/kWh while the tariff applied as per December 2008 is 0.052EUR/kWh. Further information is required on how the DOE cross-checked the suitability of the following input values used in the investment analyses: electricity generation costs, project development, equipment procurement costs sourced internationally and nationally, civil works, management cost and O&M costs. The O&M costs (total figures) are not consistent between the values reported in the Validation Report page 18 and the ones used in the investment analyses. For example, the Validation Report mentions that for landfill 2 the O&M costs are 43,895EUR/year while the investment analysis spreadsheet considers for the second year of operation a figure of 148,538EUR. Please submit consistent references throughout. It is not clear why the lower collection efficiency of 60% has been used in the investment analyses in order to calculate the electricity generated, given that as per the information in the PDD Annex 3 the percentage is estimated to fall in the range of 60-80-90%.<br>**Monitoring methodology:** Further information on the monitoring plan is required, as it is not clear if the methane fraction of the landfill gas and LFG flow will be measured on same basis (either wet or dry), in line with the requirements of page 16 of ACM0001 v.11. |
| **11** | **4567** | **Methane Recovery from waste water treatment in Seafood industry in Maharashtra** | **SGS** | **Baseline methodology:** It is not clear whether the project activity involves a co-fired system, since in section 2.3 of the validation report it is mentioned that the generated biogas will be co-fired with fuel oil in 2 TPH boiler, whereas on page 13 of the PDD it is stated that the project uses only renewal fuel. Please provide detailed |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | information regarding the total installed thermal energy generation capacity of the project equipment if co-fired system is involved;<br>**Baseline methodology:** It is not clear whether the project activity is green field project, as it is mentioned in section 4.3 (page 11) of the validation report that wastewater generated out of Seafood industry was being treated in an open anaerobic lagoon without biogas recovery. Please provide detailed description of the scenario existing prior to the implementation of the project activity if the project activity happens in an existing facility. In addition, it is not clear how the DOE has validated baseline scenario identified as per the requirement of General Guidance for SSC methodologies, in particular, what the "all other plausible and credible alternative scenarios" include as mentioned in section 4.7.3 of the validation report, how each alternative or option is eliminated and how the baseline scenario of the thermal energy production by biogas is identified; |
| **12** | **4595** | **Forestry Project in Strategic Ecological Areas of the Colombian Caribbean Savannas** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Other:** The DOE shall submit the PDD and validation report using the applicable methodology version (AR-ACM0005 version 4), the same which was used at the time of submission for the global stakeholders comments, as the PDD and validation report submitted for request for registration used an earlier version of the methodology (version 3). |
| **13** | **4574** | **Wastewater Treatment with Biogas System in Palm Oil Mill at Sinpun, Surat Thani, Thailand** | **SGS** | **Additionality:** The Doe is requested to include further information on the validation of the input values used in the investment analysis, in particular on the cross-checking made to confirm the suitability of the digester efficiency, waste water generation rate and electricity generation rate (used to calculate the electricity generation). Moreover it is not clear why a value of 70% for the digester efficiency has been used in the calculations given that as per page 56 of the Validation Report it is within the range of 65-75%. Finally, the VR page 32 states that the electricity generation rate is 2.0 kWh/m3 while the PDD reports a figure of 2.08kWh/m3. The DOE should provide further validation opinion on the calculation of the benchmark, in particular the suitability of using the market return and beta of IPPs. i.e., whether such companies are engaged in projects of the same type/scale and risk as the PP, including the period covered (2002-2006).<br>**Baseline methodology:** The Validation Report does not state the figures used in the PDD to calculate the combined margin grid emission factor and the COD values used in the emission reduction calculations. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **14** | **4537** | **DakRTih Hydropower Project, Vietnam** | **SQS** | **Additionality:** The PDD should clearly reference the sources and dates used for the input values in the investment analysis. For example, the Financial Feasibility Report referred to on page 14 of the PDD is not dated. Further, the date of the document ¨File 2: CC1, Basic Engineering design data sheet¨ refered to on page 42 of the Validation Report is not provided. The Validation Report gives the date of the Feasibility Study report as 23/12/2003 on page 14 but as 04/2008 on page 17, while page 42 states that the Feasibility Study - Supplementary report is dated 30/01/2005. It is not clear which of the input values have been sourced from which FSR, how many FSRs are related to the project and their dates. The DOE should provide further and clear information on whether the input values used in the investment analysis (such as values used for the benchmark calculation, operating hours, internal consumption and total investment) were applicable at the time of investment decision. For example, according to the VR reference 2, the benchmark has been sourced from ¨State Bank of Vietnam, 2009, Prime Interest Rate and Decision No. 16/2008/QD-NHNN dated 16 May 2008 of the Governor of the State Bank¨, while the investment decision is previous to that dates. |
| **15** | **4583** | **São Fernando Biomass Cogeneration Project** | **SGS** | **Additionality:** The VR lacks information on how the DOE has crosschecked: (a) the operational costs; and (b) energy output. **Baseline methodology:** The VR lacks information on how the baseline identification/selection was validated. 3. The VR has not reported the value of the Emission Factor of the grid and no CAR/CL was raised to address the change in the EF between the PDD published for GSP and PDD submitted for registration. |
| **16** | **4591** | **DGKCC Waste Heat Recovery and Utilization for 10.4 MW Power Generation at Dera Ghazi Khan Plant** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Baseline methodology:** The DOE shall explain means of validation of fcap in line with corresponding section of ACM0012 and paragraph 89-92 of VVM v1.2, in particular: (i) why fcap has not been calculated for each clinker production line given that they have different production capacity ; (ii) how QOE,BL and QOE,y have been validated. In responding to this issue, the DOE should provide information (for both clinker production lines) 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. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Please provide an excel sheet for the grid emission factor detailing each calculation steps as required by "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system v02". In addition, include respective data and parameters, applied for calculation of the grid emission factor, under B.6.2 of the PDD.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE shall explain how it has determined the accuracy and suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in line with the paragraph 111 (a), (b) and (c) of VVM v1.2, in particular: (i) the grid electricity cost; (ii) the annual O&M (please describe individual sub- items); (iii) the escalation on the price of electricity and annual O&M cost; (iv) the investment cost.<br>**Baseline methodology:** In the pre-project scenario, the cement facility is fulfilling its internal demand with the help of fossil fuel fired captive power plants and import from the grid. However, the proportion of electricity that would have been sourced from the grid and captive power plants in the project scenario, estimated based on historical data of proportion received during the three most recent years ( para 9a, page 2 of methodology AMS-III. Q. v03), is not presented in the PDD to support the PP's claim that the proposed activity will displace only the electricity imported from the grid. In addition, the PP/DOE shall explain the installation of more fossil fuel fired captive power plants either: i) has prohibitive barriers; or ii) is clearly economic unattractive as required by steps 2 and/or step 3 of the " Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality V 5.2. |
| **17** | **4588** | **Shanxi Jincheng Beishidian 36MW Coal Mine Methane Power Generation Project** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Baseline methodology:** The PP/DOE are requested to clarify the project description as it is not clear if the project displaces electricity from a local grid or a coal-fired power plant. If it is a local grid, the PP/DOE should substantiate the constitution of the local grid. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 64 a. In addition, please clarify PDD section A.4.3 Table A.3 Overview of equipment(s) of BAU (baseline).<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the baseline electricity supply to be the continued supply of electric power by the coal-fired Meiganshi Power Plant. In doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 87 c.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to provide further information on how it has validated the elimination of the alternative scenario of utilization for captive power generation. In doing so, please provide information on the "grid" that the project activity exports the power to. In |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | doing so, please refer to VVM version 1.2 paragraph 87. The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the emission factor for the baseline electricity in line with VVM version 1.2 paragraph 92 c. In doing so, please clarify the nature of the baseline electricity supply.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the accuracy and the suitability of the following input values used for the investment analysis: net power export, heat supply, electricity tariff and the heat tariff in line with VVM version 1.2 paragraphs 111 and 113. In doing so, please provide quantitative assessment of the values. The DOE is requested to clarify if all possible subsidies on power generation from CMM have been considered, including the electricity tariff subsidy.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the leakage by displacement of baseline thermal energy uses as per pages 3, 28 and 29 of the applied methodology. In doing so, please provide information on how it has validated the ex-ante projections of methane demand in the baseline.<br>**Other:** The PP/DOE are requested not to alter the PDD template including table A.2, section B.3. sources and gases included in the project boundary and the footnote in page 24 of the PDD. Please refer to EB41 Annex12 paragraphs 13 and 14. |
| **18** | **3730** | **12.82 MW Bundled Small Hydropower Project in Qiandongnan Autonomous Region, Guizhou Province, P. R. China** | **JACO** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall validate the sensitivity analysis carried out for each of the sub-bundles in line with VVM (v1.2), para.111 (e). In doing so, a variable relative to annual electricity generation should also be taken into account in the sensitivity analysis, in line with Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis (EB 51, Annex58), para. 17.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The value in cell F7 (Expected total annual power generation) in IRR spreadsheet for Majingao power plant is not reproducible. A higher value has been calculated by the secretariat based on the installed capacity and the operation hours reported in the spreadsheet.<br>**Other:** The methodology version (AMS-I.D ver.15) on the project view page should be updated. |
| **19** | **4463** | **Metro Delhi, India** | **SQS** | **Additionality:** The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the evidence provided for prior consideration of CDM as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104(c). In doing so, please state clearly the events and the basis on which it has confirming that CDM was seriously considered prior to the project starting date. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **Additionality:** The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). In particular, please provide details on how each value was derived and the accuracy of each value was validated. The DOE is requested to provide local and sectoral expertise on the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 113 (c). In particular, please provide basis of the validation opinion of the suitability of each input values. The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated sensitivity analysis of the investment analysis as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 111 (e). In doing so, please state clearly how it has validated the parameters varied and the results of the sensitivity analysis.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the identification of the baseline scenario of the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87. In particular, please explain in the validation report in details how the elimination of alternatives were validated. In doing so, please refer to step 2 of Procedure for the identification of the most plausible baseline scenario and demonstration of additionality, ACM 0016 page 6.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to describe how the data/parameters used in the equations were verified as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(e). In doing so, please provide detailed information on how it has validated each steps of the baseline emission, the project mission and the leakage calculations, especially the applications of each value in each equation. The DOE is requested to report in the validation document how the data and parameters fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) and ex-post (available after validation) are considered to be conservative and reasonable. In doing so please refer to VVM v1.2, paragraph 91, providing a justification on how each parameter was validated. |
| **20** | **4569** | **CEMEX Mexico: Alternative fuels and biomass project at Tepeaca cement plant** | **SGS** | **Additionality:** The DOE should provide further validation opinion on the suitability of applying an yearly increase of 3% to the alternative fuels due to inflation while it is not mentioned if an inflation rate has been applied to the baseline fuel costs. 2- The Doe should provide further information on the sensitivity analysis, in particular on the unlikelihood of the baseline fuels price to increase. In doing so it should also consider the historic trend shown in the spreadsheet ¨Fuel Cost¨ where the average fuel prices in USD/ton or m3 have increased from 2005 to 2010. |
| **21** | **4579** | **CEMEX Mexico: Alternative** | **SGS** | **Additionality:** The DOE should provide |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **fuels and biomass project at Merida cement plant** | | further validation opinion on the suitability of applying an yearly increase of 3% to the alternative fuels due to inflation while it is not mentioned if an inflation rate has been applied to the baseline fuel costs. 2- The Doe should provide further information on the sensitivity analysis, in particular on the unlikelihood of the baseline fuels price to increase. In doing so it should also consider the historic trend shown in the spreadsheet ¨Fuel Cost¨ where the average fuel prices in USD/ton or m3 have increased from 2005 to 2010 (in particular for the petcoke). |
| **22** | **4630** | **Shaanxi Haiyan Coke Making Group 24MW Waste Coke Oven Gas (COG) Based Electricity Generation Plant** | **JCI** | **Additionality:** The DOE is requested to describe in detail how the parameters used in any financial calculations have been validated in line with para 114(a) of VVM v1.2, in particular; (i) depreciation period; (ii) residual value; (iii) tax rates ( income tax, VAT and additional education and construction tax).<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to describe in detail how fcap have been validated following the steps mentioned in ACM0012 v3.2, in particular; (i) why method 1 and 2 was not chosen for calculation of fcap; (ii) how the value of Q OE,BL, sourced from FSR, is conservative given that the methodology requires to estimate the theoritical recoverable energy energy based on manufacturer's specification or technical assessment prepared by qualified/certified external expert.In addition,please provide a spreadsheet on calculation of fcap. |
| **23** | **4627** | **Henan Jiaozuo Yanxin Cement 4.5+7.5MW WHR Project** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Baseline methodology:** The DOE should indicate how it has validated the elimination of baseline alternative P7 (waste energy based captive electricity generation with lower efficiency than the project activity), in particular, how it has validated that either P7: (i) has prohibitive barriers; or (ii) is clearly economic unattractive as required by step 3 of Identification of baseline scenarios of ACM0012 v3.2.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE is requested to indicate how it has validated the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in line with para 114(a) and (b) of VVM v1.2, in particular: (i) management fee; and (ii) other fee cost. Please notice that CL6 of VR indicates that “The other fee of this project is 4 Million Yuan per year, consisting of two parts, grid connecting fee 3 Million Yuan and other manufacture fee 1 Million Yuan every year”.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to describe how fcap have been validated following the steps mentioned in ACM0012 v3.2, in particular; (i) elimination of method 2 for calculation of fcap; (ii) how the value of Q OE, BL, sourced from FSR, |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | is appropriate given that the methodology requires to estimate the theoretical recoverable energy based on manufacturer's specification or technical assessment prepared by qualified/certified external expert. In responding to this issue, the DOE should provide information (for clinker production lines) 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. In addition, please provide a spreadsheet on calculation of fcap. |
| **24** | **3807** | **Guangxi Tianlin County Weimi Hydropower Station** | **TÜV Nord** | **Other:** The version of the methodology (ACM0002 v10) applied by the project activity has been expired. |
| **25** | **4323** | **Lam Soon Wastewater Treatment for Energy Generation, Trang** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Additionality:** The DOE should provide information on the validation of the electricity purchasing price of 1,7034 THB/units used in the investment analysis to calculate the electricity savings. In doing so, it should also consider that the electricity selling price has been validated as 2,995 THB/kWh and 1,4914 THB/kWh. |
| **26** | **4663** | **Residual Organic Waste to Steam & Electricity Project in Nilai, Malaysia** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Additionality:** The project value of RM 12,200,000 is used in IRR calculations. However, information on the components of the respective costs has not been provided, as the price of Non-electric Furnace (NEF) has been validated to be RM 4,690,000 (value of USD 1,340,000, with a validated exchange rate of 1 USD = RM 3.5), and the cost of turbo generator is validated to be RM 217,830, making total cost 4,690,000 + 217,830 = RM 4,907,830 only. The validation opinion on how revenues for project activity from sale of steam and DOBE removal tipping fees will remain constant over the project lifetime has not been provided in the validation report. The validation opinion on inflation rate considered in O&M costs in IRR calculations has not been provided in the validation report.<br>**Baseline methodology:** As per paragraph 13 of applied methodology, local or national data should be first choice for emission factor of fossil fuels. The validation opinion why IPCC value for emission factor of LFO has been used has not been provided in the validation report. The validation report has not been provided information on why the emission reduction calculations in the PDD do not include enthalpy of feed water to calculate net heat generation by the project activity.<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The validation report has not been provided information |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | on why the monitoring plan in the PDD does not include the following parameters:(a) monitoring of moisture content & calorific value of biomass on dry basis used by project activity;(b) continuous monitoring of steam temperature and pressure, which is required by the applied methodology; (c) monitoring of enthalpy of feed water to NEF; and (d) cross-check of steam quantity with invoices / receipts of steam sold by EOSB to EOPSB. |
| **27** | **4592** | **Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Wuhu Conch Cement Company Limited** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Additionality:** The DOE should indicate how it has validated the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis, in particular: Other Construction Engineering and basic preparation cost, as these have not been verified.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE should provide the spreadsheets used to calculate levelised cost analysis for three possible baseline scenarios used to eliminate alternative P7 (if project activity is captive generation using waste energy, this scenario represents captive generation with lower efficiency than the project activityfrom the baseline).<br>**DOE's related issues:** The DOE shall indicate how it has closed CAR 2 since there is a lack of consistency in the fcap calculation. CAR 2 indicates that the estimated output of steam after operation is 4648.54 TJ and the calculated fcap value is 0.96. Nevertheless, the validation report in page 21 indicated that the QOE,y value is 4445.44 TJ and that the validated value for fcap is 1. Also, the DOE should indicate how it has validated the calculation of QOE,BL using the data sourced from FSR given that the applied methodology (ACM0012 v3.2, page 26) indicates that: "For estimating the theoretical energy, manufacturer's specifications can be used. Alternatively, technical assessment can be carried out by independent qualified/certified external process experts such as chartered engineers" |
| **28** | **4662** | **Yuntianhua Furui Waste Heat Recovery and Utilization Project** | **TÜV Nord** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall indicate how it has validated the consistency of the IRR value between the PDD version 1 (page 18, dated 01 April 2009) submitted for Global stakeholder consultation and the IRR of the PDD version 3 submmited for registration (page 20, dated 21 February 2011). Please notice that both versions of the PDD and the DOE itself indicate that the input values come from the same Feasibility Study Report (FSR) approved on 30 October 2008. Nevertheless, the IRR of PDD submitted for registration is 4.47% while the IRR in the PDD submitted for GSC was 5.70%. Please, also notice that some input values as running cost, total investment, sales tax and surtax indicated to be taken from the same source are |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | different. |
| **29** | **4282** | **Shuanghe Second Small Hydropower Project in Jilin Province** | **JACO** | **Additionality:** The DOE is requested to describe how it has validated the parameters used in the financial calculations in line with VVM v1.2, Para 114 (a); in particular: (i) the total investment cost (each items including acquisition cost need to be validated separately; (ii) annual O&M cost (each items need to be validated separately; (iii) tax rates for income tax, VAT and other surcharges. While responding to these, please provide the detail information on income tax calculation and when the final Financial Evaluation of the project with CDM consideration was approved by relevant government agency.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to clearly describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity in line with VVM v1.2, Para 76.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The PP/DOE is requested to list all the data and parameters, used to calculate the emission reductions, in the PDD in line with EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a). The table under B.6.2 in the PDD does not contain CapBL (Installed capacity of the hydropower plant prior to the project implementation) and A BL (area of the reservoir prior to the project implementation).<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The PP/DOE is requested to include details such as unit, source, measurement methods, QA/QC procedures, etc. for the listed parameters in the PDD in line with EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a). The monitoring frequency and QA/QC procedures for Cap PJ (Installed capacity of the hydropower plant after the project implementation) and A PJ (area of the reservoir after the project implementation) are not in line with applied methodology. |
| **30** | **3836** | **Construction of Sumgayit Combined Cycle Power Plant** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall provide further validation opinion on the suitability of input values applied in the investment analysis, in line with VVM (1.2), para.111, in particular, 1) O&M cost, considering 6.6 million USD was mentioned in CAR22; 2) tariff, considering the source of tariff available in 2005 has not been reported and it is not clear how the average tariff (74.38 USD/MWh) used to cross check the applied value has been calculated; 3) gas price, considering it is not clear how the average gas price (181.71 USD/m3) used to cross check the applied value has been calculated. The DOE shall provide further validation opinion on the selected benchmark (17.83%), in line with EB 51 Annex 58 para. 6, considering the data vintage for risk premium (7.91%) has not been provided. Moreover, web links with information about interest rate on deposits |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | of foreign currency in PDD annex 6 can not be opened. |
| **31** | **4711** | **ECC methane capture and combustion from AWMS at dairy farms in Mexico – I** | **ICONTEC** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall clarify how it has validated each of the barriers claimed to demonstrate additionality in line with VVM version 1.2, para. 117 and 118, considering that no independent sources of data has been provided and no crosscheck has been performed.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE shall describe how applicability condition of the methodology has been met in line with VVM v1.2, para. 76, in particular: 1) the retention time of the manure in the lagoons in the baseline; and 2) the storage time of manure after removal from animal barns, including transportation.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE shall validate the sources of GHG in the project boundary in line with the methodology. In doing so, the sources of GHG should be described in the PDD.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE should explain how the parameters used for calculating the baseline emissions have been validated in line with VVM version 1.2, para. 91, considering that no references are mentioned and no crosschecks are performed. In doing so, the DOE shall also clarify why B0 and MCF have been treated as monitoring parameters in the PDD and why project emission due to storage of manure (as per AMS III.D, version 16) has not been considered.<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The DOE should provide validation opinion on the compliance of the monitoring plan with the requirement of methodology in line with VVM version 1.2, para 124 (a), considering that the following parameters required by the methodology has not been included in monitoring plan: BGburned seperated for flaring and combustion, MS%i, MS%l, Ali, electricity used, ndy, soil application of final sludge disposal (AMS III.D, version 16, para. 34) and on-site inspections (AMS III.D, version 16, para. 35). |
| **32** | **4670** | **Mumbai Metro One, India** | **SQS** | **Baseline methodology:** Step 2 of identification of the baseline scenario of ACM0016 v1 (page 6) requires to conduct an investment comparison analysis for all alternatives that are remaining after Step 1. However, the DOE has not explained why the PP has not conducted the investment comparison analysis for all the alternatives that are remaining after step 1 of the methodology to identify most plausible |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | baseline scenario.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to describe in detail how it has assessed the sensitivity analysis carried out for data and parameters, which are used to calculate baseline, project and leakage emissions as indicated in page 20 of ACM0016 v01.<br>**Additionality:** The DOE is requested to explain how it has assessed the real and continuing actions were taken by the project participant to secure CDM status for the project in parallel with its implementation as indicated in paragraph 6 (b) of EB 49, Annex 22.<br>**Additionality:** The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data and references used to demonstrate additionality of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 Paragraph 10 (a). The B.5 section of the PDD doesn't contain list of input values used to calculate NPV and WACC. The validation report does not list and describe suitability of input values to WACC calculation. In addition, the PP/DOE is requested to submit reproducible spreadsheets on calculation of NPV and WACC.<br>The DOE shall describe in detail how the parameters and underlying assumptions used in any financial calculations have been validated in line with paragraph 114 of VVM v1.2.<br>The DOE shall describe in detail how it has assessed the sensitivity analysis carried out for data and parameters, which are used in the investment analysis to determine under what conditions variations in the result would occur and the likelihood of these conditions in line with paragraph 111 (e) of VVM v1.2. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **33** | **4725** | **Shenmu County Tengyuan Coal Chemical Industry Co., Ltd. 60 MW Semi-coke Waste Gas for Power Generation Project** | **LRQA** | **Additionality:** The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a),in particular; urban maintenance and construction tax given that the applied tax rate is inconsistent between the Validation report (5% as mentioned on page 29) and IRR calculation spreadsheet (7% as mentioned in basic data worksheet and PDD as well). The DOE is requested to confirm the accuracy of the financial calculations carried out for the investment analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (c).In doing so, the DOE is requested to describe in detail: (i) the calculation steps for sales tax; and (ii) how it has justified the application of different values for input parameters (such as annual net power supply,original value of fixed assests, depreciation,annual operation cost and so on) in the second and third to sixteenth year.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the identification of the baseline scenario of the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87.In particular, the elimination of W5 option given that alternatives where barriers are prohibitive or which are clearly economically unattractive can only be eliminated as per step 3 of applied methodology ACM0012 v3.2. |
| **34** | **4188** | **Methane Recovery Project of Tiancheng Corn Development Co., Ltd.** | **RINA** | **Other:** The following message was found in pages 13 and 18: "Error! Reference source not found"<br>**Additionality:** The DOE should provide a further validation opinion on the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in line with the VVM para. 111 (b), in particular: (i) the grid tariff given that it was crosschecked with only one electricity bill (December 2008) but the plant started to operate in March 2008 and the investment decision was taken in June 2009; and (ii) the O&M cost since it is not clear how the evidence cited in the validation report is appropriate in the context of the proposed project activity. In doing so, further details of the evidence listed in the report should be provided.<br>**Monitoring methodology:** The DOE should provide a validation opinion on how paragraph 26 of methodology AMS-III.H has been complied with.<br>Page A-35 of the VR mentions: "Most of the parameters are monitored in continuously; the electricity generated will be also cross-checked with records of sold electricity" however, the project activity is a captive power plant. |
| **35** | **4738** | **Inner Mongolia Tongliao** | **BVCH** | **Other:** The DOE is requested to submit |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Zhalute Qi Phase II North Wind Power Project** | | emission reduction calculation spreadsheet as there are two spreadsheets with information on the IRR calculation. In doing so, please refer to EB 48, Annex 60, para. 9 (b).<br>**Additionality:** The DOE is requested to verify the consistency of project information reported in validation report, PDD and IRR calculation spreadsheets, in particular project IRR, installed capacity, annual operation hours, O&M cost and emission reduction. In doing so, please refer to EB 48,Annex 60, para.7 (b). |
| **36** | **4551** | **Za Hung Hydropower Project** | **BVCH** | **Additionality:** The DOE is requested to further substantiate how it has validated the input values to the investment analysis as per VVM 1.2 , para 111 (b).The DOE is requested to further substantiate how it has validated the input values to the benchmark calculation,as per VVM 1.2 , para 112 (b) in particular,<br>(a) the risk free rate as the reference period has not been reported;<br>(b) the market risk premium as the reported calculation has not been provided.<br>With regard to the common practice analysis, the DOE is requested to clarify how the assessment of the existence of similar projects has been undertaken, in line with VVM version 01.2 paragraph 121 (b), in particular whether the similar projects for which construction have started before Aug 2001 are considered. (Please note that the PDD states that projects constructed AFTER August 2001 are considered). Please clarify the discrepancy. |
| **37** | **4603** | **Qinghai Province Xinghai County Moduo Hydropower Project** | **DNV** | **Additionality:** The DOE is requested to confirm the accuracy of the financial calculations carried out for the investment analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (c) given that the spreadsheet doesnot contain any steps/formulae to calculate interest ( cell no F39 to Q39 in financial analysis worksheet).<br>**Additionality:** The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a),in particular; (i) interest rate, and (ii) operation and maintenance cost ( please validate each sub items seperately). |
| **38** | **4788** | **Cachoeirao CDM Project (JUN1092)** | **RINA** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall provide further information about the calculation of the benchmark, for example, the suitability of inflation rate (IGP-M) incorporated in yield on maturity of the government bond and the suitability of 4-year period (2003 - 2006). In doing so, please refer to VVM (v1.2), para. 112 and 114 (b).<br>**Other:** The DOE shall confirm the installed capacity of the project activity, considering the installed capacity mentioned in the spreadsheet of emission reduction calculation is 27.9MW, while the PDD/VR |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | show 28.05MW. In doing so please refer to EB 48 annex 60, para 7 (b). The DOE shall provide English translation to the name of all references/documents/institutions/entities which are cited in local language in the validation report, PDD and IRR calculation spreadsheet, in particular reference /14/, /24, /25/, and /46/ "1st taller regional de electricidad," in the validation report, comments in Sheet"sources" cell F7 of the IRR calculation spreadsheet. In doing so please refer to EB 48 annex 60, para 9 (c). |
| **39** | **4785** | **Santiago 2.8 MW Hydroelectric Project** | **DNV** | **Baseline methodology:** The validation report lacks information on how the input values were validated, in particular: (1) the fuel consumption of alternative 1 (the project activity not implemented as a CDM project); and (2) the O&M costs for all alternatives. 2. Inconsistency regarding the source of input values for alternative 2a is found. The VR page 14 point '(1)' mentions that the data used for calculating the levelized cost for a sub-critical coal based power plant and a super critical coal based power plant to have been sourced from the data from the Referenced Cost Index of Power Engineering and Design in 2007, however VR page 14 point '1)' and page 15 point '4)' mention that the unit investment costs used for calculation LCOE of 2*600 MW sub-critical coal-fired power plant and super-critical coal-fired power plant, and the coal consumption efficiency for 600 MW super-critical coal-fired power plant are sourced from the approved FSR. Please clarify. |
| **40** | **3240** | **Mayang County Jiangkou Small-scale Hydropower Project** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Monitoring methodology:** The DOE should indicate how it has validated the completeness of the monitoring plan as per VVM version1.2 paragraph 123 (a) (ii). Please notice that the PDD has defined a power density of 21 W/m2 but the monitoring plan does not include the provision to monitor this parameter". **Additionality:** The DOE should indicate how it has validated the sensitivity analysis to be in line with VVM 1.2 paragraph 111 (e) guidance. Please notice that Validation Report section 3.5.3.3 does not address this issue and that the sensitivity analysis spreadsheets are missing. |
| **41** | **4768** | **Shiyazi Hydro power Project in Guizhou Province China** | **CEC** | **Additionality:** The DOE shall indicate how it has validated the consistency of the IRR value between the PDD version 3 (page 10, dated 22 February 2010) submitted for global stakeholder consultation and the IRR of the PDD version 5 submitted for registration (page 11, dated 18 January 2011). Please notice that both versions of the PDD and the DOE itself indicate that the input values come from the same Feasibility Study Report (FSR) approved on 12 February 2007. Nevertheless, the IRR of PDD submitted for registration is |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 6.43% while the IRR in the PDD submitted for GSC was 5.68%. Please, also notice that some input values as annual O&M cost and discount rate indicated to be taken from the same source are different"<br>The DOE should indicate how it has validated the suitability of the investment analysis spreadsheet, in particular the fact that the electricty production will only begin in year 6.<br>Please notice that according to PDD the starting date of the proposed project activity is 15 July 2007 and the PP requested the crediting period to start on 01 August 2011, which in total makes only a 4 years gap period.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE should indicate how it has validated the suitability of the investment analysis spreadsheet, in particular the fact that the electricty production will only begin in year 6. Please notice that according to PDD the starting date of the proposed project activity is 15 July 2007 and the PP requested the crediting period to start on 01 August 2011, which in total makes only a 4 years gap period. |
| **42** | **4442** | **Wuhan Xinzhou Chenjiachong Sanitary Landfill LFG Power Generation Project** | **TÜV Nord** | **Baseline methodology:** The VR has not reported how the DOE has validated the parameters used for baseline emission calculation, such as AF, MCF, OX, wet/dry basis and the emission factors, in line with the requirements of ACM0001 and the "Tool to determine methane emissions avoided from disposal of waste at solid waste disposal site". |
| **43** | **4732** | **Shenmu County Xiangrong Coal Chemical Industry Co., Ltd. 25 MW Semi-coke Waste Gas Power Generation Project** | **LRQA** | **Baseline methodology:** The DOE is requested to provide the spreadsheets with the calculations used to estimate the fcap value. |
| **44** | **4739** | **4.5 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Karnataka, India** | **TUEV Rheinland** | **Other:** The DOE is requested to provide a corresponding validation report in line with EB48 Annex 60 paragraph 7.c. as the validation report submitted for registration appears to be incomplete. |
| **45** | **4721** | **Chongqing Changshengqiao Landfill Gas to Energy Project** | **DNV** | **Additionality:** The DOE is requested to further validate the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in line with VVM, version 1.2, para 111 and 113, in particular:<br>i) each element of the annual O&M cost and why the same maintenance cost is applied throughout the entire investment analysis period against the equipment installation in three different stages;<br>ii) costs, amount and use of oil applied in the spreadsheet and cost of cooling water;<br>iii) interest repayments as part of investment costs; and<br>iv) population growth ratio used to estimate waste generation after 2017.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The DOE should clarify if the emission factor considered for the emission reductions calculation was |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | the latest available data at the time of the global stakeholders comments, in line with EB 50, Annex 14 p.5/p.17. |
| **46** | **4724** | **Sichuan Lingguan 76MW Hydropower Project** | **TÜV SÜD** | **Additionality:** Please clarify the inconsistency regarding the O&M value of 14,787,500 RMB/year mentioned in the PDD (page 13) and the validation report (page 21) which is not consistent with the value used in the spreadsheet (16,413,800 RMB/year) for the investment analysis. Furthermore please provide the validation opinion for any additional expenses regarding the O&M costs used in the financial analysis, in line with the VVM ver. 1.2, paragraph 111 (d). The DOE is requested to validate the estimated net electricity generated (345,750 MWh/year) mentioned in the PDD (page 13) as this amount does not match with the applied plant load factor of 60% mentioned in the validation report (page 12) and PDD (page 2). In addition please validate any discount factors such as: i) coefficient of effective power; ii) auxiliary power consumption rate; and iii) transmission line loss rate, that might have been used in addition to the PLF to calculate the net electricity generated by the project activity, in line with the VVM ver. 1.2, paragraph 111 (d).<br>**Other:** The DOE is requested to provide a reproducible financial analysis spreadsheet in line with EB 51 Annex 58 paragraph 17, as the values in row 12 of the "Total Cost&Expense" sheet do not result from a traceable formula. Furthermore the "maturity of the loan" (i.e. period where interest payment applies) considered in row 12 of the "Total Cost&Expense" sheet is not stated within the assumptions and a validation opinion of this parameter was not provided in the validation report.<br>**Baseline methodology:** The PDD mentions (page 2) that the grid emission factor used is source from the data published by the DNA in 2007, which was based on statistics from 2004-2006 ("China Energy Statistical Yearbook 2004-2006", PDD page 25). However, the data considered in the Annex 3 of the PDD refers to the years of 2003-2005. Furthermore, the DOE should clarify if the emission factor considered for the emission reductions calculation was the latest available data at time of the last global stakeholders comments, in line with EB 50 Annex 14 p.5/p.17. |

| Table 3 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Issuance | Stage 1: Completeness Check | | | | |
| # | PA | Project Title | Monitoring Period | DOE | Reasons |
| 1 | 2015 | Yunnan Dayao County Yupao River 3rd Level Hydropower Station | 14/04/09 - 31/03/10 | TÜV Nord | The revised Monitoring Report is version 03, dated 30/03/2011. However page 32 of the Verification Report does not include the revised version and date of the Monitoring Report in the list of documents verified by the DOE. |
| 2 | 1687 | 24.8 MW Wind power project by Belgaum Wind Farms Private Ltd. in Gadag, Karnataka | 19/06/09 - 30/11/09 | TÜV Nord | 1. The date of the revised Monitoring Report is 03/04/11 with version 2.0. However, the date of the Monitoring Report entered in the Document list of the Verification Report is 04/03/11, with version 2.<br>2. The final version of the revised Monitoring Report is version 2, dated 3/4/11. However the version entered on page 2 of the Verification Report is version 1.2 dated 12/08/09. |
| 3 | 0290 | Youngduk Wind Park Project | 01/01/10 - 31/12/10 | JACO | According to EB48 Annex 68,paragraph 7(b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. The Verification Statement states that the verifier confirmed that the monitoring was done in accordence with emission reductions in the revised MR version 2, dated 21 January 2010, however, the submited final monitoring report is Version 02 dated 21/02/2011. The same statement is in the Certification Report. |
| 4 | 1010 | Laizhou Diaolongzui Wind Farm | 26/11/08 - 24/06/10 | TÜV Nord | According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e),cross-referencing within and between the document must be correct and accurate. The final monitoring report submitted with this request for issuance is Version 2 and is dated 20/08/2010, however, the verification report on page 2 states the final version of the monitoring report to be dated 08/10/2010. Further page 34 refers to a monitoring report version 3, dated 08/10/2008. |
| 5 | 3027 | Jiangsu Xiangshui 201MW Wind Power Project | 18/05/10 - 30/11/10 | TÜV Rheinland | EB 48, Annex 68-para 7(b), requires that all documents are intrernally and mutually consistent. The Certification Statement and Certification Report page 43, make reference to ACM0006, version 8, whereas the registered methodology is ACM0002 ver. 8 - Consolidated methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **6** | **1284** | **Ningxia Shapotou Hydropower Project of Yellow River** | **01/07/10 - 31/12/10** | **SGS** | According with the Paragraph 9 (e) from EB48 - Annex 68 , the Secretariat shall ensure, when conducting a completeness check, that cross-referencing and versioning, including number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents is correct and accurate. However the number of CERs in the Monitoring Report, Verification Report, Certification Statement and spreadsheet is shown as 258,308. The request for issuance refers to the CERs amount of 358,308. |
| **7** | **0130** | **Antonio Moran Wind Power Plant Project in Patagonia Region, Argentina** | **01/08/06 - 31/10/08** | **DNV** | 1. As per EB 48, Annex 68, para. 7(b), requires that all documents are intrernally and mutually consistent. The submitted Monitoring Report is Version 03, dated 13 April 2011. However the Monitoring Report in the Verification and Certification Report is dated 21 February, 2011 (V03), pages 2, 7, 8, 14, 15 17, 18. Kindly revise the consistency of the date and version of the Monitoring Report throughout the documentation.<br>2. As per EB48, Annex 68, para. 9 (b), the spreadsheet must be supplied in an assessable (unprotected) format. However, the Emission Reductions spreadsheet is protected and therefore is not assessable.<br>3. The submitted documents are not dated based on the logical sign off dates: eg. MR dated 13/04/2011, and VR is dated 05/04/2011. |
| **8** | **1144** | **Tambun LPG Associated Gas Recovery and Utilization Project** | **16/01/10 - 31/05/10** | **TÜV Nord** | The Certification Statement is dated 04/03/11 whereas the Verification Opinion, which refers to the same information as the Certification Statement, is dated 13/05/2011. Kindly ensure logical sign-off sequence of the dates. |
| **9** | **0184** | **Electric Power Co-Generation by LDG Recovery – CST - Brasil** | **01/01/07 - 31/12/09** | **LRQA** | The submitted Certification and Verification Reports contain no information. Both files are blank. |
| **10** | **1139** | **Bagasse based Cogeneration Project at Pudukkottai Tamil Nadu, India** | **14/09/07 - 30 /09/08** | **TÜV SÜD** | According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), the number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents must be correct and accurate. In the Signed Form of the Request for Issuance, the number of total verified and certified emission reductions is 65.491, whereas in the Monitoring, Verification and Certification Report the number of claimed CERs is 65.490. The CER Calculations sheet in the submitted Spreadsheet shows the number of CERs to be 65.512.<br><br>According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e),cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document must be |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | correct and accurate. The Ceritification Report states that the final Monitoring Report (version 2.6 dated 21-10-2010) complies with the methodology and Monitoring Plan. The final submitted monitoring report is version 2.7 and is dated 25-03-2011. |
| **11** | **1015** | **25.70 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Udumalpet, Tamilnadu** | **24/06/05 - 12/11/07** | **TÜV NORD** | According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e), cross-referencing within and between the document must be correct and accurate. The final monitoring report submitted with this request for issuance is Version 3 and is dated 03/05/2011, however, throughout the verification report document states the final version of the monitoring report is dated 03/05/2011 version 2. Kindly also revise the consistency of the small capital letters entered in several pages of the verification report which refer to the /MR2/, eg. pages 29, 62 .<br>Additionally, the signed Certification Report is dated 21 October, 2010 which is prior to the date of the revised Monitoring Report and Verification Report. Please update this document according to revision and resubmission for this request for issuance. |
| **12** | **0588** | **12MW Captive Power Project based on Waste Heat Recovery of Industrial Waste Gases** | **01/12/09 - 31/01/11** | **TÜV SÜD** | According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9(f), the monitoring period throughout the documentation must be consistent. The Verification Statement in the VR and the Certification Statement both state the reporting period: From 01-11-2009 to 31-01-2011, whereas the monitoring report for this RfI is 01 Dec 09 - 31 Jan 11. |
| **13** | **2924** | **Ningxia Federal Solar Cooker Project** | **12/02/10 - 31/10/10** | **TÜV Rheinland** | As per EB48 -- Annex 68 all documents must be mutually and internally consistent. The last signature included in the Certification Statement is from 6 May, 2011. However the Certification Statement document in included in the Verification Report shows only one signature from 21 April, 2011; one signature and date are not included as shown in the uploaded Certification Statement. Therefore, the above leads to the fact that the date of the Certification Statement ( 6 May 2011) is prior to the one shown in the signed form for request for issuance (27 April 2011). Kindly address these inconsistencies. |
| **14** | **1181** | **6.0 MW Biomass based cogeneration power plant of Rama Paper Mills Limited, Kiratpur, Uttar Pradesh.** | **01/01/09 - 31/05/10** | **TÜV Nord** | The spreadsheets named “Baseline emissions” and “ER”of the submitted excel file “1181 2 CER Calculation” file do not refer to the correct monitoring period. |
| **15** | **0528** | **Shri Bajrang WHR CDM Project** | **01/05/08 - 31/08/08** | **DNV** | a) Paragraph 7 (a) of EB48 - Annex 68 requires that all documents submitted with the request for issuance must be mutually consistent. However, the version and the date of the PDD approved by the EB on 26 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Nov 2010 (version 11 of 2nd December 2010) does not correspond to the version and the date of PDD indicated in the Verification and Certification Statement (PDD, version 09 dated 12/07/2006). Kindly revise the version and date of the revised PDD throughout the Verification and Certification Report<br><br>Furthermore, the monitoring period (01 Nov 2007 - 30 Apr 2008) indicated in the list of documents "References", page 16, does not correspond to the request for issuance for this monitoring period (01 May 08 - 31 Aug 08). |
| **16** | **2307** | **Federal Intertrade Pengyang Solar Cooker Project** | **01/05/10 - 31/10/10** | **TÜV Rheinland** | According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e),cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document is correct and accurate. Under Verification Opinion - summary on page 3 of the Verification Report, it is stated that one of the verification steps was the desk review of revised monitoring report (version 3, 12th April 2010). Further, the VR on page 8 lists the Documentation reviewed during verification, where Monitoring Report (3rd Periodic Verification), Version 3 is dated 12th March 2011. The submitted Monitoring Report in this request for issuance is Version 3 but dated 12 April 2011. |
| **17** | **1225** | **30 MW WHR Project of Hongshi Group** | **01/05/ 08 - 30/06/09** | **TÜV Nord** | According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e),cross-referencing and versioning within and between the document is correct and accurate.The Verification Report makes reference to PDD version HS-06, dated 2007-06-19. However, the revised PDD for the project is Version: HS-07 and is dated 01/03/2010. |
| **18** | **3140** | **Sichuan Mabian Yi Minority Autonomous County Yonglexi Hydropower Station** | **09/05/10 - 25/02/11** | **CQC** | The date provided in the Certification Report (01/10/2007) is dated prior to the finalization of the Verification Report (16/05/2011). Kindly address this inconsistency. |
| **19** | **2228** | **Wind Power Plant No.1 - Binh Thuan 30MW** | **22/08/09 - 31/03/10** | **BVCH** | As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, in the submitted Certification Statement, the version of the Final Monitoring report is indicated as 1.0 from 25/05/10.This is not in consistency with the Monitoring Report submitted: Version 2, 20/09/10. |
| **20** | **0459** | **Pronaca: Afortunados Swine Waste Management** | **01/10/08 - 31/12/10** | **TÜV SÜD** | According to EB48 paragraph 9 (d), all documents shall be in English or shall contain a full translation of relevant sections into English. The spreasheet submitted contains text in other language than English (e.g. line 4 of "REMATE BRILL"sheet, among others) and units of these parameters/symbols are not indicated to allow the identification of the same. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **21** | **2482** | **Sarbari-I small hydro project of DSL Hydrowatt Limited (DSLHL), Himachal Pradesh, India** | **27/07/09 - 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. |
| **22** | **0267** | **MW Wind Power Project at Baramsar and Soda Mada, district Jaisalmer, Rajasthan, India** | **02/07/06 - 01/10/08** | **SGS** | 1. The Verification Report refers to the Monitoring Report version 02, dated 21/02/2009 in pages 17, 25, 26. The date of the revised Monitoring Report is 11/10/2010 version 03. Kindly address this inconsistency throughout the Verification Report. |
| **23** | **809** | **Garganta da Jararaca Small Hydroelectric Power Plant (SHP)** | **01/01/10 - 31/12/10** | **BVCH** | 1. The number of CERs included in the Monitoring Report, Certification Report and Verification Report refers to the amount of 55,354. However, this request for issuance is for 5,534. Please also note that the signed form also refers to the amount of 5,534 CERs.<br>2. Kindly submit a clean version of the revised Monitoring Report. The submitted one has tracked changes. |
| **24** | **2003** | **Yunnan Guangnan Duimen River Hydropower Station** | **26/03/10 - 25 /03/11** | **CEC** | The Certification Statement refers to the registered PDD dated 12/09/10. However, the last date and version of the registered PDD is from 10/11/08.<br>The revised Monitoring Report refers to version 02 dated 05/05/2011, however the Certification Report and Verification Statement refers to version 02 dated 05/05/2010. Kindly revise this information throughout the Certification Report, Verification Statement. |
| **25** | **0431** | **Puente Gallego Landfill gas recovery project, Gallego, Rosario, Argentina.** | **01/07/09 - 31/07/10** | **RINA** | 1.According to EB48 Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e)cross-referencing and versioning, including number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents is correct and accurate. The CERS stated in the Monitoring report and the Verfiifcation report is 53,015 where as the ER spreadsheet shows 53,029.<br>2. The file "ERs claimed summary" is not legible and cannot be opened. Please resubmit this file. |
| **26** | **1938** | **Guangxi Youjiang Naji Navigation and Power Generation Project** | **01/04/10 - 31/12/10** | **TÜV Nord** | As per EB48 para 7 (b), the submitted documents must be internally and mutually consistent. However, in the submitted Verification report, on pages 2 and 35 the version of the Final Monitoring report is indicated in several status ( vers. 1, vers. 4.) This is not in consistency with the version and date of the submitted Monitoring Report. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 27 | 3609 | Sichuan Jialingjiang Xinzheng Hydropower Project | 17/09/10 - 25/01/11 | Deloitte -TECO | In section A.1, E.1, E.4 and E.5 of the MR, the number of CER is 168655.5CERs while in the verification report, certification report and signed form is 168656CERs. Additionally, the spreadsheet is supplied in zip format; when unzipped, it does not give an assessable excel file. |

| Table 4 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Issuance | Stage 2: Information and Reporting Check | | | | |
| # | PA | Project Title | Monitoring Period | DOE | Reasons |
| 1 | 2404 | Leak reduction in above ground gas distribution equipment in the KazTransgaz- Tbilisi Gas Distribution System – Tbilisi, Georgia | 21/09/09-31/03/10 | AENOR | 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, Annex60 (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii)).<br>Issue: The registered PDD defines monthly calibrations for the Hi-Flow Samplers. According to the dates of calibration provided in the Monitoring Report (page 22), some of the instruments used show some days of delay in the calibration frequency, such as: HFS1 (calibrated 02/09/09 and next calibration on 05/10/09 and 21/10/09 next calibration on 24/11/09), HFS2 (calibrated 02/09/09 next calibration 05/10/09 and calibrated 04/11/09 next calibration on 29/12/09? and 04/01/10), HFS3 (calibrated 02/09/09 next calibration 05/10/09 and calibrated 04/11/09 next 04/01/10), HSF5 (calibrated on 06/03/09 next calibration on 05/10/09, calibrated on 21/10/09 next calibration on 24/11/09 and 25/12/09 next calibration on 01/02/10), HSF6 (calibrated on 21/03/09 next calibration on 05/10/09, calibrated 21/10/09 next calibration 24/11/09 and calibrated on 24/12/09 next calibration on 26/01/10). The Verification Report did not assess these delays in line with the requirements of EB52, Annex 60. |
| 2 | 1144 | Tambun LPG Associated Gas Recovery and Utilization Project | 01/06/10 - 31/07/10 | TÜV Nord | Scope 1: 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>Issue: The Monitoring Report does not contain information on the monitoring parameter “Tequipment”.<br>Scope 2: 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>Issue: Section D of the Monitoring Report does not contained information on QA/QC procedures in line with the requirement of the |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | EB54 Annex 34.<br><br>Scope 3: 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: The Monitoring Report does not contain calibration dates of the on-line gas chromatography used for the monitoring of the LPG carbon content (Wcarbon LPG, B, y) |
| **3** | **2535** | **CUIDEMOS Mexico (Campana De Uso Intelegente De Energia Mexico) - Smart Use of Energy Mexico** | **01/12/09 - 30/11/10** | **SGS** | Scope 1: Cross-referencing and versioning, including number of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), within and between the documents is correct and accurate; (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 9 (e)).<br>Issue 1: The request issuance form, the monitoring report and the verification and certification report do not contain correct reference numbers of POA (PoA 2535) and CPA (2535-0001).<br>Issue 2: The DOE verified nj (number of incandescent bulbs operational in baseline scenario) as 965,626 while the spreadsheet indicated it as “965,601”.<br>Issue 3: The monitoring report (p21) stated EBL,y (Total Baseline Energy Consumption) as 85,020 MW (85,020,381 KWh) while the excel sheet indicates it as 85,023 MWh.<br>Issue 4: The monitoring report stated the emission reduction for this monitoring period as 33,735 tCO2 while the spreadsheet indicates it as 33,736 tCO2.<br>Scope 2: All parameters required to be monitored and reported at the intervals required by the monitoring plan and the applied methodology (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10(a)(iii)),<br>Issue 1: The CPA-DD defines the total same size of CFL used for checking to ensure ongoing operation of CFLs (nPCCG) as 240, while the actual nPCCG is 504 as indicated in the monitoring report and the verification report . Further information is required on this increase in the number of nPCCG.<br>Issue 2: The verification report (p13) indicates that the weight average power of CFL (pk) is 17.01% while the monitoring report (p18) states it as 17.01watt.<br>Scope 3: All necessary documents have been submitted (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(a)).<br>Issue: “Annex 8 (‘CUIDEMOS Mexico – Selection of sample groups’)“ which provides a detailed description of the statistical methods used to select households was not included in the CPA DD. Please provide this annex. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4** | **1428** | **Monomeros Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project** | **25/03/09 - 03/05/10** | **ICONTEC** | 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>Issue: The monitoring report (page 20) provides the calibration frequency of the N2O analyzers as monthly. However the calibration dates provided for 2009 and 2010 are not in accordance with the described frequency<br>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>Issue:<br>- The monitoring report (page 20) provides the calibration frequency of the monitoring equipment to be during every gauze change for measuring gas flow, temperature, pressure and Nitric acid production. The gauze change took place on 25 March 2009 as per page 22 of the same report. The calibration dates of the meters corresponding to the above parameters are not in accordance with the date of gauze change (please see below for example). The PP is requested to provide more explanation on how these meters were calibrated as per the reported frequency.<br>a) Stack gas flow meter - 27 Jan 2009, b) Stack gas temperature meter - 27 Jan 2009, c) Stack gas pressure meter - 27 Jan 2009 and d) Nitric acid flow meters - 27 May 2009 and 24 June 2009 for two separate meters.<br>Scope: The verification report does not contain information on how the DOE verified the calibration of monitored equipments with the calibration requirements (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii))<br>Issue: The verification report (page 20, table 4) provides the calibration data for the operation condition equipment. However no information is provided for equipment monitoring N2O concentration, gas flow rate, stack gas temperature and stack gas pressure.<br>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br>Issue: The verification report (page 22) states that the Annual Surveillance Test (AST) was performed in April 2009, however page 15 of the Monitoring report mentions May 2009 for the same.<br>Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br>Issue: The verification report (page 21, table 5) provides the calibration date of the Nitric Acid flow meter (FIT-12N09) as 27 May 2009, however page 20 of the Monitoring report mentions 24 June 2009 for the same. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5** | **0545** | **Durban Landfill-gas-to-electricity project – Mariannhill and La Mercy Landfills** | **15/12/06 - 01/11/07** | **JCI** | Scope I: The monitoring report does not provide the implementation status of the project (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (i)).<br>Issue: The monitoring report does not report when project was implemented/started operation regarding each one of the sites. Additionally the number of flares installed in each site is not clearly reported.<br><br>Scope II: The Verification Report does not inform whether all physical features of the project are in place (VVM v.1.2 para 196) and does not provide findings and conclusions as to whether the proposed CDM project activity has been implemented in accordance with the PDD (VVM v.1.2 para.220 (d)).<br>Issue 1: The verification report does not contain information on physical features of the project activity, including how it confirmed the installed capacity of the project activity as per registered PDD. Additionally the verification report does not provide findings and conclusions as to whether the proposed CDM project activity has been implemented in accordance with the PDD.<br>Issue 2: The verification report does not contain information on the implementation status of the project (e.g. start of operation and/or delay in implementation).<br>Scope III: 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: The monitoring report states that "only the instruments provided by Madur and Geotechnical Instruments require annual calibration checks" and that "the Madur meters were ultimately replaced (in November 2007 at La Mercy and March 2008 at Mariannhill) by instruments from a different manufacturer and, as the instruments had not functioned correctly, periodic calibrations could not be carried out" however it does not indicate the calibration dates for such equipments and period in which the equipments have been used in the monitoring period. Additionally the calibration dates for all the monitoring equipments used in the monitoring period, and when such equipments were used/installed, are not reported in the monitoring report (e.g. electricity meters, flow meters, etc).<br>Scope/issue IV: 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). |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Scope V: The verification report does not contain information on how the DOE verified the calibration of all monitored equipments with the calibration requirements as per VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii)).<br>Issue: The verification report does not contain an assessment on the calibration for all monitoring equipment as per monitoring plan/applied methodology/VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii)).<br><br>Scope VI: The verification report does not provide an assessment on how CARs and CLs were closed-out (VVM v.1.2 para 221 (f)).<br>Issue: The verification report indicates that details of the finding are presented in Annex 1 while the verification report does not contain an Annex1.<br><br>Scope VII: 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>Issue: The national/local regulatory framework shall be monitored on an annual basis as per applied methodology and has not been reported in the monitoring report. Additionally the verification report does not indicate how this has been verified by the DOE.<br><br>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 1: The verification report does not indicate how it crosschecked the analysis of the flare conducted (e.g. information regarding source/when/how analysis was conducted is not reported).<br><br>Scope IX: 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>Issue: The verification report states that “Latest available emission factor given in the ESKOM’s annual table as follows is applied for ERs calculation. Emission factor 0.958 kgs of CO2 per kWh”, however it does not indicate how the DOE confirmed the data vintage used for the emission factor calculation as per applied methodology and relevant CDM Executive Board decisions. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Scope X: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br>Issue 1: The monitoring plan and applied methodology requires semi-annual (monthly if unstable) monitoring of combustion efficiency of engine/boiler based on methane content analysis of its exhausts gas. The monitoring report states that semi-annual testing of engine combustion efficiency has not been carried out through the duration of the monitoring period, however the data captured electronically are used to determine the engine heat rate which is checked against the manufactures specification and Quality Assurance results. The verification report states that a "default value for the engine combustion efficiency is set as 100% same as set in the original Workbook validated with PDD". Please clarify these inconsistencies.<br>Issue 2: Issue: The monitoring plan and applied methodology requires semi-annual (monthly if unstable) monitoring of heat rate of the generator (Gj/MWh). The monitoring report states that semi-annual testing of heat rate has not been carried out through the duration of the monitoring period and that the engine/generator heat rate is calculated automatically every 15 minutes, however the verification report states that a "heat rate values to be used for ERs calculation are set on the basis of the expected design performance given by the engine generator supplier, Envitek Solutions (Ptf) LTD", while in another section it states that 1P-CL-1-2 and 1P-CL-7 was addressed to clarify whether the heat rate of the generator were used appropriately in the SCADA system to calculate the emission reductions, and it was confirmed that the heat rate versus generator output is calculated every 15 minutes. Please clarify these inconsistencies.<br>Issue 3: Issue: Not all data values reported in the CER sheet correspond to the ones reported in the monitoring report (e.g. parameter “MV project”, the data reported in Appendix 1 of the monitoring report for LA Mercy landfill for May 2007 is 28,451 while the CER sheet “LM-6-1”indicates in “Sheet 1”, Cell M38, another value (16818.29), etc). Please clarify.<br>Scope XI: Other<br>Issue: The request for issuance refers to the monitoring period of 15th December 2011 to 01st November 2011, while data reported in the emission reduction sheet for Mariannhill landfill only contain data until 29th October 2011, and data reported in the emission reduction sheet for both Mariannhill and La Mercy landfill and in the monitoring report does not contain data monitored for 1st November 2011. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Scope XII: 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>Issue 1: The monitoring report does not indicate how each monitoring parameter has been monitored and which systems are related to each one of them (e.g.,meters related, recording frequency, type of record (continuous/periodical), how each data is processed and used for emission reduction calculation, etc). Please also note that, e.g., the automatic calculation for engine/generator heat rate is indicated to be every 15 minutes in the monitoring report and it states in Appendix 1 that data is aggregated and recorded in “Sheet 1”, Column S, while no data is reported in column “S” of the sheets provided. Additionally the Appendix 3 of the monitoring report list the instruments used to monitor the parameters however the monitoring report does not indicate which instrument is used for each required parameter listed in the monitoring plan/applied methodology.<br>Issue 2: The monitoring report states that "the Madur gas meter was found to be 2-3% in error with regard to methane concentration on 17th August 2007. Consequently, gas was manually monitored using fully calibrated hand held instrumentation until the Madur meter could be recalibrated on 12th October 2007". It is not clear the monitoring procedure used to obtain the data of methane concentration (continuous/periodical) and whether periodical measurements followed a 95% confidence level as per applied methodology if applicable.<br><br>Scope XIII: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not provide explanation on application of formulae EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii).<br>Issue: The CER sheets do not provide the units of the data recorded. Additionally there is no clear correspondence between the name of the parameters indicated in the monitoring plan to the ones reported in the CER spreadsheet. |
| **6** | **2414** | **SF6 Switch at Dead Sea Magnesium** | **01/01/10 - 31/12/10** | **DNV** | 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>Issue: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring equipment which cover whole monitoring period. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 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>Issue: The calibration information about bridge scale is not consistent between the monitoring report and verification report. If the calibration has been delayed, the DOE should explain how it verified the calibration of monitoring equipment in accordance with the requirements of EB 52 Annex 60. |
| **7** | **2347** | **150 MW grid connected Wind Power based electricity generation project in Gujarat, India** | **18/06/09 - 24/02/10** | **TUV-Nord** | Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br>Issue: The verification report (Pg39) states that the total electricity supplied to the grid in the monitoring period was of 205,833 MWh, however, the monitoring report and spreadsheet state that the value was of 205,794 MWh.<br>Scope: The monitoring report does not provide the implementation status of the project (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (i)).<br>Issue: Final commissioning date and operation status of the wind park was not included in the monitoring report.<br>Scope: The monitoring report does not contain the monitored parameters reported at the interval required by the monitoring plan / applied methodology (EB48 - Annex 68)<br>Issue: The Project activity did not report the following parameters in a monthly basis (as required by the applicable methodology):<br>- EGy,exp = Quantity of electricity exported to GUVNL facility<br>- EGy,imp = Quantity of electricity imported from GUVNL<br>Scope: The information on calibration of monitoring instruments reported is not in accordance with the specified by the monitoring methodology/ monitoring plan (EB48 – Annex paragraph 10 (a) (iv)).<br>Issue: The monitoring plan requires that all meters should be annually calibrated. However, the following meters located at the two substations were not properly calibrated during the present monitoring period: GJB00670, GJB00667, GJB00668, GJU00671, GJU00672, GJU00673, GJU00674, GJU00675 and GJU00676. Also, regarding the individual WTG meters, the monitoring plan requires annual calibration of the meters and some of these meters were not properly calibrated during the present monitoring period. Also, further clarification is required on the use of these meters in the proportional approach to determine the share of the electricity corresponding to the project activity and how this was considered when CAR P2 was closed. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Scope: The DOE should confirm that the project was implemented as per the PDD (VVM para 221 (d))<br>Issue: The original monitoring plan states that the electricity will be delivered through the Suthri and the Vanku substations. However, the monitoring report states that the electricity was delivered through the Suthri and the Nani Sindhodi Substation. |
| **8** | **1575** | **Kadamane Mini Hydel Scheme-1 (KMHS-1)** | **01/12/08-30/11/09** | **LRQA** | Scope: The Verification Report does not determine if the assumptions used in emission calculations, emission factors, default values and other reference values have been correctly applied. VVM v.1.2 para.208 (d) & (e)<br>Issue: The DOE did not sufficiently assess if all assumptions, emissions factors and default values used in calculations have been correctly applied, considering the value of diesel density used in ER calculation (0.86 tm3) is different from the ex-ante value indicated in revised monitoring plan (0.83 t/m3). |
| **9** | **0796** | **12MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Tenkasi, Tamilnadu** | **15/12/07 - 15/12/09** | **TUV-NORD** | 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, Annex60 (VVM v.1.2 para 184 (a) (ii)).<br>Issue: The DOE states "The energy meters are calibrated once in a year. For the current monitoring period, whenever the calibration is implemented beyond the scheduled date, the maximum permissible error for the metering for the equipment has been applied for the period of gap as per the CDM EB 52 annex 60 guidelines. Conservative approach has been exercised in applying the maximum permissible error and in the calculation of emission reductions. " However, it was not clear how the guideline was applied for the period of 02 to 11 August 2008 when the calibration of meter for wind turbine generator of "773" owned by "Naga" was delayed. |
| **10** | **1227** | **Yuyao Electricity Generation Project using Natural Gas** | **01/07/09 - 30/09/10** | **BVCH** | Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the formulae of calculation (whenever possible) (EB48/Annex 68 para 10 (b) (ii)).<br>Issue: Cells F87-F88 in the “EF_BM” tab contain values instead of formulas. Moreover, once the formula corresponding to these cells is introduced (i.e. the formula indicated in the column heading and used in adjacent cells), the resulting values are inconsistent with the ones presented currently in the spreadsheet. |
| **11** | **0752** | **Omnia Fertilizer Limited Nitrous Oxide (N2O) Reduction Project** | **01/02/09 - 31/05/09** | **TUV-NORD** | Scope: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring instruments, as specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB52 - Annex 60)<br>Issue: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring equipment which cover whole monitoring period. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 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)<br>Issue: The verification report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring equipment which cover whole monitoring period. If the calibration has been delayed, the DOE should explain how it verified the calibration of monitoring equipment in accordance with the requirements of EB 52 Annex 60. |
| **12** | **1658** | **Yinshan Profiled Iron Co., Ltd** | **01/04/09 - 27/04/10** | **ERM** | Scope 1: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br>Issue: The verification report (pages 35/36) indicates that meters M12, M13, M14 and M15 were calibrated on 30/12/2008 and 29/12/2009 (valid until 28/12/2010), however, the monitoring report (page 13) indicates that the meters were calibrated on 08/09/2008 and 07/09/2009 (valid until 06/09/2010). |
| **13** | **1214** | **Mensilin Holdings Biomass Energy Plant Project** | **08/10/07-31/07/09** | **SGS** | Scope: The measured values of steam supplied to the two consumers and invoiced values are different for some months (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br>Issue: The measured values of the monitored parameter steam generated and supplied to the client StD are inconsistent with the invoiced values for the month of October 2007 for client Corotino and for the month of October 2007, June 2009 and July 2009 for client Palmaju. |
| **14** | **0164** | **Bandeirantes Landfill Gas to Energy Project** | **01/11/10-22/12/10** | **TUV Nord** | Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the values of monitored parameters (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (i)).<br>Issue: The spreadsheet only contains values of 'Electricity exported', while the monitoring plan requires the 'Net quantity of electricity displaced' to be monitored. The DOE is requested to provide further explanation on how it assessed the measurement of net electricity generation taking into account internal consumption in the degassing plant and power plant. |
| **15** | **0198** | **San Jacinto Tizate geothermal project** | **01/01/09 - 29/06/09** | **TÜV SÜD** | Scope: The calibration of monitoring instruments reported is not in accordance with what was specified by the monitoring methodology/monitoring plan (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (iv))<br>Issue: Based on the information in the monitoring report (page 18) and verification report (page 9), it appears that the back-up electricity meter did not have a valid calibration for the monitoring period. This meter was replaced on 18 October 2006 and was calibrated at that time. Given that the calibration frequency of the electricity meters used for the project is 2 years as per the PDD and the national regulation, its next calibration was due by 18 October 2008. However, according to the monitoring report, the next calibration was performed more than 10 months later on 8 September 2009. Please provide complete information on whether the back up electricity meter was calibrated in 2007. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **16** | **0679** | **Optimization of steam consumption at the evaporator.** | **01/01/07 - 31/03/08** | **SGS** | Scope: (a): The monitoring report does not contain default values/external data used in the calculation of emission reductions (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (a) (v)). (b): The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not provide explanation on application of formulae EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii).<br>Issue: Default conversion factor between Cal and J, (not contained in MR), is applied in ER calculation. However in ER sheet equations it is sometimes applied as 4.18(when calculating ES) and sometimes as 4.186 (when calculating EFfuel or COEFcoal). Also, in Final CER tab, BE, PE and ER indicated are different from the values in MR with no explanation given.<br>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>Issue: Baseline emission, project emission indicated in verification report (eg. page 25) are different from the values reported in MR (eg. Page 28), although the final ER is the same.<br>Scope: 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>Issue: Default values for conversion factor between Cal and J are not all correctly applied, which is not covered by the verification report. |
| **17** | **2866** | **Bailongjiang Shuiboxia Hydropower Station** | **30/05/10 - 29/01/11** | **LRQA** | 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>Issue: The monitoring report does not contain information of calibration of monitoring equipment which covers whole monitoring period. |
| **18** | **1955** | **Hubei Laifeng Najitan Hydropower Station** | **28/10/09 - 27/07/10** | **CEC** | Scope: The verification report shall state that monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD or the accepted revised monitoring plan. (VVM v.1.2 para 206)<br>Issue: The verification report (page 13) states that the Project Participant revised the monitoring plan and the revised monitoring plan was approved by EB on 04/01/2011. However, in different sections of the document (e.g. section 3.4: Compliance of Monitoring) the Verification Report states that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan in the registered PDD. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Issue 1: The Monitoring Report (page 8) specifies that the accuracy of the meter M4 is 0.2S. However, the Verification Report (page 12) indicates a precision of 0.5S for the meter M4<br>Issue 2: Additionally, there is an inconsistency between the Monitoring Report and the Verification Report regarding the procedure to be followed in case of failure of meters M1-M4: The Monitoring Report (page 8) states: "When the M4 is in trouble, the emission reductions will not be claimed for conservative purpose". However, the Verification Report (page 13) specifies that if there is any trouble with M1 and M4, the data of another meter M2 will be used for measuring power generation supplied and power imported to the project by the grid. |
| **19** | **2161** | **Straw-fired Power Generation Project in Chuzhou District, Huaian City, Jiangsu Province** | **07/08/09-31/07/10** | **GLC** | 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>Issue: The monitoring report does not contain the calibration dates for the moisture content tester(s).<br>Scope: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the values of monitored parameters (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (i)).<br>Issue: The spreadsheet does not contain the values of the monitored parameter "Moisture content of the biomass residues" for each biomass residue type k. |
| **20** | **2834** | **Mokpo Landfill Gas Recovery Project for Electricity Generation** | **18/02/10 - 17/08/10** | **KFQ** | 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>Issue: Calibration dates and its validity for the monitoring period are not reported in the monitoring report.<br>Scope II: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b)).<br>Issue: The verification report states (page 14) that "Initial test of all flow meters was done on 24th July 2009 by manufacturer" however in page 18 of verification report it shows that not all meters were calibrated in same date. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 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>Issue 1: The DOE raised a CAR (5), in which PP states that "when the gap between two data is out of the range of meters unique error, the smaller measured value is used for ER as conservative manner". The DOE concludes as "verification team checked the data and confirmed that their approach is a conservative manner to calculate ER", however does not report how it verified if this procedure has been used in the monitoring period and in which data, and how it was verified. Please note additionally that the CER spreadsheet does not contain an indication of such events.<br>Issue 2: The DOE raised a CAR (4) because "When the flow rate data was transferred to the server, data lag was occurred occasionally". The DOE states that there is no record spot flow rate data but it is possible to measure total flow rate during the time because measuring figure is accumulated data. However, as per PP response, the methane concentration during these data lag has been used as the lowest CH4 concentration during this lagging time. The DOE closed the CAR stating that "Verification team checked corrected data and confirmed that their approach is a conservative manner to calculate ER.". However the verification report/monitoring report/CER spreadsheet does not indicate when these events took place and the DOE does not indicate in the closure of the CAR how this was verified.<br>Scope IV: 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 DOE does not confirm whether it verified measurements of LFG/CH4 in wet or dry basis as per applied methodology.<br>Issue 2: The verification report states that "when the CH4 data was not transferred to the server (centralized monitoring system), the monitoring LFGelectricity,y was calculated as zero as conservative manner". However the verification report does not indicate when this happened within the monitoring period and how this was verified by the DOE. Additionally, for clarity, the DOE is kindly asked to explain the several dates and months for which flow 2 is indicated as zero in the CER spreadsheet. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **21** | **2444** | **ADFEC 10 MW Solar Power Plant** | **08/06/09-01/07/10** | **TUEV-NORD** | Scope: The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 7(b))<br>Issue: The Monitoring report (pg 20) states that the project activity has 3 import-export (bi-directional) meters installed and maintained by the grid to measure total electricity delivered to the grid. However the Verification Report (pg 61) states that two tri-vector meters are installed in the site for each of the 5 MW of Photovoltaic power. This information is inconsistent and the DOE is required to clarify the actual monitoring system and the number of meters used in the project activity. |
| **22** | **0115** | **GHG emission reduction by thermal oxidation of HFC 23 at refrigerant (HCFC-22) manufacturing facility of SRF Ltd** | **01/07/09 - 30/06/10** | **SGS** | Scope 1: 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>Issue 1: For many parameters, the QA/QC system employed are linked to external documents such as, EL/F/22 , QA/SOP/03-T5. However, there is no reference for the following parameters: Quantity of oxygen used by the destruction process (used for leakage calculation), CO2 Emission due to consumption of diesel oil (used for leakage calculation), CO2 Emission due to Power Consumed for HFC-23 Incineration, Quantity of HCFC-22 Produced, Quantity of HFC-23 Sold , Quantity of fuel used for transportation of dilute HF, Oxygen and Hydrogen ,Quantity of Lime and Hydrofluoric used and Quantity of compounds emitted from the Thermal Oxidation Plant.<br>Scope 2: 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 2: It is not clear whether the Electricity meters F40/5390-1003, 64076/919/5304 and 153602/941-1408 have been duly calibrated during the whole of the monitoring period or not, since the initial calibration date (16/06/09) reported in the MR for both meters is after the starting date of the monitoring period (1 July, 2009). |
| **23** | **992** | **14.85 MW Grid connected Wind farm project, at various locations in Tamil Nadu, by M/s Goyal MG Gases Private Limited** | **21/04/08 - 20/04/09** | **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>Issue: Information is missing concerning the calibration of the two meters that have been replaced From 21/07/08 to 01/12/08 for meter 534 From 04/01/08 to 04/05/09 for meter 717<br>Scope: The emission reductions spreadsheet does not contain the formulae of calculation (EB48/Annex68 para 10 (b) (ii)).<br>Issue: Corrections to the electricity figures were not made for April 2008 where the electricity has been apportioned. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **24** | **0675** | **Vinasse Anaerobic Treatment Project - Compañía Licorera de Nicaragua, S.A. (CLNSA)** | **03/06/03 - 30/06/08** | **DNV** | Scope 1: 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 information regarding the calibration of some instruments is missing. The calibration of instruments for measuring parameters M2, M3 and M7 does not cover the whole monitoring period and these parameters have not been included in the approved deviation. Please provide the calibration details of the instruments.<br>Scope 2: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not contain the values of monitored parameters (EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (i)).<br>Issue 2: the data of M9 is not provided in the spreadsheet. Also the verification report does not provide an opinion whether this parameter is measured or not. Please provide details regarding the monitoring of this parameter.<br>Scope 3: The spreadsheet of calculation of emission reductions does not provide explanation on application of formulae EB48 - Annex 68 paragraph 10 (b) (iii).<br>Issue 3: the spreadsheet does not show transparently the application of the correction factor. |
| **25** | **0130** | **Antonio Moran Wind Power Plant Project in Patagonia Region, Argentina** | **01/08/06 - 31/10/08** | **DNV** | Scope: The monitoring report does no present calibration equipment in accordance with PDD description<br>Issue: Calibration is performed by eletronic pattern meters. PDD and MR presents different specification on Electronic Pattern Meter parameters for Nº and Class. As follows:<br>PDD:<br>- Electronic Pattern Meter; brand: SCHLUMBERGER; model SM3050 N° 00B17311; Class 0.02% Certified INTI CEFIS nº 6163.<br>- Electronic Pattern Meter; brand MTE; model PwS 1.3 N° 21684; Class 0.02%. Certified INTI CEFIS nº 4839.<br>MR:<br>- Electronic Pattern Meter; brand: SCHLUMBERGER; model SM3050 N° 00E17311; Class 0.2. Certified INTI FISICA Y METROLOGIA (CIPM-MRA); ISO/IEC 17025, N°FM-102-12541 PARTIAL 1 OF 2; year 2008.<br>- Electronic Pattern Meter; brand MTE; model PwS 1.3 N° 21684; Class 0.5. Certified INTI FISICA Y METROLOGIA (CIPMMRA); ISO/IEC 17025, N°FM-102-12541 PARTIAL 2 OF 2; year 2008 |
| **26** | **1618** | **Wulashan Line 2 N2O Abatement Project** | **20/06/10 - 13/10/10** | **DNV** | 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>Issue: The information on calibration frequency, precise calibrations dates and calibration validity of the equipment that measures of NCSG is not provided in the monitoring report. |