INFORMATION NOTE ON THE RESULTS OF THE COMPLETENESS CHECKS FOR REQUESTS FOR REGISTRATION

01 October 2011 - 31 March 2012

(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 assessment; completeness check (CC) and information & reporting check (I&RC) that cover the secretariat's initial assessment of submissions. An Information Note on the results of the two stages for requests for registration and issuance covering the period from 30 June 2010 to 23 October 2010 was published in November 2010 on the UNFCCC CDM website[1]. According to the note, the secretariat will publish results of its assessments on a regular basis. Thereafter, four information notes for the subsequent periods were published, as follows:

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

This Information Note covers the period from 01 October 2011 - 31 March 2012, and includes 933 requests processed under completeness check for registration. The total number of submissions during this reporting period is represented by requests for registration returned to DOEs as incomplete during the completeness check stage and information & reporting check stage, and the number of published requests.

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

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

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

Table 1: Requests for registration processed and returned to the DOE

	Total processed	Total returned to DOE
Completeness Check (CC)	933	117
Information and Reporting Check (I&RC)	693	196

Table 2 below comprises a DOE-wise break-up of the requests for registration 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 2: Requests for registration returned to DOE						
	Requests processed under CC	Returned During CC		Requests processed under I&RC	Returned during I&RC	
		#	%		#	%
AENOR	14	-	-	12	8	67%
Applus	1	-	-	-	-	-
BVCH	102	17	17%	73	18	25%
CEC	29	3	10%	19	4	21%
CQC	21	1	5%	15	3	20%
CRA	2	1	50%	-	-	-
Deloitte-TECO	7	1	14%	5	1	20%
DNV	164	17	10%	137	36	26%
ERM CVS	28	-	-	26	4	15%
EYG	3	1	33%	2	2	100%
GLC	27	5	19%	18	5	28%
ICONTEC	14	2	14%	11	5	45%
JACO	13	1	8%	8	1	13%
JCI	44	9	20%	28	6	21%
JQA	3	-	-	2	-	-
KECO	4	-	-	2	1	50%
KEMCO	12	2	17%	7	4	57%
KFQ	7	-	-	5	2	40%
KSA	3	-	-	3	1	33%
LRQA	41	5	12%	32	11	34%
PJRCES	6	-	-	3	1	33%
RINA	33	4	12%	26	7	27%
SGS	50	1	2%	44	10	23%
SIRIM	13	4	31%	7	5	71%
SQS	23	2	9%	18	8	44%
TÜV NORD	128	21	16%	92	30	33%
TÜV Rheinland	82	15	18%	55	10	18%
TÜV SÜD	59	5	8%	43	13	30%

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

Table 3: Reasons for returning requests for registration

Completenes Check (CC)		Information and Reporting Check (I&RC)	
Category	**Occurrence**	**Category**	**Occurrence**
Incomplete documentation	56	Additionality	238
Incomplete information	28	Baseline methodology	128
Inconsistent information	89	Monitoring methodology	19
Other	10	LoA	2
		DOE's related issues	23
		Other	137
Total Occurrences	***183***		***547***

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

Table 4: Issues for returning during CC								
	Number of requests returned							
	Incomplete documentation		Incomplete information		Inconsistent information		Other	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
AENOR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Applus	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BVCH	12	43%	2	7%	12	43%	2	7%
CEC	1	25%	-	-	3	75%	-	-
CQC	-	-	-	-	1	100%	-	-
CRA	-	-	1	100%	-	-	-	-
Deloitte-TECO	1	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNV	6	30%	3	15%	11	55%	-	-
ERM CVS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
EYG	-	-	1	100%	-	-	-	-
GLC	4	44%	-	-	3	33%	2	22%
ICONTEC	-	-	4	80%	1	20%	-	-
JACO	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	-	-
JCI	4	24%	4	24%	9	53%	-	-
JQA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KECO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KEMCO	2	67%	-	-	1	33%	-	-
KFQ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KSA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LRQA	2	25%	1	13%	5	63%	-	-
PJRCES	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RINA	3	38%	1	13%	3	38%	1	13%
SGS	-	-	-	-	1	100%	-	-
SIRIM	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	2	40%
SQS	-	-	2	100%	-	-	-	-
TÜV NORD	11	32%	3	9%	18	53%	2	6%
TÜV Rheinland	5	21%	3	13%	15	63%	1	4%
TÜV SÜD	2	29%	1	14%	4	57%	-	-

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

Table 5: Issues for returning during I&RC

	Number of reasons returned												
	Additionality		Baseline methodology		Monitoring methodology		LoA		DOE's related issues		Other		TOTAL
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
AENOR	13	62%	2	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	29%	**21**
BVCH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**
CEC	30	57%	7	13%	1	2%	-	-	6	11%	9	17%	**53**
CQC	4	40%	3	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	30%	**10**
Deloitte-TECO	2	22%	1	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	67%	**9**
DNV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**
ERM CVS	1	33%	1	33%	-	-	-	-	1	33%	-	-	**3**
EYG	30	30%	32	32%	3	3%	-	-	-	-	36	36%	**101**
GLC	2	33%	1	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	50%	**6**
ICONTEC	1	17%	-	-	2	33%	1	17%	-	-	2	33%	**6**
JACO	4	50%	1	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	38%	**8**
JCI	9	50%	5	28%	1	6%	-	-	-	-	3	17%	**18**
KECO	6	86%	-	-	1	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	**7**
KEMCO	10	59%	4	24%	-	-	-	-	2	12%	1	6%	**17**
KFQ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100%	**1**
KSA	5	56%	2	22%	-	-	-	-	2	22%	-	-	**9**
LRQA	4	67%	-	-	1	17%	-	-	-	-	1	17%	**6**
PJRCES	-	-	2	50%	2	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	**4**
RINA	20	57%	7	20%	1	3%	-	-	2	6%	5	14%	**35**
SGS	-	-	1	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**1**
SIRIM	9	43%	4	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	38%	**21**
SQS	14	44%	8	25%	3	9%	-	-	1	3%	6	19%	**32**
TÜV NORD	11	50%	8	36%	1	5%	-	-	-	-	2	9%	**22**
TÜV Rheinland	8	23%	9	26%	-	-	-	-	3	9%	15	43%	**35**
TÜV SÜD	33	49%	15	22%	2	3%	1	1%	5	7%	12	18%	**68**

History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision
01.0	20 June 2012	Further to EB 54 Annex 28, paragraphs 14 &16.
Decision Class:Ruling **Document Type**:Information Note **Business Function**: Registration		

Appendix1

Reasons for returning requests for registration during CC stage.

Stage 1: Completenes Check						
#	**PA**	**Project Title**	**DOE**	**Category**	**Reason**	**Comment**
1	**5073**	**Henan Hongtai Fuel Switching from Coal to Combustible Gas in Boilers for Heat Generation Project**	TÜV Rheinland	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the parties accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular on page 2 of the Validation report Annex 1 party is indicated as The Netherlands where as on page 3 it is Finland.
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to ensure that the letter of approval/authorization (LoA) of the host party acknowledges the project to be a bundled project as per paragraph 10 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	
2	**4605**	**Dala River Estuary Hydropower Plant, Diebu County, Gansu Province**	JCI	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the methodology/activity scale accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In doing so please clarify the applied methodology as the project view page shows ACM0002 version 12 while the validation report Table 2 (CAR 5) and Appendix B indicate ACM0002 version 11 and ACM0002 version 7 respectively.
3	**3816**	**Guanaquitas 9.74 MW Hydroelectric project**	ICONTEC	Incomplete information	The DOE is requested to provide English version of following documents as requested by paragraph 9 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	PDD Annex 5 (not listed in table of contents): no English translation of Spanish letters available.
				Incomplete information	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.	Financial analysis spreadsheet: not replicable, figures partly not viewable; Appendix 1: not replicable; Appendix 2: no formula in sheet "Table for PDD".
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	Geo-coordinates different from project view page and VR.

4	**5124**	**Installation of Natural gas based direct combined heat and power package cogeneration system in India**	SGS	Inconsistent information	There are inconsistencies related to the project data among the documents submitted. The DOE is requested to address these inconsistencies accordingly as per paragraph 9 (d) of EB 48, Annex 60.	According to the PDD and the project view page the crediting period is 7 years renewable whereas according to the PDD published for stakeholder consultation the crediting period is 10 years fixed. The Validation Report does not provide an explanation for this change and is itself inconsistent in regard to the crediting period (p. 6: 7 years renewable; p. 38 and p. 65: 10 years fixed).
5	**5028**	**CANELA II WIND FARM PROJECT**	BVCH	Incomplete information	The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on additionality as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	
				Other	The DOE is requested to merge the letters of approval/authorization (LoA) issued by the same country and upload as one file.	
6	**5120**	**Organic Waste Composting at Takon Palm Oil Mill, Malaysia**	TÜV Rheinland	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the parties accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The MoC document indicated Cayman Islands as a Party whereas the uploaded Letters of Approval are from Malaysia and UK.
7	**5181**	**Zhurihe Phase I 49.5MW Wind Farm Project in Xilingol League, Inner Mongolia**	GLC	Other	The DOE is requested to merge the letters of approval/authorization (LoA) issued by the same county and upload as one file.	The LoA from the UK for Noble Carbon Ltd is not submitted nor is it merged with the LoA for Climate Bridge Ltd.
				Other	The following document contains missing information:	Validation report: It is not possible to determine whether Table 3-1 is complete. From page 31 to page 53 it appears that the column 'final conclusion' is missing from the table.

				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective validation report to the project view page as requested by paragraph 8 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	Inside cover page confirms the report has 119 pages. Only 106 pages have been submitted.
				Incomplete documentation	The PP/DOE are requested to upload the respective PDD to the project view page as requested by paragraph 8 (a) of EB 48 Annex 60.	See Annex 2: the UNFCCC logo and page numbering are not right aligned (minor issue).
8	**4760**	**Bundled Wind Power Project in Tamil Nadu, India, co-ordinated by Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Association (TASMA-II)**	SIRIM	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In doing so please ensure that the relevant parts in section 3 and Annex 1 of the MoC are duly filled.
				Incomplete information	The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on additionality as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In doing so please provide the spreadsheet containing the levelized cost of electricity generation analysis for the 800 kW, 850 kW and 1,500 kW turbine capacites.
9	**5154**	**Shanxi Linfen 2×6MW Coke Oven Gas Power Generation Project**	LRQA	Incomplete information	The DOE is requested to provide English version of following documents as requested by paragraph 9 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In the spreadsheets "02.a IRR without CER" and "02.b IRR with CER" no English translations are available for cells A30-37 and B29-B36 of "Balance Sheet", A31-A34 of "Cost Expense" sheet, B23 of "Application of Fund" sheet and A28 of "Cost Evaluation" sheet.
10	**5133**	**CGN Guangdong Guanghai Wind Power Project**	LRQA	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The Geo-coordinates of the project sites are not provided in the validation report .
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	Please note that the submitted MoC doesn't contain the full name of the authorized signatory in Section 3.
11	**5142**	**The Colomba-Guabal Landfill Gas Project**	SQS	Incomplete information	The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on additionality as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	The investment analysis spreadsheet has not been submitted along with the request for registration.

12	5167	**Rice husk based Cogeneration Projects at a cluster of rice mills, India**	TÜV Rheinland	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to ensure that the letter of approval/authorization (LoA) of the host party acknowledges the project to be a bundled project as per paragraph 10 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	LoA doesn't acknowledges the project to be a bundled project
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	M/s Solutions, First Climate (India) Pvt. Ltd., however DOE has highlighted it in CAR-01 of VR
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	30,871 TCo2
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the methodology/activity scale accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	AMS-I.C. ver.16, however DOE has highlighted it CAR-02 of VR
13	4946	**Jilin Baicheng ChaganHot Wind Farm Phase II Project**	DNV	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular, two entities have been appointed as focal point for sole role, however when a focal point entity is sole for all scopes, no other entity should be mentioned. Please refer to EB 45, Annex 59, paragraph 6. In doing so, please also make sure that full name of authorised signatory is included in section 3 of the MoC.
14	5183	**Lao Cai-Yen Bai Bundled Hydropower Project**	TÜV NORD	Incomplete information	The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on the determination of baseline as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	
15	5107	**Gansu Province Yangtian and Hanjiashan Bundled 4.89MW Small Hydropower Project**	JCI	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	Please provide the coordinates validated by the DOE.
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project starting date accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	Only the starting date of Yangtian project has been validated. It is not clear how the starting date of another sub-bundle project has been validated.

16	**4928**	**Huaneng Changyi Phase II Wind Farm Project**	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective registration request form to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (f) and 10 (e) of EB 48 Annex 60.	
17	**5229**	**Wuwei Fengle Solar PV Power Project (Phase I) in Gansu Province**	JCI	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In the project view page and the registration request form no project participants from Switzerland are mentioned; in the PDD published for stakeholder consultation, the validation report, and the LoA from China only one of two project participants from Switzerland (namely Climate Protection Invest AG) is mentioned.
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the parties accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	Switzerland (annex I party) is not mentioned in the project view page and in the registration request form.
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload a valid letter of approval/authorization (LoA) from the other party to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (c) and (d) and 10 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	The DOE has not uploaded the LoA from Switzerland.
18	**5175**	**Awa and Binwa Small Hydro Power Projects in Kangra District of Himachal Pradesh, India**	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload a valid letter of approval/authorization (LoA) from the host party to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (c) and (d) and 10 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project starting date between the PDD (14/12/2006), PDD-GSC (18/12/2006) and Validation Report (18/12/2006) accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	
19	**5173**	**Yichun Xinqing Laobaishan Windpark First Stage 30MW Wind Power Project**	TÜV Rheinland	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project title accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular the project title provided in the submitted Modalities of Communication should be fully consistent with all other project documentation.

20	**5240**	**Windu Nabatindo Lestari Co-Composting Project**	DNV	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions between the PDD (66,492 CO2) and the rest of the documents submitted (70,923 CO2) accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	
21	**5253**	**Loma Negra vertical roller mill project**	DNV	Incomplete information	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.	Sheets "base case and sensitivity" and "Hypothetical scenario BM 55th" cells B62, C62, B66 and C66 of Investment comparison spreadsheet contain links to unknown file.
22	**5258**	**Xeset II Hydropower Project**	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	The PP/DOE are requested to upload the respective PDD to the project view page as requested by paragraph 8 (a) of EB 48 Annex 60.	
23	**5265**	**Oceanium mangrove restoration project**	EYG	Incomplete information	The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on the determination of baseline as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	
24	**5219**	**1.6 MW Bundled Rice Husk Based Cogeneration Plant by M/s Milkfood Limited in Patiala (Punjab) & Moradabad (U.P) Districts**	TÜV NORD	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	Title of the CDM Project activity is not included in the Section 1 - Project Details and Annex 1 from the MoC
25	**3992**	**Shuangyang Waste Heat Recovery and Power Generation Project in Jilin Yatai Cement Co., Ltd.**	JCI	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project starting date between PDD-GSC (15.03.2008) and the rest of the documents submitted (12.02.2008) accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location between the PDD-GSC and the PDD as well as the project view page accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	Also the validation report does not indicate exact project location and geo-coordinates of the project site. Please provide information on the geo coordinates of the project location.

				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular the uploaded MoC is not complete.
				Incomplete documentation	The PP/DOE are requested to upload the respective PDD to the project view page as requested by paragraph 8 (a) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular, the uploaded PDD-Confidential contains track changes. Please submit a clean final version.
26	**5308**	**3.6 MW renewable energy based power generation in Rajasthan, India**	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to ensure that the letter of approval/authorization (LoA) of the host party acknowledges the project to be a bundled project as per paragraph 10 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	
27	**5298**	**Hainan Nanzhonghe II & III Bundled Hydropower Project**	GLC	Incomplete documentation	The PP/ DOE is requested to upload the respective bundling form to the project view page as per paragraph 8 of EB 34 Annex 10.	
28	**5274**	**Xinjiang Xinneng Daqiao Small-Scale Hydropower Project**	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload a valid letter of approval/authorization (LoA) from the host party to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (c) and (d) and 10 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular a wrong LoA has been uploaded.
29	**5288**	**Yunnan Niulangou Hydropower Project**	TÜV Rheinland	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	According to page 2 of the validation report, China is not considered a project participant. This is inconsistent with what is indicated in the PDD and in the project view page.
30	**5278**	**Rajasthan Lighting Energy Efficiency Project (RLEEP) in 10 sub divisions of Jaipur City Circle of JVVNL, Rajasthan, India**	TÜV NORD	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The project project participant from India in the MoC is "Banyan Environmental Innovations Private Ltd", while the project project participant from India in the other documents is "Banyan Environmental Innovations Private Ltd, India".
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project starting date accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The VR page 2 mentions that the expected project start date as 01/11/2011, while the PDD mentions it as 01/08/2011.

				Inconsistent information	There are inconsistencies related to the project data among the documents submitted. The DOE is requested to address these inconsistencies accordingly as per paragraph 9 (d) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The VR page 2 refers to the initial PDD dated 09/09/2010, while the PDD for GSP is dated 13/09/2010.
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project title accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The project title in the Host Country Approval letter is "Rajasthan Lighting Energy Efficiency Project (RLEEP) in 10 sub divisions of Jaipur City Circle of JVVNL, Rajasthan, India", while the project title in the other documents is "Rajasthan Lighting Energy Efficiency Project (RLEEP) in 10 sub divisions of Jaipur City Circle of JVVNL, Rajasthan, Rajasthan, India".
31	**5256**	**#2 Steam Turbine Retrofit Project of Tianjin Guohua Panshan Power Plant Co., Ltd.**	JCI	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the parties accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular, the PDD and the validation report refer to Japan as the annex 1 party with Carbon Capital Management, Inc. as project participant. However, the project view page only refers to China as the only party. Furthermore, the LoA of Japan is wrongly uploaded as the authorization of China.
				Incomplete information	The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on the determination of baseline as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	The spreadsheet for the calculation of the baseline has not been submitted.
32	**5266**	**Sichuan Keguang 3rd Level Hydropower Project**	CEC	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details between the MoC (Arcadia Energy (Suisse) S.A. represented by Q.C.A. AG) and the rest of the documents submitted (Arcadia Energy (Suisse) S.A.) accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	
33	**4359**	**Mare Chicose Landfill Gas Project**	SQS	Incomplete information	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.	There is no formulas in the spreadsheets and the CERs are not there. Also the version of the ACM0002 ver 11 should be used and not version 8

34	**5138**	**Reduction of methane emissions in the gas distribution network of Armenia Republic**	BVCH	Inconsistent information	There are inconsistencies related to the project data among the documents submitted. In particular, following the resubmission of the request for registration, the start date of the crediting period in the PDD needs to be updated from 01/09/2011 to 01/12/2011, the date that is indicated in project view page. The DOE is requested to address these inconsistencies accordingly as per paragraph 9 (d) of EB 48, Annex 60.	
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60. In particular, Armenia and The Netherlands are not indicated as project participants in section A.3 of the PDD. This is inconsistent with the rest of the submitted documents as well as with the project view page.	
35	**5239**	**16.5 MW Wind Power Project in Surajbari, Gujarat**	TÜV NORD	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In both documents PDD last version and PDD GSC the coordinates are not consistent with the Project location document and validation report document.
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	MoC is not complete, The Annex I Party that authorizes the participation and Section 3 are missing.
36	**5338**	**Khe Giong Hydropower Plant, Vietnam**	GLC	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In the project view page, "Quang Trị" is mistakenly indicated as the project site; this needs to be changed to "Quang Tri".

				Inconsistent information	There are inconsistencies related to the project data among the documents submitted. In particular, the validation report refers to PDD version 1.5 of 11/07/2011, whereas the PDD submitted for request for registration is version 1.6 of 17/10/2011. Furthermore, the validation report is dated 14/10/2011 which is earlier than the date of the PDD submitted for request for registration (version 1.6 of 17/10/2011). The DOE is requested to address these inconsistencies accordingly as per paragraph 9 (d) of EB 48, Annex 60.	
37	**5373**	**Madinah Landfill Gas Capture Project**	BVCH	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the scope accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	Sectoral Scope 1 : Energy Industries (renewable/ non-renewable sources) should be added. (CAR 27 of Validation Report)
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective registration request form to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (f) and 10 (e) of EB 48 Annex 60.	Registration request form - The Sector in which Project Activity Falls is not updated, sectoral scope (1) Energy Industries (renewable/non-renewable sources) should be added (CAR 27 Validation Report).
38	**4986**	**Sichuan Zidazhai Hydropower Project**	GLC	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the parties accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular you have not responded to point 2 of the initial incomplete message, i.e. the inconsistency between the PDD, project view page, Validation Report, PDD-GSC and Registration request form related to the parties involvement as PDD, MoC and Validation Report mention China directly involved while Registration request form, PDD-GSC and the view page mention indirect involvement of the parties. Please respond accordingly.
39	**5370**	**1.50 MW Wind Power Project by JC Retail India Pvt. Ltd. Pune Maharashtra, India**	BVCH	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the methodology accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular the project view page refers to AMS-I.D. version 17 where as all other documents submitted refer to AMS-I.D. version 16.

40	**5365**	**Anhui Panjing Cement 18MW Waste Heat Recovery for Power Generation Project**	JCI	Incomplete information	The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on the determination of baseline as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	
41	**5350**	**Wind Power Project in Maharashtra by M/s Air Control (India) Pvt. Ltd.**	TÜV NORD	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	MOC information is incomplete: The Name of Entity in Section 2 - Focal points and in Annex 1 is missing.
42	**5369**	**Hebei Huafeng Coking Gas Recovery for Power Generation Project**	BVCH	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the methodology version between the PDD and Validation Report (ACM0012 version 3.2) and the project view page (ACM0012 version 4) accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	
				Incomplete information	The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on the determination of baseline as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular no emission reduction spreadsheet has been submitted.
43	**3816**	**Guanaquitas 9.74 MW Hydroelectric project**	ICONTEC	Incomplete information	The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on additionality as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular, there is Circular reference in Financial analysis spreadsheet, figures are partly not viewable.
				Incomplete information	The PP/DOE are requested to provide a disclosable version of the documents uploaded as confidential as per paragraph 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	Please note that the PDF version of the Financial analysis spreadsheet should be made publicly available.

44	**5382**	**Heilongjiang Yilan Hezuolinchang Wind Power Project**	DNV	Incomplete information	The DOE is requested to make the PDD uploaded for global stakeholder consultation publicly accessible as per paragraph 40 of EB 55 Annex 1.	The second version of the PDD published for global stakeholder consultation (PDD version 6 dated 15/01/2010), which the Validation Report consistently refers to, is not accessible. Only the first version of the PDD published for global stakeholder consultation (PDD version 2 dated 15/08/2007) is accessible. The DOE is requested to provide the relevant link and thereby make the 2nd version of the PDD published for global stakeholder consultation accessible.
45	**5378**	**Tongdao County Laorongtan Hydropower Station Project**	TÜV SÜD	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	
46	**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	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions between the PDD (13,410 CO2) Validation report and project view page (13,364 CO2) and the PDD-GSC (13,357 CO2) accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	
47	**4760**	**Bundled Wind Power Project in Tamil Nadu, India, co-ordinated by Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Association (TASMA-II)**	SIRIM	Other	The PP/ DOE are requested to apply a valid version of the methodology as required by paragraph 9(f) of EB 48 Annex 60. The methodology applied (ACM0002 ver. 11) is expired at the time of resubmission (10 November 2011). The DOE is therefore requested to update the methodology in the submitted documentation and on the project view page.	

48	**5416**	**Biogas Support Program - Nepal Activity-4**	TÜV NORD	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the parties involvement as the PDD and the LoA mention that Netherlands is directly involved while the project view page mention indirect involvement of the parties as required by Guidance 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	
49	**5415**	**Biogas Support Program - Nepal Activity-3**	TÜV NORD	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the parties involvement as the PDD and the LoA mention that Netherlands is directly involved while the project view page mention indirect involvement of the parties as required by Guidance 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	
50	**5276**	**Shankouyan 12MW Small Hydropower Project in Pingxiang City, Jiangxi Province, China**	Deloitte-TECO	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular, two entities have been appointed as focal point for sole role, however when a focal point entity is sole for all scopes, no other entity should be mentioned. Please refer to EB 45, Annex 59, paragraph 6.
51	**5401**	**Installation of wind power project in Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu**	LRQA	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular, the geo-coordinates indicated in the project view page are inconsistent with those indicated in the PDD and in the validation report. Furthermore, the format of the geo coordinates listed in section A.4.1.4., table A.1 of the PDD, which is replicated in section 4.2 of the validation report, is not apparent (i.e. degrees-minutes-seconds or in decimal).
52	**5266**	**Sichuan Keguang 3rd Level Hydropower Project**	CEC	Incomplete documentation	The PP/DOE are requested to upload the respective PDD to the project view page as requested by paragraph 8 (a) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular, the PP/DOE have used the PDD template for small scale projects for the uploaded PDD, although according to the project view page, the registration request form, and the validation report, the respective project is a large scale project.

				Inconsistent information		The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details stated in the Modalities of Communication form (section 3 - statement of agreement: "Q.C.A. AG acting on behalf of Arcadia Energy (Suisse) S.A."; section 2 - list of project participants: "Arcadia Energy (Suisse) S.A. represented by Q.C.A. AG") and the other submitted documents ("Arcadia Energy (Suisse) S.A.") accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60. In particular, section 3 of the Modalities of Communication form should only be signed by the project participant. Furthermore, the Modalities of Communication form needs to be dated.
53	**5433**	**Electricity generation using renewable wind energy**	LRQA	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to ensure that the letter of approval/authorization (LoA) of the host party includes statements on the following: the Kyoto Protocol ratification, voluntary participation, and sustainable development contribution as per paragraph 10 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	The letter of approval/authorization (LoA) from India does not include the statements the following: the Kyoto Protocol ratification, voluntary participation, and sustainable development contribution as per paragraph 10 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The coordinates provided in the PDD and Verification Report are consistent.
54	**5434**	**Marrakesh Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) with biogas recovery for cogeneration**	BVCH	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular the numerical value of the validated Emission Reduction in the Validation Report must be provided.
55	**5373**	**Madinah Landfill Gas Capture Project**	BVCH	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular the numerical value of the validated Emission Reduction in the Validation Report must be provided.
56	**5465**	**Mashan Wastewater Treatment Project**	TÜV SÜD	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The numerical value of the emission reduction in the PDD last version is not consistent with the Validation Report and Project view Page.

57	**4788**	**Cachoeirao CDM Project (JUN1092)**	RINA	Other	The PP/ DOE are requested to apply a valid version of the methodology as required by paragraph 9(f) of EB 48 Annex 60. The methodology applied is expired.	
58	**5486**	**Bundled 9.00 MW Wind Power Generation Project by Gangadhar Narsingdas Agrawal Group**	TÜV NORD	Incomplete documentation	The PP/ DOE is requested to upload the respective bundling form to the project view page as per paragraph 8 of EB 34 Annex 10.	Although the small-scale project is designated as a bundle as per the PDD, no bundling form has been submitted. The DOE is requested to clarify and submit the required form.
59	**5383**	**Malong River 1# Hydropower Project**	TÜV NORD	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	1. Kindly provide us with the respective modalities of communication (MoC) using only the sections concerned for the "primary authorized signatory" and "alternate authorized signatory" for the entity "Vitol S.A." involved party Switzerland. Please note that the section "primary authorized signatory" is displayed twice for two different contact person for the same entity.
60	**4966**	**Waste Energy Recovery Project at PEMEX TMDB**	TÜV NORD	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project starting date between the PDD (01.01.2012) and the Validation report (01.10.2011 on page 62 and 01.01.2012 on page 2) accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	
				Incomplete information	The DOE is requested to provide English version of following documents as requested by paragraph 9 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular Appendix 1 sheets Elec Gene 2006, 2007, Jan-Jul 2008 and Jul-Dec 2008 are in Spanish.
61	**5237**	**Anhui Laian Longtougang Wind Power Project**	DNV	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective registration request form to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (f) and 10 (e) of EB 48 Annex 60.	
62	**5488**	**BRASCARBON Methane Recovery Project BCA-BRA-10.**	DNV	Inconsistent information	There are inconsistencies related to the project data among the documents submitted. The DOE is requested to address these inconsistencies accordingly as per paragraph 9 (d) of EB 48, Annex 60.	LoA refers to an old PDD version (v.2 01/03/2010) and to a previous Validation Report (v.1 30/03/2010)

63	**5484**	**BRASCARBON Methane Recovery Project BCA-BRA-04A.**	DNV	Inconsistent information	There are inconsistencies related to the project data among the documents submitted. The DOE is requested to address these inconsistencies accordingly as per paragraph 9 (d) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The LoA document refers to an old PDD version (v.3 01/03/2010) and to a previous Validation Report (v.1 26/03/2010)
64	**5478**	**BRASCARBON Methane Recovery Project BCA-BRA-06A.**	DNV	Inconsistent information	There are inconsistencies related to the project data among the documents submitted. The DOE is requested to address these inconsistencies accordingly as per paragraph 9 (d) of EB 48, Annex 60.	LoA document refers to an old PDD version (v.4 , 01/March/2010) and to a previous Validation report (v.01, 29/March/2010)
65	**5498**	**Inner Mongolia Datang International Hongmu Phase II Wind Farm Project**	TÜV Rheinland	Incomplete information	The DOE is requested to provide English version of following documents as requested by paragraph 9 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	Kindly provide the English version of the worksheet "Electricity exchange_06~08", submitted in the excel file "Appendix 1 - IRR & ER calculation_IM Hongmu (188 KB)"
66	**5568**	**Rhodia Nuoc Trong Biogas Capture & Utilization Project, Vietnam**	RINA	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload a valid letter of approval/authorization (LoA) from the host party to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (c) and (d) and 10 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	The Letter of Approval uploaded belongs to the Other Parties involved
				Incomplete information	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.	Worksheets are protected
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload a valid letter of approval/authorization (LoA) from the other party to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (c) and (d) and 10 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	The Letter of Approval uploaded belongs to the Host Party involved.
67	**5492**	**BRASCARBON Methane Recovery Project BCA-BRA-09.**	DNV	Inconsistent information	There are inconsistencies related to the project data among the documents submitted. The DOE is requested to address these inconsistencies accordingly as per paragraph 9 (d) of EB 48, Annex 60.	LoA refers to an old PDD version (version 04 01/03/2010) and to a previous Validation Report (v.01 30/03/2010)

				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the methodology/activity scale accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	AMS-III.D. ver 15
68	**5496**	**BRASCARBON Methane Recovery Project BCA-BRA-14.**	DNV	Inconsistent information	There are inconsistencies related to the project data among the documents submitted. The DOE is requested to address these inconsistencies accordingly as per paragraph 9 (d) of EB 48, Annex 60.	LoA refers to an older PDD (version 03 01/03/2010) and to a previous Validation Report (revision 01 30/03/2010)
69	**5574**	**AzDRES Energy Efficiency Improvement**	DNV	Incomplete information	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.	The uploaded spreadsheet in sheet "Financial Analysis" contains link to external files. For example in cells F8 to Y8.
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective registration request form to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (f) and 10 (e) of EB 48 Annex 60.	The request for registration form is not signed.
70	**5433**	**Electricity generation using renewable wind energy**	LRQA	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The emission reductions in the PDD-GSC is 13,810 tCO2e. The revised PDD v. 5.1 states emission reduction to be 12,600 tCO2e. The DOE is requested to explain the reason for this difference in the emission reductions and revise the validation report accordingly.
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The LoA issued by the DNA (11 May 2011) mentions the location of the project as, village: Budh, taluka: Khatao, district: Satara. The PDD-GSC refers to Budh village, Khatao taluka and Satara district for the wind turbines Sh-4, Sh-5, Sh-6, Sh-7, Sh-9 and N5. However, the revised PDD v.5.1 mentions different location details for the same set of wind turbines, which are, village: Garalewadi, Devikhindi, Taraswadi, taluka: Khatav, Khanapur and district: Satara, Sangli.

71	**5580**	**Guizhou Huidong Hydropower Project**	DNV	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	Page 3 of 5 of the Modalities of Communication was not submitted; the contact details and signature of the focal point for the entity "Guizhou Mengjiang Valley Development Co., Ltd." were not included.
72	**5509**	**Guangdong Yudean Xuwen Yongshi 49.5MW Wind Power Project in Zhanjiang City, Guangdong Province**	TÜV NORD	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	MoC section 2 - Nomination of Focal Points is not complete. Joint Focal Point needs an authorized signature of ALL entities.
73	**5508**	**Malong River 3# Hydropower Project**	TÜV NORD	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	GSC refers to a different amount of CERs vs PDD and Web, this change is highlighted in CAR 1, page 26 of the VR
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	1. Kindly provide us with the respective modalities of communication (MoC) using only the sections concerned for the "primary authorized signatory" and "alternate authorized signatory" for the entity "Vitol S.A." involved party Switzerland. Please note that the section "primary authorized signatory" is displayed twice for two different contact person for the same entity.
74	**5138**	**Reduction of methane emissions in the gas distribution network of Armenia Republic**	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular, the DOE is requested to indicate the parties authorizing the respective project participants in Annex I of the MoC.
				Inconsistent information	There are inconsistencies related to the project data among the documents submitted. The DOE is requested to address these inconsistencies accordingly as per paragraph 9 (d) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular, the spreadsheet for the calculation of the emission reductions has not been updated with the revised crediting period dates and revised annual average amount of emission reductions.
75	**5494**	**BRASCARBON Methane Recovery Project BCA-BRA-13**	DNV	Inconsistent information	There are inconsistencies related to the project data among the documents submitted. The DOE is requested to address these inconsistencies accordingly as per paragraph 9 (d) of EB 48, Annex 60.	LoA refers to a an older version (version 04 01/03/2010) and to a previous Validation Report (rev. 01 30/03/2010)

76	**5411**	**Yunnan Chahe 3rd Level Hydropower Project**	TÜV Rheinland	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to ensure that the version of the methodology being applied is valid at the point of submission accordingly as per paragraph 9(f) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular, the grace period for the submission of requests for registration applying the expired methodology AMS-I.D. version 16 will end on 17 February 2012. The DOE is therefore requested to ensure that a valid methodology version is applied at the time of resubmission.
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload a valid Modalities of Communication form (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	The uploaded MoC is invalid because both the name of the entity from the United Kingdom and the party authorizing the project participant from the United Kingdom are missing in Annex I, Section 2 ("List of project participants").
				Inconsistent information	There are inconsistencies related to the project data among the documents submitted. The DOE is requested to address these inconsistencies accordingly as per paragraph 9 (d) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular, the start date of the crediting period in the project view page should be revised in order to be consistent with the start date indicated in the PDD and in the Validation Report.
77	**5412**	**Shanxi Shuozhou Pinglu Dashantai Wind Farm Project (Phase I)**	TÜV Rheinland	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular, the DOE is requested to indicate the exact locations of the 33 wind turbines, which are provided in the project view page (uploaded file "Coordinates of wind turbines"), in the PDD as well.
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project title accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular, the project title indicated in the request for registration form ("... Dataishan ...") is inconsistent with the rest of the submitted documents and with the project view page.
78	**5633**	**Liaoning Jianping Longgang Wind Power Project**	TÜV NORD	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular, in the project view page, the request for registration form, and the validation report, China is not indicated as a project participant (i.e. indirect involvement), whereas in the PDD (section A.3 and annex 1), the modalities of communication (MoC), and (indirectly ("China Resources Wind Power (Jianping) Co., Ltd. is permitted to transfer all CERs generated by this project into China's national account")) in the letter of approval (LoA), China is indicated as a project participant (i.e. direct involvement).

79	5585	**Aberdare Range/ Mt. Kenya Small Scale Reforestation Initiative Kibaranyeki Small Scale A/R Project**	JACO	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	PDD version 04.2 (12/02/2011), page 14, refers to the total estimated net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks as 148,539 tCO2e. However, "Appendix 3 - No.2 TARASM_PDD4_Kibaranyeki", Worksheets "CERs" and "Aexa" refer to the amount of 163,290 tCO2e. Kindly address this inconsistency.
				Incomplete information	The DOE is requested to provide the geo-coordinates of the project site in the project view page, either by direct input or uploading a file containing the respective information.	The DOE is requested to include in the project view page the location details presented in Table 3 of the "Supporting project Information" of the PDD.
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload a valid letter of approval/authorization (LoA) from the host party to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (c) and (d) and 10 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	This is only a request for future submissions: The DOE and Project Participants are kindly requested to provide Letter of Approvals which fully display the project title of the project activity. Please note that the LoA from Kenya does not display the complete name of the project activity. We understand that the clarification to this discrepancy has been noted in the Validation Report, version 3, page 6 and supporting documents. Please note that the Registry team has been informed accordingly of the above.
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	The DOE and Project Participants are kindly requested to use the approved "Modalities of Communication" avoiding modifications to the document itself (e.g. copy and paste of sections of "primary signatory")
80	4622	**Henan Taiyangshi 5MW Cement Waste Heat Recovery Project**	TÜV Rheinland	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective registration request form to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (f) and 10 (e) of EB 48 Annex 60.	Kindly revise the date in the registration request form with the re-submission request.
				Other	The PP/ DOE are requested to apply a valid version of the methodology as required by paragraph 9(f) of EB 48 Annex 60. The methodology applied is expired.	Kindly re-submit the documentation concerned reflecting the latest version of the methodologies applied for this request for registration.

81	**5001**	**3 MW Grid connected Wind Electricity Generation at Tirunelveli District, Tamil Nadu, India**	TÜV NORD	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the methodology scale accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60. In particular, the DOE is requested to ensure that the version of the methodology being applied is valid at the point of submission accordingly as per paragraph 9(f) of EB 48 Annex 60.	Since the grace period for the submission of requests for registration applying the expired methodology AMS-I.D. version 16 will end on 17 February 2012 the DOE is requested to ensure that a valid methodology version will be applied at the time of resubmission.
				Inconsistent information	There are inconsistencies related to the project data among the documents submitted. The DOE is requested to address these inconsistencies accordingly as per paragraph 9 (d) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular, the emission reductions amount indicated in the PDD and in the project view page is inconsistent with the one indicated in the CER spreadsheet, which has not been updated since the last submission.
82	**5308**	**3.6 MW renewable energy based power generation in Rajasthan, India**	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular the DOE is requested to include the name of the entity in section 2 p. 1(focal point) of the MoC.
83	**5601**	**Ta Loi 3 Hydropower Project**	KEMCO	Incomplete documentation	The PP/DOE are requested to upload the respective PDD to the project view page as requested by paragraph 8 (a) of EB 48 Annex 60.	The template used in the submitted PDD Version 4.0, dated 19/12/201 refers to large scale projects. However, this request for registration is for a small scale project activity. Therefore, the respective PDD template for small scale projects should be "CDM SSC PDD"
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The DOE is requested to include in the Validation Report the information related to the longitude and latitude coordinates of this project activity.
84	**5465**	**Mashan Wastewater Treatment Project**	TÜV SÜD	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The numerical value of the validated Emission reduction in the Project view Page - workflow (29,350 TCO2) is not consistent with the PDD last version and Validation Report (28,675 TCO2)

85	**5529**	**Electricity generation through wind power project at Jaora-MP & Tenkasi-TN**	TÜV NORD	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular project participant is inconsistent within the Validation report (M/S EnKing International on p.7 and CAR-A2) as well as PDD-GSC (Sumer Builders, Sumer Corporation, Gourav Star, Fine Star Diamonds Sharad Dnyanoba Kharade).
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular section 3 and Annex 1 of the MoC should be signed by the same Project Participants.
86	**4136**	**Kangbao Zhaoyanghe Wind Farm Project**	CEC	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The annual net electricity generation provided in the worksheet "EF(CM)& ER calculation" is not consistent with the values provided in the PDD, version 01.1, dated 25/11/2011.
87	**5679**	**Inner Mongolia Chifeng Wenggenshan 49.5MW Wind Farm Project**	CQC	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project title accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The project title in the MoC (Inner Mongolia Jingneng Huitengxile Wind Farm Phase II Project) it is not consistent with the project view page and the documents provided.
88	**5595**	**Yunnan Jiduhe Cascade IV Hydropower Project**	TÜV Rheinland	Incomplete information	The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on the determination of baseline as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	The DOE is requested to submit the corresponding spreadsheet of the project IRR (6.6%) calculation as project view page only shows two (2) spreadsheets, Appendix 1 and 2 for EF data and ER calculation.
89	**5519**	**Malong River 2# Hydropower Project**	TÜV NORD	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the methodology/activity scale accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	Please note that the first submitted PDD, version 3, dated 30/11/2009 refers to version 10 of the methodology ACM0002, and not to version 11 of the methodology ACM0002 as described in page 25 of the Validation Report, finding B10, CAR 1 which confirms updated information to version 12 of the methodology ACM0002.
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project starting date accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The Validation Report page 2, refers to the expected project starting date as of 01/01/2012. However, the Validation Report refers throughout the document to the starting date as of 01/09/2010. The revised PDD (v. 7, 13/12/2011) also refers to the starting date of the project as of 01/09/2010 (the signature date of Construction contract for tunnel project)

				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The DOE is requested to include information/clarification in the Validation Report regarding the changes to the calculation results between the PDD version 3, dated 30/11/2009 (42,523) and the revised PDD version 7, 13/12/2011 (38,459).
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	(a) Kindly provide us with the respective modalities of communication (MoC) using only the sections concerned for the "primary authorized signatory" and "alternate authorized signatory" for the entity "Vitol S.A." involved party Switzerland. Please note that the section "primary authorized signatory" is displayed twice for two different contact person for the same entity.
90	**5634**	**Advanced swine manure treatment for the Huasco Valley Agroindustry**	DNV	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project starting date accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	Validation report refers to the Starting project activity 19 May 2006 that is inconsistent with the PDD (16 May 2006)
91	**4855**	**Kim Hock Biomass Energy and Wood Recycling Plant**	SIRIM	Other	The PP/ DOE are requested to apply a valid version of the methodology as required by paragraph 9(f) of EB 48 Annex 60. The methodology applied is expired.	The methodolgy applied (AMS-I.C. ver 17) is expired. The PP/ DOE are requested to apply a valid version of the methodology.
92	**5297**	**Nanhai MSW Incineration II Project**	GLC	Incomplete documentation	The PP/DOE are requested to upload the respective PDD to the project view page as requested by paragraph 8 (a) of EB 48 Annex 60.	PDD version 10, 18/07/2011 (Amount of reductions 177,521 TCO2) , however Validation report refers to PDD last version 11 dated 06/01/2012.
93	**5434**	**Marrakesh Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) with biogas recovery for cogeneration**	BVCH	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In Particular in the MOC - Section 3 Statement of Agreement: Focal Points entities who are not project participants should not sign Section 3, this is intented for project participant only .
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective validation report to the project view page as requested by paragraph 8 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	The Validation Report document (PDF) is corrupted and therefore cannot be open.

94	**5498**	**Inner Mongolia Datang International Hongmu Phase II Wind Farm Project**	TÜV Rheinland	Incomplete information	The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on additionality as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	IRR spreadsheet calculation has not been attached
95	**5609**	**20 MW Xuzhou Xiexin Photovoltaic Solar Power Plant**	JCI	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the parties accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	
96	**5712**	**CGN Ningxia Qingtongxia Phase I 10MWp Grid-connected Solar PV Power Generation Project**	RINA	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular the DOE is requested to include the Party name (China) in the corresponding section of the Annex 1 of the Modalities of Communication.
97	**5716**	**Gansu Jinta Photovoltaic Power Project**	JCI	Incomplete information	The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on additionality as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	No spreadsheets provided by the Doe for the calculation of additionality and investment analysis
				Incomplete information	The PP/DOE are requested to provide relevant information on the determination of baseline as appendices to the PDD as requested by paragraphs 8 (g) and 9 (b) of EB 48 Annex 60.	No spreadsheets provided by the Doe for the baseline calculation
98	**5744**	**Yunnan Lincang Qianxin Small Hydropower Project**	JCI	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective registration request form to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (f) and 10 (e) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular, the DOE is requested to duly complete the registration request form. The submitted form is invalid because the names of the project participants are not indicated in the respective section.
99	**5436**	**CO2 Removal and Liquefaction from the H2 Production Plant in Campana, Argentina**	CRA	Incomplete information	The DOE is requested to provide English version of following documents as requested by paragraph 9 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular Appendix 2-Argentina Grid EF Excel version is in Spanish.
100	**5662**	**HPP Ashta**	TÜV SÜD	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular Annex 1 of the MoC states Austria as authorized party for VERBUND Hydro Power AG and EVN AG, where as it is authorized by Albania.

101	**5682**	**Sichuan Zhaojue County Bundled Hydro Project**	TÜV Rheinland	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project title between the project view page and registration request form (Zhaojue County Bundled Hydro Project) and the rest of the documents submitted (Sichuan Zhaojue County Bundled Hydro Project) accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular, the location of each bundle project should be clearly specified in the view page.
102	**5412**	**Shanxi Shuozhou Pinglu Dashantai Wind Farm Project (Phase I)**	TÜV Rheinland	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project title accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular, the project title indicated in the request for registration form ("...Dataishan...") is inconsistent with the rest of the submitted documents and with the project view page.
103	**4836**	**Heilongjiang Wanyuan Biomass Cogeneration Project**	DNV	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload a valid letter of approval/authorization (LoA) from the other party to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (c) and (d) and 10 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	As this project has more than one PP authorized by the same Party (Finland), we would appreciate if you could combine the LoA files and upload them as one continuous pdf document under the same Party in the relevant section of the registration form (i.e., instead of choosing "Add a Party", please choose "Add a participant" under Finland and ensure that all LoAs are combined into one pdf when uploaded. This ensures that statistics involving Parties in the CDM database are accurate.
104	**4406**	**ERH – Biogas recovery, heat and electricity generation from effluents ponds in Honduras**	RINA	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project location accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The GEO coordinates from the project view page are not consistent with the PDD last version and Validation report.
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the methodology/activity scale accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	Methodology AMS-III.H. ver 16 should be updated in the project view. PDD last version and Validation Report refers to this version 16.

				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The emission reductions amount in the project view page 35,538 TCO2 is not consistent with the PDD last version and Validation Report (38,685 TCO2)
105	**5770**	**Buseruka Mini Hydro Power Plant**	DNV	Inconsistent information	There are inconsistencies related to the project data among the documents submitted. The DOE is requested to address these inconsistencies accordingly as per paragraph 9 (d) of EB 48, Annex 60.	(a) The VR page 26 mentions that the PDD version 02 is dated 10/02/2010, whereas in page 3 reference /1/ mentions the PDD version 02 is dated 27/07/2010;
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	The MOC is not readable. The information about the focal point is not clearly displayed.
106	**5707**	**Sichuan Xiangcheng Mayi River Second Dieshui Hydropower Project**	TÜV Rheinland	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular the alternate authorised signatory must sign the form as well in section 2 and Annex 1 of the MoC. Also in section 3 the Full name of authorised signatory from China must be included.
107	**5709**	**Hunan Daxing Small Hydropower Project**	TÜV Rheinland	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The project participant "ecolutions Trading GmbH" has not been included in the project view page along with the LoA concerned, under "Other Parties Involved" from United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
108	**3108**	**Sichuan Liangshan Huidong Yanba Bundled Hydro Power Project**	TÜV SÜD	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular there are inconsistencies between the MoC and the PDD-GSC (Huidong County Guangyman Power Development Co., Ltd) and the rest of the documents submitted (Sichuan Huidong County Guangyman Power Development Co., Ltd).
				Incomplete information	The DOE is requested to provide English version of following documents as requested by paragraph 9 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular, the spreadsheet in Appendix 1-Enclosure is in Chinese.
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the methodology/activity scale accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48,	In particular there is inconsistency in Methodology version between the PDD (ACM0002 version 12), PDD-GSC (ACM0002 version 7) and the project view page (ACM0002 version 10).

					Annex 60.	
109	**5481**	**Huadian Inner Mongolia Tongliao Kailu Jieji Wind Farm Project**	TÜV NORD	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular section 3 and Annex 1 of the MoC should be signed by the same Project Participants.
110	**4120**	**Inner Mongolia Eergetu Phase I Wind Farm Project**	TÜV NORD	Other	The PP/ DOE are requested to apply a valid version of the methodology as required by paragraph 9(f) of EB 48 Annex 60. The methodology applied is expired.	
111	**5731**	**Biomass based power plant in Batu Pahat in Johor state, Malaysia**	BVCH	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	In particular the Japanese project participant is not consistent throughout the Validation report. (Page 36 refers to Mitsui & Co. Ltd) .
				Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular section 3 of the MoC should be signed by all project participant. Please note that Mr. Atsuhi Yoshida has not signed section 3.
				Other	The following document contains blank pages:	Validation report page 112.
112	**5461**	**Fatima N2O Abatement Project**	TÜV NORD	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project participants details accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	Kindly revise Annex 1 in the MoC, page 5: The entity "Fatima Fertilizer Company Limited" states to be authorized by the Party "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland". Please note that the contact details of the above information is entered twice in Annex 1 (see pages 4 and 5).
				Incomplete information	The DOE is requested to provide English version of following documents as requested by paragraph 9 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	The revised PDD, version 02.1, dated 20/01/2012, page 24, refers to a formula information which was not transmitted. Rather, a sentence in German language was provided. Kindly insert the formula referring to the paragraph "Project Emissions"..."Formula xxx is applied for the determination of the parameter..."

113	**5692**	**Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan's Landfill Gas Project**	DNV	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload a valid letter of approval/authorization (LoA) from the other party to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (c) and (d) and 10 (c) of EB 48 Annex 60.	As this project has more than one PP authorized by the same Party (Finland), we would appreciate if you could combine the LoA files and upload them as one continuous pdf document under the same Party in the relevant section of the registration form (i.e., instead of choosing "Add a Party", please choose "Add a participant" under Finland and ensure that all LoAs are combined into one pdf when uploaded. This ensures that statistics involving Parties in the CDM database are accurate.
114	**5546**	**9.75 MW wind power project in Southern India**	TÜV NORD	Other	The PP/ DOE are requested to apply a valid version of the methodology as required by paragraph 9(f) of EB 48 Annex 60.	Please note that by the time of resubmission the methodology applied should be updated.
				Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address inconsistencies in the project starting date accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The Verification Report, pages 2 and 125 refers to the starting date of the project as of 21/08/2007. However, the revised PDD, version 01.50, dated 13/02/2012 and the bundling form both documents refer to the starting date of the project activity as of 11/12/2007.
115	**5138**	**Reduction of methane emissions in the gas distribution network of Armenia Republic**	BVCH	Inconsistent information	The DOE is requested to address the inconsistencies in the amount of emission reductions accordingly as per paragraph 7 (b) of EB 48, Annex 60.	The Validation Report page 16, refers to the amount of CERs as follows: "The estimated annual average of approximately 210,108.24 tCO2e over the crediting period of emission reduction represents a reasonable estimation using the assumptions given by the project."
116	**5529**	**Electricity generation through wind power project at Jaora-MP & Tenkasi-TN**	TÜV NORD	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular section 3 and Annex 1 of the MoC should be signed by the same Project Participants. As the only project participant for this project is M/s EnKing International hence only M/s EnKing International should sign Annex 1 and section 3 of MoC.
117	**5631**	**Dak Srong 3B Hydropower Project.**	KEMCO	Incomplete documentation	The DOE is requested to upload the respective modalities of communication (MoC) to the project view page as requested by paragraphs 8 (e) and 10 (d) of EB 48 Annex 60.	In particular the name of the entity in section 2 page 1(focal point) of the MoC should be included.

Appendix 2

Reasons for returning requests for registration during information & reporting check (I&RC) stage

Stage 2: Information & Reporting Check						
#	Ref	Title	DOE	Category	Standard Text	Comment
1	4950	**Hunan Taojiang Baizhuzhou Hydroelectric Project**	TÜV Rheinland	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed the existence of the similar projects for common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (b).	The upper limit of the range of installed capacity selected (i.e. 50MW) was considered appropriate by the DOE since projects over 50 MW in rural areas cannot apply SL16-95 in the investment analysis; however, the DOE has not explained why this reason is deemed sufficient to rule out similar activities given that details on the impact of this regulation on hydropower plants, including the proposed project activity, were not provided.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how the distinctive differences between the project activity and the similar projects identified in the selected scope are justified as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (c).	The DOE has explained that the proposed project has higher unit investment cost and lower electricity tariff, which resulted in less financially attractive investment conditions compared with the identified six similar activities. However, the DOE has not explained why the similar activities were able to achieve better investment conditions than the proposed project activity.
				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, the DOE should transparently report the list of similar activities used to cross-check the investment cost and the annual O&M cost. In addition, the DOE should explain the means used to cross-check the suitability of the annual utilization hours and the annual net electricity supply. In doing so, the DOE should also clearly report the values assumed for the effective coefficient, plant use rate and loss loss rate used to calculate the annual net electricity supply.

2	5088	**AWMS METHANE RECOVERY PROJECT C5 – RECOVERY, CAPTURE AND FLARING OF METHANE FROM MANURE TREATMENT**	TÜV SÜD	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	AMS-III.D version 16 paragraph 30 requires the monitoring of " the number of days that the animal manure management system capturing methane and flaring/combusting or gainfully using methane was operational (ndy)". However the PDD Section B.7.1 only requires to monitor the "Number of days that the animal manure management system capturing methane was operational".
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76.	For the farm ¨La Pilarcita¨ the DOE should report if the retention time of on-manure waste in the anaerobic treatment system.
				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).	Issue a) The DOE should provide information on how they have validated that farm ¨Xlapac" has no energy savings. Issue b) The DOE should provide information on how they have validated the energy savings, as the VR and PDD state a value of 1,282,761 per year while the spreadsheet submitted uses a value of 1,740,706.69 per year.
3	5080	**Ningxia Shizuishan District Heating System Project**	TÜV Rheinland	DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to address the changes made to the project deign since the global stakeholder consultation was conducted as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 173(c).	All PDD previous versions have been listed in the reference document list but DOE has not described the changes made in the project deisgh since the global stakeholder consultation was conducted.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how it has validated that the selected monitoring methodology(ies) are correctly applied and they are not subject to clarifications, revisions or deviations as per VVM v1.2, paragraphs 72-74.	The DOE has not requested a clarification of how to calculate and consider project emission due to the electricity consumption in heat exchange stations.
4	5053	**Yingkou EDZ District Heating Project**	AENOR	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	EGmax, hist (Maximum annual amount of electricity supplied by the power plant to the grid prior to the start of the project activity during the last 3 years before the project implementation) and EGmin, hist (Minimum annual amount of electricity supplied by the power plant to the grid prior to the start of the project activity during the last 3 years before the project implementation) were determined based on the electricity generation data

						from July to June in the respective years, not from January to December. Since these parameters are used in the calculation of emission reductions together with grid emission factor, which is estimated based on the electricity generation data from January to December in each year, these parameters should be determined based on the electricity generation data from January to December in each year, It is requested to correct these parameters based on the electricity generation data from January to December in each year.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the calculation of ex-ante emission reductions (with actual data and equations) as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In leakage calculation, the operating margin emission factor was calculated using 3 year data. Since the methodology requires the ex-post monitoring of the grid emission factor, the operating margin emission factor should be calculated using 1 year data. It is requested to correct the operating margin emission factor using 1 year data.
5	**5105**	**Waste to Energy Project of SURE VN in Binh Duong Province, Viet Nam**	TÜV Rheinland	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a).	The DOE is requested to clarify how it has validated the appropriateness of the value used for parameter LF AD (methane leakage from anaerobic digester), as the 0.02 value used by the PP (PDD, page 48) is less conservative than the IPCC default value indicated by the methodology (ACM0010 ver 05 p. 27).
				Additionality	For input values based on FSRs that are approved by national authorities for proposed CDM project activities, the DOE is requested to ensure that the values used in the PDD and associated annexes are fully consistent with the FSR, and where inconsistencies occur the DOE should validate the appropriateness of the values (VVM paragraph 113 (b)).	The DOE is requested to clarify if the FSR from which input values were derived (FSR dated 30/10/2009 as per Validation Report, p. 74) is consistent with the approved FSR (dated 2/5/2009 according to CL 13 in p. 104 of the Validation Report). Likewise, it should be clarified which version of the FSR received the 9/7/2009 approval mentioned on page 20 of the PDD.
6	**5121**	**Fujian Niutoushan Hydropower Project**	JCI	DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to include a list of interviewees and document reviewed as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 174 (d).	Please note that the references are miss-matching throughout the validation report.

				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how the distinctive differences between the project activity and the similar projects identified in the selected scope are justified as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (c).	In particular, the DOE should further clarify why the similar activities were able to achieve lower investment per kWh/kW than the proposed project activity.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the actions taken to secure the CDM status between the project starting date and the start of validation as per EB 49 Annex 22 paragraph 8 b.	In particular, the DOE should further explain how it has validated that the evidence listed as real and continuing action taken by the PP complies with the current applicable guidelines.
				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, the DOE should explain how it has validated the suitability of the "City construction and maintenance tax, and Educational surcharge".
7	**5096**	**Wind Power Project by NACL in Tamil Nadu**	SGS	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a).	In doing so, please specify the version number and the date of publication of the reference used for the grid emission factor (CO2 Baseline Database for the Indian Power Sector, Central Electricity Authority).
				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 doing so, please state how it has validated: a) the credibility of the reference documents used for the validation of the O&M costs ("offer-email"); b) the relevance and the implication of Comprehensive Tariff Order in the validation of the O&M costs; c) the O&M costs indicated in Comprehensive Tariff Order; and d) the value of the O&M costs applied to the recently registered projects referred to for the comparison.
8	**5099**	**Luni, Iqu and Neogal Small Hydro Power Projects in Kangra District of Himachal Pradesh, India**	BVCH	DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to include a statement on the validation of the expected emission reductions in the validation opinion as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 176 (d).	Please note that the amount of emission reductions is not mentioned.

				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	i) Provide the source for: the cost of debt (PLR), the tax on the debt and the beta value. ii) Historical values of BSE indices (webpage) was provided as the source for the market premium and beta value, however, it is unclear if this resource was available before the project start date.
				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).	i) Further crosscheck and provide clear sources for the input values: 'royalty or free power to the State Electricity Board', 'debt to equity ratio', 'capital subsidy', 'interest during construction (IDC)', 'working capital', 'interest on loan' and 'repayment period'. ii) Validate the suitability of the application of the minimum applicable tax (MAT) and income tax in the IRR calculation.
9	**4925**	**Wutuhe 25MW First-Level Hydropower Project in Guizhou Province China**	JACO	Additionality	The DOE is requested to identify if the FSR has been the basis of the investment decision as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 113 (a).	There is no clear statement that the PDR was the basis for the investment decision. It is unclear whether the PDR was available at the time of the investment decision as there is an inconsistency between the PDD and the validation report regarding the draft PDR. In the PDD (page 15) a draft PDR was available in March 2005, whereas the validation report (page 11) only reports on a meeting with the design institute in March 2005. Please clarify.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed the existence of the similar projects for common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (b).	There is an inconsistency between the projects presented for analysis between the PDD and the validation report.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how the distinctive differences between the project activity and the similar projects identified in the selected scope are justified as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (c).	In particular, the DOE should provide a validation opinion on why the similar activities identified were able to achieve lower unit investment cost and higher operational hours than the proposed project.

				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the actions taken to secure the CDM status between the project starting date and the start of validation as per EB 49 Annex 22 paragraph 8 b.	In particular, the DOE should provide a validation opinion on the specific CDM deliverables and actions carried out under the first and second CDM consultancy contracts. Further, the DOE should confirm whether the sequence of events is correct, given that the validation report indicates that the letter of intent to buy the CERs was concluded after the ERPA. In addition, there are several inconsistencies between the PDD and the Validation Report, namely: date of the board decision to pursue the CDM, date on which the project participant applies to the Guizhou Development and Reform Commission for CDM support, name of the CDM consultant and the reference to the ERPA /17/. Please clarify.
				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).	Further validate the suitability of the debt/equity ratio and loan repayment. In addition the following inconsistency was observed: reference for the 'economic evaluation code for small hydropower project'/13/ seems incorrect.
				Additionality	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).	The DOE is requested to determine under what variation in the input values the IRR would reach the benchmark and the likelihood of these conditions.
				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	Inconsistent information is given about where electricity generation will be monitored. Page 9 of the validation report says monitoring will be carried out 'in the power station' (and therefore line losses are 0%). This statement appears to show that meters M1, M2 and M3 will be used. However, page 15 of the same validation report states that EG will be monitored at the meters installed at Yuni and Yezhong substations, hence that M4 and M5 meters will be used.
10	**5089**	**Small Hydro Power Project by Kurmi Energy Private Limited**	DNV	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	In particular, the DOE should further explain how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark selected at the time of investment decision (29 March 2010 - project starting date).

				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(b).	In particular, the DOE should provide a further validation opinion on how the prior consideration of the CDM complies with para. 2 of EB 49, Annex 22.
				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 doing so, the DOE should describe the means used to cross-check the suitability of the electricity tariff applied in the investment analysis.
11	**4627**	**Henan Jiaozuo Yanxin Cement 4.5+7.5MW WHR Project**	TÜV Rheinland	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe on identification of baseline scenario(s) in PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The DOE is requested to further assess the baseline scenario for the 5000 TPD "greenfield facility" in line with the Clarification provided by EB 61,Annex 5 .The DOE should in order to determine the baseline scenario : 1.Identify alternative design options for the 5000 TPD clinker facility along with the feasible usage of the waste energy for those designs (with/without waste heat recovery component /with a waste heat recovery component of a different denomination) that was available to the PP. 2.Undertake an investment comparison analysis for the identified alternative designs to the entire greenfield facility for the determination of the baseline scenario. With regard to this, the DOE is requested to refer Clarification "AM_CLA_0219" on ACM0012 version 03.2 for better clarity.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data, input values and references used in the investment analysis and the results of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The DOE is requested to provide further information on how it validated the components of O&M costs. In doing so the DOE shall provide an analysis as to how it deemed that the components of the O&M costs are comparable to the other similar projects. The DOE shall also substantiate whether all the components of the O&M costs are linked to the project activity only especially with respect to "Management Cost".

				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to present common practice analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	PDD version 07 states that 29 similar clinker production lines have been identified. The DOE validated that out of these 17 facilities were CDM project activities.The DOE is requested to provide further information on the balance 12 projects in accordance with Step 4-a and 4-b of the Additionality Tool (Version 05.2.1).
12	**5128**	**Jilin Qianguo Fuhui 49.5MW Wind Farm Project**	GLC	Additionality	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 doing so, please provide information on how it has validated the total investment and the O&M costs to be reasonable in the context of the project activity, using its local and sectoral expertise. For the O&M costs, please clarify the relevance of the document used (European Wind Energy Association report) int he context of the project activity.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed the existence of the similar projects for common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (b).	In doing so, please provide information on how it has confirmed the list provided in the PDD to be complete, in particular, the relevance of the reference document used, especially its coverage and correspondence of the projects listed in the reference to those in the PDD.
				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 doing so, please clarify why it is not likely for the power output to increase by 4.6%, considering the variability of the wind resources and the location of the wind measurement which is not the project site.
13	**5140**	**Kalansa Biomass Renewable Energy Project**	SIRIM	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	In particular : (i) DOCj (Fraction of degradable organic carbon (by weight) in the waste type j, 49%); (ii) MCF (Methane correction factor, 0.4) and (iii) kj (Decay rate for the waste type j, 0.17). In doing so, please document in the CDM-PDD : (i) the climatic conditions at the SWDS site (temperature, precipitation and, where applicable, evapotranspiration) and use long term averages based on statistical data, where available; along with references; and (ii) location and charateristics of the solid waste disposal site as per the requirement of the applied methodology.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76.	Please provide clear information on the location and characteristics of the disposal site in the baseline condition to allow the estimation of its methane emissions as per requirement of applied methodology AMS IIIE v16, paragraph 7.

				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	In particular : (i) Please report how the suitability of the vintage of data selected for the market risk premium and beta that determine the WACC has been assessed given that there is no information regarding vintage year; (ii) Please provide information on key parameters of the government bond including the time of maturity; (iii) Please report how the beta value (determined based on global renewable) corresponds to the risk profile of the proposed activity in the host country.
				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).	It is not clear how the DOE has cross checked following input values/parameters against third party or publicly available sources : (i) Electricity tariff (208 RM/MWh), (ii) investment (44,000,000 RM),(iii) Operation & Maintenance Cost (1,200,000RM/year), (iv) EFB (Fuel) Cost (337,010 RM/year), (v) Total EFB Transportation Cost (842,525 RM/year), (vi) Site Lease (39,600 RM/year + 10% escalation every 3 yrs), (vii) Salary & wages (250,000 RM/year),(viii) Miscellaneous (100,000 RM/year),(ix) Exportable electricity (37,800 Mwh/yr),(x) Amount of EFB consumed (168,505 tonne/yr). In addition, please provide following information : (a) What is the date of Kalansa bank loan offer used to validate debt equit ratio ? (b) When the Operation & Maintenance Agreement was signed between Technogine Sdn. Bhd. and Kalansa Energy Corporation Sdn. Bhd ? (c) How the Site Lease Agreement signed between Sabah Electricity Sdn.Bhd. and Kalansa Energy Corporation Sdn. Bhd on 14/04/2008 is suitable data source given that signed date is later than investment decision ? (d) What is the date of completion for project developer's financial feasibility calculation ? (e) what is the data source for Exportable electricity (37,800Mwh/yr)?
				Additionality	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).	Please report why exportable electricity amount was not included in the sensitivity analysis.

14	**4891**	**Dak Psi 3 and 4 Hydropower Project**	KEMCO	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe whether the assumptions and data used for the baseline identification are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87 (c).	Please clarify whether the data used to calculate the emission factor is taken from the report published by Vietnamese DNA in 2009 or 2010. In particular, section B.6.2 and validation report, pg 25 states that the grid emission factor data is taken from report published in 2009 and the validation reeport,pg 9 states 2010.
				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).	Please clarify that how DOE validated the suitability of parameters such as interest rate on term loan, depriciation, D/E ratio, loan and moratorium period, natural resource tax and salvage value. In particular, please provide the means of validation and source to confirm each parameter along with their values.
				Additionality	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).	Please clarify that how it was validated that the variations in the key parameters that would make the IRR reach the benchmark are likely to occur.
15	**5075**	**Ordos Future Resource Biomass Cogeneration Project**	TÜV Rheinland	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the equations applied to calculate the baseline/ project emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per the chosen methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92.	1. The validation report does not contain any assessment of : a) the energy balance of the project, i.e balance between inputs and outputs. The DOE has not reported how it has assessed that the 171,600t of shrubbery branches consumed per year (PDD pag 75) are equivalent to a 176,162 MWh/year electricity output and 490 TJ heat supply output.; and b) the following input parameters used to calculated the heat supply: A) enthalpy value for steam extraction; b) hydrophobic enthalpy value for steam extraction; and c) steam extraction for heat.
				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	The PDD indicated that the proposed project activity consists of burning biomass residue (shrubbery branches) in order to produce and sell electricity and heat. Nevertheless, the NCV (Net calorific value) and the HCbl,y (Baseline process heat generation) are not monitored and the reason for not monitoring these parameters has not been provided.

16	**4996**	**Pampeana and Terra Santa Small Hydropower Plants Project Activity**	TÜV NORD	DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to include a summary of the validation conclusions in the validation opinion as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 176 (c).	The page with DOE's validation opinion (page 56 in the validation report) is not clear.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	In doing so, the DOE shall explain 1) why data from chemical specific industries were considered in the calculation of beta value considering that the project activity is a hydro power generation project; 2) why relevered beta value based on USA market data was considered suitable considering the project activity was located in Brazil. In addition, the DOE shall also provide its validation opinion on inflation rate (1.81%).
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the scope of the common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (a).	In doing so, the DOE shall explain how projects with installed capacity less than 30 MW were seclected as similar projects given that the total installed capacity of the project activity is 55MW. In addition, the selection of similar projects shall cover +/-50% of the installed capacity of single power plant.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a) and the Glossary of the CDM.	In doing so, the DOE shall explain how it has validated evidences listed in the PDD page 13, in particular 1) the construction permit (18/05/2006) for Terra Santa SHPP and 2) the time (15/04/2006) when the construction of Pampeana SHPP started.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the actions taken to secure the CDM status between the project starting date and the start of validation as per EB 62 Annex 13 paragraph 6 (b), paragraph 7 and paragraph 8 (b) .	In doing so, the DOE shall assess whether there is any contract available as reliable evidence as per para.6 (b). The DOE shall also confirm the authenticity of the email provided to demonstrate the real and continuing actions and describe in detail how the cross-checking process has been conducted.
				Other	The DOE is requested to include a clear validation opinion on the adequacy of the local stakeholder consultation as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 130(b).	

17	**4563**	**Methane recovery in wastewater treatment in Famailla fruit processing plant, Tucuman, Argentina**	TÜV NORD	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the equations applied to calculate the baseline/ project emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per the chosen methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92.	
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if the methodology provides different options for equations and parameters and if the selection is appropriate as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 90.	
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76.	
18	**5162**	**Gansu Heihe Baopinghe Hydropower Project**	TÜV SÜD	Other	The documents submitted are not internally and mutually consistent. EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 7 (b).	The values for the Total Cost are not consistent between the submitted spreadsheets: 205,336 (10,000 Yuan) in the Enclosure 1, and 202,996 (10,000 Yuan) in the Enclosure 2.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the monitoring plan as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PDD states that the power grid company shall allocate the data monitored by M1 and M2 through certain calculation method in order to determine the on-grid electricity quantity of both Baopinghe and Sandaowan hydropower stations. The calculation method is subject to that specified in the power purchase agreement and other relevant documents signed between the project owner and provincial power grid. The PDD does not describe the calculation method for EGy.
19	**3694**	**Yangzhou City MSW Incineration Power Generation Project**	ERM CVS	Other	The DOE is requested to identify if the PDD has been updated and rectified according to the responses to the CARs, CLs and or FARs raised during validation as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 39.	It is not clear if the conclusions of CAR 17 are reflected in the emission reduction spreadsheet.

				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how the data/parameters used in the equations were verified as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 93.	VR p31 states that ratios of 70%, 80% and 90% are respectively applied in the emission reduction calculations in the first three years of operation, in consistency with the financial analysis of the project. This is also addressed in CAR 17 which was closed. However, in the ER calculation spreadsheet, it is applied 80% the first year, 90% the second year and 100% from the 3rd year onward.
20	**4588**	**Shanxi Jincheng Beishidian 36MW Coal Mine Methane Power Generation Project**	TÜV SÜD	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data, input values and references used in the investment analysis and the results of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In doing so, please ensure all relevant input values including the total investment, the O&M costs, the heat tariff and the amount of heat replaced, and the electricity tariff and the amount of electricity generated are presented in the PDD with respective references.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to present common practice analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In doing so, please present an inclusive list of similar projects and explain how each of them is eliminated.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the equations applied to calculate the baseline/ project emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per the chosen methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92.	In particular, the DOE shall provide validation on the calculation of the emission factor of the baseline electricity generation. In doing so, please provide validation on the suitability of each parameter used in the calculation.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	In particular, the DOE is requested to provide information on how it has considered the choice of the baseline electricity emission factor to be conservative.
				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 DOE shall explain how it has validated the elimination of the alternative iii (flaring), vi/v (power generation), vi (heat generation), and vii (pipeline) for which the elimination was based on investment barriers. In doing so, please refer to paragraph 7 of EB 50 Annex 13.

				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe all the assumptions/ data/references listed in the PDD for the baseline identification as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87 (a).	In particular, the DOE shall explain how it has validated the baseline to be the captive power generation rather than the grid power, considering that it is connected to the grid. In addition, please provide validation on the remaining lifetime of the existing captive power plant.
				Additionality	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, the DOE shall include details on how it has validated the suitability of the following parameters:a) the total investment cost of 267.32 million RMB;b) the O&M costs of 48.85 million RMB/year;c) the CMM fee of 0.6 RMB/m3;d) the PLF; e) the power tariff of 0.354 RMB/kWh; f) amount of heat 0.16 million tonne steam/year; and g) heat tariff of 66 RMB/tonne of steam or 30 RMB/GJ.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed the existence of the similar projects for common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (b).	In doing so, please present the list of projects obtained from the reference indicated in the validation report page 26 and identify the projects that are or are not considered similar and how it is justified.
21	**4721**	**Chongqing Changshengqiao Landfill Gas to Energy Project**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PP/DOE is requested to report why the monitoring plan doesn't include all the required monitoring parameters to calculate : (i) PE flare,y as per the "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane v01, EB 28 Annex 13"; (ii) MG PR,y as per the "Tool to determine methane emissions avoided from disposal of waste at a solid waste disposal site v05.1 EB61 Annex 10" and (iii) CEF eley,BL,y as required by the methodology ACM0001 v11 (page 20).
				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) annual O&M cost since it is not clear why the same annual operation and maintenance cost is applied throughout the entire investment analysis period given that the equipment installation is in three different stages; (ii) annual electricity generation and internal consumption. Please report how annual electricity generation has been derived since the electricity generation tab in IRR calculation spreadsheet contains only the values for annual electricity generation but no formula.
22	**5155**	**Co-composting of organic residues in ORO ROJO's Palm Oil Mill at Sabana de Torres, Colombia**	ICONTEC	Additionality		The DOE is requested to provide a clear validation opinion and corresponding evidence on the compliance of the project activity with the requirements of EB 49 Annex 22 as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 104 (b) and (c), as the project starting date is after 02 August 2008, and therefore the PP

						is required to submit notifications to the UNFCCC secretariat and the DNA within 6 months of (or from) the cited project starting date (9 February 2011). In particular, the DOE is requested to clarify whether the events cited in the validation report on page 18, to wit: "26/10/2009, Prior consideration submission date" and "04/05/2009, PDD submitted to DNA" refer to such notifications for the project activity.
23	**5041**	**Beizhen City Wufeng Rice Trade Processing Co., Ltd. 10MW Biomass (Rice Husk) Power Plant Project**	CQC	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to complete all the PDD sections for the description of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The section A.4.3 of the PDD does not include levels of services (in terms of mass and energy flows) provided by the systems and equipments that are being installed under the project activity. This is required as per the latest version of GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETING THE PROJECT DESIGN DOCUMENT (CDM-PDD) AND THE PROPOSED NEW BASELINE AND MONITORING METHODOLOGIES (CDM-NM).
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe on identification of baseline scenario(s) in PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The Validation Report on page 26 Table 7, row (a) states that it was confirmed by validation team during the on-site visit via interviewing local government officials that heat was generated by local coal fired boilers in pre-project scenario. On page 28 in the validation report the DOE states that "PP then submitted a statement from Goubangzi Economic Development Zone, in which announced that in absence of the proposed CDM project activity, the electricity is imported from NECPG and the heat is generated by local co-fired boiler system and the proposed project is the first biomass co-generation plant within the local area or Liaoning Province." DOE shall clearly discuss in the validation report as to which fuels were co-fired in the local boiler systems. Further, DOE shall also discuss in the validation report if these local boilers would continue to operate or not after implementation of the project activity.

				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PDD does not include monitoring of: 1. Quantity of biomass residues used in project activity 2. Moisture content of biomass residues 3. NCV of biomass residues 4. net quantity of heat supplied by project acitivity at the recipient's end 5. temperature of feed water to boiler to account for enthalpy of feed water in calculation of net heat supplied by project activity. These parameters are required to be monitored as per paragraph 48 of AMS I.C. version 18.
				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).	The PDD, validation report and the IRR spreadsheet do not state if the 'heat tariff' used in IRR calculations as 40 RMB / GJ is inclusive of VAT or is it exclusive of VAT.
24	**4993**	**Hydroelectric Project in Kinnaur District in Himachal Pradesh**	TÜV NORD	DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to address the changes made to the project deign since the global stakeholder consultation was conducted as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 173(c).	Paragraph 173 (c) of the VVM states Reflect the results of the dialogue between the DOE and the project participants, as well as any adjustments made to the project design following stakeholder consultation. It shall reflect the responses to CARs and CLs, and discussions on and revisions to project documentation. The DOE is requested to justify how it verified the following changes to be appropriate in the absence of a CAR/CL for the following changes from the GSC PDD: a) The chronology in the GSCPDD doesnot report the Board resolution of CDM that took place in October 2005. b) In the GSC PDD,NSE indices had been considered for calculation of WACC.It is observed that in the Final PDD submitted, the market index had been changed to the BSE.However no CAR/CL has been requested by the DOE .
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to identify if the FSR has been the basis of the investment decision as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 113 (a).	The CDM Board Resolution for this project was passed in June 2003. EB 51 ,Annex 58 paragraph 6 states that “Input values used in all investment analysis should be valid and applicable at the time of the investment decision taken by the project participant”. The DOE is requested to provide further information as how it justified the input values of 2005 for the benchmark analysis and investment analysis purpose when the decision to implement the project with CDM revenues has been undertaken in June 2003.

				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).	The DOE is requested to provide further information with reference to the Investment analysis worksheet submitted "Main Relevant Sheet.: a).For the calculation of the Project IRR, (worksheet "P&L"), under Head "Income", the entire revenue is assumed to be through sale of power regulated through PPA. Further clarification is sought since the project will sell 704 MW (70.40%) power to the grid, 12 % free power to Himachal Pradesh and the balance power will be sold as Merchant Power to the open market.The component of "Income" obtained through sale of merchant power has not been included in the P&L calculation. b)Worksheet "Tariff", Row 22 , refers to the calculation of Tariff Part B1- for sale of tariff regulated by PPA and Row 26 refers to the calculation of Tariff Part B2for sale of Merchant Power.Further explaination is required as to why for calculation of B1 tariff, the formula used is (D19/Para!D24) and not (D19/D21).
				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).	a)The DOE is requested to provide further information on how it validated both the "Utility tariff component" as well as the "Merchant Power "tariff for the project activity. b)In doing so, the DOE should also substantiate the "Utility tariff" for comparable power projects selling electricity to PTC and provide a basis for the fluctuation tariff as provided in the worksheet "Main Relevant sheet_Tariff " (Row 22). The DOE is also requested to confirm that the signed PPA doesnot indicate an estimated tariff. c)Further justification as why there has been no escalation considered for the "Merchant Power" tariff.
25	**5093**	**Jinhanlazha hydropower station (58MW) of Niru River, Yunnan Province, P.R.China**	CEC	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to indicate the project starting date in the PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	as the starting date of the project activity has not been indicated in DD/MM/YYYY format.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how the data/parameters used in the equations were verified as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 93.	The DOE is requested to explain how the power density of the dam was verified.

				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, the DOE is requested explain how the construction period of 3 years and how the debt/equity ratio were validated.
26	**5112**	**Green House Gas Abatement through installation of a wind power project for export to the Grid.**	DNV	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(b).	The DOE stated that it has observed that there are no gaps of more than two years between efforts to secure CDM status from the project participants. However, It has not provided the information on how it has validated the effort to secure CDM status based on documented evidences. The DOE should provide the information on how it has validated the documented evidences as per EB 62 Annex 13.
27	**4990**	**15 MW Wind Power Project by Shriram Leitwind Ltd**	TÜV NORD	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to present the sensitivity analysis of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The sensitivity analysis for the investment costs parameter is not in the associated investment analysis spreadsheet. The PP/DOE are requested to include the relevant calculations in the spreadsheet.
				DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to address the changes made to the project deign since the global stakeholder consultation was conducted as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 173(c).	The VR has not addressed the changes made to project design since the global stakeholder consultation.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state that the estimates in the PDD are reasonable for data and parameters that are monitored during implementation and are available after validation as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	In Section B7.1 of the PDD, the exported electricity is 35,083.8 kWh, imported electricity is 0 kWh and net electricity is 36,082.4 MWh. However, this is not consistent with the net amount of electricity mentioned in other sections of the PDD and the CER calculation spreadsheet, in terms of the amounts and in the units.
28	**4926**	**Huaneng Shanghai Chongming Qianwei Wind Farm Project**	BVCH	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to complete all the PDD sections for the description of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In doing so please clarify the inconsistency in the project location as the PDD and the validation report show that the project activity is located Lat: 31°42′ 1.82′′ North; Long: 121°36′18.00′′ East while the project view page indicates Lat: 31.7005; Long: 21.605.

				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).	In doing so please confirm the correctness of the financial calculations presented (appendix 1) as when the total investment cost is varied by -10% (on the IRR cashflow workbook) the project IRR without CDM is 7.98% but with the same variation the sensitivity analysis workbook shows a project IRR of 7.69%.
29	**5090**	**Renewable Energy Wind Power Project in Rajasthan**	BVCH	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The monitoring plan does not list paramters such as the electricity exported and imported by the non project WEGs used in the formula 1 (page 38 of the PDD), which define the electricity exported by the project activity to the grid as per the applied methodology.
30	**5191**	**Van Chan Hydropower Project.**	KEMCO	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state that the estimates in the PDD are reasonable for data and parameters that are monitored during implementation and are available after validation as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	The values of installed capacity and area of reservoir mentioned in section B.7.1 of the PDD are inconsistent with the values mentioned in other sections of PDD.
				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).	The tariff values used in IRR calculations is sourced from FSR. There was a pre Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) signed between the PP and EVN. DOE is request to include information on the tariff specified in the pre PPA and date when this PPA was signed.
31	**4929**	**Yunnan Dali Tiechuanqiao Hydro Power Project**	DNV	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a).	In accordance with glossary of CDM terms version 05, it is not clear that why the starting date of the project activity is not considered as the date of acquisition between Datang Binchuan Hydro Power Generation Co., Ltd. and Dali Huihuang Hydro Power Generation Co., Ltd. (previous owner).
				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, the DOE is requested to report the project IRR as per initial FSR prepared in July 2007. In doing so, please validate the changes made in the assumptions such as O&M cost, electricity generation, electricity tariff, other costs etc. in the SFSR prepared in August 2008.

32	**5135**	**Energy efficient slurry filtration project at ESL, Vizag, India**	SGS	Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	Page 82-85 of the Validation Report contain DOE's assessment that the calibration details of the monitoring equipments and the contingency plans are not elaborated in the PDD. Yet, there are no CAR/CL raised.
33	**5241**	**Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions through Wind Energy Generation Technology – Bundle - I**	TÜV NORD	DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to include a list of interviewees and document reviewed as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 174 (d).	In doing so please provide the documents listed under the following references: /LAND/, /PDD7/, /WO/, /INS/, /CHRO/ and /unfccc-letter/. In addition please ensure that all referenced documents have been dated.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if the baseline methodology is correctly applied to calculate project/baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(d).	In doing so, please clarify the inconsistency in the applied methodology as the validation report (pg 103) and Appendix 2 show ACM0002 while the PDD and other parts of the VR indicate AMS-I.D.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to include a clear validation opinion on the compliance of the project activity with the requirements made in EB 49 Annex 22 as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 104(c).	In doing so please provide the dates for each sub-bundle when the secretariat and the DNA were informed about the intention to seek the CDM status .
				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 doing so please clarify the inconsistency in the project cost as the validation report (Annex 3) indicates that project ID. 1 applied a value of 12.15 Million INR/Turbine and project IDs. 2 to11 applied a value of 11.53 Million INR/Turbine while the PDD and the excel sheet show that all the sub-bundles (project IDs. 1 to 11) applied a value of 10.30 Million INR/Turbine.
34	**5232**	**Yunnan Diqing Luoma Hydroelectric Project**	KFQ	Additionality	The DOE is requested to confirm the correctness of computations carried out and documented by the project participants as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 111 (d).	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.

35	**4955**	**Dak Me 1 Hydropower Project in Vietnam**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The "area of the reservoir, measured in the surface of the water, after the implementation of the project activity, when the reservoir is full" is not included as a monitoring parameter in the submitted PDD, as per the requirements in page 12 of AMS.I.D version 16 (which requires to monitor parameters relevant to reservoir based hydro following the most recent version of ACM0002).
				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).	The DOE should include information on the validation of the income tax calculation, in particular if it complies with the requirements of EB62, Annex 5 paragraph 11.
36	**4957**	**SECURITIZATION AND CARBON SINKS PROJECT**	ICONTEC	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a).	In particular, the DOE shall explain how it has validated the baseline sink and the actual net GHG removal by sinks in line with the applied methodology. In doing so, please provide information on the validation of each of the methodological choice for the calculations and the parameters applied to the chosen equations.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76.	In doing so, please provide information on how it has considered the requirements by "Tool for the identification of degraded or degrading lands for consideration in implementing CDM A/R project activities"version 1 in validating the project land.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to provide a statement whether the identified boundary, sources and gases are justified for the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 80.	In particular, to provide validation on how the boundary was identified according to "Guidance on Application of the Definition of the Project Boundary to A/R CDM Project Activities" version 1.
				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 doing so, please provide information on how it has assessed the each step of the "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" version 3.0.1 taken to identify the baseline scenario.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a).	In doing so, please confirm that the date indicated as the starting date is the earliest date when real actions takes place for the project activity as per the latest CDM glossary of terms.

				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(b).	In doing so, please provide clear statements on the specific events that are considered as the prior considerations and why.
37	**5189**	**Song Chay 5 Hydropower project**	KEMCO	DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to address the changes made to the project deign since the global stakeholder consultation was conducted as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 173(c).	
				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 the DOE is requested to transparently report the list of projects used to crosscheck the suitability of the benchmark, investment cost and O&M cost of the proposed project, given that a different number of CDM registered similar activities in Vietnam was used in each case (i.e. 25 projects are listed to crosscheck the benchmark, 38 projects are considered to crosscheck the total investment cost, and 52 projects are used to crosscheck the O&M cost).
				Additionality	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).	The DOE should include a validation opinion on the variations in the total investment costs, O&M costs, power tariff, and operational hours (PLF) that would make the IRR of the project reach the benchmark and the likelihood of these conditions.
38	**4460**	**Avoided Methane Emissions Through Composting of EFB Biomass at PT Pinago Utama Sugihwaras Palm Oil Mill, Sumatera Selatan, Indonesia.**	SIRIM	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In particular; the data and parameters as mentioned in the " Tool to determine methane emissions avoided from disposal of waste at a solid waste disposal site " for the calculation of methane produced in the landfill site in the absence of the project activity in year y.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a).	In particular : climatic conditions at the solid waste disposal site. Information is required on how the requirement of using long term averages based on statistical data as mentioned in the " Tool to determine methane emissions avoided from disposal of waste at disposal site" has been met given that only 3 years data were selected (Validation report page 19/29).

				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) admin cost and operation and maintenance cost , the sub items of "payment to creditors"as indicated in the financial analysis spreadsheet. Please also report how each individual item of operation and maintenance cost (396000 USD at the first year) has been validated; (ii) amount of compost generated given that the assumed value is based on in house lab analysis and has not been cross checked with third party or publicly available sources; (iii) price of compost given that the assumed value has not been cross checked with third party or publicly available sources such as invoices or market price of compost; (iv) the depreciation rate and (v) the tax rate.
39	**4542**	**CEMEX Dominicana: Alternative fuels and biomass project at San Pedro Cement Plant**	SGS	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if the methodology provides different options for equations and parameters and if the selection is appropriate as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 90.	In doing so, the DOE shall explain why the baseline methane emission avoided from anaerobic decay of biomass residues at solid waste disposal site (BEch4,B2,y) was calculated, considering B2 has been eliminated from the alternatives in the baseline identification.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	In doing so, please provide 1) the data source of market risk premium, and 2) date when the data for risk free rate, country risk premium and beta value were available.
				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	In doing so, the DOE shall explain why the monitoring parameters related to approach L1 and L3 are included, considering approach L2 has been chosen to rule out leakage.
40	**5166**	**Leak reduction in above ground gas distribution system in the gas distribution networks in Khorezm region and the Republic of Karakalpakstan**	SGS	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the calculation of ex-ante emission reductions (with actual data and equations) as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In doing so, please provide formular in the emission reduction spreadsheet for the leaking rate calculation.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed each barrier presented as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118 (a) and (b).	In particular, 1) institutional barrier considering no independent evidence has been provided to demonstrate this barrier; 2) technical barrier considering the written explanation from Heath Consult was not provided in the reference list in the validation report.

				Additionality	The DOE is requested to report how it has validated common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121.	In doing so, the DOE shall 1) validate the geographical scope of the common practice analysis; 2) validate whether there is similar activities taking place in other sections within UTG or in other companies within the country; and 3) validate documented evidences (e.g. interview notes) used in the analysis in line with the Tool for the demonstration and the assessment of additionality.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a).	In doing so, the DOE shall explain how it has validated the action taken to conduct the initial baseline survey given that the data from the survey might be necessary to compile the PDD for global stakeholder consultation.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to clarify if the list of alternatives to the project activity in the PDD is complete according to the applied baseline methodology as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 107.	In doing so, the DOE shall explain why implementing the project activity by gas producer has not been considered as one of the baseline alternatives.
41	**5025**	**Tunjita Diversion Hydroelectric Project**	ICONTEC	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data, input values and references used in the investment analysis and the results of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	It is requested to explain how the internal benchmark of 14% was derived or related to the other values described in the PDD (Market Return rate, unlevered beta, risk-free rate, average leverage, country risk rate, long-term bank interest rate, etc). Also, it is requred to provide the information on whether this internal benchmark is the weighted average capital cost (WACC) of the company or the expected return on equity in the calculation of WACC or other value.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The parameters used for the calculation of the grid emission factor are not listed in section B.7.1 of the PDD.
42	**4840**	**Leluasa Biomas Steam Plant in Lahad Datu, Sabah, Malaysia**	BVCH	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the equations applied to calculate the baseline/ project emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per the chosen methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92.	The Validation Report does not contain any information whether there is a surplus of at least 25% of available biomass in the region, in line with the "Attachment C to Appendix B: Indicative simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for selected small-scale CDM project activity categories".

				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed each barrier presented as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118 (a) and (b).	The Validation Report does not report whether the barriers presented (technological barrier and barrier due to prevailing practice) are in line with VVM 1.2 paragraph 117 guidance.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the actions taken to secure the CDM status between the project starting date and the start of validation as per EB 49 Annex 22 paragraph 8 b.	The DOE should inform and report how the individual real and continuing actions reported in the PDD to secure CDM status have been validated. Please notice that the Validation Report page 17 only quotes the events described in PDD page 25-26.
				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	The PDD indicated that the proposed project activity consists of burning biomass residue (PKS, Mesocarp, EFB) in order to produce heat. Nevertheless, the NCVk (Net calorific value of biomass residue type k) for these three biomass residues is not monitored. Please refer to methodology AMS IC v18 parameter 12 guidance.
43	**5307**	**Bundled Grid Connected Wind Power Generation –Abi Energy Bundle 3**	LRQA	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the monitoring plan as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the monitoring plan, including clear descriptions of which measurement equipment is used, and where and how the parameters are to be measured, as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a) and EB 34 Annex 09.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to provide the information about the greenhouse gas emissions within the project boundary caused by the implementation of the project activity which contribute to more than 1% of the expected annual emission reductions ER/year and which are not addressed in by the applied methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 77.	The Validation Report does not contain information about the greenhouse gas emissions within the project boundary caused by the implementation of the project activity which contribute to more than 1% of the expected annual emission reductions ER/year and which are not addressed in by the applied methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 77.
44	**3771**	**La Mora Hydroelectric Project**	AENOR	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to present the sensitivity analysis of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The Project Design Document (PDD) has not provided the description on result of project cost variation in the sensitivity analysis given that 5% reduction in the project cost could result in the Project IRR higher than the benchmark.

				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	Please report why the installed capacity of the project and surface area of the reservoir are not included in the monitoring plan given that the project activity results in new reservoir (page 15 of the Final Validation Report).
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed each barrier presented as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118 (a) and (b).	The page 23 of the Final Validation Report presents the following two different sets of statistics for share of small hydro powers, large hydro powers and fossil fuel based power plants in the total power generation of Nicaragua in 2008 : (i) 0.1%,11.75%, 64.33% and (ii) 0.12%,17.4%,73%. Please clarify this inconsistency.Information is required on how the prevailing practice prevent the project activity from being implemented and how the CDM status will eliminate such barrier.
				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 : 1. the project cost, the DOE requires to provide detail information on: (a) the exact source of the project cost including the relevant dates; (b) the name, value and dates of the contracts used for cross checking, (c) how the capital cost range US1400/kW and 2,200/KW is suitable to cross check the unit capital cost of the proposed activity?, 2. the price for energy sale , the DOE is requested to provide information on how the price for energy sale was valid and available at the time of investment decision given that the Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) was signed on 06/02/2009 after the project starting date 15 Dec 2008; 3. the O&M cost, information is required on :(i) the values and date of contract signed for O&M of the project, (ii) how individual elements of the O&M cost has been validated ?, (iii) how the unitary O&M Cost of 107$/KW for the proposed activity is justified given that the average O&M cost of other mini-hydro power plants is in the range of 60-80 $/kW ?
45	**5223**	**Anhui Laian Baoshan Wind Power Project**	DNV	Other	The DOE is requested to explain how the comments received during the stakeholder consultation were considered as per VVM v1.2, paragraph 40, 174 (c).	The VR lacks information on how the DOE has considered the comments received.

				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).	The VR lacks information on how the DOE validated: (a) that comparison with projects under validation is appropriate; (b) the likelihood of the remaining portion of the investment cost; (c) the loan interest and the repayment period in line with the VVM version 0.1 para 111.
				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	The PDD section B.7.1 mentions that electricity meter for parameter Egfacility,y is installed in the substation, and the meter for parameter Egexport,y/Egimport/y is installed at project boundary. However, the VR page 25 mentions that the metering equipment is installed at the project site.
46	**5215**	**Yugong River 24MW Hydropower Project**	LRQA	Other	The DOE is requested to explain how the comments received during the stakeholder consultation were considered as per VVM v1.2, paragraph 40, 174 (c).	The comments uploaded in the GSC page is the PDD GSC, thus the comments received are not available in the GSC page. In addition, the DOE is requested to provide explanation in the validation report on how the comments received were resolved.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	In doing so, please confirm the benchmark value applied; it is indicated to be 8% in page 66 of the validation report while 10% in other part of the report and the PDD.
47	**5237**	**Anhui Laian Longtougang Wind Power 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).	The VR lacks information on how the DOE has validated that a)comparison with projects under validation is appropriate (b) the loan interest and the repayment period in line with the VVM version 0.1 para 111.
48	**4551**	**Za Hung Hydropower Project**	BVCH	DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to include appointment certificate or CV of each validation team member as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 174 (g).	
				DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to include a statement on the validation of the expected emission reductions in the validation opinion as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 176 (d).	Please include the expected emission reductions in the validation opinion.

				DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to resolve all CARs and CLs raised as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 37.	According to the Validation Report Section 3, 18 Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and 07 Clarification Requests (CLs) have been raised, however they are not reported in the Validation Report. Please submit a complete file also including the Appendix A (Validation Protocol).
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to identify if the FSR has been the basis of the investment decision as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 113 (a).	Please indicate this information in the Validation Report.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide confirmation that the values used in PDD are fully consistent with the FSR as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 113 (b).	In particular: for the O&M costs and electricity tariff.
				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 111.	The Validation Report does not include information on the validation of the total investment, annual net electricity generated and annual O&M costs. In particular for the O&M costs, the DOE should indicate if the value used was valid and applicable at the time of the investment decision as per the requirements of EB62, Annex 5 paragraph 6.
49	**5280**	**Pure-low Temperature Waste Heat Recovery for Power Generation (4.5MW) in Zhejiang Yunshi Cement Co., Ltd. of Zhaoshan Xinxing Group (ZSYS)**	DNV	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how it has validated that the selected baseline methodology(ies)applies(y) correctly to the project boundary, baseline identification and algorithms and formulae used to determine emission reductions as per VVM v1.2, paragraphs 67.	The version of the methodology applied to calculate the fcap is not consistent given that ACM0012 Version 3.2 was indicated in page 40 of the validation report whereas ACM0012 Version 4 was indicated in page 41 of the validation report.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if the methodology provides different options for equations and parameters and if the selection is appropriate as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 90.	The DOE shall explain the suitability of the Case 1 of method-3 to determine the fcap as per ACM0012 given that it appears there is an intermediate energy recovery equipment using an intermediate source (water/steam) for the waste energy recovery.

				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	The specific waste energy content of the clinker produced is 240,000 kJ/ton clinker (67,200 kJ/ton + 172,800 kJ/ton) as per page 20 of the validation report. However, the energy balance in page 42 of the validation report indicates that the waste heat vented is 1,009 kJ/kg clinker (3070 kJ/kg * 32.87%). Please clarify.
50	**5230**	**Anhui Laian Dongsigang Wind Power Project**	DNV	Other	The DOE is requested to explain how the comments received during the stakeholder consultation were considered as per VVM v1.2, paragraph 40, 174 (c).	VR lacks information on why issues raised in the comment are not related specifically to the project in question.
				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).	The VR lacks information on how the DOE has validated: (a) that comparison with projects under validation is appropriate; (b) the likelihood of the remaining portion of the investment cost;(c) the loan interest and the repayment period in line with the VVM version 0.1 para 111.
				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	The PDD section B.7.1 mentions that electricity meter for parameter Egfacility,y is installed in the substation, However, the VR page 25 mentions that the metering equipment is installed at the project site.
51	**4999**	**Ranhill Powertron II 190 MW Gas Fired CCPP Project**	TÜV NORD	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe the GHG sources with in the project boundary in the PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PDD (page 10) includes a diagram of the project boundary that is not complete.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each monitoring parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The applicable methodology (page 12) requires that "The total fuel consumption will be monitored both at supplier and project end for cross-verification", however, this requirement was not included in the monitoring plan.
				DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to resolve all CARs and CLs raised as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 37.	CAR B-4 (VR page 26) was left as OPEN.

52	**4188**	**Methane Recovery Project of Tiancheng Corn Development Co., Ltd.**	RINA	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list the data and parameters used to calculate the emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In particular, the values considered for Bo,ww (Methane generation capacity) is not consistent within the PDD (page 41, 43 and 44).
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each monitoring parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	Please clarify whether the parameter TMRG,h (Mass flow rate of flaring of the residual gas in hour h) as mentioned in section B.7.2 of the PDD will be used to monitor biogas flared or mass flow rate of methane in residual gas to calculate flare efficiency.
				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, the DOE shall validate and confirm the suitability of the depreciation cost considered in the IRR calculation.
53	**5248**	**Song Nhiem 3 Hydropower Project**	CEC	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).	The DOE is requested to provide the confidential version of the IRR spreadsheet with formulas.
				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, the DOE is requested to provide the list of similar projects used to compare the total investment cost and electricity tariff in the validation report.
54	**5297**	**Nanhai MSW Incineration II Project**	GLC	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PDD does not include monitoring of flare operation parameters and temperature in exhaust gas of flare as required by 'Tool to calculate project emission from flaring gases containing methane'.
55	**5249**	**Zhanjiang Biomass Power Generation Project in Guangdong Province**	DNV	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if all the documents/data used in the PDD for the emission reduction calculations are correctly quoted and interpreted in the PDD as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92.	The validation report does not contain any assessment of the energy balance of the project, i.e balance between inputs and outputs. The DOE has not reported how it has assessed that the 578,000 t of biomass (eucalyptus branch, eucalyptus trunk, eucalyptus residual and eucalyptus root) consumed per year are equivalent to 600,000 MWh/year electricity production.

56	**3370**	**Amman Ghabawi Landfill Gas to Energy Project**	TÜV SÜD	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each monitoring parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The amount of LFG used in gas engines is measured after the gas blowers while the fraction of methane in the LFG is analysed on the main gas pipe before the gas blowers. The PP has not explained how it is ensured that both the methane fraction and LFG flow are be measured on same basis (either wet or dry) as required by the methodology.
57	**4831**	**India-FaL-G Brick and Blocks Project No.3**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In particular, the PDD does not include the monitoring of NCV and density of diesel as required by the paragraph 15 (f) of AMS III Z version 03.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a).	The DOE is requested to clarify that whether the start date of the project activity is the earliest of the date of establishment among all the 42 FaL-G plants or the earliest date of commencement of production among all the 42 FaL-G units (as explained in section 4.6.1 of the validation report, page 18). In doing so, please confirm the start date of the project activity mentioned on page 26 and 68 (Annex 7) of the PDD.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the actions taken to secure the CDM status between the project starting date and the start of validation as per EB 62 Annex 13 paragraph 8 b.	In particular, the DOE is requested to clarify that how it has validated the real and continuing actions listed in the PDD in line with paragraph 7 of EB 62 Annex 13. In doing so, please clarify: 1. the means of validation of the event "submission of the PDD dated 24 March 2008 for Bundle III for validation, using AMS-II.D in convention to the earlier project, Bundle I that was duly registered and; 2. whether the event "Request for deviation submitted by DNV on 16 December 2008 (M-DEV0219) that was approved at the EB48 in 11 March 2009" is specific to the proposed project activity.
58	**5001**	**3 MW Grid connected Wind Electricity Generation at Tirunelveli District, Tamil Nadu, India**	TÜV NORD	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) and> paragraph 6 of the "Guidelines on the assessment of Investment Analysis" EB 62 Annex 5.	In particular, the DOE should provide a validation opinion on which was the source of the tariff and PLF at the time of investment decision (i.e. 11 June 2008 - the project starting date).

59	**4301**	**20.8 MW Grid connected wind electricity generation project at Dhule, Maharashtra**	SIRIM	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	In particular, to report how it has validated: a) the application of the inflation rate based on the data between 2004 and 2008 considering that the project starting date is in 2005; b) the parameter used to calculate the WACC: i) 19.8% cost of equity; and ii) 33.36% tax rate.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a).	In doing so, the DOE is requested to report whether the starting dates for the other four components of the project activity are later than 27 September 2004.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the actions taken to secure the CDM status between the project starting date and the start of validation as per EB 62 Annex 13 paragraph 7.	In particular, the DOE is requested to report the output delivered by each of the three CDM consultants in terms of CDM.
				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, the DOE is requested to report the findings of the comparisons, such as the figures, for: a) the investment cost to the actual cost in the purchase order; b) the PLF to the actual generation records; and c) the O&M costs. In addition, the DOE is requested to report further on the appropriateness of: a) the tax rate of 33.6% for the whole project lifetime, b) assuming the tariff of the first year (3.5 INR/kWh) from the 14th year.
60	**5279**	**Recovery of residual energy project at VF2**	TÜV NORD	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to include description of the process taken to validate the accuracy and completeness of the project description in VR as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 64(a).	in particular, a description of the energy demand in the pre-project scenario and how this energy demand has been met.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed the credibility of the barrier analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118.	in particular, 1) how the DOE has validated the prevailing practice, technological barrier and other barriers (please refer to GUIDELINES FOR OBJECTIVE DEMONSTRATION AND ASSESSMENT OF BARRIERS) 2) the difference between the identified technological barrier and "other barrier" as described in the PDD.

				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).	in particular, a) the breakdown of the annual O&M cost; b) how the input values, such as total investment, cost of natural gas and risk premium for private investment have been cross checked; c)The detail information on the sources used for cross-checking the cost of petcoke; d) The suitability of the "other fee paid to Vitro"; e) the reason why the amount of steam produced is different in 2010, 2011 and 2012 onwards.
				Additionality	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 particular, the PDD/VR lacks information on the sensitivity analysis of alternative 2 (Current Practice scenario).
61	**5328**	**10 MW Biomass based Power Plant at Narsimhapur, Madhya Pradesh**	LRQA	DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to include appointment certificate or CV of each validation team member as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 174 (g).	
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	In particular, the DOE is requested to provide validation on the leakage related to competing use of biomass. In doing so, please provide information on the project consumption and the availability of each type of biomass used by the project activity.
				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, the DOE shall provide further information on how it has validated: a) the biomass calorific value by providing the composition of the biomass used and the calorific value of each type of biomass; b) the 5% annual escalation rate of the biomass and the O&M costs from the 2nd year; and c) the electricity tariff and the escalation rate of 5% from the 6th year. In doing so, please provide evidence and information used for crosschecking the values used.

62	**5292**	**Installation of a high-pressure/high-efficiency bagasse boiler to cogenerate heat and power**	ICONTEC	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to provide the information about the greenhouse gas emissions within the project boundary caused by the implementation of the project activity which contribute to more than 1% of the expected annual emission reductions ER/year and which are not addressed in by the applied methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 77.	The Validation Report does not contain information about the greenhouse gas emissions within the project boundary caused by the implementation of the project activity which contribute to more than 1% of the expected annual emission reductions ER/year and which are not addressed in by the applied methodology as per VVM v1.2
				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).	The Validation Report does not contain information on how the DOE validated the application of a 35% income tax to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a).
63	**5316**	**Jiyuan MSW Landfill Site LFG Recovery to Power Project**	GLC	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The landfill will received waste till year 2017. As per paragraph 8 of AMS III.G. version 6 the total amount of waste landfilled in a year and weight fraction of each waste type should be monitored.
				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).	1. Average O&M cost in the period of investment analysis is calculated to be 1,874,250 RMB/yr, which is about 10% of total investment. The DOE states on page A139 of validation report that average annual O&M cost is only 1.5% of the total investment and hence it was considered as reasonable by DOE. DOE shall clearly state how O&M costs were assessed to be reasonable.
64	**5326**	**Hunan Changsha Qiaoyi Landfill Gas Recovery and Electricity Generation Project**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list the data and parameters used to calculate the emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	(i) According with the applied version of the "Tool to determine methane emissions avoided from disposal of waste at a solid waste disposal site", one parameter required to calculate methane emissions is the "Weight fraction of the waste type j in the sample n collected during the year x". However, this parameter and its source are missing in Section B.6.2. (ii) the flare efficiency was included in Section B.6.2 (90% as default value), however this parameter should have been included in the section of monitored parameters.

				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	According with Section B.6.1 (page 25), the flare efficiency will be determined based on the default values, which requires to monitor both the temperature in the exhaust gas of the flare and the manufacturer's specifications on proper operation of the flare. However, the monitoring of the parameter "Other flare operation parameters" was not included in Sections B.7.1 and B.7.2.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if all the documents/data used in the PDD for the emission reduction calculations are correctly quoted and interpreted in the PDD as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(b).	i) According with the applied version of the "Tool to determine methane emissions avoided from disposal of waste at a solid waste disposal site", one parameter required to calculate methane emissions is the "Weight fraction of the waste type j in the sample n collected during the year x". The DOE is required to explain how it verified the source of this parameter and whether it was correctly applied in ERs calculations
				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	The DOE states that the flare efficiency will be determined based on the default values. In such cases, the flare efficiency tool requires to monitor both the temperature in the exhaust gas of the flare and the manufacturer's specifications on proper operation of the flare. However, the DOE shall proivde an assesment on how the parameter "Other flare operation parameters" will be monitored.
65	**5142**	**The Colomba-Guabal Landfill Gas Project**	SQS	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The monitoring parameter "TDLy" is not included in the monitoring plan.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each monitoring parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	Regarding the parameters monitored using a gas analyzer (e.g. fvi,h & tO2,h & fvCH4,FG,h), the Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane requires zero checks to be conducted for gas analyzers while this is not included in the monitoring plan. Additionally, page 54 of PDD states that one flow meter is installed for each flare but does not state if the other parameters used to calculate flare efficiency will also be monitored separated.

				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the monitoring plan as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	It is not clear whether a separated flow meter will be used to monitor the landfill gas recovered since the project has flares and engines involved. The diagram in Figure B.7.2.2 "Monitoring plan for phase 2" shows that LFGflare is installed before the landfill gas is separated for gensets and flares while page 57 of the PDD states that LFGtotal is the flow meter installed at the flares measuring LFGflare,y and flow meter installed at the gensets measuring LFGelectricity,y.
				DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to address the changes made to the project deign since the global stakeholder consultation was conducted as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 173(c).	Validation reported states that "Main changes between the PDD (Version 01, dated 01/12/2010) published for the 30 days stakeholder commenting period and the final version (version 04, dated 27/07/2011), submitted for registration, are issues related to the six CARs and six CLs identified during validation (for details see appendix F: Summary of requests)." However emission reductions and the start date of project activity have changed between the PDD v.1 and PDD v.4, while from the CARs and CLs listed in validation report is not clear which has affected the emission reductions and the start date of the project, and how this has been solved and validated by the DOE.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the equations applied to calculate the baseline/ project emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per the chosen methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92.	The validation report states that "it is SQS's opinion that the methodology has correctly been applied to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions and emission reductions." however does not provide an assessment if the selections were appropriate and the steps taken to assess the equations applied.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how the data/parameters used in the equations were verified as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 93.	The validation report does not indicate how the amount of landfill waste (historical and projected), waste composition (including its data source), default values such as TDL,y (20%) and other sources indicated in the emission reduction spreadsheet (such as efficiency of genset, operating hours, Working Efficiency and electricity consumption of of blowers) used in estimated emission reductions have been validated.
				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.	The validation report does not describe the steps taken to assess the identification of the baseline scenario of the project activity.

				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	The validation report states that "The longer term commercial lending rate in Colombia at the time of the starting date of the project was 13.25%." and the DOE does not provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark.
				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).	The validation report states that "The used input parameters for investments and O&M costs [6,7,and 8] were verified; expert judgment was used, and both, CAPEX and OPEX were found realistic and reasonable in the national and international context." and does not validate all inputs values used in financial calculations.
				Additionality	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).	The validation report does not assess the sensitivity analysis to determine under what conditions variations in the result would occur and the likelihood of these conditions.
66	**5351**	**Huaneng Wuchuan Shilatu Wind Farm Project**	DNV	Other	The DOE is requested to explain how the comments received during the stakeholder consultation were considered as per VVM v1.2, paragraph 40, 174 (c).	The VR lacks information on why issues raised in the comment are not related specifically to the project in question. Furthermore, the GSP page does not show that there were 55 issues as mentioned by page 28 of the Validation Report.
				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).	The VR lacks information on how the DOE validated the loan interest and the repayment period in line with the VVM version 0.1 para 111.
67	**5274**	**Xinjiang Xinneng Daqiao Small-Scale Hydropower Project**	BVCH	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	In particular, how the DOE has validated that the project activity is entitled to use 10% as benchmark by using the definition of rural area in the Economic evaluation code for small hydropower projects (SL16-95).
68	**5367**	**5 MW Dunali Run-of-the-river, Small Hydro Electric Project", Chamba district, Himachal Pradesh by M/s Jala Shakti Limited (JSL).**	LRQA	Other	The PDD must undergo global stakeholder consultation for 30 days or 45 days for large-scale forestation/Reforestation projects as per VVM v1.2, paragraph 40, 174 (c).	There is an inconsistency in the validation report regarding the reported date on which the PDD was made publicly available in accordance with the requirements of the procedure for global stakeholder consultation. The validation report (page 34) indicates that the GSC started for the period of 07/04/2010- 06/05/2010 whereas in page 25 of validation report the date is mentioned as 12/01/2009. Please clarify.

				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to include validation opinion on the accuracy and completeness of the project description in the validation report as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 64(b).	The DOE has not reported the exact Geo-coordinates of the project site in the validation report.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	(1) As per the PDD (page 16) and the benchmark spreadsheet (benchmark tab_cell F11), the interest rate (Rd) used for the calculation of WACC is 11.5% whereas the validation report (page 15) refers to the interest rate of 10.75%. Please clarify this inconsistency. (2) Information is required on how the DOE has validated the suitability of vintage year for BSE-500 Index data and Beta value given that the vintage year of BSE-500 index data and beta value is only for 5 years (2002 to 2006) whereas the financial analysis is performed for a 20 year operation period.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to identify if the FSR has been the basis of the investment decision as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 113 (a).	The DOE is requested to report in detail that the detailed project report (dated Sep 2000), techno-economic clearance (dated 20/03/2002), CERC tariff order (dated 29/03/2004),HPERC model PPA (dated 24/03/2003) are the basis for investment decision given that the time gap between the investment decision (08/01/2007) / project starting date (07/04/2008) and dates of above documents is significantly long.
				Additionality	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).	The DOE shall report in detail that input values used in the investment analysis are valid and applicable at the time of investment decision.
				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) annual escalation rate of 5% in O&M cost as the DOE has not reported on how it has assessed the suitability of annual escalation rate of 5% in O&M cost; (ii) the royalty power/free power of 10%, the DOE is requested to report in detail how the royalty power/free power of 10% from the 15th year till 30th year is still valid and applicable to the project activity based on the Implementation Agreement date 18/11/2002; (iii) subsidy of INR 41.25 million, please provide detail information regarding the subsidy.

69	**5348**	**India-FaL-G Brick and Blocks Project No.4.**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In particular, the PDD does not include the monitoring of NCV and density of diesel as required by the paragraph 15 (f) of AMS III Z version 03.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how it has validated that the selected baseline and monitoring methodology(ies) are correctly applied and they are not subject to clarifications, revisions or deviations as per VVM v1.2, paragraphs 72-74.	In particular, the DOE shall demonstrate why the project activity is not a debundling component of a large scale project activity considering there is a similar small scale project activity (PA 4585) which has been registered under the same methodology in the year 2011. In doing so, the DOE may refer to EB54 annex 13, paragraph 2, 3, 7.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the actions taken to secure the CDM status between the project starting date and the start of validation as per EB 49 Annex 22 paragraph 8 b.	In particular, the DOE shall validate 1) whether the event "Request for deviation submitted by DNV on 16 December 2008 (M-DEV0219) that was approved at the EB48 in 11 March 2009" is specific to the proposed project activity; and 2) whether there is any documented evidence available during the gap between the ERPA signed on 28 June 2006 and the request for deviation (M-DEV0219) submitted on 16 December 2008.
70	**5229**	**Wuwei Fengle Solar PV Power Project (Phase I) in Gansu Province**	JCI	DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to address the changes made to the project deign since the global stakeholder consultation was conducted as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 173(c).	The DOE is requested to address the changes made to the project deign since the global stakeholder consultation was conducted as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 173(c). In doing so the DOE should also submit the correct version of the validation report given that the validation report submitted by the DOE has the first section (first 30 pages) repeated thrice in the validation report.
				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).	The DOE is requested to explain how it has validated the suitability of the input parameters used in the investment analysis in line with the requirement of VVM v1.2 paragraph 114(a). In doing so, the DOE should explain the method of validation of the input parameters such as project lifetime, value added tax, income tax, surcharges on city building and maintenance, surcharge on education, depreciation rate, residual rate, number of staffs, insurance charge and public reserve fund and public welfare fund.

71	**4380**	**Hutama Green Energy Methane Capture and Utilization Project at Starch Tapioca Mesuji, Central Lampung, Indonesia**	TÜV NORD	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.	1. In accordance with the ACM 0014 version 04.1.0, please clarify how the DOE has validated the elimination of plausible alternative scenarios based on technological barriers listed in the PDD version 1.8. 2. Please clarify how CL B7 is considered as closed since the alternative scenario W5 (i.e. Anaerobic digester with methane recovery and utilization for electricity generation) is identified as project activity and the investment analysis is conducted only on the basis of biogas recovery plant.
				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).	1. Please clarify how the DOE has validated the suitability of total investment cost and operating cost considering the financial analysis is based on biogas plant only and does not include electricity generation component. In doing so, the DOE shall validate the maintenance cost from SPM1starch plant (i.e. 8,500 USD/month) and clarify the O&M cost validated as 213,108 USD/year (page 130 of the validation report). 2. The DOE shall clarify the inconsistencies of the following input parameters used in the financial calculation: a) Operating days used in the IRR analysis (310 days) is not consistent with the operating days taken as 330 in the emission reductions calculation. b) Biogas production rate used in the IRR analysis (35,000 Nm3/day) is not consistent with the value mentioned in the validation report (42,600 Nm3/day). 3. The DOE shall report the means of validation of 100% equity in the proposed project activity.
72	**5364**	**Wastewater Treatment and Methane Recovery at Green Field Joint Stock Company**	SGS	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The project employs an open flare. Monitoring plan does not list monitoring of flame detector to monitor continuous operation of open flare as required by 'Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane'.

				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how it has validated that the selected monitoring methodology(ies) are correctly applied and they are not subject to clarifications, revisions or deviations as per VVM v1.2, paragraphs 72-74.	PDD on page 59 states that the net heat supplied by biogas is based on measurement of amount of steam generated with biogas multiplied by enthalpy of the dead steam after back pressure turbine. Amount of steam generated with biogas will be determined by indirect method based on monitoring the gross steam generated after back pressure-turbine, the quantity of the fired coal and the biogas and their respective net calorific values. Enthalpy of steam after back pressure turbine will be determined based on steam table. The DOE is requested to describe how it has validated that the selected monitoring approach to calculate the net heat supplied by biogas is in compliance with the applied methodology, and is not subject to clarification, revision or deviation.
				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 paragraphs 110 and 114 (c).	The excel file 'Dong Xanh Project Financial (Risk) Assessment_CDM project activity' in the sheet named 'Project sensitivity' presents the sensitivity analysis. However, the outcome of the sensitivity analysis especially for input parameters, 'electricity export' and 'Costs for electricity from the grid' cannot be reproduced.
				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).	The validation report does not contain information on how the DOE has cross-checked the suitability of the applied electricity tariff for import of electricity from gird against third-party or publicly available sources.
73	**5355**	**Sichuan Emeishan Foguang Cement Waste Heat Recovery Power Generation (12MW) Project**	KECO	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe on identification of baseline scenario(s) in PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The DOE is requested to further assess the baseline scenario for the new 4500TPD facility indicated in PDD in line with the Clarification provided by EB 61, Annex 5.The DOE should in order to determine the baseline scenario: a) Identify alternative design options for the 4500TPD clinker facility along with the feasible usage of the waste energy for those designs (with/without waste heat recovery component /with a waste heat recovery component of a different denomination) that was available to the PP. b) Undertake an investment comparison analysis for the identified alternative designs to the entire greenfield facility for the determination of the baseline scenario.

74	**5381**	**ZOOMLION GHANA LTD Composting of Municipal Solid Waste in Accra area**	JCI	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	(a) The DOE should provide information on how it has validated that the following ex-ante figures are also applicable to the Nsumiah landfill (which would have received the waste in the absence of the project activity from 2013 onwards): ¨0.1¨ oxidation factor and ¨1¨ methane correction factor. (b) The DOE should provide information on how they have validated that the calculation of the ex-ante combined margin grid emission factor complies with the ¨Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" Version 02.2.0.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed each barrier presented as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118 (a) and (b).	The DOE is requested to provide further information to support the barrier analysis, in particular (a) that the access-to-finance barrier is real and would have prevented the implementation of the project activity, given that the evidence provided is dated after the starting date of the project activity; and (b) that the project activity is the first-of-its kind in Ghana. In doing so, the DOE should also include information on how they have validated that the proposed project complies with the Guidelines on additionality of first-of-its-kind project activities form EB 63, Annex 11 (as per Validation Report page 25).
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed the existence of the similar projects for common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (b).	The DOE should provide information on how they have validated that there are no similar projects to the proposed project activity in Ghana.
75	**5107**	**Gansu Province Yangtian and Hanjiashan Bundled 4.89MW Small Hydropower Project**	JCI	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate that the geographic location of the project activity is in a special underdeveloped zone of the host country identified by the government before 28 May 2010 as per EB 63 Annex 23 paragraph 2 (a).	It is not clear how the DOE has validated the project activity is in a special underdeveloped zone of the host country, and why the "national poverty alleviation and development area" published by the governmental organization is applicable to identify the special underdeveloped zone of the host country.

				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the actions taken to secure the CDM status between the project starting date and the start of validation as per EB 62 Annex 13 paragraph 7 & 8.	It is not clear how the DOE has validated the real and continuing actions based on the real documented evidences, including an assessment of the authenticity of the evidence.
76	**5352**	**Changge Hengguang Biomass Power Generation Project**	TÜV NORD	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to explain the methodological choices for the calculation of the baseline, project emissions and emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	Some information on leakage at page 45 of the PDD is not readable; text is missing.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each monitoring parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	Some information about the parameter "Biomass residues categories and quantities used in the project activity" at page 51 of the PDD is not readable; text is missing. The same situation is at page 52 of the PDD.
				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(b).	At page 47 of the Validation Report (VR) it is stated that "On 2007-05-08, the project owner applied for bank loan to Bank of China, Changge Branch. This was refused on 2007-06-11 due to the poor financial condition of the project"; however the VR does not say what evidence was provided in this regard and how it was assessed. It is also noted that the PDD does not contain any information about application for and refusal of the bank loan.
77	**5402**	**La Glorita Landfill Gas Project**	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(b).	The date of notification to UNFCCC and Columbian DNA is mentioned as 21/06/2011 in PDD and 20/06/2011 in the validation report.
				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).	Quantitative information/ranges for input values like Capex, O&M costs of other CDM projects, used for comparison are not provided.

				Additionality	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).	Please provide information indicating the extent of variations of the key input values that the project NPV would cross the benchmark, and discuss their likelihood.
78	**4157**	**Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Chizhou Conch Cement Company Limited**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to indicate the reference and the versions of the applied methodology in the PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	. The DOE is requested to further assess the baseline scenario for the new 4*4500TPD facility indicated in PDD in line with the Clarification AM_CLA_0219 .in particular : a).Identify alternative design options for the 4*4500TPD clinker facility along with the feasible usage of partially recovery b).Undertake an investment comparison analysis for the identified alternative designs to the entire greenfield facility(ie, the clinker production line with/without WHR components) for the determination of the baseline scenario.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe whether the assumptions and data used for the baseline identification are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87 (c).	in particular, the DOE is requested to substantiate how it has validated the input values used in the investment comparison.
79	**5261**	**Nam La Hydro Electric Power Project, Vietnam**	BVCH	DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to report if it has applied standard auditing techniques in reviewing the documents as per VVM v1.2, paragraph, 33 (a).	In doing so, the DOE shall submit a new registration request form with information specific for the project activity, given that the registration form submitted is not relevant to the project activity.
				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, the DOE shall conduct cross checking by comparing the unit investment cost of the project activity with that of similar projects within the region or the country if the information available. The DOE shall also further validate the suitability of the feed-in tariff applied in the investment analysis given that it is not clear 1) when the PPA was signed and what tariff has been fixed in the PPA ; and 2) what Decision 709/QD-NLK refers to.
80	**4787**	**Yunnan Yingjiang Xiangbai River Lushan Hydropower Station**	TÜV SÜD	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PDD does not include the monitoring of parameters relevant to hydropower plants, as per the requirements of AMS-I.D, version 16, paragraph 22, item 10.

				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to present common practice analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	PP and DOE shall further discuss clearly and include information in the PDD as to how circumstances for the project activity are different from the Listed companies who have implemented similar projects.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PDD/VR should include information (i) on the location of the meter that measures T flare in the line diagram, Fig. B.7.2., PDD, page 66; and (ii) on how the PP plans to "Measure the temperature of the exhaust gas stream in the flare by a thermocouple", while monitoring T flare (PDD, page 63) considering there is no physical "flare".
81	**5375**	**Zhoushan MSW Incineration Power Generation Project**	CQC	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the equations applied to calculate the baseline/ project emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per the chosen methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92.	With reference to PDD, page 31, where it is stated, "…. As the incinerator can be regarded as an enclosed chamber with the temperature higher than 500 C (Tflare >500 C), as per the Tool, the default value 90% for flare efficiency can be used to calculate project emission from flaring". The DOE is requested to provide information: (i) on the technical/manufacture specifications of the incinerator, including, (a) the operating temperatures of the incinerator; (b) the combustion efficiency at different operating temperatures (range); (ii) the co-relation between the temperature of the incinerator versus the temperature of the exhaust gas of flare (referred to the fore mentioned Tool);
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how the distinctive differences between the project activity and the similar projects identified in the selected scope are justified as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (c).	PP and DOE shall further discuss clearly and include information in the validation report as to how circumstances for the project activity are different from the Listed companies who have implemented similar projects.
82	**5053**	**Yingkou EDZ District Heating Project**	AENOR	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	The efficiency of the power plant used prior to the start of the implementation of the project activity is determined as 36.59%. However, CL3 of the validation report indicates the efficiency as 36.62% . It is requested to correct the inconsistency.

83	**5430**	**Reduction of Methane Leakages in the Gas Distribution Networks operated by the company JP Serbiagas**	ERM CVS	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each monitoring parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The uncertainty range for the measurement method applied to leak i is required to be determined for each leak i. However, the proposed method in the PDD shows that the uncertainty range is calculated for the total leak flow, not for each leak i. It is requested to provide the calculation method for each leak i as required by the methodology.
84	**2939**	**Project of treatment and swine's manure utilization at Ecobio Carbon – Swine Culture Nº 1**	DNV	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76.	The DOE is requested to provide further information on how the assessment on the applicability conditions of paragraph 1 d) of the methodology AMS III-D v17 regarding the retention time and depth of the other lagoons has been performed.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed each barrier presented as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118 (a) and (b).	The DOE is requested to provide further information on the assessment of the technological barrier, specially by describing if the barrier has a direct impact on the financial returns as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 116.
				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).	The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values "electricity price" and "Biogas Conversion Factor m3 to kWh" to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). Furthermore, the DOE is requested to state the availability of the input values to the financial calculations at the time of investment decision.
85	**5407**	**Zhenxiong County Pingzi Hydropower Project**	CEC	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to indicate the starting date of crediting period in the PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The starting date of the crediting period is described as "The starting date of the first crediting period is on 01/01/2012 or the date whichever comes later after registration" in the PDD. It is not clearly described what "the date" means. It is requested to clearly describe the starting date of the crediting period.

				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76.	(a) It is clearly described that the project activity is a newly hydropower plant. However, it is not clearly described how the DOE validated whether the project activity involves a capacity addition or replacement as described in footnotes 1 and 3 of the methodology. The DOE is requested to clearly describe how it validate the applicability condition described in paragraph 2 of the methodology. (b) The validation report describes that "the project is a newly built power plant with no reservoir" in page 15. However, considering the statement from the PDD - the spatial extent of the project boundary includes...and the reservoir area. and the fact that the O&M cost includes the maintenance rate of reservoir, it seems the reservoir exists. The DOE is requested to clarify how it validate the applicability condition described in paragraph 3 of the methodology.
				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).	The DOE concluded that the estimation of the construction investment in the PDD and financial spreadsheet sourced from the approved FSR is considered reasonable even though the total costs in the signed contracts are 78.740444 Million RMB, which is about 91.47% of the total construction investment assumed in the PDD (86.0851 Million RMB). As a justification for this difference, the DOE described that the proposed project is still under construction at the time of validation starting further expenditure is still yet to be incurred. The DOE is requested to further substantiate what kind of further expenditure and how much such expenditure is expected and how the DOE concluded that the estimation of the construction investment in the PDD and financial spreadsheet sourced from the approved FSR is considered reasonable, based on such findings.
86	**5154**	**Shanxi Linfen 2×6MW Coke Oven Gas Power Generation Project**	LRQA	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to complete all the PDD sections for the description of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The steam system of the project activity is not clear. In particular, (i) in page 6 of the PDD, the description (the waste COG is combusted in gas-fired boilers to produce steam with medium temperature and pressure, and partial steam is pumped for heat supply and the rest steam is used for generating electricity) indicates that the steam is derived from the gas-fired boilers; (ii) whereas the Figure A.3 (PDD, page 7) indicates that the heat (in the form of steam) is derived from the steam turbine. Please also provide a diagram of the steam network within the project boundary, in which the sources and the end users of the steam system are clearly illustrated.

				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to include validation opinion on the accuracy and completeness of the project description in the validation report as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 64(b).	The data of coke oven gas are not consistent within the PDD and validation report. In particular, (i) the amount of the coke oven gas production; (ii) the amount of coke oven gas used in the absence of the project activity; (iii) the amount of coke oven gas released in the absence of the project activity. Please refer to page 10, 12, 13, 39 of the validation report, and page 2, 6 of the PDD. The description of the pre-project scenario is not clear. In particular, whether the partial COG has been used for heat generation (page 6 of the PDD) or for tabular furnace and chiller usage (page 13 of validation report).
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a).	(i) The project starting date is not clear and not consistent. As per the description in page 43 of the validation report, the project starting date is 22/05/2005, whereas the PDD (page 35) indicates that the project started implementation in 2007; and (ii) The dates of the construction contract are not consistent. Please refer to page 22 and 23 of the PDD.
87	**5422**	**Guizhou Jinqiao Coal Mine CMM Utilization Project**	TÜV SÜD	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a).	In particular, the DOE is requested to indicate the date of the publication of the references used for the calculation and the verification of the grid emission factor.
				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 DOE shall explain in details: a) if the list of alternatives formed under ACM0008 version 7 page 6 Step 1 contains all technically feasible options and the list is complete; and b) how it has validated the elimination of each alternative scenario in the subsequent steps. In doing so, please justify the elimination of each scenario by explaining the legal requirements and/ or the prohibitive barriers.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the scope of the common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (a).	In Particular, the DOE shall justify the choice of the geographical area to cover the province considering that paragraph 1 of the referred guideline (EB63 annex 12) specifies the applicable geographical area to "cover the entire host country as a default".

				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, the DOE is requested to explain how it has validated the VAT of 17% for the electricity sales. In doing so, please explain if there is any applicable VAT refund policy for such activity.
88	**3992**	**Shuangyang Waste Heat Recovery and Power Generation Project in Jilin Yatai Cement Co., Ltd.**	JCI	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to complete all the PDD sections for the description of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	in particular, whether the WHR project has started operation.
				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.	The DOE is requested to further assess the appropriateness of baseline identification determination of the baseline scenario in light of the clarification provided by EB 61,Annex 5.
				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).	in particular, how the DOE has cross checked each component of the O&M cost.
				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, surtax for education,VAT,urban maintenance and construction tax, lifetime, residual value, equity/debt ratio, loan amount , and interest rate.

89	**5395**	**Shanxi Tunliu 1st Phase 24MW Coking Waste Heat Power Generation Project**	TÜV NORD	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to include validation opinion on the accuracy and completeness of the project description in the validation report as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 64(b).	(i) it is not clear whether the project activity is implemented in an existing facility or new facility given the inconsistency between the description (the new coke ovens) in page 9 of the PDD and description (the 1st phase utilizes the waste heat carried by the flue gas produced by existing facility) in page 10 of the PDD. In doing so, please also explain: (a) how many phases of the coking plant have been implemented and the operation date of each phase; (b) how many units of the project activity have been implemented and what is the source of the waste heat of each unit of the project activity. (ii) the source of the waste energy in the project activity is not clear. In particular, as described in page 2 of the PDD, the project activity is to recover the waste heat from flue gas with 1,000℃ temperature of the coke oven whereas the page 34 of the validation report indicate the coke oven gas as the source of the waste energy.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a).	It is not clear how the DOE has validated the supplementary electricity consumption which has been assumed as 0.1% of the net electricity supplied. The PDD in page 34 explains that as per the methodology ACM0012, in case where the electricity was consumed in gas cleaning equipment in the baseline as well, project emissions due to electricity consumption for gas cleaning can be ignored. However, the project is possible to import some electricity to supplement the electricity consumption.
				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.	It is not clear how the DOE has validated that the energy from waste energy streams would have been released without its recovery (or with partial recovery) in the absence of the project activity as per EB61 Annex 5, given that the starting date of the project activity (06/03/2005) is prior to the operation date of the facilities (coking oven).
90	**5162**	**Gansu Heihe Baopinghe Hydropower Project**	TÜV SÜD	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to indicate the starting date of crediting period in the PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PDD has reported a fixed crediting period for the project activity and accordingly emission reductions have been calculated. However, Section C.2 states that the proposed project activity would select a renewable crediting period, which is not consistent.
				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).	The validation report mentioned that the applied tariff is 0.29 RMB/kWh with VAT in the whole operation period of the financial analysis which has been sourced from FSR, however, a tariff of 0.227 RMB/kWh has been applied for calculation of IRR in the investment analysis spreadsheet.

91	**5461**	**Fatima N2O Abatement Project**	TÜV NORD	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the calculation of ex-ante emission reductions (with actual data and equations) as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In doing so, please clarify the inconsistency in the emission reduction as the project view page reports 405,175 tCO2e/year while the validation report (page 45) and the PDD (table 6) indicate that 4,456,927 tCO2e emission reductions will be achieved within 10 years.
92	**5278**	**Rajasthan Lighting Energy Efficiency Project (RLEEP) in 10 sub divisions of Jaipur City Circle of JVVNL, Rajasthan, India**	TÜV NORD	Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	There are inconsistencies in the survey frequency and the number of households for sampling in the validation report and the PDD. Page 44 of VR mentions: "The project activity targets to install the CFL bulbs ... and will conduct the survey every third year to determine the Lamp Failure Rate, ... The selection of the sample size is deemed acceptable ..., the project activity tends to survey a minimum of 200 CFL bulbs in 100 households to ensure a minimum confidence interval of 90% and the maximum margin of error at 10%.". However, the PDD page 38 shows that 1685, 306 and 131 households will be sampled in the 1st, 4th and 7th year respectively. Furthermore, the DOE has not provided its validation on the calculation of the number of sampling used in the survey.
93	**5439**	**Wind power project in Jaisalmer, Rajasthan by Centaur Mercantile Pvt. Ltd.**	LRQA	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	Information is required on how the DOE has validated the suitability of vintage year for BSE-500 Index data and Beta value given that the vintage year of BSE-500 index data and beta value is only for 11.25 years from February 1999 – 24/05/2010 and 5 year period from 01/05/2005 -31/04/2010 respectively whereas the financial analysis is performed for a 20 year operation period.
				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(b).	The DOE is requested to report on how it has reviewed the prior consideration form sent to the DNA and the confirmation received from the DNA since the final validation report (page 25) reported only regarding the form sent to the UNFCCC and the confirmation received from the UNFCCC.
				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).	Please report on how the fair value of the equipments at the end of the project lifetime had been considered by the PP in the investment analysis given that only land price has been considered as the other income in the investment analysis (IRR tab_cell W33 of investment analysis sheet).

				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).	Please respond to the following issues/concerns : (i) The DOE is requested to report why escalation of 5% is considered for annual O&M cost only where as the income for the project (electricity tariff) has been kept as fixed; (ii) The DOE is requested to report on what basis the similar CDM projects were identified to have comparative assessment of the input values to the investment analysis? Please provide information regarding the identified similar projects.
94	**5265**	**Oceanium mangrove restoration project**	EYG	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PDD on page 32 states that the same values for Biomass Expansion factor (BEF) and Basic Wood Density (Dj) should be used in the ex post and in the ex ante calculations. However, BEF and Dj are included as monitored parameters, the values of which shall be determined during monitoring (page 34 of PDD). The DOE is requested to verify which approach is observed for determining the two parameters, and to update the relevant sections of the PDD accordingly.
				LoA	2: The DOE is requested to confirm on section A. Approval, page 12, of the validation report whether the DNA of Senegal in the LoA is authorizing the participant Océanium for the project activity. This is because the LoA from Senegal is addressed to Danone. The DOE may update the information in the validation report for consistency with the LoA issued by Senegal (a new LoA from Senegal is not required). In doing so please refer to VVM v1.2 paragraph 49.	
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a).	The DOE has validated the project starting date to be 27/06/2008 when the first main purchase (a moto) was made in relation to the project activity. The DOE is requested to further explain: (a) the purpose behind the purchase of the moto and (b) how this date corresponds to the definition of project starting date of A/R small-scale projects (CDM Glossary of terms, page 28) which states that the starting date of an SSC A/R CDM project activity is the date at which the implementation or real action of an SSC A/R CDM project activity begins marks as the date of real implementation of the project.
				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per	The DOE is requested to validate the sampling procedure in the PDD, in particular the calculation of the number of sample plots carried out on page 30 of the PDD.

					VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	
				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to provide information on the PPs' ability to implement the monitoring plan as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(c).	The DOE is requested to provide a statement in the validation report on the PP's ability to implement the monitoring plan.
95	**5455**	**Purmacana Hydroelectric Power Plant**	AENOR	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data, input values and references used in the investment analysis and the results of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PDD and validation report do not specify if the total project cost is funded by equity or if any loan has been taken. In case any loan has been taken from banks then the loan interest rate has not been specified in the PDD and validation report and interest paid has not been accounted in income tax calculation.
				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).	The PDD and validation report do not specify if the total project cost is funded by equity or if any loan has been taken. In case any loan has been taken from banks then the loan interest rate has not been specified in the PDD and validation report and interest paid has not been accounted in income tax calculation.
96	**5410**	**Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Shuangfeng Conch Cement Company Limited**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to complete all the PDD sections for the description of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PP/DOE is requested to provide information on implementation status,in particular, whether the power plant has already started operation
				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.	The DOE is requested to further assess the baseline scenario for the "greenfield facilities" in line with the Clarification provided by EB 61,Annex 5 .The DOE should in order to determine the baseline scenario: 1. Identify alternative design options for the 4500TPD clinker facility along with the feasible usage of the waste energy for those designs (with/without waste heat recovery component /with a waste heat recovery component of a different denomination) that was available to the PP; 2.Undertake an investment comparison analysis for the identified alternative designs to the entire greenfield facility for the determination of the baseline scenario. In doing so,please refer to Clarification "AM_CLA_0219".
97	**5414**	**Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Shimen Conch Cement Company Limited**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to complete all the PDD sections for the description of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PP/DOE is requested to provide further information on the implementation status (phase wise) of the power plant; in particular whether the power plant has already started operation. Section A.2.2 of the Validation Protocol (Page A-5) states that the project activity is not a Greenfield. Further clarification is required.

				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.	The DOE is requested to further assess the baseline scenario for the 4500 TPD "greenfield facilities" in line with the Clarification provided by EB 61, Annex 5. The DOE should in order to determine the baseline scenario: 1.Identify alternative design options for the 2 x 4500TPD clinker facility along with the feasible usage of the waste energy for those designs (with/without waste heat recovery component /with a waste heat recovery component of a different denomination) that was available to the PP. 2.Undertake an investment comparison analysis for the identified alternative designs to the entire greenfield facility for the determination of the baseline scenario. With regard to this, the DOE is requested to refer Clarification "AM_CLA_0219" on ACM0012 version 03.2 for better clarity.
98	**5432**	**Nam An Hydropower Project**	TÜV SÜD	Additionality	The DOE is requested to identify if the FSR has been the basis of the investment decision as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 113 (a).	The PDD on page 14 mentions that the FSR was issued in August 2007. The PDD also mentions an adjusted FSR issued in September 2009. From the input parameters in the investment analysis (such as applicable tariff), it seems that the FSR issued in 2009 has been considered. However, the DOE is requested to state clearly which FSR has been used and justify the choice, considering that between August 2007 and September 2009, the PP notified the DNA about the CDM project activity, conducted the stakeholder consultation and contracted a CDM consultant, demonstrating serious CDM consideration.
				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).	The DOE is requested to clarify how it validated the plant load factor (PLF) for the project activity. In doing so, please provide the PLF value and the validation of its source.

99	**5406**	**Waste Heat Recovery and Utilization for Power Generation at Maple Leaf Cement Factory Limited, Iskanderabad, Pakistan**	TÜV SÜD	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, please (i) justify the applicability of the "Letter of Credit Acknowledgment to Applicant" from HABIB bank to Maple Leaf Cement Factory Limited as an evidence for cross checking the assumed investment cost and how it is avoided the inclusion of costs not related to project investment costs, (ii) provide detailed information related to actual investment cost which was used for cross checking. i.e. values, (iii) justify the auxiliary consumption calculation assumptions, (iv) provide the input values of historical average of electricity price, and source and values of price evolution calculation, and (v) justify the input values regarding the loan, e.g. project loan period, number of repayments and grace period.
100	**5090**	**Renewable Energy Wind Power Project in Rajasthan**	BVCH	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The applied methodology requires "Continuous measurement" of "Quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project plant/unit to the grid". However, the PP in page 40 of the PDD, formula 2, states that the total electricity imported by the project activity will be calculated based on the electricity imported read by the main meter multiplied by the proportion of electricity exported by the project activity (instead of imported).
101	5363	MASISA Biomass Power Project	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to complete all the PDD sections for the description of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In the fourth paragraph of Section A.2 of the PDD, the installation of a a new high-pressure boiler is mentioned as part of the project activity. However, no technical information about this new boiler is provided within the PDD.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe the GHG sources with in the project boundary in the PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The identified project boundary does not include the grid the project is connected to and the free customers the project sell electricity to in line with para 15 (b) and (c) of the applied methodology.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe on identification of baseline scenario(s) in PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The baseline scenario defined in Section B.4 of the PDD (i.e. Electricity is imported from a grid and thermal energy (steam/heat) is produced using fossil fuel) is inconsistent with the baseline scenario individuated under section B.5 (i.e. Electricity is imported from a grid and thermal energy (steam/heat) is produced using biomass).
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe that CDM was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The discussion on prior CDM consideration is limited to the timeline of real and continuing actions with no description on how the incentive from the CDM was considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity.

				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to explain the methodological choices for the calculation of the baseline, project emissions and emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PDD does not describe the methodological choices for the calculation of project emissions (i.e. PEy,startup and PEy,aux); specifically it does not describe what option of the applied Tool is used for the calculation of the project emissions.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	For the estimation of the energy generated annually by the project activity, the PDD assumes a value of Plant Load Factor of 94%. However, the PDD does not include justification of the chosen PLF value as per requirement of the Guidelines for reporting and validation of plant load factors (EB48 Annex11).
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PDD does not list the following monitor parameters that are required to be monitored: i) Net calorific value of biomass type k ; ii) Quantity of fuel consumed in the year y (l) in the auxiliary vehicles (QAy,fuel).

				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each monitoring parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	Issue 1: with regard to the parameter Energy generated by the project activity in the year y (EGBL,y): i) the PDD states at page 3 that a portion of the generated electricity is sold to free (unregulated) customers, but it does not include details on measurement methods and procedures for the portion of the electricity supplied to free customers, considering that - as per methodology requirement - in case the project activity is exporting electricity to other facilities, the metering shall be carried out at the recipient's end and measurement results shall be cross checked with records for sold/purchased electricity; ii) the PDD does not include details on how own electricity consumption is monitored and discounted to arrive to the net energy generated. Issue 2: with regard to the parameter Quantity of fuel consumed in the year y for startup and back-up purposes (QSy,fuel) the PDD does not include details on measurement methods and QA/QC procedures as per requirement of the Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emission from fossil fuel combustion. Issue 3: with regard to the parameters Amount of Biomass used in the power plant per year (Bbiomass): i) the PDD does not include details on whether the quantity of biomass is monitored on dry basis or wet basis; and ii) the PDD does not include cross-checking requirement as per methodology, i.e. in cases where emission reductions are calculated based on energy output, check the consistency of measurements ex post with annual data on energy generation, fossil fuels and biomass used and the efficiency of energy generation as determined ex ante (AMS-I.C version 19, page 21).
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how the data/parameters used in the equations were verified as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 93.	The DOE has not described how the data used for the estimation of electricity generated (including the plant load factor) have been verified.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if the methodology provides different options for equations and parameters and if the selection is appropriate as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 90.	With regard to the project emission due to fossil fuel consumption (PEy,aux and PEy,startup), the DOE has not validated if the options provided by the Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion are properly selected.

				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76.	Considering that the electricity is also sold to free (unregulated) customers (PDD, section A.2), the DOE has not clearly described how the applicability criteria as per para 12 of the methodology is fulfilled by the project activity.
102	**5370**	**1.50 MW Wind Power Project by JC Retail India Pvt. Ltd. Pune Maharashtra, India**	BVCH	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	In particular, the DOE shall clearly indicate the dates of publication for the reference used for the risk free rate of return.
				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, to explain how it has validated the tax calculation as it is not clear: i) how the income tax rate of 33.99% was validated, considering that the validation report page 35 indicates income tax rate of 30%; ii) how MAT was applied in the tax calculation; iii) how it considered "Deduction Under 80IA"; and iv) how the "Net Tax" was accounted in the cashflow, especially in the first three years for which the taxable profit is negative.
103	**5440**	**Sichuan Jinchuan Taiyang River 21MW Hydropower Project**	ERM CVS	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, the DOE shall further explain how it has validated: a) the coefficient of effective electricity, including the validation of the "applicable range" as per the reference used; b) the comparison of the O&M costs and the PLF with "similar registered projects", giving the details of the projects compared to and justifying the similarities to the project activity; and c) application of the VAT rate of 17% issued on 1 November 2008 while the project starting date was validated as 18 December 2007.
104	**5437**	**BRT Macrobus Guadalajara, Mexico**	SQS	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to complete all the PDD sections for the description of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In particular, the PP is requested to clarify the statement in page 15: "Phase I (Line 3) of the BRT is already operational since March 2009. All other BRT lines (Phase II to VIII corresponding to Lines 3 to 10) are under planning or construction" as it is not clear if Line 3 is referred to as Phase I or Phase II.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the calculation of ex-ante emission reductions (with actual data and equations) as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	Equations 1-17 and 19-21 in PDD pages 36-47 are not visible.

105	**5442**	**7 MW Hydel Based Power Unit on River Jatashankari, Chhattisgarh**	DNV	Additionality	The DOE is requested to include a clear validation opinion on the compliance of the project activity with the requirements made in EB 49 Annex 22 as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 104(c).	The DOE is requested to report how it has reviewed the prior consideration form sent to the DNA also and the confirmation received from the DNA as per EB 49 Annex 22, 11 Sep 2009 which is applicable to the project since the project starting date is 1 Dec 2009. The final validation report (page 15) only reported regarding the form sent to the UNFCCC and the confirmation received from the UNFCCC.
				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).	The DOE is requested to report how escalation of 5% considered for annual O&M cost in the investment analysis is appropriate given that the income for the project (electricity tariff) has been kept as fixed.
106	**3779**	**Accion Fraterna Biogas CDM project for rural communities in Anantapur, Andhra Pradesh**	PJRCES	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to correct the inconsistencies regarding the: a) amount of kerosene required to replace fuel wood and meet the cooking requirements, as CAR 7 refers to 26 liters while the VR page 18 and the PDD refers to a value of 24.7 liters; b) validation of the actual amount of kerosene consumption used in the baseline scenario and reported in the PDD, as page 13 of the PDD refers to 0.37 litres/yr while page 26 mentions 0.38 litres/yr and the VR did not report the actual amount of kerosene consumption used in the baseline scenario; c) the amount of kerosene used for crosschecking and reported in the reference /37/ as in some parts of the VR the value of 60.56 lts/family/yr is given while in other parts 90.40 lts/family/yr is mentioned.	
107	**5120**	**Organic Waste Composting at Takon Palm Oil Mill, Malaysia**	TÜV Rheinland	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).	The DOE has not explained why a net book value of 540 USD has been included as expense in the 11th year of the financial assessment.

108	**5423**	**Jiangsu Guodian Taizhou Ultra-supercritical Power Project**	TÜV SÜD	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a).	The DOE is required to provide further information on whether the baseline emission factor of the option 1 has been determined based on the energy efficiency at optimum load as required by the methodology ACM0013 v.04 pages 6-9.
				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).	1) The methodology states "the baseline alternative is available to the project participant(s)." However, there is no information available in the validation report regarding this requirement of the methodology. 2) The DOE is required to provide further information on why the calculation of the LCOE analysis has not considered any revenue from the sale of the ash which is common in coal power plants.
				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).	The DOE is requested to provide further information on how it has validated the input values (unit cost, material expenditure, desulphurization expenditure, other expenditure, person number, waste expenditure and coal consumption) used in the calculation of the financial analysis for the alternative scenario 3 as there is no information on how the input values have been crosschecked with a different source other than the one used in the PDD.
109	**5369**	**Hebei Huafeng Coking Gas Recovery for Power Generation Project**	BVCH	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data, input values and references used in the investment analysis and the results of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The DOE is requested to provide further clarification on how it verified the i) the Plant Load Factor for the project and ii) the different components of the O&M costs in accordance with paragraph 111 of the V.V.M version 1.2.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to present common practice analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	Page 34 of the Validation Report states that the Common Practice was demonstrated as per Step 4 of the "Additionality Tool" and latest rules issued by EB.However the DOE is requested to provide further clarification on :i)which Guidelines has been followed to demonstrate Common Practice,ii) how it verified Common Practice analysis in accordance with paragraph 120 of the V.V.M version 1.2.

				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to explain the methodological choices for the calculation of the baseline, project emissions and emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The "Tool for the emission factor for an electricity system"(EB 63 Annex 19) Page 5 states that "For grid power plants, use a 3-year generation-weighted average, based on the most recent data available at the time of submission of the CDM-PDD to the DOE for validation." The DOE is requested to further clarify why the emission factor has not been calculated with the values available during the time of PDD submission.
110	**5258**	**Xeset II Hydropower Project**	BVCH	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(b).	The DOE is requested to further clarify whether it validated if i) the EDL-Norinco finance contract (2004), ii) Dialogues with the 1st CDM consultant (2004-2006) and iii) Project approval from National Assembly (June 2005), were actions taken by the PP to secure CDM status, or were related to project implementation.
				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).	The DOE is requested to explain how it validated the investment analysis considering that the spreadsheet is not replicable. For example, in the worksheet, 'IRR (without CDM), cell W46', the FIRR value is not obtained using a formula but is a punched value. The same is observed on all the worksheets. The DOE is requested to submit a revised spreadsheet wherein the FIRR can be replicated.
111	5452	Shenzhen Nantian LNG Power Generation Project	DNV	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe if the methodology is correctly applied to determine the most plausible baseline scenario as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87 (e).	The identification of the most plausible baseline scenario (Alternative A4) does not follow the applied methodology requirements as the alternative with the lowest levelised cost is not chosen as the baseline. The DOE is required to provide further information to support the adoption of this alternative as a baseline scenario.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a).	The validation report lacks information on how the selected baseline efficiency under Alternative A4 Super critical coal-fired power plant with a unit capacity of 600 MW is in accordance with the methodology AM0029 v. 3 page 5 (i.e. nBL - Energy efficiency of the most likely baseline technology).

				Additionality	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).	'Sensitivy analysis' reported in the validation report (p 17) is different from the calculations in the submitted spreadsheet. The VR shows the LCOEs of the selected baseline & the PA with +10% in PLF as 0.2434 and 0.4655, with -10% in PLF as 0.2581 and 0.4918 respectively, with +10% in fuel cost as 0.2560 and 0.5085 with -10% in fuel cost 0.2340 and 0.4466, while the spreadsheet shows them as +10% in PLF as 0.2390 and 0.4655, with -10% in PLF as 0.2639 and 0.4918 respectively, with +10% in fuel cost as 0.2612 and 0.5085 with -10% in fuel cost 0.2392 and 0.4466. The same inconsistency is found in alternatives A2 and A3.
112	**5426**	**Yunnan Baoshan Baihuashu Hydropower Bundled Project**	TÜV Rheinland	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to cross-check the given information in the PDD and to determine the authenticity of the documentation to demonstrate additionality as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 97.	The DOE validated that the additionality of the project has been demonstrated by application of the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality, Version 05.2" (VR page 27); however, the PDD states that the additionality is demonstrated based on the requirement of Appendix B of the Simplified Modalities and Procedures for Small-Scale CDM project activities (PDD page 13). Additional information are required on how the DOE validated the methodological approach used in the PDD for the demonstration of additionality.
113	**5445**	**Ta Thang Hydropower Project**	TÜV NORD	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how the distinctive differences between the project activity and the similar projects identified in the selected scope are justified as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (c).	The DOE should explain how essential distinctions between the proposed project activity and Cua Dat Hydropower Project were validated.
				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).	The DOE should clarify how the accuracy of financial calculations was validated considering that the financial indicator in the investment analysis is the NPV whereas the VR in page 52 indicates that financial indicator is project IRR. Further the DOE shall clarify why the benchmark applied to calculate the NPV in the investment analysis is different from the benchmark validated (i.e. 12.375%).

114	**5469**	**Switch from Single Cycle to Combined Cycle (CC) CDM Project at Shirvan Power Plant**	BVCH	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a).	The validation report lacks information why only 3 years of data were used to determine parameter EGOC and EFHIST, given that the emission reductions spreadsheet shows that 4 years of data are available.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed the existence of the similar projects for common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (b).	The validation report has not explained how the application of the common practice analysis complies with the EB63 Annex 12, as: (1) Step 2 of the analysis only lists combined cycle power plants; (2) Step 3 only identifies combined cycle power plants that have different technologies.
				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).	The validation report has not justified why there are two types of variable costs (EUR/MWh and Rial/MWh) for each open cycle and combined cycle.
115	**4379**	**Hutama Green Energy Methane Capture and Utilization Project at Starch Tapioca Bandar Mataram, Central Lampung, Indonesia**	TÜV NORD	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PDD (p36) presents the average depth of the lagoon as 5m fr the baseline calculation and 9.5 m for the project emission calculations but no explanation is provided about the difference in the depth value. Further, the spreadsheet indicates a depth of 6 m.
				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.	According to methodology (Step 1 p6), in case of project activities implemented in Greenfield facilities, the DOE undertaking the validation shall include an interview with an independent wastewater expert. The DOE has not reported compliance with this requirement.
116	**5464**	**Hunan Zhuzhou Sinoma Cement 9MW Waste heat Recovery Project**	DNV	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to include validation opinion on the accuracy and completeness of the project description in the validation report as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 64(b).	The DOE shall clarify whether the project is implemented in an existing or new industry facility given that the PDD in page 10 indicates that project activity is implemented at a newly constructed cement production facilty whereas VR in page 12 indicates that the project activity is implemented at an existing facilty.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if the methodology provides different options for equations and parameters and if the selection is appropriate as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 90.	The DOE shall explain the appropriateness of method selection to determine the capping of baseline emissions. In doing so, the DOE shall explain: (i). what the source of the waste energy is; (ii). what the WECM is; and (iii). how the waste energy is converted into the final output.

117	**5093**	**Jinhanlazha hydropower station (58MW) of Niru River, Yunnan Province, P.R.China**	CEC	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data, input values and references used in the investment analysis and the results of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	1. The DOE is requested to provide further information on how it verified the (i)Static Investment (ii) Annual Operational Cost (with details on each component). 2. The DOE shall clarify on what basis has it considered similar projects for cross checking; in particular whether the capacity and the number of projects chosen is representative to provide a comparable range for cross checking of parameters. 3. The DOE shall provide further information on why the latest tariff applicable in 2008 (investment decision) has not been considered in the investment analysis.
118	**4977**	**Coke Dry Quenching Waste Heat Recovery for 50MW Power Generation Project in Guangxi Liuzhou Iron and Steel (Group) Company**	SGS	Additionality	The DOE is requested to identify if the FSR has been the basis of the investment decision as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 113 (a).	The PP/DOE is requested to clarify how it has validated that i) the signing of the construction contracts on 30 May 2008 constitutes the investment decision for the project activity and ii) the input values from the FSR dated May 2008 were valid at the time of the investment decision; considering that on page 19 of the PDD states that the "Liu Steel Group approved to construct the project" in May 2007.
119	**5447**	**Ferrosilicon waste heat power generation project**	JCI	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if the methodology provides different options for equations and parameters and if the selection is appropriate as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 90.	The DOE is requested to clarify the calculation of QOE,BL using Method 3 (Case 1). In doing so the DOE should note that ACM0012 ver 4 states that "fcap should be the ratio of maximum energy that could be recovered (MER) by the waste heat recovery equipment implemented under the CDM project activity and the actual energy recovered under the project activity (using direct measurement)."
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76.	The DOE is requested to provide further information on how it validated Option 2 of Annex 2 (ACM0012 ver.4) in line with CL 16 of the Validation Report.

120	**5468**	**Emission reductions through partial substitution of fossil fuels with alternative fuels at PT Semen Tonasa**	TÜV NORD	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).	1. The DOE shall report how it has validated the calorific value of Coal, IDO and Rice husk and the cost of main burner of Kiln 2 and 3 as per the breakup of capital expenditure given in Annex 3 of the validation report. 2. The DOE shall validate the per ton cost of coal and IDO for scenario 2 (all 3 kilns). 3. The DOE shall clarify the mismatch in the total cost of kiln 2 and 3 (9,788 million IDR) reported in the validation report with the sum of individual kiln cost of 4,744 million IDR each as mentioned in the PDD and financial calculation spreadsheet. 4. The DOE is requested to clarify the suitability of rice husk price for scenario 1 and scenario 2 which is based on packaging cost and the transportation cost assuming 50 KM and 75 KM radius as the biomass procurement region.
121	**5481**	**Huadian Inner Mongolia Tongliao Kailu Jieji Wind Farm Project**	TÜV NORD	Other	The DOE is requested to explain how the comments received during the stakeholder consultation were considered as per VVM v1.2, paragraph 40, 174 (c).	The validation report (p 10) states that the public stakeholder comments are discussed in annex 5. However, there is no information in annex 5.
122	**5482**	**Efficient Wood Fuel Stove-Cooking-Sets, Lesotho**	TÜV NORD	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the calculation of ex-ante emission reductions (with actual data and equations) as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	According to the PDD v.2.2 (p 31), the formula to calculate "quantity of woody biomass used in the absence of the project activity" applies the adjusted drop out from total population of appliances in period y (DOy). However, the spreadsheet applies (1-DOy) for the calculation of woody biomass used in the absence of the project activity
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how it has validated that the selected baseline methodology(ies)applies(y) correctly to the project boundary, baseline identification and algorithms and formulae used to determine emission reductions as per VVM v1.2, paragraphs 67.	Further information is required on how the minimum sampling size of 68 in baseline survey is determined as the baseline survey (page 15- PDD v 2,2) was argued to be based on multi-stage geographical cluster sampling approach (225 elements).The EB 50 Annex 30 para 30 refers to the multistage sampling which is based on sub-groups.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state that the estimates in the PDD are reasonable for data and parameters that are monitored during implementation and are available after validation as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	The PDD (p.35) states that systems deployed (Ny) in year of 2012, 2013 and 2014 are 5,000, 7,000 and 12,000 accordingly. Further information is required on why the estimation of the monitored parameter Ny (systems deployed per year) is different for the first 4 years as no relevant information is provided in either the PDD or the validation report.

				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe all the assumptions/ data/references listed in the PDD for the baseline identification as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87 (a).	The DOE is required to provide further information related to the replacement of low efficiency appliances as it is not clear whether they will be disposed or still use within the boundary (Methodology II.G V.3, para 20 a) b))
123	**5480**	**Wind Power Project Activity by M/s Orient Abrasives Ltd**	LRQA	DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to include a list of interviewees and document reviewed as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 174 (d).	There are multiple number of documents with the same reference number (validation report pages 42-45). Due to this, the reference provided in the document cannot be identified. Please provide unique identification for each reference document.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	In particular, the DOE is requested to provide the date for the following values used for the benchmark calculation for sub-project 1: a) risk free rate of return; and b) beta value.
				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 doing so, please report further on how it has validated: a) the investment costs based on a proposal considering that purchase agreements were available before the investment decision which are the project starting dates (25/06/2009 and 24/10/2009); and b) the crosschecking of the investment and O&M costs considering that different sets of "similar projects" were used to assess these two input values.
124	**5483**	**Caquende and Juliões Small Hydroelectric Power Plants**	DNV	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed each barrier presented as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118 (a) and (b).	In doing so, the DOE shall provide: a) a clear definition of "small-hydro projects" in terms of the installed capacity; b) list of projects considered; and c) how it is interpreted as a barrier, in the context of the prevailing practice barrier.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a).	In doing so, please explain how the DOE validated the contract with turbine supplier to be the earliest commitment made by the project participant out of all the activities related to both power plants. in doing so, please provide clear timelines of the project and CDM implementation for each hydro power plant.

				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 doing so, the DOE shall provide: a) separate investment analysis for each hdro power plant; and b) detailed validation of all relevant input values used in the calculation of the IRR, which includes validation of: i) the total investment: breakdown of the cost, clearly distinguishing the cost related to the modification of the old plant and the construction of the new plant; ii) the O&M costs: the breakdown of the costs; iii) the net electricity export: the estimation of the operating hours and any discounting factor applied such as the line loss; iv) the electricity tariff.
125	**5343**	**Nho Que 3 Hydropower Project**	BVCH	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	The detailed calculations for the cost of equity calculation (CAPM) have not been submitted. The cost of equity, based on Ibbotson, has not been validated. The variable Tc (the average enterprise tax rate) has not been validated, only the enterprise tax rate during certain periods has been validated.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how the distinctive differences between the project activity and the similar projects identified in the selected scope are justified as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (c).	No references have been provided to demonstrate that, of the six hydro projects presented for common practice analysis, four of them were built prior to 2001 and that the remaining two are state owned.
				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).	The crosschecking of the project cost is incomplete. The value from the investment certificate (2 Dec 2009) is not provided. The identification numbers for the 'local registered projects' are not provided. The 'Technical Design Report' (Jan 2010) is not referenced and it is unclear what this is. Crosschecking of the tariff is incomplete as the government decision 2014QD/BCN is not referenced and no date is provided.
				Additionality	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).	The sensitivity analysis is incomplete as it has excluded operation and maintenance costs from the analysis without an explanation.

126	**5394**	**Funing County District Heating Project**	TÜV NORD	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In doing so, the DOE/PP are requested to document in the CDM-PDD the results of the measured boiler efficiencies (ε BL,,HG,j,i) used for calculating the CO2 emission factor for the heat generation system (EFBL,HG,j,i) as required by the AM0058 ver. 3 methodology (page 19).
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In doing so, the DOE is requested to provide information justifying the exclusion of the monitoring of CO2 emission factor of the fuels used in the project activity (EFCO2,i,y) from the monitoring plan considering that the "Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion" requires this parameter to be monitored.
				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 doing so, the DOE is requested to provide information clarifying: i) the inconsistent in the fuel consumption rate (FCi,j,y) as the validation report shows 64,146 tons while the PDD and the excel-sheet calculation applies a value of 45,763 tons, and ii) clarify the conservativeness of the applied coal price of 511 RMB/ton when compared to the actual value of 460 RMB/ton as it appears that a decrease in fuel expenditure is more conservative.
				Additionality	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, the DOE is requested to: i) provide information justifying the exclusion of the heat generation parameter from the sensitivity analysis, and ii) confirm the calculated critical point (46% increase) for the fuel consumption.
127	**5458**	**Inner Mongolia Erdos Metallurgy Co., Ltd Electric Furnaces Waste Energy Utilization for Power Generation Project (Phase One)**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe on identification of baseline scenario(s) in PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	There is no information about "Demonstration of use of waste energy in absence of CDM project activity" for Type 1 project activities.(page4 of ACM0012 ver 3.2). The PP shall incorporate the same in Section B.2 of the PDD.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data, input values and references used in the investment analysis and the results of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	a) The DOE is requested to provide further details on how it validated and cross-checked the "O&M cost" in particular the "Employee Cost" in line with paragraph 111 of the V.V.M (ver 1.2) and how the DOE verified the costs are only pertaining to the project activity. b) The DOE shall provide information on how it verified and cross checked the debt equity ratio for the project and the interest on term loan.

				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to explain the methodological choices for the calculation of the baseline, project emissions and emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The DOE shall provide further information on how it verified the value of fcap in accordance with Method 3 of ACM0012 ver 3.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the monitoring plan as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	Page 40 of the PDD states that "Meteri2 (i=1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and represents the number of generator) is installed at the high voltage side of the transformer which is near the recipient side and it is the main meter" which is in accordance with the monitoring methodology ACM0012 ver-3. However the algorithm for calculating the net electricity refers to meter (Mi1) which is installed near the generation plant and not the recipient plant. The PP/DOE is requested to correct the inconsistencies in the algorithm.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76.	The DOE is requested to provide further clarification on how it verified "Demonstration of use of waste energy in absence of CDM project activity" for Type 1 project activities.(page4 of ACM0012 ver 3.2)
128	**5124**	**Installation of Natural gas based direct combined heat and power package cogeneration system in India**	SGS	DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to resolve all CARs and CLs raised as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 37.	The CL-16 (VR page 91) asked the PP how the VAM installed in 'retail' sector and/or in industrial sector is different from 'commercial office sector/building sector'. The PP responded that the industrial sector load is uniform and not intermittent as in case of building sector. However, there is no information on how the DOE has validated this in order to close the CL.
				Other	The DOE is requested to identify if the PDD has been updated and rectified according to the responses to the CARs, CLs and or FARs raised during validation as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 39.	The CAR-19 (page 97) was closed as the monitoring of fuel consumption in DG sets and electricity consumption by electric chillers had been included in the monitoring plan. However, the PDD version 6.2 submitted for registration has not included those parameters in the monitoring plan.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the equations applied to calculate the baseline/ project emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per the chosen methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92.	The PDD has not stated and the VR has not confirmed which option is chosen to determine the parameter COEFi,y in order to calculate the project emission from fossil fuel combustion as per Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion.

				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76.	The PDD page 6 mentions that the VAM will generate heating effects in the winters. There Validation Report lacks information on how this has been taken into account in the calculation of the energy saving.
				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.	The Validation Report has not explained why the baseline for cooling was determined based on the baseline for electricity. Furthermore, it lacks information on when the the survey/study used to identify the baseline was carried out.
				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	The VR lacks information why following parameters are not included in the monitoring plan: (1) Weighted average mass fraction of carbon in fuel type i in year y and Weighted average density of fuel type i in year y, for Option A to determine the CO2 emission coefficient COEFi,y as per Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion ; (2) Weighted average net calorific value of fuel type i in year y and Weighted average CO2 emission factor of fuel type i in year y, for Option B to determine the CO2 emission coefficient COEFi,y as per Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion; (3) Quantity of fuel type combusted in the emergency DG as it is included in the project boundary as per Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion; (4) Electricity consumption by electrical chillers for emergency; (5) EFgrid. Furthermore, discrepancy was found. The PDD page 29 and the VR page 23 mentions that for parameter FCGE,y (Volume of natural gas consumed in the gas engines) data will be monitored through flow meters installed at project site to measure the natural gas consumed in the gas engine. However, the PDD page 40 mentions that the flow meters are installed for measuring gas consumption by building 8 (i.e. not the project activity), and based on the difference between the GAIL supply meter and building 8, the natural gas consumption by the Infinity Tower (i.e. the project activity) is determined.
129	**4009**	**Pure-low Temperature Waste Heat Recovery for Power Generation in Chifeng Yuanhang Cement Co., Ltd.**	DNV	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76.	The DOE is requested to apply the last version of the methodology ACM0012 (ver. 4) since the project activity has been resubmitted and the methodology ACM0012 ver. 03.2 has expired. Requests for registration that use the version 03.2 could be submitted until 15 Dec 2011.

				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, how verified the exclusion of baseline alternatives W3 (Waste energy is sold as an energy source) and P5 (On/off-site existing/new renewable energy or other waste energy based existing captive or identified plant), since the methodology requires that the exclusion of any baseline option shall be justified with documented evidence. Additionally, the DOE is requested to justify how assessed that the Chifeng Kelaqinqi Economy and Trade Bureau is a verifiable and credible source to cross check the information provided in the PDD about geothermal energy availability, as per the VVM paragraph 84.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to cross-check the given information in the PDD and to determine the authenticity of the documentation to demonstrate additionality as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 97.	In particular the DOE is requested to provide information on how it has been assessed the existence of similar projects to the proposed project activity for cross checking the investment analysis.
130	**5565**	**Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Yiyang Conch Cement Company Limited**	DNV	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.	The DOE is requested to assess the baseline scenario for the "greenfield facilities" in line with the Clarification provided by EB 61,Annex 5 .The DOE should in order to determine the baseline scenario : 1.Identify alternative design options for the clinker facility along with the feasible usage of the waste energy for those designs (with/without waste heat recovery component /with a waste heat recovery component of a different denomination) that was available to the PP. 2.Undertake an investment analysis for the identified alternative designs to the entire greenfield facility for the determination of the baseline scenario In doing so,please refer to Clarification "AM_CLA_0219"
131	**5041**	**Beizhen City Wufeng Rice Trade Processing Co., Ltd. 10MW Biomass (Rice Husk) Power Plant Project**	CQC	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to complete all the PDD sections for the description of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The section A.4.3 of the PDD does not include levels of services in QUANTITATIVE terms, (in terms of mass and energy flows) for heating and non-heating period separately, as provided by the systems and equipments that are being installed under the project activity. This is required as per the latest version of GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETING THE PROJECT DESIGN DOCUMENT (CDM-PDD) AND THE PROPOSED NEW BASELINE AND MONITORING METHODOLOGIES (CDM-NM).

132	**5579**	**Nam Cat Hydropower Plant, Vietnam**	SQS	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to insert the map to section A.4.1.4 of the PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The Map 1 is not visible in the submitted PDD.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	Please provide the actual values applied or correct reference for the values for tables in B.6.2. as some reference provided seem incorrect. For example, value applied for EGm,y is referred to section B.6.3 but there is no EGm,y value found in that section.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the calculation of ex-ante emission reductions (with actual data and equations) as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In particular, please provide sample calculations to demonstrate how the values were applied to each equation to calculate the emission reductions.
				DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to resolve all CARs and CLs raised as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 37.	In particular, the following issues shall be addressed: CL3: map not visible in the PDD. CL6: the methodology used is version 16, not 15. CL16: it not clear what "electricity break down in the grid" implies.
				Other	The DOE is requested to indicate in the validation report if the latest PDD template is used as per VVM v1.2, paragraph 55.	Footer of the PDD template is modified. The template must not be modified. Please refer to para 13 of Guidelines for completing t he simplified project design document Version 05. In addition, information that is not related to the baseline, such as "stakeholder consultation" and "list of documents" is included in Annex 3 Baseline Information. Those pieces of information should be relocated to appropriate sections of the PDD.
133	**5578**	**Installation of natural gas based combined cooling heating and power (CCHP) systems in DLF Building 8 in Gurgaon, India**	SIRIM	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.	The Validation Report lacks of information of why the baseline for cooling was determined based on the baseline for electricity and not referred to another source.

				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	The VR does not present information of why following parameters are not included in the monitoring plan: a) Weighted average net calorific value of fuel type i in year y and b) Weighted average CO2 emission factor of fuel type i in year y, to determine the CO2 emission coefficient COEFi,y as per Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion
134	**5564**	**Fuel replacement with waste gas stream containing hydrogen and biomass at the CMPC Pacífico mill**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to complete all the PDD sections for the description of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The DOE is requested to clarify whether TRS (Total Reduced Sulphur) gases used in the lime kiln prior to the implementation of the project would be continued to be utilized in the project activity.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	Further clarification is required on: i) how "HGj,y" (Net quantity of heat supplied to the recipient plant j by the project activity during the year y) is monitored in accordance with ACM0012 (ver 3.2); ii) how "EGthermal " (net quantity of heat supplied by the project) is monitored in accordance with A.M.S I-C (ver 19); and iii) how the project activity is in accordance with the monitoring methodology I-C (ver 19).
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if the baseline methodology is correctly applied to calculate project/baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(d).	Page 3 of the PDD states that turpentine was sold to chemical industries. However the DOE did not assess the impact on leakage emissions from the utilization of the turpentine in the project activity in line with EB 47, Annex 28 .
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how it has validated that the selected monitoring methodology(ies) are correctly applied and they are not subject to clarifications, revisions or deviations as per VVM v1.2, paragraphs 72-74.	The DOE is requested to clarify how it validated that the project activity has correctly applied the baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0012 (ver 3.2) in conjunction with I-C (ver-19).In doing so please refer to AM_CLA_0149.
				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.	Further clarification is required on: i) how the DOE ensured that the sodium chlorate plant was not designed to recover hydrogen from its inception. ii) how the DOE validated the demonstration of use of waste energy in absence of project activity in accordance with Page 4 of ACM0012 ver 3.2

				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed the credibility of the barrier analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118.	The DOE is requested to further clarify how it considered the barrier analysis to be appropriate, in particular: i) Most of the barrier analysis is linked to the barrier faced due to recovery of hydrogen gas (component of ACM0012) only. Since the project activity claims emission reductions from thermal energy generation from biomass residue (component of I-C) also, the DOE shall further validate the barrier analysis; ii) Page 32 of the PDD states : "Technological Barriers: In Chile hydrogen has never before been used as an energy source in any kind of project in the pulp industry". The DOE is requested to validate the barriers for similar pulp industries with sodium chlorate facilities; iii) Why EB 50,Annex 13 has not been applied to demonstrate barriers; iv) How the DOE validated the barriers in accordance with paragraph 117 of the VVM (ver 1.2).
135	**5518**	**VG Energy's Waste to Power at Vichitbhan Palmoil Co., Ltd.**	TÜV NORD	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to provide validation opinion on all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a), (b) and paragraph 93.	In particular, the DOE should provide information on the validation of calorific value and the density assumed for the biogas (row 10 on the "Explanation of Elec.gener" tab within the emission reduction spreadsheet).
				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 the DOE should provide information, how it has validated the allocation of electricity produced by the project among peak/off-peak hours and its impact on the tariff received.
136	**5474**	**Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Zongyang Conch Cement Company Limited**	DNV	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.	The DOE is requested to further assess the baseline scenario for the "greenfield facilities" in line with the Clarification provided by EB 61,Annex 5 .The DOE should in order to determine the baseline scenario : 1.Identify alternative design options for the 2*4500TPD clinker facility along with the feasible usage of the waste energy for those designs (with/without waste heat recovery component /with a waste heat recovery component of a different denomination) that was available to the PP. 2.Undertake an investment comparison analysis for the identified alternative designs to the entire greenfield facility for the determination of the baseline scenario In doing so,please refer to Clarification "AM_CLA_0219".

137	**5676**	**Oaxaca III Wind Energy Project**	AENOR	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	The DOE is requested to clarify whether the benchmark applied is pre-tax benchmark or post-tax benchmark.
138	**5444**	**Fumeng Gulibengao Wind Farm 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 doing so please provide information regarding the similar projects with which the project activity was compared to and source of the estimated expenditure of 90.2% on the total investment cost.
139	**5615**	**Suoi Trang Hydropower Plant, Vietnam**	SQS	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the calculation of ex-ante emission reductions (with actual data and equations) as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	It should contain step-wise calculation of the emission reductions, demonstrating how the values are applied to the equations.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In doing so, the PP should clearly indicate how the monitored parameter (EGy) is determined in section B.7.1.by identifying: a) the parameters that are directly measured; b) the meter used for each measured parameter; and c) how the monitored parameter is determined from the measured parameters.
				DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to resolve all CARs and CLs raised as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 37.	In particular, it is not clear: a) how CL7 regarding the plant load factor is closed, in particular, if the PLF was based on the FSR or the revised FSR, considering that the capacity was revised after the detailed survey (see CAR 2 and 3); and b) how CL11 regarding the "underdeveloped area" was closed as it is not clear how the DOE has interpreted the decree (DECREE No. 108/2006/ND-CP).
				Other	The DOE is requested to indicate in the validation report if the latest PDD template is used as per VVM v1.2, paragraph 55.	The footer of the PDD is modified; the template must not be codified. Please refer to Guideline of completing PDD. Also, the font is altered in some parts of the PDD.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a).	In particular, the DOE shall report how it has validated the grid emission factor (EFgrid), including the details of the data used, such as the source and date.

				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state that the estimates in the PDD are reasonable for data and parameters that are monitored during implementation and are available after validation as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	In particular, the DOE shall clearly report how the net electricity supplied to the grid by the project activity will be determined by clearly stating the functions of each meter, M11, M12 and M2. In doing so, also clarify which measurement the power sales/ purchase invoice will be based on.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a).	In particular, the DOE shall report: a) how it has confirmed the purchase of the construction material to be the earliest commitment; and b) if any other contract related to the implementation of the project such as EPC contract or construction contract was signed prior to this date.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the actions taken to secure the CDM status between the project starting date and the start of validation as per EB 49 Annex 22 paragraph 8 b.	In particular, the DOE shall report if the continuing and real actions to secure the CDM status i.e. activities related to the implementation of the project activity as a CDM project, is demonstrated with evidence such as contractual agreements.
140	**5316**	**Jiyuan MSW Landfill Site LFG Recovery to Power Project**	GLC	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The DOE has validated that the monitoring plan complies with the methodology and noted that the LFG temperature and pressure are among the parameters that need to be monitored. However, the monitoring plan in the PDD does not include the measurement of the temperature and pressure of the LFG, which are required to calculate the density of methane, as per the monitoring methodology in AMS. III.G v6.
141	**5514**	**Henan Dengzhou Biomass cogeneration Project**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe the GHG sources with in the project boundary in the PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PDD (page 10) and the validation report (page 16) indicate that baseline emissions of CH4 from uncontrolled burning or decay of surplus biomass and project emissions of CH4 from combustion of biomass residues for electricity and heat are excluded for simplification. This is not consistent with the ex-ante calculation of Emission Reductions provided in page 49, which accounts 6,461.7 tCO2e from the anearobic decay of biomass residues (BEbr,y) and 1,840.57 tCO2e from the combustion of biomass residues (PEbr,y). Further, the validation report does not contain information on how the DOE assessed the equations applied to calculate the baseline emissions due to uncontrolled burning or decay of biomass residues (BEbr,y) and project emissions from the combustion of biomass residues (PEbr,y), as per as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92.

				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list the data and parameters used to calculate the emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PDD states that the combined margin (CM) emission factor is calculated according to data published by the DNA. Please indicate if parameter EFgrid,CM should be included in Section B.6.2 of the PDD (Data and parameters that are available at validation).
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PDD, section B.7.1 contains monitoring parameter EFkm,y with two different values (EFkm,y = 0.001011 tCO2/km on page 52 and EFkm,y = 0.001097 tCO2/km on page 56). Please clarify.
142	**5623**	**KSEPA 2.6MW PV power plants bundle CDM project**	KSA	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how the data/parameters used in the equations were verified as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 93.	It is not described by the DOE how it was verified the average annual power generation (3,331 MWh per year). Please, provide further explanation about the verification of this data.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe all the assumptions/ data/references listed in the PDD for the baseline identification as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87 (a).	According to the Validation Report the OM is calculated using data from 2006 ~ 2008 and the build margin (BM) with data from 2007 (VR, pg 17). Since data from 2008 appears to be available for the BM, please clarify how year 2007 was validated as the most appropriate for the BM. Additionally, the DOE has explained that the approximate operating margin is calculated as the average of data for years 2006, 2007 and 2008, which is the most recent available statistics at the time of preparation of the initial PDD. Please clarify the date of publication of the data source (Statistic of Electric Power in Korea by KEPCO), and how it was validated that the source was the most recent available at the time of initial PDD preparation.
				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	
				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to provide information on the PPs' ability to implement the monitoring plan as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(c).	

143	**4359**	**Mare Chicose Landfill Gas Project**	SQS	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if the baseline methodology is correctly applied to calculate project/baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(d).	The DOE has confirmed that the baseline methodology is correctly applied, and the VR on p. 22 says, "The project falls under scenario C ("Electricity consumption from the grid and a fossil fuel fired captive power plant"), case CIII ("Electricity from both the grid and captive power plant(s)"), as electricity consumed may come either from the grid or from the captive power plant, depending on the situation. Therefore, the emission factor for electricity generation is taken the more conservative value between the emission factor determined as per guidance for scenarios A and B of the "Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption". This value is noted in the PDD, p.46, as 1.3 tCO2/MWh, as per option 2B of the Tool). However, for the calculation of PEEC,y, the value used in the ER Spreadheet (Tab "Input data" cel F69) is the grid emission factor of 0.967 tCO2/MWh (CEFelec,BL,y). The DOE is requested to explain this inconsistency.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state that the estimates in the PDD are reasonable for data and parameters that are monitored during implementation and are available after validation as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	The DOE reports the project activity falls under scenario C ("Electricity consumption from the grid and a fossil fuel fired captive power plant"), case CIII ("Electricity from both the grid and captive power plant(s)"), as electricity consumed may come either from the grid or from the captive power plant, depending on the situation. Therefore, the applicable emission factor for electricity generation (EFEL,j,y) is 1.3 tCO2/MWh (as per option 2B of the "Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption"). However, this value does not match with the reported in the PDD Section B.7.1 and the one used in the calculation of PEEC,y in the ER Spreadheet (Tab "Input data" cel F69).
144	**5408**	**Fujian Jinniu Waste Heat Recovery Project**	ERM CVS	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each monitoring parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	EIp,y is not included in the monitoring plan as per the methodology
				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).	it is not clear how the DOE has validated each component under O&M cost.

145	**3895**	**Power generation from renewable sources – Arvoredo and Varginha Small Hydropower Plants**	RINA	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state that the estimates in the PDD are reasonable for data and parameters that are monitored during implementation and are available after validation as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	Since the parameters APJ and CapPJ were used to estimate ex-ante the emission reductions, please provide further information about how these parameters were verified.
				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(b).	It is not clear how the DOE verified that the benefits of the CDM were a decisive factor in the decision to proceed with the project, as it is required by the Guidance on the Demonstration and Assessment of Prior Consideration of the CDM . Please, provide further information about how the company's annual information forms include an explicit reference to the proposed project activity.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to include a clear validation opinion on the compliance of the project activity with the requirements made in EB 62 Annex 13 as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 104(c).	The DOE is requested to use the last version of the Guidance on the Demonstration and Assessment of Prior Consideration of the CDM, since the validation report (reference /20/, pg. 47) uses the EB 41 - Annex 46, and the last version is the version 4 EB 62 - Annex 13 -.
146	**5639**	**Energy efficiency initiative of KDHP by replacing ICLs with CFLs at Munnar, Kerala state, India**	RINA	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how it has validated that the selected monitoring methodology(ies) are correctly applied and they are not subject to clarifications, revisions or deviations as per VVM v1.2, paragraphs 72-74.	The lumen output of the replaced ICLs of 40,60 and 100 Watts as per the methodology are 415, 715 and 1350 Watts respectively. The lumen output of the CFLs of 8, 14 and 18 Watts as per the PDD page 9 are 380, 800 and 1100 Watts. Therefore, the total lumen output of the CFL is not equal or more than that of ICL being replaced. The DOE/PP are required to revised this issue as per the methodology AMS II-J ver. 04 paragraph 2
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a).	The project starting date is10/02/2009 when the first slot of CFLs was distributed (PDD page 38). However, the PDD page 22 mentions that a purchase order was sent to Philips for the first lot of CFL bulbs on 22/12/2008. The DOE/PP are requested to clarify why this date is not considered as a starting date as per VVM ver 1.2 para 104 a).

				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).	The DOE/PP are requested to provide further description and supporting information of how the input values of the investment barrier analysis have been considered appropriate for the project activity, in particular the components under project costs (awareness campaign, introductory meeting, baseline study, implementation/follow-up, project execution, cost of stationery, CDM related expenses, data collection, and miscellaneous for project execution) and the components under the O&M expenses as per VVM v 1,2 para 111 and 114 c) as table 6 (project cost) and table 7 (operational and maintenance expenses) of the PDD do not provide any explanation or justification of the listed costs
				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).	The DOE/PP are requested to provide further information on what each sub-component/parameter used to calculate the savings, and how each is appropriate for the project activity as per VVM v 1,2 para 111
				Additionality	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).	The parameters used in the sensitivity analysis presented in the PDD (cost of bulb, savings in peak load penalty and savings in diesel consumption) differ from the values presented in the VR and the spreadsheet (cost of bulb, savings in peak load penalty, savings in diesel consumption, and Cost of implementation & administrative expenses). The DOE/PP are requested to provide a clarification of this inconsistency as per VVM v 1,2 para 111 e) and EB39, Annex 10 page7
147	**3897**	**Electric Power Generation from Renewable Sources – Barra da Paciência, Ninho da Águia, Corrente Grande, Paiol, São Gonçalo and Várzea Alegre Small Hydropower Plants**	RINA	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the actions taken to secure the CDM status between the project starting date and the start of validation as per EB 49 Annex 22 paragraph 8 b.	It is not clear how the DOE verified that the benefits of the CDM were a decisive factor in the decision to proceed with the project, as it is required by the Guidance on the Demonstration and Assessment of Prior Consideration of the CDM . Please, provide further information about how the company's annual information forms include an explicit reference to the proposed project activity.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to include a clear validation opinion on the compliance of the project activity with the requirements made in EB 49 Annex 22 as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 104(c).	The DOE is requested to use the last version of the Guidance on the Demonstration and Assessment of Prior Consideration of the CDM, since the validation report (reference /20/, pg. 47) uses the EB 41 - Annex 46, and the last version is the version 4 EB 62 - Annex 13 -.

148	**5507**	**Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Fenyi Conch Cement Company Limited**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data, input values and references used in the investment analysis and the results of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	(i) The DOE is requested to provide further information on the Total Investment Cost considering that the Validation Report contains details on the total static investment costs only. The DOE shall further elaborate on the other components of the total costs including the "intangible assets". Note: In providing the revised documentation please correct the typographical error on Page 38 of the VR which states “Compared with the registered wind power projects, the investment per kWh for the proposed project….”
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe in detail the calculation of ex-ante emission reductions (with actual data and equations) as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The DOE/PP shall provide information on the Combined Margin emission factor considering that Validation report and the PDD are inconsistent. Please refer to Page 49 and 51 of the Validation Report and Page 103 of the PDD.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76.	The DOE is requested to provide further clarification on how it validated"Demonstration of use of waste energy in absence of CDM project activity" for Type 1 project activities in accordance with Page 4 of ACM00012 ver 3.2
				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.	The DOE is requested to further assess the baseline scenario for the 2500 TPD “greenfield facilities” in line with the Clarification provided by EB 61, Annex 5. The DOE should in order to determine the baseline scenario: 1. Identify alternative design options for the 2500TPD (greenfield facility commissioned in October 2008) clinker facility along with the feasible usage of the waste energy for those designs (with/without waste heat recovery component /with a waste heat recovery component of a different denomination) that was available to the PP; 2. Undertake an investment comparison analysis for the identified alternative designs to the entire greenfield facility (and not only for the power plant) for the determination of the baseline scenario. With regard to this, the DOE is requested to refer Clarification “AM_CLA_0219” on ACM0012 version 03.2 for better clarity.

149	**4460**	**Avoided Methane Emissions Through Composting of EFB Biomass at PT Pinago Utama Sugihwaras Palm Oil Mill, Sumatera Selatan, Indonesia.**	SIRIM	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each monitoring parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The monitoring plan does not include parameter "Amount of compost produced" as listed in the methodology AM0025 V.12 page 46.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a).	EFc,N2O (emission factor for N2O emissions from the composting process (0.000043 t N2O/t compost)) is not listed in section B.6.2 of the PDD.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	More information is required in how the DOE crosschecked the MCF value (0.8) used to calculate baseline emissions, as as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 71.	Information on the applicability conditions of the applied Tool to determine methane emissions avoided from dumping waste at a solid waste disposal site v.5.1 has not been validated by the DOE, as per VVM v.1.2 para 71.
				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.	The validation report (p.14) indicates that "The disposal of EFB using incinerator was stopped as the open burning or uncontrolled burning has been banned in Indonesia /42//44/&/62/ since 2008. This was evident in the mill monthly report to the Department of Environment where it was clearly indicated that the incinerator has not been in use since 2008." More information is required in the inconsistency in the validation report since the same states (p.9) that "from the amount of EFB wastes generated, 20% was sent for mulching in the plantation and 80% disposed at dump sites within the plantation" and that "the current prevailing practice where the EFB is disposed to the landfill sites without capturing of landfill gas has been the practice for the treatment of EFB waste. This prevailing practice is the same as the baseline scenario of this project activity." In doing so the DOE is requested to provide more information on incineration as not been considered as an alternative scenario to be discussed under Step 1 of the Identification of alternative scenarios.

				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	More information is required on the relation to the benchmark applied (12.20%) as validated by the DOE, in relation to the Investment Loan Rate of 13.16% as published by the Bank of Indonesia (Oct-Dec 2007).
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how the distinctive differences between the project activity and the similar projects identified in the selected scope are justified as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (c).	More information is required in how the DOE has assessed the essential distinctions between the proposed CDM project activity and any similar projects that are widely observed and commonly carried out, in particular, regarding the 5 composting plants in Indonesia which were validated to be relatively small in capacity however the capacity information of the same and other technical information compared to the project activity are not provided.
				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).	Additional information is required for inputs values used in financial calculations: (1) the DOE validates that project cost is 12,909 USD (p.15) while the capital cost used in IRR is 12,809 USD; (2) the price of diesel was validated to be based on the current price (p.16) however no information is given if the same is applicable at the time of investment decision; (3) the validation report indicates (p.14) that the savings for the project are from the fertilizer displaced by the compost product from the project activity and revenue from the sales of excess compost product however it is not clear why all compost (100%) is considered to be sold in IRR calculations and fertilizers savings are not validated by the DOE.; (4) more information is required on whether any tipping fee (to be paid per ton of waste to be treated and disposed in landfill) savings are applicable for the project activity.
150	**5053**	**Yingkou EDZ District Heating Project**	AENOR	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a).	In line with "Glossary of CDM terms, the DOE is requested to further provide information regarding other relevant dates including the dates on which contracts have been signed for equipment or construction/operation services for the project activity to justify the determination of current starting date. "
151	**5647**	**2.85 MW Bundled Wind Power Project by Manjeet Cotton, India**	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).	The DOE is asked to include information related to the financial calculations for Maharashtra site and to explain: - why different electricity tariffs are applied in the months of September - March and April - August ; and - why the sensitivity analysis considers a variation in tariff only in the year 2023 (see spreadsheet).

152	**5527**	**3 MW wind project by Shah Foils**	TÜV NORD	LoA	The DOE is requested to indicate whether the letter of approvals was received from the project participants or directly from the DNA as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 49(b).	Validation report does not indicates whether the letter of approvals has been received directly from PP or from DNA. DOE is requested to confirm whether LoA was received directly from PP or DNA office.
				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).	The project IRR reported in the PDD and Validation Report is 11.20 %, however, the project IRR calculated in IRR calculation sheet is 11.47 %.
153	**5278**	**Rajasthan Lighting Energy Efficiency Project (RLEEP) in 10 sub divisions of Jaipur City Circle of JVVNL, Rajasthan, India**	TÜV NORD	Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	The sample method that will be carried out during the monitoring period has not been defined. The EB50 Annex 30 para 33 requires the sample method to be presented (i.e. simple random sample, systematic sampling, stratified random sample, cluster sampling, or multi-stage sampling).
154	**5645**	**Afam Combined Cycle Gas Turbine Power Project**	DNV	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe whether the assumptions and data used for the baseline identification are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87 (c).	For the input values used, the Validation Report has not explained: (a) why the O&M cost of the project (7%) is higher than the value the DOE checked (4%); (b) how the range used as means of comparison for O&M cost (4.92-47.36 USD/kW) is appropriate, considering the very wide of range; (c) how the gas price can be determined based on PPA; (d) how the use of the O&M cost based on the highest bidder is appropriate/conservative.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the equations applied to calculate the baseline/ project emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per the chosen methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92.	The Validation Report has not explained: (a) whether the set of power plants used to calculate the build margin falls as 5 units/power plants most recently built, or power plants that comprise 20% of the total generation in the grid, as required by the Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system; (b) how the DOE validated the efficiency of 37.4% (for diesel engine) used un the BM calculation is appropriate and conservative in line with the VVM version 01.2 paragraph 91; (c) how the DOE validated the efficiency used to calculate emission factor of option 3 (36%) being conservative in line with the VVM version 01.2 paragraph 91, as the DOE acknowledges a higher value (40%); (d) how the calculation of the EFOM/EFBM in line with the Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, as the data required by the Tool on page 20 are not provided in the PDD.

				Additionality	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).	The Validation Report has not explained why the O&M cost (contributing more than 20% to the total costs), was also not considered in the sensitivity analysis.
155	**5257**	**Combined cycle natural gas based grid connected power plant at Jegurupadu, India**	BVCH	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe on identification of baseline scenario(s) in PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The baseline scenario has been identified by applying the levelised cost of electricity. The levelized cost for the project activity is calculated considering 100% debt. The DOE is required to clarify if this consideration is the common practice in market as per para 18 of EB61 Annex 13.
				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.	The DOE (p24) states that " Such a large difference in the plant efficiencies makes the operation of an open cycle gas turbine plant an uneconomical option and is hence not feasible to be implemented." The DOE is required to substantiate further information on how an open cycle gas turbine plant is "an uneconomical option" as per the para 87(c) of VVM v.1.2 as the validation report did not contain any related figures
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to report how it has validated common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121.	The DOE is requested to further explain how it has validated the common practice analysis, in particular: (a) how the difference in tariff system can be regarded as essential distinction in line with the Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality v05.2.1 Sub-step 4b as the DOE has not provided any information with regard to the differences between the tariff systems of the similar projects and the project activity, and (b) how tariff system applied to the project activity affects its implementation. Please refer to Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality v05.1.2 Sub-step 4b
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a).	The DOE (page 102) states that “"The project activity, on the other hand, was established through an international competitive bidding (ICB) process”. The DOE is required to justify why the date of the bidding process was not considered as the start date of the project activity as the validation report does not provide any information of when the bidding process took place.

				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).	The validation report (p 56) indicates there is "incentive payment (for PLF of 80% and more)" and the project considers 85% of PLF. However, the spreadsheet shows that the incentive is zero.; 2) The validation report (p 102) and the PDD (p 26) indicates that the coal power plant option considers the same tariff as the project activity. The DOE is required to provide further clarification on how the application of the same tariff is appropriate as the tariff of the PA is based on the PPA and the project was established through a bidding process where the bidder quoted a tariff for natural gas based power projects; 3) The DOE (p 77) states that cost of coal was based on "D Grade coal". Further clarification is required on the selection of "D Grade coal" as the DOE did not provide any justification
156	**5618**	**BRT Metroplus Medellin, Columbia**	SQS	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to explain the methodological choices for the calculation of the baseline, project emissions and emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	1. According to the methodology AM0031 v.3.1.0 (page 9), for the estimation of the Baseline Emission Factor per passenger per vehicle category, average trip distance (TDi) is required to be surveyed. It is also required that the time period for passengers and distance must be equal (e.g. one year or one month). In the project activity, the average trip distance for passenger cars and taxis is calculated based on; average trip speed (data source from 2010) and average trip time (data source from 2007) - CER spreadsheet, worksheet 'Baseline EF'. The PP/DOE are requested to further justify; i) why trip distance was not directly surveyed, ii) how the estimation of trip distance based on two sets of data sources; 2007 for trip time and 2010 for trip speed is the most appropriate and representative choice of data, and, iii) how the time period for trip distance and passengers meets the methodology requirement. 2. The methodology further states that for the estimation of the Baseline Emission Factor for buses, total distance driven (DDz) and passengers transported (Pz) should have the same data source to ensure consistency (page 33). The PP/DOE are requested to further justify how the estimation of the emission factor based on two sets of data sources; 2007 for passengers transported and 2010 for distance driven, is the most representative choice of data and in accordance with the methodology.

157	**5654**	**Anning River Canyon Wind Farm (Phase I) Project in Dechang County Sichuan Province**	KFQ	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each monitoring parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The description of each parameter should include what the measured parameter is; for example, for EGM1, in addition to "quantity of electricity measured by the Meter M1", the description should include what Meter M1 measures, such as "gross output by the project activity wind turbines".
				Additionality	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 doing so, the DOE is requested to provide the details of the seven "similar projects" used for the comparison of the investment, the O&M costs and the PLF, considering that this is the first wind power project in the province. Also, please clarify if there is no more wind farms other than those 7 projects in the selected area.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the scope of the common practice analysis as per paragraphs 5, 9 and 47 of Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality version 6.	In particular, it should be justified why the geographical area is limited to the province while the guideline applied specifies the default geographical area to be the whole host country.
				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, please explain how it has validated the VAT of 8.5% and if there are any applicable tax reimbursement policies.
				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	In particular, the DOE shall clarify how it has validated: a) the monitoring of the net electricity output to the grid to be conservative, in particular, the calculation method used for the transmission losses; b) details of the connection with Wanao hydropower plant; and c) how the invoice will be issued: i) which meter measurements the amount of electricity for the invoice will be based on for the project activity, and ii) the apportioning method applied, if applicable.
158	**5373**	**Madinah Landfill Gas Capture Project**	BVCH	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	PDD monitoring parameters (p. 40) does not indicate whether LFGflare,y will be monitored for each one of the proposed flares to be installed in the project activity and does not include parameter LFGtotal,y.
				DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to report if it has applied standard auditing techniques to refer to relevant information as per VVM v1.2, paragraph 33 (c).	The DOE is requested to indicate in the validation report which references listed have been used as evidences for the statements provided in the validation report. Please note that not all validation statements and assessment of the report indicate which evidence or reference has been used by the DOE.

			Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to include description of the process taken to validate the accuracy and completeness of the project description in VR as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 64(a).	The validation report does not indicate how the DOE confirmed the information provided in PDD (Section A.2 and A.4) and in validation report (Section 3.5) regarding: project location, different areas of the landfill such as "old landfill" area containing 3 separate zones and "new landfill" area, and estimates on cells closure.
			Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if all assumptions/ data/references used in the PDD for emission reduction calculations are in line with the methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(a).	The validation report does not provide information on how assumptions, data, references and related calculations were validated. This includes information on: OX (appropriateness of value adopted), MCF (appropriateness of values adopted for each landfill zone), Kj (appropriateness of values adopted), waste amount and composition (assumptions, data, sources and calculations of Annex 3 of PDD), ELLFG,y (data used for calculation and its source including efficiency of gas engines, manufacture defined, operating hours/load factor and default values), CEFelec,BL,y (validation of the selection of manufacture Olympian GEP 150 kVA diesel generator set type used and how this has been crosschecked), NCVfuel,BL (appropriateness and source of value adopted), EFfuel,BL (appropriateness and source of value adopted and calculation), efficiency of baseline power generation plant (data used, source, calculation and assessment on appropriateness of option chosen from the ones given by applied methodology p.11), ECPJ,j,y (including power capacity per unit (30 Kw) and operating hours), EFEL,j,y (appropriateness of default value used), TDLj,y (data used, source and calculation).
			Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if the methodology provides different options for equations and parameters and if the selection is appropriate as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 90.	The validation report does not provide information on how the DOE validated the steps containing different methodological choices in the applied methodology, and applicable Tools, for calculation of baseline baseline/ project emissions, leakage and emission reductions.
			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.	More information is required in how the DOE validated scenarios P4 and P6 as being realistic baseline scenarios for the project activity, including assumptions, data and references for each scenario. In particular for captive power plant, more information is required in terms of energy demand for this electricity produced in baseline scenario (e.g related to the nearby industries).

				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark, considering that there are two alternatives for the project activity (grid exported to the grid and nearby industries).
				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).	The validation report does not provide information on whether the input values (electricity tariff, investment and O&M cost, loan interest, conversion rates) used in financial analysis were valid at the time of decision, also considering in particular that for the flaring component, the date of quotations are not provided. In addition, more information is required in how the DOE crosschecked the estimated value of 5% for O&M (energy component) and how it confirmed that the comparison of investment and O&M costs with CDM project from countries other than the project activity was appropriate. Additionally, information on how DOE confirmed the share of revenues from electricity production for project entity with municipality, and value used for loan interest is not provided.
159	**5631**	**Dak Srong 3B Hydropower Project.**	KEMCO	DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to resolve all CARs and CLs raised as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 37.	The DOE has raised CL4 relating to the REAP scheme (Renewable Energy Action Plan) in Vietnam that provides technical and financial assistance for up to 25 MW of renewable energy projects. The DOE checked that this scheme is mainly for isolated households and mini grid in rural areas. The DOE also checked 11 hydro power plants supported by this scheme and found them to be under 9MW. Finally, the DOE determined that it's difficult for the proposed 19.5MW project to receive any assistance because the capacity of this project is not proper to be adapted under this scheme (page 18, validation report).
160	**5460**	**Compost from Municipal Solid Waste in Peshawar, Pakistan**	GLC	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 DOE shall provide information how it has validated the exclusion of realistic and credible alternatives for power and heat generation in the selection of baseline scenario.

161	**3816**	**Guanaquitas 9.74 MW Hydroelectric project**	ICONTEC	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a).	Please clarify if the chosen starting date (04/04/2008) corresponds to the signature of the purchase order or the construction and delivery of the turbine and generator. It is since the description of this date is not complety clear in two different sections: (i) VR pg 19: In the purchase order No. 2259-00-EL-PO-001-01-6 signed between the technology supplier VATECH and the technical advisor HMV Ingenieros Ltda, has been established as a starting date for the construction and delivery of the turbine and generator April 04, 2008. The project developer decides to use this date as a starting date for the project activity, since this was the moment in which the project participants have acquired contractual obligations to develop the project (point of no return for the project developer). (ii) VR pg 28, Table CDM Actions prior to the project start date: The construction of the project started after the technology supplier VATECH responded positively to the purchase order.
				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(b).	In particular, please clarify the date on which the decision to undertake the project as a CDM project activity was made. In doing so, please provide further information about how the DOE verified the appropriateness of the date chosen.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to include a clear validation opinion on the compliance of the project activity with the requirements made in EB 62 Annex 13 as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 104(c).	
				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).	

				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) please clarify what is the source of investment analysis input values used by PP. In doing so, please clarify how the DOE has verified that this source was valid at the time of CDM decision as per the last Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis (para. 6). (ii) how the DOE has confirmed that PLF is valid and applicable by comparing against third party or publicy available information (please provide detail information on cross checking); (iii) how the DOE has confirmed the validity of the electricity tariff used as input value as per the para. 6 of the last Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis.
				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to provide information on the PPs' ability to implement the monitoring plan as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(c).	
				Other	The DOE is requested to include a clear validation opinion on the adequacy of the local stakeholder consultation as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 130(b).	
162	**5523**	**Hangzhou II Landfill Gas Power Generation Project**	TÜV NORD	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).	Validation report on page 110 states that interest payment of the proposed project has been considered to calculate the income tax. The correctness of the interest rate was cross-checked with the People's Bank of China's public information on the website. However, the IRR calculation spreadsheet does not consider interest payment to calculate income tax. The income tax rate has not been mentioned in IRR spreadsheet or PDD. The PDD, Validation Report and IRR calculation spreadsheet do not contain consistent information regarding interest payment to calculate income tax.
163	**5198**	**Tuppadahalli Wind Energy Project**	BVCH	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).	The DOE is requested to validate the following input values and, where applicable, their escalation: operation and maintenance charge, administrative expense and insurance charge.
				Additionality	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).	The DOE is requested to assess under what conditions the investment analysis would result in a different result. The worksheet 'sensitivity', referred to on page 42 of the Verification Report, is missing from the submission.

164	**5265**	**Oceanium mangrove restoration project**	EYG	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each monitoring parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The resubmitted PDD excludes the parameters Biomass Expansion factor (BEF) and Basic wood density (Dj) from the table B.8.1.1.1. However, neither the PDD nor the TARAM spreadsheet provide the ex-ante values of the two parameters. The PP/DOE are requested to choose of the following options; a) provide validated ex-ante values of BEF and Dj in the PDD and the validation report, OR b) include the two parameters in the monitoring table in the PDD stating that they will be estimated once from the sample plots, and the used for the entire crediting period. In case option b) is chosen, the PP/DOE is requested to remove the statement in page 32 of the PDD that states, " The same values for BEF2,j and Dj should be used in the ex post and in the ex ante calculations".
165	**5668**	**Yichun xiaochengshan wind power Project**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data, input values and references used in the investment analysis and the results of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The DOE is requested to submit the IRR calculation spreadsheet as indicated in the PDD version 08.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed the existence of the similar projects for common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (b).	The DOE is requested to clarify how it has validated the similar projects in Heilongjiang province given that the projects with the capacity below 50MW have been considered for the common practice analysis in the PDD (page 16), where as the validation report states the selected capacity scope ranging from 50% to 150% of the capacity of the project i.e. 49.3 MW.
166	**5661**	**Inner Mongolia Xing'an League KeyouqianQi Wind Power Project**	SGS	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data, input values and references used in the investment analysis and the results of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In doing so please confirm if the information provided in the PDD (Table B-5) is consistent with the content in the referenced registered CDM project activities (i.e. The PDD shows a unit investment cost of 122,614 Yuan/kW for project 0689 while the registered 0689 indicates 10,445 Yuan/kW).
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to identify if the FSR has been the basis of the investment decision as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 113 (a).	In doing so please clarify the inconsistency in the FSR completion date as the PDD timeline indicates May 2009 while page 14 shows November 2009; while the investment decision was made in August 2009.

				Additionality	The DOE is requested to report how it has validated common practice analysis as per EB61 Annex21 para 47 (steps 2&3).	In doing so the PP/DOE are requested to: i) identify all the plants delivering the same output (Nall) and applying technologies different (Ndiff) from the proposed project activity in the region, and ii) provide information clarifying the start date (27/11/2009) for the commercial operation of one of the projects included in the Nall list.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the scope of the common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (a).	In doing so the DOE is requested to provide information supporting the justifications on the geographical and social-economic differences given by the PP in determining the applicable geographical area.
167	**5528**	**Quilvio Cabrera Wind Farm Project**	TÜV NORD	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).	The DOE is required to provide information about: 1. How the total investment, land lease cost and the insurance cost were cross checked against third-party or publicly available sources as it is required by VVM para. 111 (b). In particular, please clarify: (i) the source used to state that: commonly only the turbines investment costs are around 1.5– 2.0 million USD/MW (as per, VR pg. 162) and doing so, please include a description of the source appropriateness; (ii) how it has validated that the land agreement with IAD signed on 2008/03/19 is appropriate to estimate the Land Lease. Please clarify how has validated that this document refers on particular to the proposed project activity, and how justify that the CDM investment decision date (2010/05/18, more than two years after the land agreement was signed) is appropriate to estimate the Land Lease; (iii) how the insurance cost was cross checked against third-party or publicly available sources. 2. The sources used to cross check the percentage of contingencies used by PP. It is since it is not clear how the DOE has chosen other CDM projects (Project 2667 : Biogas Project, Olmeca III, Tecún Uman and Project 1405 : CEMEX Costa Rica: Use of biomass residues in Colorado cement plant, VR pg. 167) as comparable cases to the proposed project activity, since they appear to belong to different technologies from the proposed project activity. Doing so, please include the values used to cross checking. 3. It is not clear how the DOE justify the appropriateness of the sources of information used for O&M costs. In particular, please provide a further explanation on:

						(i) how the DOE has validated the appropriateness of the document: "Cabo Engaño Wind Park Construction and Turbine Supply Agreement", since it belongs to a different project (Engaño Wind Park) and additionally, this agreement was issued on 2004/09/16, more than six years after the CDM investment decision (2010/05/18). (ii) how the DOE has validated that the information sourced from the "Amended and Restarted Operation and Maintenance Service Agreement" issued on 2010/11/22 was available at the time of the CDM decision (2010/05/18). (iii) how the DOE has validated that the CDM projects (6 wind projects from latino america and the caribbean) chosen to cross checking are similar to the proposed project activity. It is since, at the validation starting date (2010/11/12) there were 23 wind CDM wind projects registered from latino america and the caribbean.
168	**5531**	**1.5 MW wind power project of Nirmal B. Thakkar H.U.F. at Rajasthan, India**	TÜV NORD	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, the electricity tariff given that the data source for this input value is RERC order dated on 29 September 2006 on validation report page 46, while it is RERC order dated on 09 March 2007 in other places of the validation report and in the PDD. In addition, the DOE shall also explain why the residual value and the D/E ratio are not sourced from the latest available RERC order at the time of the investement decision. i.e. the RERC order dated on 09 March 2007.

169	**5477**	**Changshan Nanfang Cement 18MW Waste Heat Recovery Project**	TÜV NORD	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed each barrier presented as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118 (a) and (b).	1.The DOE is requested to provide information on the Financial statement of "China National Building Materials Group Corporation" and the “South Group” Ltd during the time of the investment decision of the project activity . In this context the DOE is requested to provide the financial details for a larger time frame and not limit its information to the year of decision making. 2. The DOE is requested to clarify why did the Mother Group lack the financial means to invest in the project activity of Changshan Nanfang Cement Co.Ltd. 3. The PDD and the validation report provides the financial status of the Changshan Nanfang Cement Co., Ltd for the year 2007 only. However the DOE is requested to provide more information on the financial status of the Company for a larger time frame prior to the start date of the project activity. 4.The DOE is requested to provide further information on how it compared the project activity to other "similar" projects in accordance with Guideline 3 (paragraph 6) of EB 50 Annex 13. 5.The DOE is requested to provide information on the reason for rejection of the loan application by the Industrial Bank on 3/3/2008. 6. Page 33 of the PDD states: " The guarantee is made by an entity operating in the cement industry. This does not comply with the guarantee policy of the Bank of China as well as the Industrial Bank".The DOE is requested to further provide details on how it validated the policy of the bank and deemed it to be applicable to the project activity.

170	**5568**	**Rhodia Nuoc Trong Biogas Capture & Utilization Project, Vietnam**	RINA	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to explain the methodological choices for the calculation of the baseline, project emissions and emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	1. On page 28 of the PDD it is stated that the boundary of the baseline is only the covered first anaerobic lagoon. The remaining lagoon system is not integrated in the baseline emission calculations and therefore also not in the project activity emissions. On page 26 of the PDD it is stated that "COD removal efficiency (ηCOD,BL,i) of the baseline system has been established based on a measurement campaign of at least 10 days. COD inflow was measured from the samples collected from influent entering into first anaerobic pond (i.e. Lagoon 1) and COD outflow was measured from the samples collected from effluent exit from Lagoon 1." Contrary information is available on page 34 of the PDD, which states that samples of wastewater entering first anaerobic lagoon (Lagoon 1) and exiting the third anaerobic lagoon (Lagoon 3) were collected to determine the COD removal efficiency of baseline system. Consistent information is not available in the PDD and DOE has not stated in the validation report as to what were the samplings points to determine the COD removal efficiency of baseline system; 2. On page 17 of the PDD it is stated that "according to the methodology only the first anaerobic pond has met the definition of anaerobic pond under the methodology". In section A.2 and B.3 of the PDD and in the validation report it is stated that the first three lagoons 1, 2 and 3 are operating under anaerobic conditions. Consistent information is not available in the PDD and validation report.

				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if the baseline methodology is correctly applied to calculate project/baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(d).	1. On page 28 of the PDD it is stated that the boundary of the baseline is only the covered first anaerobic lagoon. The remaining lagoon system is not integrated in the baseline emission calculations and therefore also not in the project activity emissions. On page 26 of the PDD it is stated that "COD removal efficiency (ηCOD,BL,i) of the baseline system has been established based on a measurement campaign of at least 10 days. COD inflow was measured from the samples collected from influent entering into first anaerobic pond (i.e. Lagoon 1) and COD outflow was measured from the samples collected from effluent exit from Lagoon 1." Contrary information is available on page 34 of the PDD, which states that samples of wastewater entering first anaerobic lagoon (Lagoon 1) and exiting the third anaerobic lagoon (Lagoon 3) were collected to determine the COD removal efficiency of baseline system. Consistent information is not available in the PDD and DOE has not stated in the validation report as to what were the samplings points to determine the COD removal efficiency of baseline system; 2. On page 17 of the PDD it is stated that "according to the methodology only the first anaerobic pond has met the definition of anaerobic pond under the methodology". In section A.2 and B.3 of the PDD and in the validation report it is stated that the first three lagoons 1, 2 and 3 are operating under anaerobic conditions. Consistent information is not available in the PDD and validation report.

				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if the methodology provides different options for equations and parameters and if the selection is appropriate as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 90.	On page 28 of the PDD it is stated that the boundary of the baseline is only the covered first anaerobic lagoon. The remaining lagoon system is not integrated in the baseline emission calculations and therefore also not in the project activity emissions. Whereas on page 34 of the PDD it is stated that samples of wastewater entering first anaerobic lagoon (Lagoon 1) and exiting the third anaerobic lagoon (Lagoon 3) were collected to determine the COD removal efficiency of baseline system. Information in the PDD is not consistent to explain if lagoons 2 and lagoon 3 have been integrated in the baseline emission calculations. As per the requirement of paragraph 16 of AMS III.H, version 16, the validation report does not discuss as to, which sections of baseline treatment system are affected by implementation of the project activity and which are not affected. Further DOE has not confirmed in the validation report that emissions from sections affected by the project are accounted for in the baseline and project emission calculations.
171	**5715**	**Sonawade Small Hydro Power Project**	LRQA	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe that CDM was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In particular, it should be clearly explained in which event and date CDM was seriously considered.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	In particular, the DOE shall clarify if the grid emission factor will be fixed for the whole crediting period i.e. ex-ante value will be used, or it will be monitored ex-post as PDD page 27 mentions application of ex-ante value for the entire crediting period while page 43 of the validation report mentions monitoring of the grid emission factor. If the ex-ante grid emission factor is used, operating margin and built margin emission factor of the connected grid should be included in the list of parameters available at validation (B.6.2). If it is monitored, monitoring frequency should be included in the PDD.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	In particular, the DOE shall address the following inconsistencies: i) cut-off date for expected market return; VR page 20 indicates July 2010 while the spreadsheet indicates 31 March 2008; and ii) beta value: VR page 21 indicates 0.8339 while the spreadsheet uses 0.8536.

				Additionality	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, the DOE shall clarify the definition of the SHP in terms of the installed capacity as defined by the "Ministry of Non-conventional Energy Sources", as the threshold for SHP in India appears to be 3 MW.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the actions taken to secure the CDM status between the project starting date and the start of validation as per EB 62 Annex 13 paragraph 6 b.	In particular, the DOE shall report the evidence that was used to demonstrate the activities, such as signed contracts, indicating the date of signature.
				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, it should clarify: a) the relevance of Techno Economic Feasibility Report (TEFR) in connection to the development of the project activity, i.e. whether it is submitted for approval by the local authority or it is a document prepared for internal decision making; and b) the use of PDR mentioned in validation report page 26.
				Monitoring methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps undertaken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to be implemented within the project design as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 124(b).	In particular, the DOE shall clarify the monitoring frequency of the grid emission factor.

172	**5574**	**AzDRES Energy Efficiency Improvement**	DNV	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe the steps taken to assess the equations applied to calculate the baseline/ project emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per the chosen methodology as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92.	The VR lacks information how the DOE has validated the following: (a) the use of the 5 years historical data (2003-2007) for parameters ELX, HMRx, Fi,x, Optimal efficiency of the project activity power plant prior to implementation of the project activity, given that the methodology requires the use of set of data prior to the project implementation (i.e. project start date); (b) parameter Optimal efficiency of the project activity power plant prior to implementation of the project activity, in accordance with the methodology page 18 (maximum of three options), as the third option is missing; (c) parameter Energy efficiency of the technology identified as the most likely baseline scenario, which is not available in the PDD/VR in line with the methodology page 19; (d) the parameter EFBL,plant,y in the spreadsheet which appears to be calculated not in line with the formula 9 of the methodology; (e) parameter EFBL,non-plant,y in the spreadsheet in line with the methodology page 11-12; (f) parameter CAPBL, in line with the methodology page 15; (g) the calculation of the project emission which does not follow the steps provided in the Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion; (h) the ex-ante estimation of ELPJ,y.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe all the assumptions/ data/references listed in the PDD for the baseline identification as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 87 (a).	The Validation Report has not explained how the choice of 10 year crediting period is in accordance with the methodology page 5, given that the earliest remaining lifetime is identified to be 9.8 years.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how the distinctive differences between the project activity and the similar projects identified in the selected scope are justified as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (c).	Please clarify the information in the VR page 22, that concludes that no projects are found in the statistics while it identified the existence of seven thermal plants.

173	**5199**	**Datang Qingyuan Phase II Wind Power Project**	BVCH	Additionality	The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the sensitivity analysis of the investment analysis as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 111 (e).	The sensitivity analysis, based on the input values of the re-assessment report, has not been submitted.
174	**5521**	**Waste Heat Recovery and Utilization for Power Generation at Lucky Cement Limited, Karachi Plant**	TÜV SÜD	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data, input values and references used in the investment analysis and the results of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	1. Further information is required on how the DOE validated the (a) Total Project Investment and b) O&M cost. In doing so the DOE is requested to provide details on each componnet of the total cost and how the DOE verified the same in accordance with paragraph 111 (b) (c) of the VVM. 2. The DOE is requested to provide further details on how it validated the basis of the 10% annual escalation of the O&M costs. 3. The DOE is requested to clarify how it validated the fuel costs (NG,HFO) as no information is provided in the VR. 4. The values in the PDD/VR is inconsistent with the values in the IRR spreadsheet. The DOE is requested to submit the correct worksheet for the IRR calculation . 5. Page 31 of the VR states that the FSR of the project was done internally by the PP. The DOE is requested to clarify how it verified all input values to be credible in accordance with paragraph 111 (a) and 113 of VVM (ver 1.2)
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list the data and parameters used to calculate the emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	1. Further information is required how the DOE validated the baseline emissions from the electricity displaced by the project activity based on historical generation in accordance with III-Q ver 4 which states:"The proportion of electricity that would have been sourced from the ith source to the jth recipient plant should be estimated based on historical data of the proportion received...". In doing so, the DOE shall transparently detail the documented evidence in the Validation Report. 2. The DOE is requested to provide further details on how it validated the efficiency calculation in accordance with option (i) of AMS III-Q. In doing so the DOE shall transparently document the sources from which the values have been taken and how it ensured that such values are accordance with Opition (i) of the methodology.

				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how it has validated that the selected baseline methodology(ies)applies(y) correctly to the project boundary, baseline identification and algorithms and formulae used to determine emission reductions as per VVM v1.2, paragraphs 67.	The DOE shall clarify how it validated the project to be applicable under III-Q version 4 which states that "category is for project activities that utilize waste gas and/or waste heat at existing facilities".The DOE may refer to footnote 1 for the definition of "existing facility " and note that Kiln G started operation in January 2009 whereas the start date of the project is May 2008.
175	**5620**	**Pine Ridge Landfill Gas to Energy Project**	RINA	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe that CDM was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	Prior consideration of CER revenues has not been demonstrated in the PDD.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe the continuing and real actions taken to achieve CDM status for the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The timeline of events has not been given in the PDD to check if continuous and real actions have been taken in parallel with the project implementation to secure carbon revenues.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data, input values and references used in the investment analysis and the results of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The input values used in conducting the financial analysis has not been detailed in the PDD.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to indicate the project starting date in the PDD as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	It is not clear in the PDD how the start date has been defined.
176	**5640**	**Dashiqiao Central Heating Project**	AENOR	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if the baseline methodology is correctly applied to calculate project/baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 92(d).	In doing so, the PP/DOE are requested to provide information justifying the length of the heating season (149 days), the heat demand (57.35 w/m2) and the total carpet area, Aj,I, (4.47 million m2) as required by the AM0058 v.3 approved methodology (page 5).

				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has assessed each barrier presented as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 118 (a) and (b).	In doing so, the DOE is requested to provide qualitative or quantitative augments to show how the registration of the CDM project activity will alleviate the barriers that prevent the proposed project activity from occurring in the absence of CDM.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to report how it has validated the scope of the common practice analysis as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 121 (a).	In doing so, the DOE is requested to provide information supporting the justification on the applicable geographical area selected for demonstrating that the project activity is First-of-its-kind.
				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 doing so the DOE is requested to i) provide a breakdown of the major equipment costs, required construction work and installation of the total investment cost, ii) clarify why the total carpet area, Aj,I, of 4.47 million m2 and the investment cost for the boiler house of 11.24 million RMB (alternative 2(a)) were taken into account considering that the methodology applies for the existing buildings, and ii) provide information from public, official publications from a government body or from international market prices etc to substatiate the cost of fuel purchase as required by the methodology (page 8).
				Additionality	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, the DOE is requested to provide information justifying the exclusion of the heat generation parameter from the sensitivity analysis
177	**5536**	**BIPPL small scale renewable energy project**	TÜV NORD	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).	Issue: a) The DOE is requested to clarify how it has validated the accuracy of the investment analysis given that the PDD and IRR spreadsheet state the IRR as 11.25%, whereas the validation report page 136 and 142 states IRR 10.92%. b) The DOE should clarify the name of the entity "North Eastern Cables and Conductors Pvt. Ltd." given in the board note dated 15/12/2008; whereas, the validation report and PDD mentions the PP name as "Brahmputra Infra Power Private Limited (BIPPL)". In doing so, the DOE should clarify who has signed the EPC contract on 23.06.2010 with Boving Fouress Pvt Limited.

				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).	Issue: a) The DOE is requested to clarify how it has validated the suitability of subsidy applicable to the proposed project activity, given that only 30.1 million INR has been taken as cashflow in the IRR calculations; whereas the total subsidy from Ministry of New and Renewable Energy (MNRE) for SHPs has been validated to be 60.3 million INR. In doing so, the DOE shall further explain how the subsidy has been derived as per MNRE scheme. b) The DOE is requested to clarify the PLR published by the Reserve Bank of India prevailaing at the time of project starting date i.e. 23/06/2010.
178	**5753**	**Grid connected hydro power project in Sri Lanka**	SGS	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to complete all the PDD sections for the description of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	It is requested to provide the technical details of the generator.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list the data and parameters used to calculate the emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The raw data and detailed calculation of the combined margin calculation are not provided. The PP/DOE are requested to submit the raw data and detailed calculation used in the combined margin calculation in a spreadsheet.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to include validation opinion on the accuracy and completeness of the project description in the validation report as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 64(b).	It is requested to clarify how the DOE validate the completeness of the project description without information about the generators.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76.	The capacity is determined based on the turbine, not generator. Even with the generator capacity, the project activity may fall under small scale threshold (15 MW). However, it is requested to provide the exact capacity based on the generators.
				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).	It is requested to clarify i) how the DOE validated the inclusion of financial cost during construction is appropriate in the calculation of project IRR and ii) whether separate transmission line is constructed for phase I and phase II and how the cost for construction of new transmission line is estimated for each phase.

179	**5751**	**Kalasin Wastewater Treatment to Energy Project**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to explain the methodological choices for the calculation of the baseline, project emissions and emission reductions as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	As per information on page 24 of the PDD, the project undertook the measurement campaign for wastewater COD entering to open lagoon during 21 July – 3 Aug 2006. The average of the measurement campaign is 17,983 mg/l multiplied by 0.89. However as per Annex 5 of the PDD, the measurement campaign for wastewater COD entering to open lagoon was done during 16 March - 25 March 2006 and 1 April – 5 April 2006. The average of the measurement campaign is 14,739 mg/l multiplied by 0.89. PDD does not include consistent information.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	Net quantity of thermal energy supplied by project activity is not included in monitoring plan in the PDD although this is required as per paragraph 50 of methodology AMS I.C., version 19.
180	**5087**	**GHG abatement project through wind based energy generation, in Kutch, Gujarat**	RINA	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The PP/DOE is requested to provide missing information on and include all the monitored parameters, introduced in the apportioning procedures to calculate the net electricity supplied to the grid, in the section B.7.1. of the PDD given that the quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project plant to the grid in year y should be based on continuous measurement and at least monthly recording.
181	**4936**	**Ouro Small Hydropower Plant – Brennand CDM Project Activity**	TÜV SÜD	Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the project starting date as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 104 (a).	The DOE is requested to provide further information on a) when Rija investmento acquired the project b) how the contract became valid at the time of CDM decision as it is indicated in VR page 26 that the contract would be valid and effective only if the conditionings presented in clause 3.1 were fully performed AND if ANEEL authorized the transfer from Guascor Geratec Ltda?
182	**5684**	**La Yesca Hydroelectric Power Plant**	AENOR	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to describe the procedure taken to demonstrate additionality of the project activity as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	PP is requested to provide information on why the investment comparison, instead of benchmark analysis , is applied , considering that alternatives are to invest or not to invest.

				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on the steps taken to validate the actions taken to secure the CDM status between the project starting date and the start of validation as per EB 49 Annex 22 paragraph 8 b.	The PP/DOE is requested to explain the gap between the project starting date (21/09/2007) and the start of validation(23/12/2010)
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to clarify if the list of alternatives to the project activity in the PDD is complete according to the applied baseline methodology as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 107.	The DOE is requested to explain why the natural gas combined cycle is selected as baseline alternative, not coal or the other technologies.
				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).	Further information is requested on a)how the DOE has validated the credibility of LCOE of Natural gas combined cycle, with a comparable output and baseline Scenario. b)the source and credibility of Cost-Benefit Analysis and how it verified all input values to be credible in accordance with paragraph 111 (a) and 113 of VVM (ver 1.2) c)O&M cost, O&M grid cost, water use, self consumption
				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).	1)Cell M14-BJ14 in the excel sheet has no formula and it is inconsistent with Cell L14(O&M grid) 2))the unit O&M cost indicated in VR page 32 (3.77 US$/MWh) is inconsistent with the excel spreadsheet.
183	**5659**	**Shandong Taipingshan Wind Farm Project**	SGS	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).	The DOE is requested to clarify how it validated the values of the following parameters as the VR does not contain any information on the same. a) Total static investment Cost for the project . b) O&M cost and other costs. For each of the above parameters, the DOE shall provide details on each component of the costs (both (a) and (b)) and also clarify how it cross checked the values of these parameters from the PAR (Project Assessment Report) against actual evidences. Please refer to paragraph 111 of the VVM (ver 1.2).

184	**5708**	**Sanhe Energy One Environmental Technology Co., Ltd Biogas Recovery and Utilization Project, Sanhe City, Hebei Province**	TÜV Rheinland	Other	The project activity was published for stakeholders comments on 24 Jun 2010 using the following methodologies: AMS-I.C. ver. 17 and AMS-III.D. ver. 16. However this request for registration has been submitted using the following methodologies AMS-I.F. ver.2, AMS-III.D. ver. 17 and AMS-I.D. ver. 17. The DOE is requested to address this inconsistency, in particular referring to the requirement in EB25 report, paragraph 92 which mentions that "The Board agreed that in cases where during validation of a project activity the project participants wish to change the methodology applied from one approved methodology to another after the PDD was available to the public for comments (note the PDD is to be made public as received from project participants), the DOE shall make publicly available again, for 30 days, the CDM-PDD in accordance with paragraph 40 (a) and (b) of the modalities and procedures for the CDM".	
				Baseline methodology	The project description mentions that there is one open lagoon for the storage of manure and the project will replace the current open lagoon system with an anaerobic digestion system. However the VR page 20 also reports that "Since the existing lagoon was full of manure, a new one with the same capacity is in construction". The DOE is requested to address this inconsistency in the project description, while at the same time referring to requirement of VVM v1.2, paragraphs 67 to validate that the selected baseline methodology(ies) applies(y) correctly to the project boundary, baseline identification and algorithms and formulae used to determine emission reductions.	

				Additionality	The DOE validated that the input values used in the financial calculations were based on the Project Application Report (March 2012) which contemplates the construction of pipelines for the supply of biogas to the households. In the VR the DOE mentions that for the household part, the cost in the contract of phase I is 0.4120 Million RMB, whereas in other sections the DOE mentions that the pipeline is excluded from the financial analysis. Thus it is not clear what is the real source or references used to validate the input values for the actual project activity. The DOE is requested to address this inconsistency by including information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a).	
				Other	The DOE confirmed that the PP conducted the local stakeholders meeting on 30 April 2010 and in the validation report it is stated that: "Most of the comments from stakeholders considered that the project would bring positive impacts to the local economy and livelihoods of local people with increased job opportunities and tax income to local community." and "The majority of them expressed their support to the implementation of the project activity". However it appears that the local stakeholders comments was conducted with the original project design including a pipeline system to supply biogas to the households for cooking purposes. The DOE is requested to address this inconsistency by including a clear validation opinion on the adequacy of the local stakeholder consultation as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 130(b) considering that the project design had significantly changed from the version which appears to be the one presented to the stakeholders.	

185	**5693**	**Dalian Tuoshan Wind Power Project**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to present common practice analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The DOE shall also provide further details on how it validated the Common Practice analysis for the project activity and also data sources which confirm that there are no similar projects in the Liaoning province. In doing so please refer to Paragraph 120 and 121 of the VVM (1.2)
				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).	1. The DOE is requested to clarify how it validated the value of the following parameters as the VR does not contain any information on the same. a) Total static investment Cost for the project . b) O&M cost and other costs. For each of the above parameters, the DOE shall provide details on each component of the costs (both (a) and (b)) and also clarify how it cross checked the values of these parameters from the Feasibility Study Report against actual evidences. Please refer to paragraph 111 of the VVM (ver 1.2). 2.The DOE shall further substantiate how it confirmed that a two part tariff is applicable to the project activity.
186	**5508**	**Malong River 3# Hydropower Project**	TÜV NORD	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).	The DOE shall further validate the suitability of the investment cost considering that 1) it is not clear how the similar activities used to crosscheck the unit investment cost of the project activity were selected and 2) details of the similar activities were not provided.
187	**5726**	**Laja Hydroelectric Project**	DNV	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all the data and parameters to be monitored in line with applied methodology as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	Please explain whether the parameter TEGy should be monitored as part of the monitoring plan
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	In particular, the emission factor of SIC grid given that the emission factor applied in the project activity is about 60% higher than the emission factor applied in another project (reference number 1374) which is connected to the same grid as the project activity.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to include information on how it has validated the input values to the financial calculations as per VVM v1.2 , paragraph 111(b).	In particular, the electromechanical equipment costs, civil works costs, engineering and supervision costs and transmission line costs which are listed in page 14 of the validation report. Further, the DOE shall explain why the acquisition costs has been included as part of the investment cost.
188	**5673**	**Waste Heat Recovery and Utilization for Power Generation**	TÜV SÜD	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state if the methodology provides different options for equations and	In particular, the selected method (method 3, case 1) to determine the fcap given that the waste energy of the project activity is recovered from WECM

					parameters and if the selection is appropriate as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 90.	through an intermediate system using an intermediate source (water/steam). Further, the DOE shall explain how it have validated the QOE,BL (maximum recoverable energy) as per ACM0012 version 4 (page 32)
		at Cherat Cement Company Limited, Nowshera, Pakistan		Baseline methodology	The DOE shall explain how it has validated the baseline emission, in particular, the proportion of electricity that would have been source from different sources given that there are three types of captive power generators using difference fuel in the pre-project scenario. Please refer to page 5 of AMS III.Q version 4.	
				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).	(i) The DOE shall explain how it has validated the suitability of the auxiliary electricity consumption given that the installed capacity is 7MW whereas the net output of the project activity is only 5.35 MW, in doing so, please also explain how it has validated the annual power generated; (ii) It is not clear why an additional overhaul cost has been considered given that an Operational & Maintenance Cost has already been included in the financial analysis. Please also provide a breakdown of the assumed O&M cost and the actual annual O&M cost for year 2011 as per the audit report prepared by ERNSYT & Young Ford Rhodes Sidat Hyder Charted Accountant.
189	**5445**	**Ta Thang Hydropower Project**	TÜV NORD	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).	The DOE should clarify in the VR whether the appropriate financial indicator used to demonstrate additionality is the IRR or the NPV, as both are referred in several sections of the VR. The DOE states in page 54 that "Project IRR was identified as the financial/economic indicator which is suitable for the project type and decision context". It is also mentioned in page 112, 113 & 138 of the VR that the IRR is below the benchmark. This is neither consistent with the investment analysis nor with the statement in page 40 of the VR, where the DOE states that the NPV waas applied as an appropriate approach according to the EB62, Annex 5.

190	**5001**	**3 MW Grid connected Wind Electricity Generation at Tirunelveli District, Tamil Nadu, India**	TÜV NORD	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).	The DOE is requested to clarify the variation in IRR while applying actual values of input parameters given that IRR based on actual values of project investment cost, PLF and electricity tariff mentioned in validation report (page 40) is 10.09%; however, this is not reproducible from the financial calculation spreadsheet submitted by the DOE.
191	**5779**	**Masan Biomass Boiler Project**	TÜV Rheinland	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).	Issue 1: The validation report does not contain information on how the DOE validated the Plant Load Factor used in the financial calculations, particularly the source and how it is calculated, as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a). Issue 2: The validation report does not contain information on how the DOE validated the salaries of the 4 supervisory staff and 33 other staff, as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (a).
192	**5748**	**Yunnan Langgeluohe Hydropower Project**	Deloitte-TECO	DOE's related issues	The DOE is requested to resolve all CARs and CLs raised as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 37.	Information is required on how the DOE has resolved Clarification Request (CL7) that requests the PP to further clarify and explain on any loan taken for the project with supporting evidence. The DOE has insufficiently closed the CL 7 because the detail information on explanation and evidence provided by the PP on this matter is not reported.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to include validation opinion on the accuracy and completeness of the project description in the validation report as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 64(b).	The validation report does not contain information on how the geographic coordinates of the project site has been assessed.
				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).	Information is required on how the DOE has assessed the loan amount from the bank and the city maintenance tax. The validation report (page 42) states that the project includes no loan from bank, while the IRR calculation sheet has considered the amount of money loaned from the bank (6244.41*10000 RMB) and interest paid. Similarly, there is inconsistency in the value reported for city maintenance tax rate among the various documents such as 5% on page 5 of the PDD and cell D52_Basic Info for IRR worksheet and 1% on page 21 of the validation report.

193	**5772**	**Putian Shijing Phase II Wind Farm Project**	TÜV Rheinland	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).	The validation report (p 58) states that "the FSR was made in March 2010 and the investment decision was made on 01 April 2010. (p58)" while the DOE validated the interest rate used in FSR by stating "The Audit Team can confirm that actual interest rates in November 2008 (which is the closest to the date of investment decision) are corresponding to synchronized interest rates published (for year 2008, i.e., 5.94%)." Further information is required on why the DOE validated the interest rate of the FSR finalized in 2010 by crosschecking the interest rate in 2008 (instead of 2009 or 2010).
194	**5402**	**La Glorita Landfill Gas Project**	SQS	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to list all relevant assumptions, data, input values and references used in the investment analysis and the results of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The project design document does not include project IRR with and without CER revenues.
				Other	The PP/DOE are requested to present the sensitivity analysis of the investment analysis as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	The project design document does not include at values of the identified parameters will the project IRR exceed the benchmark and the possibility of this occurring.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state whether the data and parameters are conservative and appropriate if they are fixed ex-ante (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	The validation report does not provide information on how the validation of the parameters fixed ex-ante is conducted, along with the sources and the confirmation that these are reasonable.
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to state that the estimates in the PDD are reasonable for data and parameters that are monitored during implementation and are available after validation as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 91.	The validation report does not provide information of how the parameters to be monitored is valdiated and opinion is provided on how reasonable these values are.

195	**5154**	**Shanxi Linfen 2×6MW Coke Oven Gas Power Generation Project**	LRQA	Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 76.	In particular, (i) the project activity is implemented in an existing industry facility, please provide the information on operation dates of the industry facilities (including the #1 and #2 coking plants); (ii) the project activity is to increase the capture and utilization of waste gas that is flared or vented in the absence of the project activity, since all the COG seems to have already been utilized in the absence of the project activity (page 13 of the validation report). In doing so, please provide the energy balance of the waste gas in both the pre-project and project scenario in which the COG generated, COG reused by the coke plant, COG consumed for heat generation/electricity generation/other use, and COG released in the absence of the project activity can be clearly illustrated; and (iii) the generation of heat or other use in the crediting period remain same as that in the baseline, please provide the detailed information on the users of energy generated by COG in the pre-project scenario (including the amount of energy supplied to each recipient and a diagram of the steam network within the project boundary, in which the sources and the end users of the steam system are clearly illustrated), further explain how the project activity will ensure the compliance with this criteria during the crediting period. Please refer to page 3 & 5 of ACM0012 v.3.2. Please also provide the information on the operation dates of the existing boilers and recipient plants (coking plants).
				Baseline methodology	The DOE is requested to describe how it has validated the project boundary as per VVM v1.2 paragraph 80.	The figure B.5 referred by the validation report (page 14) can not be found.

				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).	In particular: (i) the formula used in the spreadsheet to calculate the project IRR; (ii) the O&M cost, please specify the similar projects used to justify the suitability of O&M cost and how the DOE has validated that those projects are similar to the project activity; (iii) the COG price, please explain whether the desulphurization equipment cost has already been considered in the project investment cost, and how the COG price was determined in a qualitatively manner; (iv) the steam price, please explain whether the official heat price (15 RMB/GJ) is applicable to the project activity in terms of the characteristic of the steam supplied by the project activity, and whether the agreement on the actual steam price is an internal agreement given that the heat generated by the project activity is for captive use (page 10 of the validation report); and (v) two components of O&M cost (the cost of material, other manufacturing expense) in page 30 of the validation report are not consistent with the values applied in the investment analysis spreadsheet. Further, the DOE shall explained whether there is double counting of some components of the O&M cost,e.g an expense "water charge" and an operation cost "Fuel and power fee(water)" have been considered simultaneously, in doing so, please provide a breakdown of the O&M cost and the calculation of COG cost.
196	**5308**	**3.6 MW renewable energy based power generation in Rajasthan, India**	BVCH	Other	The PP/DOE are requested to include the details of each monitoring parameter listed as per EB 48 Annex 60 paragraph 10 (a).	In particular, the PDD should clearly present what is measured by the main meter: a) if the total electricity output from all project components are monitored together with one main meter at the substation; or b) if they are monitored individually; or c) main meter is shared with any other wind power projects. In addition, the means of crosschecking should be clarified.
				Additionality	The DOE is requested to provide information on how it has validated the suitability of the benchmark as per VVM v 1.2 paragraph 114 (b).	In particular, the DOE should explicitly indicate the date when the commercial lending rates were obtained.
				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, the DOE should explain how it has validated: a) the source of the applied PLF values, in particular, implication the approval for "the further development of the wind farm" by Rajasthan Renewable Energy Corporation Ltd. has; b) the tax shield; and c) application of the income tax rate and/or minimum alternate tax in the IRR calculation spreadsheet.