



# SSC POA VALIDATION REPORT

UPM UMWELT-PROJEKT-MANAGEMENT  
GMBH

SICHUAN ANIMAL FARMS GHG MITIGATION  
PROGRAMME

**Report No: 8000405963 – 12/128**

**Date: 2012-12-11**

TÜV NORD CERT GmbH  
JI/CDM Certification Program  
Langemarckstraße, 20  
45141 Essen, Germany  
Phone: +49-201-825-3335  
Fax: +49-201-825-3290  
[www.tuev-nord.de](http://www.tuev-nord.de)  
[www.global-warming.de](http://www.global-warming.de)

<b>Validation Report:</b>	<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Rev. No.</b>	<b>Date of 1<sup>st</sup> issue:</b>	<b>Date of this rev.</b>
	8000405963 – 12/128	0	2012-12-11	2012-12-11
<b>Client:</b>	<b>UPM Umwelt-Projekt-Management GmbH</b>	<b>Client ref.:</b>	<b>Mr. Martin Dilger</b>	
<b>Project: PoA-DD</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Initial Version:</b>	<b>Final Version</b>	
	<i>Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation Programme</i>	version 1 dated 2012-02-28	version 1.8 dated 2012-12-03	
<b>Generic CPA-DD</b>	<i>Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation Programme, CPA Nb. SCAFBG</i>	version 1 dated 2012-02-28	version 1.6 dated 2012-12-03	
<b>Involved Parties</b>	<b>Host party:</b>	<b>Other involved parties:</b>		
	<i>P.R. China</i>	<i>United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</i>		
<b>CME and Project Participants</b>	<b>Involved Entities/ Roles</b>	<b>CME:</b>	<b>Project Participant:</b>	
	<i>Chengdu Oasis Science &amp; Technology Co., Ltd.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	<i>UPM Umwelt-Projekt-Management GmbH</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Applied methodology(ies):</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Version No.:</b>	<b>Scope:</b>	<b>Approved for PoA:</b>
	<i>Methane recovery in animal manure management systems</i>	AMS-III.D. version 18	15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Validation team / Technical Review and Final Approval</b>	<b>Validation Team:</b>	<b>Technical review:</b>	<b>Final approval:</b>	
	<i>Stefan Winter (TL); Wang Jingyi, Jiang Zhi</i>	<i>Walter Ulrich</i>	<i>Jochen Schubert</i>	
<b>Real Case Details</b>	<b>Expected annual average emission reductions over the first crediting period:</b>	<b>PoA Duration:</b>	<b>Expected PoA starting date:</b>	
	<i>5,039 t CO<sub>2e</sub></i>	<i>28 years</i>	<i>2013-02-01</i>	
<b>Summary</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Positive validation opinion</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Negative validation opinion</i>	
<b>Summary of Validation Opinion:</b>	<p>UPM Umwelt-Projekt-Management GmbH has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program (CP) to validate the programme of activities (PoA): "Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation Programme" with regard to the relevant requirements of the UNFCCC for CDM project activities, as well as criteria for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria include article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the modalities and procedures for CDM (Marrakech Accords) and the relevant decisions by COP/MOP and CDM Executive Board.</p> <p>In the course of the validation 21 Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and 1 Clarification Requests (CLs) for PoA-DD and 6 CAR and 2 CLs for generic CPA-DD were raised and all have been successfully closed. No FAR has been raised.</p> <p>The review of the PoA design documentations and additional documents related to baseline and monitoring methodology; the subsequent background investigation, follow-up interviews and review of comments by parties, stakeholders and NGOs have provided TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP with sufficient evidence to validate the fulfilment of the stated criteria.</p> <p>In detail the conclusions can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The PoA is in line with all relevant host country criteria (P.R. China) and all relevant UNFCCC requirements for CDM. Project activity approvals (LoAs) have been obtained from DNA of P.R. China dated 2012-03-16 and from DNA of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated 2012-04-19.</li> <li>- The baseline has been appropriately identified as per the applied methodology.</li> <li>- The PoA additionality is sufficiently justified in the PoA-DD.</li> <li>- The eligibility criteria established for CPA inclusion are deemed appropriate and sufficient.</li> <li>- The monitoring plan is transparent and adequate.</li> <li>- The calculation of the emission factors and the CPA emission reductions is carried out in a transparent and conservative manner.</li> <li>- Information on the local stakeholders' consultation by the project participants prior to submitting the PoA for validation is sufficiently provided in the PoA-DD.</li> <li>- All information has been also consistently applied in the generic CPA-DD form.</li> </ul> <p>The conclusions of this report show, that the PoA, as it was described in the project documentations, is in line with all criteria applicable for the validation.</p>			
<b>Document information:</b>	<b>Filename:</b>	<b>No. of pages:</b>		
	<i>2012-12-11 PoA FVR_Sichuan Animal Farms clean.docx</i>	<i>175</i>		

## Abbreviations

<b>BAU</b>	Business as usual
<b>CA</b>	Corrective Action / Clarification Action
<b>CAR</b>	Corrective Action Request
<b>CDM</b>	Clean Development Mechanism
<b>CER</b>	Certified Emission Reduction
<b>CL</b>	Clarification Request
<b>C/ME</b>	coordinating/managing entity
<b>CO<sub>2</sub></b>	Carbon dioxide
<b>CO<sub>2e</sub></b>	Carbon dioxide equivalent
<b>CP</b>	Certification Program
<b>CPA</b>	CDM Programme Activities
<b>CPA-DD</b>	CDM programme Activity Design Document
<b>DNA</b>	Designated National Authority
<b>DOE</b>	Designated Operational Entities
<b>EB</b>	CDM Executive Board
<b>EC</b>	Eligibility Criteria
<b>EIA</b>	Environmental Impact Assessment
<b>FAR</b>	Forward Action Request
<b>FSR</b>	Feasibility Study Report
<b>GHG</b>	Greenhouse gas(es)
<b>GNI</b>	Gross National Income
<b>GSCP</b>	Global Stakeholder Consultation Process
<b>IPCC</b>	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
<b>LoA</b>	Letter of Approval
<b>NDRC</b>	National Development and Reform Commission
<b>ODA</b>	Official Development Assistance
<b>PLC</b>	Programmable Logical Controller
<b>PoA</b>	Programme of Activities
<b>PoA-DD</b>	CDM Programme of Activities Design Document
<b>POA-DDs</b>	(CDM PoA and CPA) Design Documents
<b>PP</b>	Project Participant
<b>SSC</b>	Small Scale
<b>SUZ</b>	Special Underdeveloped Zone
<b>QC/QA</b>	Quality control/Quality assurance
<b>UNFCCC</b>	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
<b>VVM</b>	Validation and Verification Manual

<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
1 OBJECTIVE / SCOPE .....	6
2 GHG POA DESCRIPTION.....	10
2.1 PoA Characteristics	10
2.2 Involved Parties, Coordinating / managing entity(ies), program participants of the POA and operators of individual CPAs	10
2.3 Programme Boundary and Location	11
2.4 Technical Programme Description	11
3 METHODOLOGY AND VALIDATION SEQUENCE.....	13
3.1 Validation Steps	13
3.2 Contract review	14
3.3 Appointment of team members and technical reviewers	14
3.4 Consideration of Public Stakeholder Comments	15
3.5 Validation Protocol	15
3.6 Review of Documents	16
3.7 Follow-up Interviews	16
3.8 Project comparison	17
3.9 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests	17
3.9.1 Definition	17
3.9.2 Draft Validation	17
3.9.3 Final Validation	17
3.10 Technical review	18
3.11 Final approval	18
4 VALIDATION FINDINGS .....	19
5 VALIDATION ASSESSMENT SUMMARY .....	56
5.1 General Description of the PoA	56
5.1.1 Participation	56
5.1.2 Contribution to Sustainable Development	56
5.1.3 PDDs editorial Aspects	56
5.1.4 Technology to be employed	56
5.1.5 Small Scale Projects	57
5.2 PoA Baseline, Additionality and Monitoring Plan	58
5.2.1 Application of the Methodology	58
5.2.2 PoA Boundary and CPA Boundary	59
5.2.3 Baseline Identification	59
5.2.4 Calculation of GHG Emission Reductions	60
5.2.5 Additionality Determination	68
5.2.6 Eligibility criteria	72
5.2.7 Monitoring Methodology	72
5.2.8 Monitoring Plan	72

5.2.9	Project Management Planning	74
5.2.10	Crediting Period and PoA Duration	75
5.2.11	Environmental Impacts	75
5.2.12	Comments by Local Stakeholders	75
5.2.13	CPA Eligibility Criteria	75
6	VALIDATION OPINION .....	76
7	REFERENCES .....	77
	ANNEX 1: VALIDATION PROTOCOL.....	85
	ANNEX 2: ASSESSMENT OF BASELINE IDENTIFICATION.....	154
	ANNEX 3: ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL PARAMETERS.....	156
	ANNEX 4: ASSESSMENT OF BARRIER ANALYSIS .....	157
	ANNEX 5: OUTCOME OF THE GSCP.....	158
	ANNEX 6: ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA ASSESSMENT .....	159
	ANNEX 7: APPOINTMENT CERTIFICATES OF TEAM MEMBERS.....	175

## 1 OBJECTIVE / SCOPE

The purpose of a PoA validation is to have an independent third party assess the project design. In particular the project's baseline, the monitoring plan (MP), and the project's compliance with

- the requirements set forth in the most recent versions of the CDM Rules, including the requirements of Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM modalities and procedures as agreed in the Marrakech Accords under decision 3/CMP.1 the subsequent decisions by the CMP, and any relevant documents released by the CDM Executive Board (the “**EB**”) and available on the UNFCCC CDM website at <http://unfccc.int> (the aforementioned requirements together the “CDM Requirements”);
- Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Manual (current version 01.2; EB55 Annex 1, esp. para 165 – 168) (the “VVM”)
- Procedures for registration of a programme of activities as a single CDM project activity and issuance of certified emission reductions for a programme of activities (current version 04.1, EB 55 Annex 38) (the “PoA Procedures”);
- Procedures for review of erroneous inclusion of a CPA (current version 03, EB 61 Annex 22) (the “CPA Review Procedures”)
- Guidelines on assessment of de-bundling for SSC project activities especially Guidance for determining the occurrence of de-bundling under a programme of activities (PoA) (current version 03, EB54 Annex 13) (the “De-bundling Guidance”)
- Procedures for approval of the application of multiple methodologies to a programme of activities (current version 01; EB 47 Annex 31) (the “Multi-Meth Approval Procedures”);
- Guidelines for demonstrating additionality of microscale project activities (version 04, EB 68 Annex 26);
- Guidelines for the demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities (version 09, EB 68 Annex 27)
- Standard for Demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programmes of activities (version 02.1, EB 70 Annex 5)
- Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities (version 03.0, EB 69 Annex 4)
- CDM-SSC-PoA-DD - Small-Scale CDM Programme of Activities Design Document form (version 01, EB 33 Annex 43)

- CDM-SSC-CPA-DD - Small-Scale CDM Programme Activity Design Document form (version 01, EB 33 Annex 44)
- the host country legislation and sustainability criteria as applicable under the CDM-related laws and regulations of the country in which the PoA and CPAs are physically located;

are validated in order to confirm that the programme design as documented is sound and reasonable and meets the stated requirements and identified criteria. Validation is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders on the quality of the programme and its intended generation of certified emission reductions (CERs).

The validation scope is given as a thorough independent and objective assessment of the programme design, information that are included in the POA-DDs and other relevant supporting documents, to ensure that the proposed CDM programme activity meets all relevant and applicable CDM and PoA criteria.

As per the PoA procedures, TÜV NORD will validate the following documentation as provided by the client:

- a completed Clean Development Mechanism Programme of Activities Design Document Form (the “**PoA-DD**”);
- a completed PoA-specific Clean Development Mechanism Program Activity Design Document Form (the “**CPA-DD form**”) with generic information relevant to all CPAs (as the “**generic CPA-DD**”);
- a completed CDM-CPA-DD which is to be based on the application of the PoA to one real case (the “**real case CPA-DD**”), and
- relevant supporting documents.

TÜV NORD validates the following information provided by the client in the PoA-DD:

- the correct application of the baseline and monitoring methodology (ies) and tools,
  - In cases where more than one approved methodology will be applied to each CPA, confirmation that the application of multiple methodologies has been approved in accordance with “Procedures for approval of the application of multiple methodologies to a programme of activities” (EB 47 annex 31).
- coordinating/managing entity, host party/ies and PoA Participants
- geographical boundaries of the PoA including all national and/or sectoral policies and regulations;
- policy, measure or stated goal of the PoA;
- confirmation about voluntary action by the coordinating/managing entity;
- the programme’s baseline study;
- demonstration of additionality of the PoA;

- description of a typical CPA (including technology or measures, baseline and monitoring methodology justification and application, demonstration of additionality, and accounting for leakage);
- eligibility criteria designed for the inclusion of CPAs in the PoA, including criteria to be used for demonstration of additionality of a CPA;
- starting date and length of the PoA;
- operational and management arrangements established by the coordinating/ managing entity for the implementation of the PoA, including
  - a record keeping system for each CPA under the PoA,
  - a system/procedure to avoid double accounting e.g. to avoid the case of including a new CPA that has been already registered either as CDM project activity or as a CPA of another PoA,
  - the provisions to ensure that those operating the CPA are aware and have agreed that their activity is being subscribed to the PoA;
- monitoring plan for a CPA with record-keeping system;
- indicators/data to be monitored and reported;
- statistically sound sampling method to be used for verification;
- environmental impacts and analysis;
- Stakeholder Consultation Procedure as required under the CDM Rules;
- public funding;
- Letter(s) of Approval as required under the CDM Rules.

TÜV NORD validates the following information provided by the client in the PoA- Generic CDM-CPA-DD:

- unique identification of the CPA by location or if applicable by registration code;
- contact details of persons responsible for each CPA;
- host party;
- starting date and duration of the crediting period;
- eligibility criteria;
- demonstration of additionality;
- baseline greenhouse gas emissions;
- estimated emission reductions;
- environmental impacts and analysis;
- stakeholder consultation procedure;
- confirmation regarding no prior CDM registration or inclusion in another PoA;
- consistency between CDM-POA-DD and the PoA- Generic CDM-CPA-DD.

TÜV NORD validates the Real-Case CDM-CPA-DD with regard to

- consistency with the PoA-DD;
- consistency with the generic CPA-DD;

- additionality;
- eligibility criteria fulfilment;
- emission reduction calculation;
- monitoring plan;
- environmental impacts;
- local stakeholder commenting process.

The information included in the POA-DDs and the supporting documents were reviewed against the requirements as set out by the UNFCCC. The validation team has, based on the requirements in the Validation and Verification Manual<sup>VVM</sup>, carried out a full assessment of all evidences to assess the compliance of the programme with the key areas as outlined in section V.E. and V.F. of the VVM (version 1.2, EB 55 Annex 1).

The validation is based on the information made available to TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP and on the contract conditions. TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP cannot be held liable by any entity for making its validation opinion based on any false or misleading information supplied to it during the course of validation.

The validation is not meant to provide any consulting to the project participants. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the project design.

## 2 GHG POA DESCRIPTION

### 2.1 PoA Characteristics

Essential data of the project is presented in the following Table 2-1.

**Table 2-1:** PoA Characteristics

Item	Data	
PoA title	Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation Programme	
Generic CPA title	Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation Programme, CPA Nb. SCAFBG	
1st CPA (real case) title	Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation Programme, CPA Nb. SCAFBG-2011-01	
CPA size	<input type="checkbox"/> Large Scale <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small Scale	
Programme Scope (according to UNFCCC sectoral scope numbers for CDM)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Energy Industries (renewable- /non-renewable sources)
	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Energy distribution
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Energy demand
	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	Manufacturing industries
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	Chemical industry
	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	Construction
	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	Transport
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	Mining/Mineral production
	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	Metal production
	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	Fugitive emissions from fuels (solid, oil and gas)
	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	Fugitive emissions from production and consumption of halocarbons and hexafluoride
	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	Solvents use
	<input type="checkbox"/> 13	Waste handling and disposal
	<input type="checkbox"/> 14	Afforestation and Reforestation
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 15	Agriculture
Applied Methodology(ies) Title and Version No.	Methane recovery in animal manure management systems (AMS-III.D. version 18)	
PoA Duration	28 years	
Starting date of the PoA	2013-02-01 or the date of registration whatever occurs later	
CPA Crediting period	<input type="checkbox"/> Renewable Crediting Period (7 y) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fixed Crediting Period (10 y)	
Start of crediting period of the 1 <sup>st</sup> (real case) CPA	2013-06-01	
Estimated metric tCO <sub>2</sub> equivalent reductions of the 1 <sup>st</sup> CPA over the first crediting period	Annual average	5,093 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
	Total estimation over the 1st crediting period	50,934 tCO <sub>2</sub> e

### 2.2 Involved Parties, Coordinating / managing entity(ies), program participants of the POA and operators of individual CPAs

The following parties to the Kyoto Protocol and project participants are involved in this PoA (Table 2-2-1).

**Table 2-2-1: Parties and Project Participants of the PoA**

Name of Party Involved ((host) indicates a host party)	Private and/or Public Entity(ies) Project Participants ((CME) indicates the Coordinating and Managing Entity)	Does Party Involved Wish to be Considered as Project Participant (Yes/No)
P.R. China ( host party)	Chengdu Oasis Science & Technology Co., Ltd. (CME)	No
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	UPM Umwelt-Projekt-Management GmbH	No

The CPA operator(s) of the 1st real case CPA is(are) listed in Table 2-2-2.

**Table 2-2-2: Operator(s) of individual CPAs**

CPA No.	CPA title	Operator	CPA Location	Geographic Coordinates
SCAFBG-2011-01	Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation Programme, CPA Nb. SCAFBG-2011-01		Shuanghe Town, Zizhong County, Sichuan Province, P. R. China	E: 104°46'56" N: 29°39'29"

## 2.3 Programme Boundary and Location

The details of the programme location are given in table 2-3:

**Table 2-3-1: Programme Location**

No.	Programme Location
Host Country	P.R. China
Region(s):	Sichuan province
1 <sup>st</sup> (real case) CPA Project location address:	Shuanghe Town, Zizhong County, Sichuan Province, P. R. China

## 2.4 Technical Programme Description

The technology to be employed under this PoA involves the installation of a biogas generation system. This biogas generation system implemented under this PoA usually consists of two biogas digesters adjusted to the amount of available manure at the farm which depends on the number of pigs produced per year. The first digester will work under mesophilic conditions, the second subsequent digester under normal conditions. However it is also possible under this PoA that the number of biogas digesters could be different adjusted to the actual circumstances. Further the system will include a biogas purification stage to remove water and H<sub>2</sub>S. The purified biogas is then further guided for electrical and/or thermal energy generation e.g. to utilization in gas engine generator, thermal gas boiler to generate steam

and/or hot water or used for cooking by the farm itself or maybe transported to surrounding households.

As an example under the 1<sup>st</sup> CPA the following system will be implemented:

A mesophilic anaerobic fermentation tank with a volume of 1,000 m<sup>3</sup> and a normal-temperature anaerobic fermentation tank with a volume of 600 m<sup>3</sup> will be installed to treat the manure of annual average 11,000 swine (in stable) for biogas production which is expected to be around 1,100 m<sup>3</sup> per day in average. The PP expects to increase the pig population to an annual average of 11,000 swine in stable. To utilize the biogas, the project will employ a generator set with a capacity of 180 kW which also reuses the waste heat for the operation of mesophilic fermentation system. It's expected to generate around 1,515 kWh electricity per day for internal use. Furthermore, 2 t of steam per hour will be produced in a gas boiler and additionally, small amounts of thermal energy are generated for daily living consumption within the farm premises. Finally a flare will be installed for exgincencies.

The technical key data are provided in table 2-4 below

**Table 2-4:** Technical data of the 1<sup>st</sup> CPA project activity

Type/Model	Parameter	Unit	Value
Digester 1	Number of Units	-	1
	Working condition	-	Mesophilic
	Volume	m <sup>3</sup>	1,000
Digester 2	Number of Units	-	1
	Working condition	-	normal
	Volume	m <sup>3</sup>	600
	Expected biogas production from digesters	m <sup>3</sup> /d	1,100
Gas engine	Capacity	kW	180
Gas boiler	Capacity	t/h	2
Flare	Number of Units	-	1

## 3 METHODOLOGY AND VALIDATION SEQUENCE

### 3.1 Validation Steps

The validation of the PoA consists of the following steps:

- Contract review
- Appointment of team members and technical reviewers
- Publication of the following project documents POA-DDs
  - the **PoA-DD**
  - the **generic CPA-DD**
  - the **real case CPA-DD**
- A desk review of all abovementioned POA-DDs<sup>/PDDs/</sup> submitted by the client and additional supporting documents with the use of customised validation protocol<sup>/CPM/</sup> according to the Validation and Verification Manual<sup>/VVM/</sup>, and all PoA related regulations<sup>/POAR/</sup>
- Validation planning,
- On-Site assessment,
- Background investigation and follow-up interviews with personnel of the project developer and its contractors,
- Draft validation reporting
- Resolution of corrective actions (if any)
- Final validation reporting
- Technical review
- Final approval of the validation.

The sequence of the validation is given in the table 3-1 below:

**Table 3-1:** Validation sequence

Topic	Time
Assignment of validation	2012-02-29
POA-DD and CPA-DDs global stakeholder commenting period	2012-03-01 – 2012-03-30
On-site visit	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31
Draft reporting finalised	2012-04-06
Final reporting finalised	2012-12-03
Technical review on final reporting finalised	2012-12-03

### 3.2 Contract review

To assure that

- the PoA falls within the scopes for which accreditation is held,
- the necessary competences to carry out the validation can be provided,
- Impartiality issues are clear and in line with the CDM accreditation requirements,

a contract review was carried out before the contract was signed.

### 3.3 Appointment of team members and technical reviewers

On the basis of a competence analysis and individual availabilities a verification team, consistent of one team leader and 2 additional team members, were appointed. Furthermore also the personnel for the technical review and the final approval were determined.

The list of involved personnel, the tasks assigned and the qualification status are summarized in the table 3-2 below.

**Table 3-2:** Involved Personnel

	Name	Company	Function <sup>1)</sup>	Qualification Status <sup>2)</sup>	Scheme competence	Technical competence <sup>4)</sup>	Host country Competence	Team Leading competence	Onsite
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Stefan Winter	TÜV Nord Germany	TL	SA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15.2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Jiang Zhi	TÜV NORD China	TM	A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Wang Jingyi	TÜV NORD China	TM	T	<input type="checkbox"/>	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Walter Ullrich	TÜV Nord Germany	TR <sup>3)</sup>	LA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15.2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Jochen Schubert	TÜV Nord Germany	FA	SA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-

<sup>1)</sup> TL: Team Leader; TM: Team Member, TR: Technical review; FA: Final approval

<sup>2)</sup> GHG Auditor Status: A: Assessor; E: Expert; SA: Senior Assessor; T: Trainee; TE: Technical Expert

<sup>3)</sup> No team member

<sup>4)</sup> As per S01-MU03 or S01-VA070 A2 (such as A, B, C.....)

Certificates of appointment for the above mentioned team members are enclosed in annex 7 of this report.

### 3.4 Consideration of Public Stakeholder Comments

Acc. to the modalities and procedures the draft POA-DDs, as received from the project participants, has been made publicly available on the dedicated UNFCCC CDM website prior to the validation activity commenced. Stakeholders have been invited to comment on the POA-DD within the 30 days public commenting period.

In case comments were received, they are taken into account during the validation process. The comments and the discussion of the same are documented in annex 5 of this report.

### 3.5 Validation Protocol

In order to ensure consideration of all relevant assessment criteria, a validation protocol is used. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria and requirements, means of validation and the results from pre-validating the identified criteria. The validation protocol reflects the generic CDM requirements each CDM project has to meet as well as PoA specific issues as applicable. The validation protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organises, details and clarifies the requirements that a PoA is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent validation process where the validating entity will document how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the determination.

The validation protocol as described in Figure 1.

**Figure 1:** Validation protocol tables

<b>Validation Protocol Table A-1: Requirement checklist</b>				
<b>Checklist Item</b>	<b>Validation Team Comment</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Draft Conclusion</b>	<b>Final Conclusion</b>
<i>The checklist items in Table A-1 are linked to the various requirements the project should meet. The checklist is organised in various sections. Each section is then further sub-divided as per the requirements of the topic and the individual project activity.</i>	<i>The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist item in detail. It includes the assessment of the validation team and how the assessment was carried out. The reporting requirements of the VVM shall be covered in this section.</i>	<i>Gives reference to the information source on which the assessment is based on</i>	<i>Assessment based on evidence provided if the criterion is fulfilled (OK), or a CAR, CL or FAR (see below) is raised. The assessment refers to the draft validation stage.</i>	<i>In case a corrective action or a clarification the final assessment at the final validation stage is given.</i>

The completed validation protocol is enclosed in Annex 1 to this report.

### 3.6 Review of Documents

The published POA-DDs (draft) and supporting background documents related to the programme design and baseline were reviewed.

Furthermore, the validation team used additional documentation by third parties like host party legislation, technical reports referring to the programme design or to the basic conditions and technical data.

### 3.7 Follow-up Interviews

The validation team has carried out interviews in order to assess the information included in the programme documentations and to gain additional information regarding the compliance of the PoA with the relevant criteria applicable for CDM.

During validation the validation team has performed interviews to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. The main topics of the interviews are summarized in table 3-3.

**Table 3-3:** Interviewed persons and interview topics

Interviewed Persons / Entities	Interview topics
Project participant representatives Project consultant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chronological description of the programme activity with documents of key steps of the implementation.</li> <li>- Current status of programme design</li> <li>- Technical details of the programme realization, programme feasibility, designing, operational life time, monitoring of the programme</li> <li>- Host Government Approval</li> <li>- Approval procedures and status</li> <li>- Monitoring and measurement equipment and system</li> <li>- Financial aspects</li> <li>- Crediting period</li> <li>- Programme activity starting date</li> <li>- CER allocation / ownership</li> <li>- Baseline study assumptions</li> <li>- Additionality</li> <li>- Sustainable development issues</li> <li>- Monitoring of CPAs</li> <li>- Analysis of local stakeholder consultation</li> <li>- Roles &amp; responsibilities of the project participants w.r.t. programme management, monitoring and reporting</li> <li>- National Legislation</li> <li>- Editorial issues of the POA-DD and CPA-DDs</li> </ul>

A comprehensive list of all interviewed persons is part of section 7 'References'.

### 3.8 Project comparison

The validation team has compared the proposed PoA activity with similar PoA or CDM projects / technology that have similar or comparable characteristics and with similar projects in the host country in order to achieve additional information esp. regarding:

- Programme technology
- Additionality issues
- Reasons for reviews, requests for reviews and rejections within the CDM registration process.

### 3.9 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

#### 3.9.1 Definition

A **Corrective Action Request (CAR)** will be established where:

- mistakes have been made in assumptions, application of the methodology or the programme documentation which will have a direct influence on the programme results,
- the requirements deemed relevant for validation of the PoA with certain characteristics have not been met or
- there is a risk that the programme would not be registered by the UNFCCC or that emission reductions would not be able to be verified and certified.

A **Clarification Request (CL)** will be issued where information is insufficient, unclear or not transparent enough to establish whether a requirement is met.

A **Forward Action Request (FAR)** will be issued when certain issues related to programme implementation should be reviewed during the first verification of each CPA.

#### 3.9.2 Draft Validation

After reviewing all relevant documents and taken all other relevant information into account, the validation team issues all findings in the course of a draft validation report and hands this report over to the project participant in order to respond on the issues raised and to revise the programme documentations accordingly.

#### 3.9.3 Final Validation

The final validation starts after receiving the proposed corrective actions (CAs) to the CARs, CLs and FARs from the project participant. The project participant has to reply on all CARs, CLs and FARs and the requests are “closed out” by the validation team in case the response is assessed as sufficient. In case of raised FARs the project participant has to respond on this, identifying the necessary actions to ensure that

the topics raised in this finding are likely to be resolved at the latest during the first verification of each CPA. The validation team has to assess whether the proposed action is adequate or not.

In case the findings from CARs and CLs cannot be resolved by the project participant or the proposed action related to the FARs raised cannot be assessed as adequate, no positive validation opinion can be issued by the validation team.

The CAR(s) / CL(s) / FAR(s) are documented in chapter 4.

### **3.10 Technical review**

Before submission of the final validation report a technical review of the whole validation procedure is carried out. The technical reviewer is a competent GHG auditor being appointed for the scope this PoA falls under. The technical reviewer is not considered to be part of the verification team and thus not involved in the decision making process up to the technical review.

As a result of the technical review process the validation opinion and the topic specific assessments as prepared by the validation team leader may be confirmed or revised. Furthermore reporting improvements might be achieved.

### **3.11 Final approval**

After successful technical review of the final report an overall (esp. procedural) assessment of the complete validation will be carried out by a senior assessor located in the accredited premises of TÜV NORD.

Only after this step the request for registration can be started (in case of a positive validation opinion).

## 4 VALIDATION FINDINGS

In the following table the findings from the desk review of the published POA-DDs, visits, interviews and supporting documents are summarised:

**Table 4-1:** Summary of CARs, CLs and FARs issued

Validation topic <sup>1)</sup>	No. of CAR	No. of CL	No. of FAR
<b>CDM-POA-DD</b>			
General description of the programme of activities (PoA-A) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Programme title and description</li> <li>- PoA Operating and implementing framework</li> <li>- Policy/measure or stated goal of the PoA</li> <li>- Confirmation of voluntary action</li> <li>- Coordinating/managing entity and Participation</li> <li>- Communication with the Board</li> <li>- PP in relation to the PoA</li> <li>- Technical description of the PoA</li> <li>- PoA boundary and locations</li> <li>- Description of a typical CPA</li> <li>- Eligibility criteria for CPA inclusion</li> <li>- Description of PoA GHG emission reduction</li> <li>- Additionality demonstration of the PoA</li> <li>- Operational, management and monitoring plan of the PoA</li> <li>- Public funding of the PoA</li> <li>- POA-DD editorial and consistency aspects</li> </ul>	9	0	0
Duration of the PoA (PoA-B)	1	0	0
Environmental analysis (PoA-C)	0	1	0
Stakeholder Comments (PoA-D)	0	0	0
Application of baseline and monitoring methodology (PoA-E) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Application of the Methodology to a typical CPA</li> <li>- Sources and gases within the CPA boundary</li> <li>- Baseline identification</li> <li>- Additionality demonstration of a CPA</li> <li>- Emission reductions Estimation of a CPA</li> <li>- Methodological choices</li> <li>- Equations, ex-ante parameters</li> </ul>	11	0	0

Validation topic <sup>1)</sup>	No. of CAR	No. of CL	No. of FAR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To be reported CPA data and parameters</li> <li>- Monitoring Methodology and Monitoring Plan</li> <li>- To be monitored CPA data and parameters</li> <li>- CPA monitoring plan</li> </ul>			
Annexes 1 to 4	0	0	0
<b>Sum</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Generic CDM-CPA-DD</b>			
<b>Overall Consistency with finalized PoA-DD</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
General description of the CDM programme activity (CPA-A) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Title and description of the CPA</li> <li>- Entity/individual responsible for the CPA</li> <li>- Technical Description of the CPA</li> <li>- Identification of the CPA</li> <li>- Duration and crediting period of CPA</li> <li>- Estimated emission reduction</li> <li>- Public funding</li> <li>- Confirmation of de-bundling in case of SSC</li> <li>- Confirmation of no double counting</li> <li>- CPA-DD editorial and consistency aspects</li> </ul>	1	2	0
Eligibility of CPA and Estimation of Emission Reductions (CPA-B) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CPA reference to the PoA</li> <li>- Justification to CPA inclusion eligibility criteria</li> <li>- Demonstration of CPA additionality</li> <li>- Confirmation of CPA boundary</li> <li>- CPA Emission Reduction</li> <li>- Ex-ante CPA Data an parameters</li> <li>- Ex-ante CPA Emission reduction calculation</li> <li>- Summary of Ex-ante estimation</li> <li>- CPA Monitoring Plan</li> </ul>	3	0	0
Environmental analysis (CPA-C)	0	0	0
Stakeholder Comments (CPA-D)	1	0	0

Validation topic <sup>1)</sup>	No. of CAR	No. of CL	No. of FAR
<b>SUM</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

<sup>1)</sup> The letters in brackets refer to the finding titles, corresponding sections in PoA-DD and generic CPA-DD and validation protocol

The following tables include all raised CARs, CLs and FARs. For an in depth evaluation of all validation items it should be referred to the validation protocols (see Annex 1 of this report).

The findings of validation process are summarized in the tables below.

PoA-DD v1 initial finding

PoA-DD v1.1 Assessment #1

PoA-DD v1.2 Assessment #2

PoA-DD v1.3 Assessment #3

PoA-DD v1.4 Assessment #4

PoA-DD v1.5 as specified in related DOE assessment.

PoA-DD v.1.6 as specified in related DOE assessment.

PoA-DD v.1.7 as specified in related DOE assessment.

PoA-DD v.1.8 as specified in related DOE assessment.

gCPA-DD v1.0 initial finding

gCPA-DD v1.1 Assessment #1

gCPA-DD v1.3 Assessment #2 (from v1.1 directly to v1.3, v1.2 left out by PP)

gCPA-DD v1.4 as specified in related DOE assessment.

gCPA-DD v1.5 due to updates in PoA-DD v.1.7.

gCPA-DD v1.6 due to updates in PoA-DD v.1.8.

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>The letters of approval from Annex I county have not yet been provided by the PP at the draft validation stage. All information shall be checked upon the submission.</p> <p>Please notice that each of the written approvals shall confirm the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) that the corresponding party is a Party to the Kyoto Protocol;</li> <li>ii) that the participation is voluntary;</li> <li>iii) that the project contributes to the sustainable development in the country (only for host country approval(s));</li> </ul>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	iv) that the project participant's information is exactly the same as in the PoA-DD; v) that the PoA title referred in the approvals is consistent with the one in the PoA-DD submitted for registration, or is there an additional specification of the PoA, e.g. PoA-DD version number; vi) that the CME is authorized for its coordination and implementation of the PoA from each Host Party (only for host country approval(s)); vii) that the approvals are unconditional w.r.t. the above points.		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	Both LoAs have been provided.		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	HCA of Chinese DNA NDRC has been provided vide the letter No 3766 dated 16/03/2012. The HCA is checked and DOE therefore can confirm the following: i) that the corresponding party is a Party to the Kyoto Protocol; ii) that the participation is voluntary; iii) that the project participant's information is exactly the same as in the PoA-DD; iv) that the PoA title referred in the approvals is consistent with the one in the POA-DD submitted for registration; v) that the CME is authorized for its coordination and implementation of the PoA from each Host Party (only for host country approval(s)); vi) that the approvals are unconditional w.r.t. the above points. vii) That the approval is unconditional  LoA of UK DNA Environment Agency DNA Ref: EA/UPM/03/2012 dated 19/04/2012 has been provided. The LoA is checked and DOE therefore can confirm the following: i) that the corresponding party is a Party to the Kyoto Protocol; ii) that the participation is voluntary; iii) that the project participant's information is exactly the same as in the PoA-DD; iv) that the PoA title referred in the approvals is consistent with the one in the POA-DD submitted for registration; v) that the CME is authorized for its coordination and implementation of the PoA from each Host Party (only for host country approval(s)); vi) that the approvals are unconditional w.r.t. the above points. vii) That the approval is unconditional  As both LoAs are provided this CAR is closed.		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b>	Following issues w.r.t. section A.1 have been identified:		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inconsistency w.r.t. the utilization of produced biogas under any CPA as at beginning of the section it is stated that it is used for electricity generation and thermal energy but later it is referred to elec generation and/or thermal energy. Further it is referred to that “biogas to replace electricity and thermal energy generated based on fossil fuel”. Clarification and unification is requested.</li> <li>2. The abbreviation AWMS is not determined at first appearance. Please clarify.</li> <li>3. Clarify following statement: “emission reductions from electricity and heat replacement are ignored for simplification”. Besides clarify whether the captured biogas is to replace electricity and thermal energy based on fossil fuel in any case.</li> <li>4. Clarification is requested w.r.t. following “the emission reductions owing to the avoidance of methane emission due to the existing”.</li> <li>5. Specify how Sichuan government “encourages” biogas projects for livestock farms.</li> <li>6. Clarification is requested whether CME is also a CPA implementer.</li> </ol>		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The CPAs will avoid methane emissions in the baseline and generate biogas from animal manure. The biogas will be used to generate electricity and/or thermal energy, depending on the local demand of the farms involved in the specific CPAs. The wording has been changed towards and/or.</li> <li>2. The name Animal Waste Management System has been inserted.</li> <li>3. The emission reductions from electricity and heat replacement are not ignored, but not claimed for as CERs. The wording has been corrected. Although fossil-fuel based generation of electricity and heat is the vastly used common practice in Sichuan province, a CPA in which electricity and/or heat from other sources is replaced will not be excluded from the PoA. Therefore, it is highly unlikely, but theoretically possible that there will be a CPA without replacement of electricity and/or heat from other sources than fossil fuel.</li> <li>4. The mistake has been corrected, the sentence has been completed towards “For the included CPAs, only emission reductions from the replacement of the existing anaerobic manure management systems are claimed.”.</li> <li>5. Biogas projects are encouraged in the form of a subsidy. However, even considering the subsidy, the IRR of such projects is still below the nationally accepted benchmarks. Furthermore, the subsidy is not granted by the Sichuan government, but by the central government of China, that is distributed by the provincial authorities in Sichuan.</li> <li>6. The C/ME will not be an implementer of the projects. The mistake has been removed.</li> </ol>		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ok. PoA-DD revised accordingly and consistent now.</li> <li>2. Ok. Abbreviation is defined.</li> <li>3. Ok as PoA-DD has been revised w.r.t. that related emission reductions are not claimed.</li> <li>4. Not ok. Clarification is requested as sentences as per response is inconsistent with revision conducted as per PoA-DD.</li> <li>5. Ok related clarification provided and PoA-DD revised accordingly. This has been confirmed by related government officials during interview<sup>IM02/</sup>.</li> </ol>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	6. Ok. PoA-DD has been revised accordingly that the farm owner will be the implementer of the biogas recovery and utilization system.		
<b>Corrective Action #2</b>	4. The PoA-DD states the following: "For the included CPAs, only emission reductions from the replacement of the existing anaerobic manure management systems are claimed. Further emission reductions from electricity and heat replacement are not claimed as CERs for simplification."		
<b>DOE Assessment #2</b>	4. Ok. Clarification has been provided and response is now consistent with PoA-DD. As all issues are closed this CAR is closed.		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Following issue w.r.t. the name of the CME as per table in Section A.3 and Annex 1 has been identified: The name is inconsistent with the name as per section A.2 and sentence prior to table in A.3. Clarification and unification is requested.		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	The name has been corrected in all occurrences. The name is "Chengdu Oasis Science & Technology Co., Ltd.".		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	Ok. Names are fully consistent now. CAR closed.		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	The quality of the map provided in section A.4.1.2 of PoA-DD is unclear.		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the cor-</i>	A new map has been included.		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<i>rective action taken in details.</i>			
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	The updated map in PDD is now of high quality and clear. CAR closed.		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Following issues w.r.t. technology or measures to be employed have been identified: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The two standards stated are inconsistent in name and standard number with the standards provided as supporting document and as stated in FSR for the first CPA. Besides this FSR states further standards. Clarification and revision requested.</li> <li>Clarification is requested w.r.t. following statement "the biogas will be stored in a gas tanks". Besides the grammar please clarify whether in all cases a separate gas tank is installed and for which period the gas tank could act as a buffer for the utilization equipment.</li> </ol>		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A comprehensive list of all applicable technical standards has been included in section A.4.2.1.</li> <li>The wording has been revised. All facilities will be equipped with a gas storage system. This can either be a separate tank, or balloon-type storage on top of the digester. The storage system is usually designed to store more than 50% of one daily production volume of biogas.</li> </ol>		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ok. All related standards have been mentioned in PoA-DD now and names and standard numbers are consistent with provided evidence<sup>/FSR/</sup>. Completeness and correct numbering and titles have been confirmed by related government officials during onsite audit and interview<sup>/IM02/</sup>. Besides correct title and numbering has been crosschecked by DOE with related standards<sup>/STAND/</sup>.</li> <li>Not Ok. Clarification provided. PDD revised accordingly. However specification is missing w.r.t. installation of a flare for exingenies.</li> </ol>		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b>	2. A.4.2.1 states now "in cases where gas engine and boiler face technical issues or are undergoing maintenance, a flare will be used to destroy the gas".		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b>	Based on PoA-DD version 1.7: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ok. PoA-DD is updated accordingly and now states that a flare is installed for back-up and emergency to ensure that all biogas produced is destroyed.</li> </ol> CAR is closed.		
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Tick the appropriate checkbox	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Following issues w.r.t. the eligibility criteria (EC) have been identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clarify the difference between EC 2 and EC 7.1 as well as EC 3 and 5.3.</li> <li>2. EC 5.1 states that all CPAs will only include replacement of anaerobic manure management system. Please clarify how e.g. an open lagoon is replaced in a CPA under the PoA.</li> <li>3. The footnote 1 is only incompletely shown. Therefore clarify.</li> <li>4. Further the footnote 1 states that also "criteria"/para 6 of AMS III.D is not applicable. Clarify and further justify the exclusion of this para.</li> <li>5. During validation it has been identified that for almost all EC further evidence examples could be applied. Clarify why the evidence examples are limited to the stated ones?</li> <li>6. Clarify the evidence example "application record" and "contracts signed by farms", which contract is meant.</li> <li>7. During onsite audit it has been identified that also EB 63 Annex 23 will be applied for additionality demonstration. However the applicability criteria do not refer to this approach. Revision requested.</li> <li>8. Clarify the difference between EC 7.2 and combination of EC 5.1 and 5.1.5</li> <li>9. Clarify the sentence stated under "Rational" of EC 7.2.</li> <li>10. The date of hosting PoA for GSC is wrong. Revision requested.</li> <li>11. Clarify the meaning of "monitoring plant" under EC 11.</li> <li>12. Clarify the difference between EC 12.1 and EC 12.2.</li> <li>13. EC 13: Clarify whether an EIA is only necessary for each "new CPA" or for each installation under a CPA in case these are more than one.</li> <li>14. During interview with government officials and as stated in section C.3 of PoA-DD not all biogas and utilization systems require an EIA. Clarify whether all CPAs/installations under this PoA will conduct an EIA.</li> <li>15. Further clarify whether an EIA approval is required as no such EC is provided.</li> <li>16. Clarify if for all CPAs/installations a FSR will be prepared as no such EC is provided.</li> <li>17. EC 14: Clarify whether local stakeholder consultation will be held on CPA level especially how this is managed if more than one installation is covered under one CPA.</li> </ol>		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Duplicate criteria have been removed.</li> <li>2. The wording has been revised to meet the wording of the methodology "replacement or modification".</li> <li>3. The footnote has been corrected during the PDF creation process. It is provided in better quality now.</li> </ol>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	<p>4. The justification in E.2 has been revised and the footnote removed.</p> <p>5. Several additional documents have been added as evidence example.</p> <p>6. Both documents have been found as not suitable as evidence. They have been removed.</p> <p>7. Eligibility criterion 4 is referring to the additionality criteria. There, EB63, Annex 23 has been included in the revised PoA-DD.</p> <p>8. There is no difference, 7.2 has been removed.</p> <p>9. Obsolete, see 8.</p> <p>10. The mistake has been corrected.</p> <p>11. The typo has been corrected.</p> <p>12. As the C/ME is not a project implementer (see PoA-A2), the difference should be clearer. 12.1 (now 10.1) refers to the implementers, 12.3 (now 10.2) refers to the C/ME.</p> <p>13. In case a CPA covers more than one farm, all farms need to meet the eligibility criteria in order for the CPA to be included into the PoA.</p> <p>14. All installations need to perform an EIA. However, not for all farms, a full EIA report is required. Due to the small project size, the EIA will be documented by an EIA result table, not a full report. However, even the EIA result table will be approved by the responsible governmental authorities.</p> <p>15. As explained under sub-item 14, each farm needs to perform an EIA that needs to be approved officially. EC11 has been extended.</p> <p>16. Yes, all farms of each CPA will perform an FS and prepare an FSR. This has been added in EC 13.</p> <p>17. Criterion 12 has been revised. For each farm, the stakeholders will be informed separately. The CPA-DD will provide a summary of all stakeholder comments received during the different meetings.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>1. Ok. Criteria EC 2 and EC 3 have been removed in updated PoA-DD.</p> <p>2. Ok. Related EC has been revised. Besides replacement of the baseline scenario the baseline scenario may also be modified by the project activity.</p> <p>3. Ok. The footnote is now fully visible and correctly referring that §3 of AMS III.D is not applicable as the measures under this PoA are not recovering landfill methane.</p> <p>4. Ok. Justification for related applicability criteria has been revised. As all installations will be new biogas systems and no replacement of biogas collection and utilization system will take place the response is reasonable. During onsite visit at the first CPA DOE can confirm that no biogas recovery or utilization takes place which substantiates the justification provided.</p> <p>5. Ok. The list of related evidence examples has been updated as applicable.</p> <p>6. Ok. Related evidence examples have been replaced by "FSR" and "Instruction to farms".</p> <p>7. Not ok. The set of EC have been updated w.r.t. the incorporation of additionality approach as per EB 63 Annex 23. Section E.5.2 of PoA-DD provides now two approaches for the demonstration of additionality. Related sub criteria as per EB 63 Annex 23 are correctly provided. However EB63 Annex 23 has been replaced</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	<p>with EB68 Annex 26. Revision requested.</p> <p>8. Ok. EC 7.2 is deleted.</p> <p>9. Ok. As EC 7.2 is deleted this issue lost its relevance.</p> <p>10. Ok. Correct date, 2012-03-01, is now provided.</p> <p>11. OK. Clarified it was mistype. It is corrected to monitoring plan.</p> <p>12. Ok. Clarification provided and PDD revised accordingly especially EC 10.2 now clearly refers to C/ME instead of all involved farms. By this clear difference is between EC 10.1 (prior 12.1) and EC 10.2 (prior 12.2) is possible.</p> <p>13. Ok. PDD is revised in a way that each farm under a CPA will conduct an EIA. As per interview with government officials it is confirmed that due to size of the intended measures under this PoA no complete EIA report is required<sup>/IM02/</sup>. A simple EIA assessment called EIA table is requested. Either an EIA report or table is prepared both will be approved by government<sup>/IM01/, /IM02/</sup>.</p> <p>14. Ok. It is clarified that all installations, each farm, have to conduct an EIA. This could be either an EIA report or an EIA table. However both would be approved. PDD is revised accordingly.</p> <p>15. Ok. EC 11 is updated w.r.t. evidence example EIA approval and EC description now clearly requests a related approval by responsible authority.</p> <p>16. Ok. EC 13 has been introduced in a way that all farms under a CPA require a FSR which is also approved by responsible authority.</p> <p>17. Ok. EC 12 (prior EC 14) now clearly requests that a local stakeholder meeting has to be conducted for each farm that is part of new CPA.</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #2</b>	7. Microscale Guideline will not be applied any more. Related sections and descriptions have been removed from PoA-DD and gCPA-DD.		
<b>DOE Assessment #2</b>	<p>Based on PoA-DD version 1.5:</p> <p>7. Ok. As related approach via EB68 Annex 26 is deleted from PoA-DD. PoA will only use one approach to demonstrate additionality via EB68 Annex 27.</p> <p>As all outstanding issues are solved this CAR is closed.</p>		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Section A.4.3 of PoA-DD states "as per EB47th meeting report, Paragraph 73, the additionality can be demonstrated either on PoA or CPA-level. However this is not latest regulation. Revision requested.		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	The section now refers to EB 70, Annex 5.		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>Ok. PDD has been updated and is now referring to latest related Guidance EB 70 Annex 5.</p> <p>Therefore CAR closed.</p>		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Section A.4.4.1 of PoA-DD states that a CPA shall be deemed to be de-bundled if "both conditions (a) and (b) below" are satisfied. However there are no bullet points (a) and (b) below. Please clarify.</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	<p>The bullet points have been corrected.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>Ok. The bullet points have been removed and now consistent with description the PoA-DD refers to (a) and (b).</p> <p>Therefore this CAR is closed.</p>		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-A9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>At time of onsite validation the MoC has not yet been provided. The MOC shall be provided prior to submission of PoA for request for registration.</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	<p>The MOC is provided.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective</i>	<p>Ok. Related and duly filled MOC is provided.</p> <p>Therefore this CAR is closed.</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD	
Finding	PoA-A9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<i>action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>				
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements			

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD	
Finding	PoA-B1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Clarification is requested w.r.t. statement for starting date of the PoA: "4 weeks after the estimated date of submission for registration".			
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	This sentence has been included since the webform to upload PoAs does not allow a starting date earlier than 4 weeks after the uploading of the documents. It has been changed towards: "or the date of registration, whatever occurs later."			
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	PoA-DD is revised and provides now a date as 01/11/2012 or the date of registration whatever occurs later.			
<b>Corrective Action #2</b>	The date is further revised to 01/02/2013.			
<b>DOE Assessment #2</b>	PoA-DD version 1.8: PoA-DD is revised and provides now a date as 01/02/2013 or the date of registration whatever occurs later. As the date is several months in the future and in line with guidance to fill DD it is found reasonable and ok. Therefore CAR is closed.			
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements			

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD	
Finding	PoA-C1	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Clarify the contradiction that section C.1 of PoA-DD states that "every livestock farm included in the PoA will undertake environmental analysis but section C.3 that EIA "is not required for biogas projects for thermal energy application".			
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	Projects with only thermal energy application do not require an entire EIA report, but an EIA table that contains the main data from the environmental analysis. Both documents (either EIA report or EIA table) need to be provided to the local Environmental Protection Bureau and will be officially approved before the project can be put into practice.			

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-C1	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>PDD is revised and C.1 states now that “the required EIA outcome table will be approved [...]” and C.3 “However, the required outcome of the EIA for biogas project is not a full EIA report, but just an EIA result table. The EIA table will be approved [...]”.</p> <p>DOE can confirm by interview with related government authority representatives responsible for the approval for such type of projects that no full EIA report will be required due to the size of the intended project activities. Due to interviewed government officials any biogas project without electricity generation or investment is below 50 Mio RMB only requires simple EIA notification (EIA table). E.g. the investment for the first CPA is 5,045,900 RMB far below the given limit.</p> <p>Even though as per EC 11 if required an EIA report would be provided. However C.1 and C.3 are inconsistent with EC 11 as both sections only refer to an EIA table.</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #2</b>	<p>EC 11 has been revised to reflect the possibility of both, EIA report and EIA table. It is now consistent with C.1 and C.3.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #2</b>	<p>Ok. EC 11 has been updated to clearly refer to EIA Table or EIA report under criterion description and evidence example.</p> <p>Therefore as all issues are successfully closed this CAR is closed.</p>		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Following issues w.r.t. the applicability criteria (AC) stated have been identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specification w.r.t. which EC is established to justify the fulfillment of AC is requested.</li> <li>2. Justification for AC 1 only refers to replacement of current manure system. Clarification requested.</li> <li>3. Further specification is requested w.r.t. justification of compliance with AC 1 (c).</li> <li>4. Besides clarify whether justification for an AC is demonstrated on CPA level or for each installation under a CPA.</li> <li>5. AC 2: Related sub bullet (c) refers to an EC w.r.t. storage time of manure after removal from animal barns. However no such EC could be identified. Therefore clarification is requested.</li> <li>6. Specification is requested w.r.t. AC 4 as justification makes only reference to “biogas is mainly used for power generation”.</li> <li>7. Clarification is requested w.r.t. justification of AC 6 as it is referred to an EC however a related EC could not be found.</li> </ol>		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A new column has been added to the table in section E.2 to show the eligibility criteria established to fulfill the applicability criteria of the methodology.</li> <li>2. The justification has been revised.</li> <li>3. An additional explanation has been inserted: As shown in Annex 3, the mean annual temperatures of all cities within the geographical boundary of the PoA have been well above 5.0 °C.</li> </ol>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	<p>4. An additional explanation has been inserted into section E.2: For the inclusion of new CPAs, the applicability of all criteria will be demonstrated for each farm of each CPA. Only if all farms meet the applicability criteria, the CPA can be included.</p> <p>5. EC 3.2.3 refers to and limits the storage time of manure.</p> <p>6. The justification for the AC has been revised. Furthermore, EC 5.4 has been introduced.</p> <p>7. AC6 now refers to EC 3.1 and 3.1.5 in which it is stipulated, that no methane recovery and utilization has been used in the past. Therefore, no equipment will be replaced.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>1. Ok. An additional column is provided in E.2 which clearly and transparently refers to the related EC established to comply with the AC.</p> <p>2. Ok. The justification has been revised and now includes also "[...] modification of current manure management practice [...]".</p> <p>3. Ok. The justification has been specified w.r.t. annual average temperature. As per Annex 3 none of the intended counties/region/city within the PoA-boundary of Sichuan province as an annual average temperature of below 8.0°C. The values as per Annex 3 have been crosschecked with the Sichuan Statistical Yearbook 2010 and found consistent. Therefore this applicability criterion is deemed fulfilled.</p> <p>4. Ok. Clarification is provided that all applicability criteria will be demonstrated for each farm of each CPA.</p> <p>5. Ok. EC 3.2.3 is established w.r.t. AC 2 (c) and related FSR will be provided as supporting evidence. As the FSR will contain a detailed project description and design to ensure that this criterion is met.</p> <p>6. Not ok. Justification has been revised and is now referring that recovered biogas will be only used for electrical or thermal energy generation. However reference to EC 5.4 as per response is unclear as no such EC exists and PoA-DD refers to EC 5.3.</p> <p>7. Ok. AC 6 refers to EC 3.1 and 3.1.5. Especially as per EC 3.1.5. only CPAs are eligible which have no methane recovery or destruction under the pre-project scenario. Therefore no equipment will be replaced and AC 6 is fulfilled.</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #2</b>	<p>6. The response was wrongly referring to the non existing criteria 5.4 Consistently with the PoA-DD, AC4 is reflected in EC 5.3</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #2</b>	<p>6. Ok. Correction w.r.t. to wrong reference has been made in updated PoA-DD. EC 5.3 is established to justify that produced biogas is gainfully utilized for electricity and/or thermal energy generation and will be evidenced by a FSR,</p> <p>As all issues are successfully closed this CAR is closed.</p>		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Following issues w.r.t. description of sources of GHG and CPA boundary have been identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The provided Figure 1 is inconsistent with Figure as per E.7.2 of PoA-DD.</li> <li>2. Clarification is requested why not all GHG emissions as per subsequent table and E.6.2 are shown in Figure 1.</li> <li>3. Clarify why CO<sub>2</sub> emissions have been indicated for “emissions from storage of manure before being fed into the anaerobic digester”.</li> </ol>		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The figures are now consistent.</li> <li>2. The figure has been revised and now shows all sources of emissions as per subsequent table and E.6.2.</li> <li>3. The mistake has been corrected. CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are now indicated, not CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.</li> </ol>		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ok. The figures have been checked and are now consistent between E.3 and E.7.2.</li> <li>2. Ok. The updated figure now provides all GHG emissions as per Table in E.3 and mentioned under E.6.2.</li> <li>3. Ok. PoA-DD is corrected accordingly and makes now related reference to CH<sub>4</sub> emissions.</li> </ol> <p>As all outstanding issues are solved this CAR is closed.</p>		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Clarification is requested as section E.4 refers to “section 5” w.r.t. the calculation of baseline emissions.</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	<p>The mistake has been corrected, E.4. now refers to section E.6 for the calculation of baseline emissions.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>Ok. PoA-DD now correctly refers to E.6. CAR closed.</p>		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Following issues w.r.t. demonstration of additionality have been identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section E.5.1 states that additionality is demonstrated based on Tool to demonstration and assessment of additionality version 5.2 however subsequent demonstration is not fully in line with requirements as per tool. Clarify.</li> <li>2. During onsite audit it has been identified that EB 63 Annex 23 may be also applied for additionality demonstration however E.5.1 does not make reference to the same.</li> <li>3. Justification is requested why benchmark method is applicable.</li> <li>4. Clarification is requested that benchmark applied fits to the IRR calculated.</li> <li>5. Specification w.r.t. IRR calculated is requested.</li> <li>6. Clarify whether in all cases/CPAs the IRR result considering CDM will be higher than the benchmark and that the result of the sensitivity analysis for all parameters will be lower than the benchmark.</li> <li>7. Following parameters are missing in Table 2: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Amount of subsidy received for each installation</li> <li>b. CER price</li> <li>c. Exchange rate</li> </ol> </li> <li>8. Specification w.r.t. the Annual O&amp;M cost is requested.</li> <li>9. Following statement is not inline with EB 62 Annex 5 §6 "in case more recent and reliable data is available from purchase orders, financing agreements, the data may be applied as well".</li> <li>10. Clarify why the sensitivity analysis is conducted for a range of -15% to +15%.</li> <li>11. Justification is requested why biogas price, quantity of biogas produced, quantity of biogas sold, operation hours of digester, electricity generated are not considered as sensitivity parameter.</li> <li>12. Clarify why only maintenance costs are considered for sensitivity analysis and not total annual O&amp;M cost.</li> <li>13. Discussion on the likeness of the sensitivity analysis result is missing.</li> <li>14. Clarify why no project history is provided to justify the time of investment decision.</li> <li>15. Clarify whether the additionality demonstration is conducted on CPA level or for each installation within a CPA.</li> </ol>		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The listing of the Tool to demonstration and assessment of additionality version 5.2 has been removed and replaced by Attachment A of Appendix B. This is possible, since all CPAs under the PoA will be SSC-CPAs.</li> <li>2. A second option of demonstrating additionality has been included for future CPAs. Now option 1 refers to Attachment A of Appendix B and option 2 refers to EB63, Annex 23. Option 2 will be used, as certain counties in Sichuan province have been defined as special poverty counties by the central government. CPAs that are located in such counties might chose option 2 for the demonstration of additionality.</li> <li>3. A justification, why the benchmark analysis is the most suitable for the new CPAs is included.</li> <li>4. The following justification has been included in the PoA-DD: For the installations under each CPA, a benchmark analysis can be identified as most suitable financial analysis. Since all CPAs comprise existing farms, they do not face a situation, in which an</li> </ol>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	<p>investment is required (where an investment comparison analysis would be more suitable). Furthermore, the biogas digesters will generate biogas that can be used to generate electricity, an economic benefit, other than the CDM related income is generated. Therefore, also the simple cost analysis is not deemed suitable and the benchmark analysis is chosen for the following.</p> <p>5. The following justification on the choice of IRR and benchmark has been included in the PoA-DD:</p> <p>To compare the two values (IRR and benchmark), two suitable values and calculation methods need to be chosen. For the determination of the project's IRR, the pre-tax project IRR calculation has been chosen and consequently, a pre-tax project IRR benchmark is applied for the following analysis.</p> <p>6. For certain farms, the IRR including CDM revenues might still be lower than the identified benchmark. However, if the IRR including CDM is higher than the IRR excluding CDM, the investment barrier is elevated through the additional income from CDM and the CPA is considered additional.</p> <p>Furthermore, the sensitivity analysis for certain CPAs might come to a result, higher than the identified benchmark. Such projects are still additional, if the respective scenarios are unlikely to occur. Both conditions have been changed accordingly.</p> <p>7. The three values have been inserted.</p> <p>8. No response</p> <p>9. The respective sentence has been removed. The investment analysis for the individual farms will not use purchase orders or contracts as input values for the calculation, but the values that have been applicable at the time of investment decision.</p> <p>10. Since a variation of input parameters of -15% and +15% is not considered necessary and the fluctuation of parameters will not be that drastic, a +-10% variation is considered sufficient and is applied.</p> <p>11. The parameters listed by the DOE, except of the operation hours of the digester (which is no input parameter of the calculation) is added to the list of parameters.</p> <p>12. The wording has been corrected, not only the maintenance costs, but the entire O&amp;M costs will be considered for the sensitivity analysis.</p> <p>13. The discussion of the likelihood of scenarios that exceed the benchmark has been added.</p> <p>14. The time between the feasibility study report and the investment decision will be discussed in each CPA to demonstrate, that the time between the two events is sufficiently short, to ensure that all input values and results have been applicable at the time of investment decision.</p> <p>15. The demonstration of additionality (following either option 1 or option 2) will be carried out for each involved installation within a CPA.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments</i>	<p>1. And 2. Ok. E.5.1 of PoA-DD is updated accordingly and provides now Option 1 and Option 2 for the demonstration of additionality. Option 1 is as per Attachment A to Appendix B and Option 2 as per Guidelines for demonstrating additionality of microscale project activities EB63 Annex 23.</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
(#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	<p>3. Ok. The PDD is updated accordingly. It is correctly stated that as the project generates output with economic benefit a simple cost analysis is not applicable. Further as every farm under the PoA will have an anaerobic manure treatment system e.g. open lagoon without gainful use (see EC 3.1.4 and EC 3.1.5) the farm owner could choose whether to invest or not and is not forced to invest in a biogas generation and utilization system.</p> <p>4. Not ok. Response unclear w.r.t. issue raised.</p> <p>5. Not ok. Response unclear w.r.t. issue raised.</p> <p>6. Not ok. PDD is revised and now clearly states that IRR incl. CDM revenue makes the project financially more feasible (alleviates the barrier) as well as that the sensitivity analysis shows that the IRR is lower than the benchmark or the scenario where the benchmark is exceeded is unlikely. Specification is requested whether in scenarios where the benchmark is exceeded a justification is provided why this scenario is unlikely.</p> <p>7. Ok. Updated PoA-DD has been checked and related three values are now provided.</p> <p>8. Not ok. Response pending.</p> <p>9. Ok as sentence is deleted, each biogas generation and utilization system will come with a FSR, FSR will be approved by provincial authority (see EC 13) and input values to IRR calculation are fully based on FSR inline with EB 55 Annex 1 §113 (b) as well as demonstration will be provided that the time between FSR and investment decision is sufficiently short.</p> <p>10. Ok, as the applied range is within the minimum range as per EB62 Annex 5 §20 for each parameter under sensitivity analysis.</p> <p>11. Not ok. Missing parameter have been included. Updated PoA-DD has been checked and found that including the initial investment cost and parameter that constitute more than 20% of either total project costs or total project revenues in line with EB62 Annex 5 §21. Further as the biogas produced and electricity generated are parameters of the sensitivity analysis it is deemed reasonable and plausible that operation hours are excluded from sensitivity analysis. The biogas and electricity produced is the product of operation hours of the system (digester or engine) and their capacity (gas generation capacity of engine capacity). However as the biogas produced will be utilized to generate electricity and/or thermal energy clarification is requested why thermal energy generation is not part of sensitivity analysis but only electricity generation.</p> <p>12. Ok. PoA-DD has been updated accordingly total O&amp;M costs are now considered for sensitivity analysis. The wording is unified.</p> <p>13. Ok. PoA-DD is updated and each sensitivity analysis will provide a discussion of the sensitivity analysis results and in case one scenario exceeds the benchmark the likelihood will be discussed.</p> <p>14. Ok as each biogas generation and utilization system will come with a FSR, the FSR will be approved by national in this case provincial authorities (see EC 13) and demonstration will be provided that the time between FSR and investment decision is sufficiently short inline with EB 55 Annex 1 §113 (a) and (c).</p> <p>15. Ok. As per updated summary of the section E.5.1 of PoA-DD the additionality will be demonstrated for each individual farm under a CPA.</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Corrective Action #2</b>	<p>1. Microscale Guideline will not be applied any more. Related sections and descriptions have been removed from PoA-DD and gCPA-DD.</p> <p>4. The following justification on the choice of IRR and benchmark has been included in the PoA-DD:</p> <p>To compare the two values (IRR and benchmark), two suitable values and calculation methods need to be chosen. For the determination of the project's IRR, the pre-tax project IRR calculation has been chosen and consequently, a pre-tax project IRR benchmark is applied for the following analysis.</p> <p>5. See 4.</p> <p>6. As per the description in the PoA-DD, the likelihood of the scenario(s) exceeding the benchmark will be discussed. The sentence has been revised to include the following:</p> <p>"In case, one of the scenarios exceeds the identified benchmark, the likelihood of this scenario will be discussed and a justification for the discussion will be provided."</p> <p>8. The Annual O&amp;M costs has been further specified as material costs, power costs, labor costs and repair costs.</p> <p>11. The thermal energy generation has been included in the sensitivity analysis.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #2</b>	<p>Based on PoA-DD version 1.5:</p> <p>1. Ok. As related approach via EB 68 Annex 26 is deleted from PoA-DD. PoA will only use one approach to demonstrate additionality via EB 68 Annex 27.</p> <p>4. Ok. Clarification and justification has been provided. DOE has checked related supporting document used as source for the benchmark, and can confirm that the benchmark of 7% applied is pre-tax project figure for animal husbandry and therefore applicable.</p> <p>5. Ok. PoA-DD has been updated and specifies now the IRR calculated as pre-tax project IRR. DOE confirms by check PoA-DD, CPA-DD and of provided financial calculation for first CPA that pre-tax project IRR is calculated.</p> <p>6. Ok. PoA-DD has been updated accordingly and includes now a justification in case the result of the sensitivity analysis for any parameter would be higher than the applied benchmark. This is inline with EB62 Annex 5 §21 which states that "in cases where a scenario will result in the project activity passing the benchmark [...] the DOE shall provide an assessment of the probability of the occurrence of this scenario".</p> <p>8. Ok. PoA-DD has been updated and each CPA or project activity under a CPA will now further specify the sub-items constituting the Annual O&amp;M costs.</p> <p>11. Ok. PoA-DD has been updated and each project activity under a CPA will now include thermal energy generated as parameter for sensitivity analysis if applicable. By including thermal energy generated DOE confirms based on sectoral knowledge and experience compliance with EB62 Annex 5 §20.</p> <p>16. Not ok. Table 2 refers for price of gas supply to farm and electricity price from grid that both are "incl. VAT". Further a separate row for Value added Tax is provided. Clarify whether</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	<p>VAT is anyway applicable to this type of project activities under this PoA as especially as own electricity are savings for the farm and as indicated in FSR for 1<sup>st</sup> CPA page 74 small husbandry farms are excluded from paying VAT.</p> <p>17. Not ok. Clarification is requested w.r.t. applied "Education additional expense Tax" and "City Maintenance and Construction Tax" in contrast to calculation of "pre-tax project IRR".</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #2</b>	<p>16. According to the applied calculation method, the IRR needs to be calculated applying the savings in gas and electricity expenditures without VAT. Furthermore, as the pre-tax IRR is calculated, no VAT is applied to the income. The VAT is therefore not applicable to this calculation and is removed from the table. The result of IRR calculation does not change though, as the VAT was not applied to the income and this farm is exempted from VAT payments on electricity and gas, as it is considered a small agricultural enterprise. (See FSR p. 74)</p> <p>17. Both taxes have been listed in the table, however, are not applied in the calculation as the pre-tax IRR is calculated. They have been removed in an updated version of the calculation provided to the DOE.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #2</b>	<p>PoA-DD version 1.8:</p> <p>16. Ok. The PoA-DD is updated and states now price of gas supply to farm and Electricity price from grid excluding VAT. The IRR calculation of first real case CPA has been updated accordingly. Now it states that price of gas and electricity tariff are excluding VAT in accordance to related FSR. Further DOE checked the IRR calculation and found that no VAT is considered for the pre-tax IRR calculation.</p> <p>17. Ok. DOE checked updated PoA-DD as well as latest submitted IRR calculation spreadsheet. Based on that DOE can confirm that PoA-DD states related taxes however the same are not considered for pre-tax IRR calculation of first real case as per spreadsheet provided. Therefore the calculation of the financial indicator is correct.</p> <p>As all outstanding issues are solved this CAR is closed.</p>		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Section E.5.2 states that "the following three steps have to be carried out" however five steps are presented.</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	<p>The mistake has been corrected. The section now refers to the three conditions that need to be fulfilled by each CPA.</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	Ok. The related description w.r.t. “[...] the following three steps have been carried out [...]” is deleted and replaced by “[...] each installation covered under a new CPA needs to fulfill one of the two criteria below.” Subsequently E.5.2 provides two approaches for the demonstration of additionality. This is either by financial analysis or via EB 63 Annex 23. However EB 63 Annex 23 is replaced by EB68 Annex 26. Revision requested.		
<b>Corrective Action #2</b>	Microscale Guideline will not be applied any more. Related sections and descriptions have been removed from PoA-DD and gCPA-DD.		
<b>DOE Assessment #2</b>	Based on PoA-DD version 1.5: Ok. As related approach via EB 68 Annex 26 is deleted from PoA-DD. PoA will only use one approach to demonstrate additionality via EB 68 Annex 27.		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	In section E.6.1 it is referenced to two tools however AMS III.D makes further reference to other methodologies and tools that are missing.		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	All utilized tools and methodologies are now listed in E.6.1.		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	Not ok. Not all related tools are provided. Further revision requested.		
<b>Corrective Action #2</b>	The list of tools has been further elaborated as per the monitoring requirements. Two tools have been included: “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption” (Version 01, EB39) – Monitoring procedures “Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion” (Version 02, EB 41) – Monitoring procedures		
<b>DOE Assessment #2</b>	Not Ok. PoA-DD has been updated accordingly and provides now all tools referenced in corresponding methodology AMS III.D. The “Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane” is missing.		
<b>Corrective Action #3</b>	“Methodological Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane” (Version 1, EB 28) is included.		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>DOE Assessment #3</b>	PoA-DD version 1.5: Not ok. Version one of stated tool is already outdated as per unfccc webpage. Besides the “Guidelines for demonstrating additionality of micro scale project activities” has been updated as well. Related revisions requested.		
<b>Corrective Action #4</b>	Methodological Tool “Project emissions from flaring” (Version 2, EB 68) is included. Further microscale Guideline will not be applied any more. Related sections and descriptions have been removed from PoA-DD and gCPA-DD.		
<b>DOE Assessment #4</b>	PoA-DD version 1.6 Ok. Also the tool to determine PE from flaring is now included in section E.6.1 of updated PDD. However w.r.t. the monitoring of project emissions from potential manure transport methodology under §26 point 12 refers to AMS-III.AO.		
<b>Corrective Action #5</b>	AMS-III.D under parameter description for $PE_{transp,y}$ for equation (5), §12 refers to AMS-III.F which is contradicting to §26 point 12. Therefore the most conservative approach from both methodologies has been applied now which is AMS-III.AO.		
<b>DOE Assessment #5</b>	PoA-DD version 1.8: Updated PoA-DD has been reviewed and found that now reference to AMS-III.AO instead of AMS-III.F is given. Related further sections w.r.t. $PE_{transp,y}$ calculation and monitoring sections E.6.2 and E.7.1 have been also updated correctly inline with AMS-III.AO. Therefore this CAR is closed.		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Following issues w.r.t. the emission reductions calculation have been identified: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The parameter descriptions refers to AMS I.D for parameter <math>BE_{III,D,y}</math> under equation 1. Please clarify.</li> <li>2. ER calculation does not specify how the annual average number of animals is determined in accordance to AMS III.D §10 (g).</li> <li>3. Further specification w.r.t. the determination of <math>B_o</math>, VS and MCF is required. Especially for VS as no further information is provided how the adjusted value based on animal weight in accordance with AMS III.D is determined. Further related monitoring section may be updated accordingly. As IPCC values are used, as no country-specific data are available, assessment on the suitability as per AMS III.D §10 (a) is requested.</li> <li>4. Point (c) under Project emissions is inconsistent with corresponding methodology AMS III.D.</li> <li>5. Clarify why no project emissions due to fossil fuel combustion is provided.</li> <li>6. The descriptions w.r.t. baseline emission parameters come with related units however the same is not provided for all other</li> </ol>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	<p>parameter description. Clarification is requested why.</p> <p>7. Under CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from elec. use and related parameter description it is referenced to “Centre China Power Grid”, which is inconsistent to Annex 3, which refers to “Central China Power Grid”. Clarification and unification throughout the DD is requested.</p> <p>8. The provided equation for <math>PE_{power,y}</math> is inconsistent with related “tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from electricity consumption” as indicated under Point No. 14 of AMS III.D §26.</p> <p>9. Clarification is requested w.r.t. following sentence provided under CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from incremental transport distances, “However, in the proposed PoA, there is no compost involved in any farm, therefore the second summand of the equation regarding the compost is 0”. Clarification is requested, as the provided equation has no second summand.</p> <p>10. Clarification is requested w.r.t. the parameter <math>LK_{D,y}</math>.</p> <p>11. Clarify why leakage in accordance to AMS III.D §27 has not been considered.</p> <p>12. Clarify how <math>MD_y</math> is calculated.</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	<p>1. The type has been corrected.</p> <p>2. The calculation of the parameter has been added to the ER calculation.</p> <p>3. Provisions for the assessment of default values by new CPAs have been added.</p> <p>4. The calculation has been corrected. The calculation of the project emission is carried out along the referenced methodology AMS I.D v.17 and the project emission due to fossil fuel consumption are calculated as per the provisions in paragraph 15 of the methodology.</p> <p>5. See point 4.</p> <p>6. The units have been added where previously missing.</p> <p>7. Typo has been corrected.</p> <p>8. The calculation has been adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>9. The wording has been revised to be more clearly.</p> <p>10. The parameter has been renamed to <math>LE_y</math>.</p> <p>11. A clarification on the application of paragraph 27 has been included.</p> <p>12. The description on the calculation of <math>MD_y</math> has been included in accordance with the methodology.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>1. Ok. Updated PoA-DD now references to the correct methodology, AMS III.D for parameter <math>BE_{III.D,y}</math>.</p> <p>2. Ok. The updated PoA-DD provides now following equation:  <math display="block">N_{LT,y} = N_{da,y} \cdot \left( \frac{N_{p,y}}{365} \right)</math> DOE has checked corresponding methodology AMS III.D especially §10 (g) and can therefore confirm that correct equation is applied and related parameter descriptions are consistent.</p> <p>3. Ok. Specification w.r.t. parameters <math>B_o</math>, VS and MCF has been provided in updated PoA-DD. DOE can confirm that no country specific data for these parameters are available based in interview with authorities<sup>/IMO2/</sup> and application of default values as per IPCC 2006 are applicable. For the choice of the default values <math>B_o</math> and VS AMS III.D §10 (d) is applied. As the genetic source of the pigs originates from Netherlands an Annex I country and the farms</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	<p>apply formulated feed rations for each animal type, category and growth stage which have been validated via farm records and feed supplier and substantiated via interview with government officials<sup>/IM02/</sup> for the first CPA the application of IPCC default values from developed country is deemed justified. Besides as the PoA-DD makes reference that the application has to be justified for each CPA and that default values for Asia will be applied in case justification for developed country is not available this issue is closed as principle of conservativeness applied.</p> <p>4. Ok. Point (c) under 2. Project Emissions has been updated and is now fully consistent with description as per AMS III.D.</p> <p>5. Ok. Section E.6.2 is updated accordingly. The project emission (PE) includes now also PE from fossil fuel consumption, <math>PE_{FC,y}</math>. Related equations are updated and PE are calculated as following:  <math display="block">PE_{FC,y} = \sum_i FC_{i,y} \cdot COEF_{i,y}</math> The equation has been checked against tool to calculate project and leakage CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fossil fuel consumption and found consistent.</p> <p>6. Ok. Section E.6.2. of PoA-DD has been updated accordingly. All parameter description comes now with related units. DOE has checked the PoA-DD and found that units are stated correct.</p> <p>7. Not ok. Parameter description for <math>EF_{CO_2}</math> under 2.3 of E.6.2 still refers to “Centre China Power Grid”.</p> <p>8. Not ok. Equation 5 for <math>PE_{el,y}</math> is still inconsistent with EB39 Annex 7. Further revision requested.</p> <p>9. Clarification is provided. Updated PoA-DD now states as there is no composting involved only the first summand of equation 3 of AMS III.F is applied. Based on onsite visit and interview with CME and government officials besides first CPA operator DOE can confirm that no composting is involved under this PoA. Besides DOE has checked AMS III.F and found that applied equation for <math>PE_{transp,y}</math> on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from incremental transport distances is correctly applied.</p> <p>10. Not ok. Parameter description for parameter <math>LK_{D,y}</math> is still missing.</p> <p>11. Not ok. Related justification is provided. DOE based on onsite visit can confirm that in baseline scenario the manure treatment and storage system is not mobile as it is open lagoons made of concrete. However justification is requested that in no case in each CPA under this PoA mobile equipment is used in baseline scenario.</p> <p>12. Ok. Equation 11 has been provided w.r.t <math>MD_y</math> calculation. DOE has checked corresponding methodology and found the equation in PoA-DD consistent with AMS III.D.</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #2</b>	<p>7. The parameter now refers to “Central China Power Grid”.</p> <p>8. The calculation has been adjusted. Where the methodology only refers to the small scale methodology AMS I.D, the monitoring methodology refers to the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption”. This is an inconsistency in the methodology. Equation 5 now is consistent with the tool.</p> <p>10. As the parameter is not required at all, it has been removed.</p> <p>11. Eligibility criteria 5.4 has been introduced to exclude leakage in case of mobile equipment.</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>DOE Assessment #2</b>	<p>7. Ok. The PoA-DD was updated and now it is consistently mentioned Central China Power Grid.</p> <p>8. Not Ok. The PoA-DD now correctly refers and calculates project emissions from electricity consumption as per EB39 Annex 7 equation (1) and includes now transmission and distribution losses. PoA-DD and related tool have been checked and found consistent. However the PoA-DD does not specify monitoring of the related parameter <math>TDL_y</math>.</p> <p>10. Ok as deleted.</p> <p>11. Ok as EC 5.4.1 and EC 5.4.2 are introduced under which each CPA has to either justify that the manure management system is immobile or that any removed equipment is scrapped and scrapping is documented and kept until DOE observation inline with AMS III.D §27.</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #3</b>	8. The monitoring of parameter $TDL_y$ has been included.		
<b>DOE Assessment #3</b>	8. Not ok. TDL has been included as parameter however clarification is requested why the parameter is provided under B.7.1 as a default value is applied.		
<b>Corrective Action #4</b>	8. DDs are updated.		
<b>DOE Assessment #4</b>	<p>8. Ok. Parameter <math>TDL_y</math> has been correctly moved to section E.6.3 Data and parameters that are to be reported in CDM-SSC-CPA-DD as a default value as per related tool is applied.</p> <p>13. Re-opened due to reason that AMS-III.D under §26 point 12 refers to AMS-III.AO for calculation of project emissions from manure transport and not as per §9 of AMS-III.D to AMS-III.F.</p> <p>14. Equation to calculate project emissions from potential flaring of biogas during emergencies is missing.</p> <p>15. Specification w.r.t. the basis for calculation method for project emission from combustion of fossil fuel is requested.</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #5</b>	<p>13. AMS-III.D under parameter description for <math>PE_{transp,y}</math> for equation (5), §12 refers to AMS-III.F which is contradicting to §26 point 12. Therefore the most conservative approach from both methodologies has been applied now which is AMS-III.AO.</p> <p>14. PoA-DD has been updated to include equation to calculate project emissions from flaring based on tool "Project emissions from flaring" version 2.0.0. Related monitoring parameters <math>F_{CH4,RG,m}</math> and <math>\eta_{flare,m}</math> have been also included in section E.7.1.</p> <p>15. It is specified that related project emissions are calculated as per tool to calculate project or leakage emissions from fossil fuel combustion.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #5</b>	<p>PoA-DD version 1.8:</p> <p>13. Updated PoA-DD has been reviewed and found that now reference to AMS-III.AO instead of AMS-III.F is given. Related further sections w.r.t. <math>PE_{transp,y}</math> calculation and monitoring sections E.6.2 and E.7.1 have been also updated correctly inline with AMS-III.AO and are now consistent with AMS-III.AO. Three new monitoring parameters <math>Q_{res-waste,y}</math>, <math>CT_{res-waste,y}</math> and <math>DAF_{res-waste}</math> have been included as per AMS-III.AO.</p> <p>14. Ok. PoA-DD has been updated accordingly and provides now provision to calculate project emissions from flaring. The equation has been checked against stated tool and equation is found</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	<p>consistent and correct. The mass flow of methane in the residual gas is determined by monitoring the quantity/volume of the biogas to the flare times the default value of methane content as per AMS-III.D §26 point 6 (60%) and times the default value of methane density as per AMS-III.D. (0.00067 t/m³). Section E.7.1 has been also checked against stated flaring tool and found that parameters are correctly included in monitoring plan as per guidance by tool.</p> <p>15. Ok. PoA-DD has been updated accordingly in line with methodology. Specification is provided.</p> <p>As the only remaining issue is successfully solved this CAR is closed.</p>		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Following issues w.r.t. data and parameters that are to be reported in CDM-SSC-DD have been identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The parameter <math>VS_{LT,y}</math> is inconsistent with related provided data unit and description. Please clarify.</li> <li>2. Parameter <math>VS_{LT,d}</math> is missing.</li> <li>3. Clarify why values, which are calculated, or default values such as <math>D_{CH_4}</math>, Methane Fraction, <math>GWP_{CH_4}</math> and <math>k</math> (degradation rate) are provided under section E.6.3 of PoA-DD.</li> </ol>		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The parameter information has been corrected.</li> <li>2. The value has been added.</li> <li>3. The parameters have been removed from the list.</li> </ol>		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ok. Parameter unit fits now with related description.</li> <li>2. Ok. Parameter <math>VS_{LT,d}</math> is now provided. The values stated are correct as they are calculated from Parameter <math>VS_{LT,y}/365</math> (total number of days of a calendar year). DOE recalculated the values and found them correct.</li> <li>3. Ok. Based on EB 34 Annex 9 and EB 67 Annex 30 default values specified in the methodology should not be included in the compilation. Therefore the exclusion of <math>D_{CH_4}</math>, Methane Fraction, <math>GWP_{CH_4}</math> and <math>k</math> (degradation rate) are deemed reasonable.</li> <li>4. Not ok. Parameter description for <math>MS\%BL_j</math> is inconsistent between E.6.2 and E.6.3.</li> </ol>		
<b>Corrective Action #2</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The description has been revised towards: Fraction of manure handled in baseline animal manure management system "j"</li> </ol>		
<b>DOE Assessment #2</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Ok. The parameter description in section E.6.3 of PoA-DD is now consistent with corresponding description in section E.6.2.</li> </ol> <p>As all outstanding issues are successfully solved this CAR is closed.</p>		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Following issues w.r.t. data and parameters to be monitored by each SSC-CPA have been identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. data units shall be in accordance to SI-Units</li> <li>2. Clarification is requested w.r.t. the parameter biogas flow. Clarify whether this is the amount of biogas produced or the amount of biogas destroyed by gainful use. Besides clarify whether biogas flow is measured continuously with accumulated volume recording as per AMS III.D. Further clarify how total biogas flow is monitored in case of several sources or utilization equipments. Finally clarify if the system is operated to ensure that no air ingress in biogas pipeline takes place.</li> <li>3. EG<sub>p,y</sub>: Parameter description is inconsistent with section E.6.2. besides clarify how "net electricity consumed" is determined.</li> <li>4. N<sub>LT</sub>: Clarify why this is provided as a monitoring parameter. Besides the parameter description is inconsistent with E.6.2.</li> <li>5. W<sub>site</sub>: To sources/approaches are provided for this parameter. Clarify the sampling approach to determine the value for option 2) stated.</li> <li>6. MCF: Clarify whether parameter MCF is parameter MCF<sub>j</sub> or MCF<sub>i</sub> as per E.6.2. Further the values provided in the table in E.7.1 are inconsistent with Annex 3. Finally specify what "will be achieved from the official source" Sichuan Statistic Year Book as well as what "will be checked" by CME.</li> <li>7. MS<sub>p</sub>, MS<sub>p,i</sub>: Clarify to which parameter in E.6.2 this parameter complies to. Specify what "will be checked" by CME directly.</li> <li>8. AI<sub>i</sub>: The monitoring frequency as per AMS III.D is missing.</li> <li>9. Q<sub>y</sub>: Parameter description is inconsistent with E.6.2. Further the measurement method is inconsistent with related AMS III.F.</li> <li>10. CT<sub>y</sub> and DAT<sub>w</sub>: Specification w.r.t. data source is requested. Further the measurement method is inconsistent with related AMS III.F.</li> <li>11. According to AMS III.F §16 (iii) IPCC default values or local values may be used). Therefore clarify the data source stated in PoA-DD refers to „US Heavy Duty Diesel Truck“</li> <li>12. The following parameters are missing:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. BG<sub>burnt,y</sub></li> <li>b. N<sub>p,y</sub></li> <li>c. N<sub>da,y</sub></li> <li>d. Proper soil application of residual waste</li> </ol> </li> </ol>		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Some mistakes have been removed. All units should be in SI units now.</li> <li>2. The description of the parameter has been split into the biogas recovered and the biogas destroyed and revised according to the findings.</li> <li>3. The description has been revised and improved.</li> <li>4. The parameter N<sub>LT</sub> has been replaced by the parameters N<sub>p,y</sub> and N<sub>da,y</sub> as per the methodology.</li> </ol>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	<p>5. Since the respective formula is not used in the calculations of E.5.2, this parameter does not need to be monitored and is removed.</p> <p>6. The description of the parameter <math>MCF_j</math> has been revised.</p> <p>7. The parameter has been named correctly according to the methodology <math>MS_{\%i}</math>. The second parameter from the methodology, <math>MS_{\%i,y}</math> is not required, as a standard value is assumed for physical leakage.</p> <p>8. The monitoring frequency has been added.</p> <p>9. The parameter and its description has been revised.</p> <p>10. Both parameters have been revised.</p> <p>11. Since no local value and no suitable IPCC value could be identified, the standard values in the Methodological tool "Project and leakage emissions from road transportation of freight" are applied. Since the values given there describe the emission per transported ton, they are multiplied with the distance to obtain the emission per truck drive.</p> <p>12. The required parameters have been included.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>1. Ok. Updated PoA-DD has been checked and all units are in SI-unit now.</p> <p>2. Not ok. An additional parameter <math>BG_{burnt,y}</math> has been added. By this quantity of biogas produced and quantity of biogas burnt will be monitored in line with AMS III.D. However clarification is requested why the description for <math>BG_{burnt,y}</math> includes monitoring method.</p> <p>3. Ok. Parameter description in updated PoA-DD is now consistent within E.6.2 and E.7.1. Besides monitoring method of <math>EG_{p,y}</math> specifies that net electricity is the difference between electricity exports and import.</p> <p>4. Not ok. As <math>N_{LT,y}</math> is calculated by parameters <math>N_{p,y}</math> and <math>N_{da,y}</math> those have been provided in updated PDD accordingly and consistent with related methodology. However clear description on monitoring method should be provided as AMS III.D requires the PDD to describe the system for monitoring the number of livestock population. Clarification is also requested w.r.t. how the different types of livestock are monitored.</p> <p>5. Ok as correctly removed as <math>VS_{LT,y}</math> is determined via AMS III.D §10 (d) and not (c).</p> <p>6. Ok. The description is updated to <math>MCF_j</math>. Besides the values are now consistent between E.7.1 and Annex 3. Further the description of measurement method has been specified accordingly w.r.t. that the mean annual temperature is derived from official source (Sichuan Statistic Yearbook) and <math>MCF_j</math> is derived from IPCC Guidelines accordingly.</p> <p>7. Ok. Parameter description has been revised to <math>MS_{\%i}</math> consistent with E.6.2. Parameters <math>MS_p</math> and <math>MS_{p,i}</math> are not required as for physical leakage default value as per AMS III.D §13 (b) is applied.</p> <p>8. Ok. Monitoring frequency inline with AMS III.F is provided in updated PoA-DD</p> <p>9. Ok. Parameter description is consistent now and measurement method inline with AMS III.F.</p> <p>10. Not ok. The Source for the data is specified for both parameters. However the parameter abbreviation for <math>DAF_w</math> is inconsistent with E.6.2.</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	<p>11. Ok. As IPCC does not provide values in kgCO<sub>2</sub>/km and based on host country expertise as US Heavy Duty Diesel Trucks value are not appropriate for the local circumstances the applied values derived from EB 63 Annex 10 are deemed reasonable and plausible.</p> <p>12. Ok all missing parameters are provided in updated PoA-DD.</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #2</b>	<p>2. The description of the monitoring method has been moved to the respective table field.</p> <p>4. A more detailed description has been included for the parameters.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #2</b>	<p>2. Ok. In the updated PoA-DD the monitoring method was moved from the description cell to the cell for description of measurement method.</p> <p>4. Ok. The monitoring method for the parameters N<sub>p,y</sub> and N<sub>da,y</sub> have been specified. The farmers will provide monthly counting records, and the different types of livestock will be recorded besides sales records will be kept which is inline with the corresponding methodology which requires annually monitoring frequency based on monthly records and consistency check against indirect information e.g. sales records.</p> <p>13. Not ok. Parameters w.r.t. project emissions from transportation are missing.</p> <p>14. Not ok. Parameters w.r.t. project emissions from flaring are missing.</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #3</b>	<p>13. AMS-III.D under parameter description for PE<sub>transp,y</sub> for equation (5), §12 refers to AMS-III.F which is contradicting to §26 point 12. Therefore the most conservative approach from both methodologies has been applied now which is AMS-III.AO. Parameters Q<sub>res-waste,y</sub>, CT<sub>res-waste,y</sub>, DAF<sub>res-waste</sub> have been included.</p> <p>14. PoA-DD has been updated to include equation to calculate project emissions from flaring based on tool "Project emissions from flaring" version 2.0.0. Related monitoring parameters F<sub>CH4,RG,m</sub> and η<sub>flare,m</sub> have been included in section E.7.1.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #3</b>	<p>PoA-DD version 1.8:</p> <p>13. Ok. Related parameters are included now as per AMS III.AO.</p> <p>14. Ok. Section E.7.1 has been checked against stated flaring tool and found that parameters are correctly included in monitoring plan as per guidance by tool.</p> <p>As all outstanding issues are successfully solved this CAR is closed.</p>		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	<p>Following issues w.r.t. the monitoring plan have been identified:</p> <p>1. Clarify whether biogas production refers to amount of biogas generated or destroyed by gainful use.</p> <p>2. The Figure provided is inconsistent with E.3 of PoA-DD. Besides</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	<p>the several shown parameters miss description e.g. E1, E2, F1. Revision requested.</p> <p>3. The figure in E.7.2 does not provide the location of all monitoring parameters e.g. biogas temperature and pressure.</p> <p>4. Clarify corresponding procedure in case of emergency, failure of monitoring equipment and what kind of back-up procedures will be established.</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	<p>1. The project participants will monitor the biogas destroyed by the installed equipment, i.e. boiler, gas engine, local gas grid and/or flare inline with methodology.</p> <p>2. The figure is now consistent with the one provided in E.3. Furthermore, for usability reasons this figure only displays the physically installed meters, not all parameters that are monitored.</p> <p>3. The following statement has been included: To monitor the biogas flows, either included meters that will display the flow under norm conditions will be used or temperature and pressure will be monitored at the same measuring points in addition.</p> <p>4. The following statement has been added: Due to the targeted number of CPAs in Sichuan province, suitable meters are planned to be kept available to replace broken equipment quickly. However, in cases where no data is monitored for a certain period of time, no CERs shall be claimed for that period.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>1. Not ok. The monitoring plan is updated accordingly. It now specifies the F1 monitor biogas recovered and F2 to Fn measures the gas flow to the different utilization equipments. However the following figure only makes reference to Fn however F2 is not mentioned. Please clarify.</p> <p>2. Ok. Both figures are now consistent.</p> <p>3. Ok. The description has been specified in accordance with corresponding methodology.</p> <p>4. Ok. PoA-DD is updated. As no emission reduction will be claimed for period for which no data is available which is inline with EB55 Annex 1 §208 (a) this issue is closed.</p>		
<b>Corrective Action #2</b>	<p>1. In the respective figure, Fn represents several meters. Each individual gas stream is monitored individually. In case on one type of gas combustion is installed, Fn only represents F2. In case, several forms of gas combustion equipment are installed, Fn represents e.g. F2 for the gas flow to the gas engine, F3 for the flow to the boiler and F4 for the gas flow to the local households.</p>		
<b>DOE Assessment #2</b>	<p>2. Ok. The monitoring plan is updated accordingly and states that Fn measures the relevant gas flows where Fn can consist of several meters. Fn measures the amount of biogas destroyed and gainfully used by different destruction equipments. This is inline with corresponding methodology §26 point 5 which states "If the biogas flared and fuelled (or utilized) is continuously monitored separately, the two fractions can be added to determine the biogas recovered. In that case, recovered biogas need not be monitored separately." As per PoA-DD the biogas streams to each destruction/utilization type are continuously monitored separately. The description is therefore now consistent with the corresponding provided figure.</p> <p>As the outstanding issue is successfully solved this CAR is closed.</p>		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	PoA-E11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Several inconsistencies w.r.t. grid emission factor as per Annex 3 of PoA-DD have been identified.		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	PoA-DD updated accordingly. Mistakes revised.		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	PoA-DD version 1.5: Data and information is now consistent with data as per official sources /CESY/, /CEPY/, /BMG/, /GEF/ CAR PoA-E11 is closed.		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	gCPA-A1	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Clarify why C/ME is pre-stated as CPA implementer in section A.2 and A.3.		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	The C/ME will not be implementer of any CPA and has been removed as such in the gCPA template.		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	Ok. gCPA-DD has been revised accordingly. The C/ME has been removed from both sections and gCPA-DD only requests for IMPLEMENTER(s) or IMPLEMENTER(s) OF THE CPA. Therefore this CAR is closed.		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly		

Related DDs	<input type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD	
Finding	gCPA-A1	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken</div> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements</div>			

Related DDs	<input type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD	
Finding	gCPA-A2	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Clarify why gCPA-DD makes reference to project schedule and animal type under section A.4.1.2.			
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	The reference has been removed.			
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	Ok. Section A.4.1.2 refers and requests now only and correctly input data and information w.r.t. Name of the farm, Address, Latitude and Longitude. Therefore this CL is closed.			
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements			

Related DDs	<input type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD	
Finding	gCPA-A3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Following editorial issues have been identified: <div><div>1. Font style is not as per template.</div><div>2. Several text or text boxes are misallocated in the document, which leads to unclear meanings and visibility of descriptions.</div></div>			
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	The editorial issues have been corrected.			
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<div><div>1. Ok. gCPA-DD has been checked and all font style mistakes are corrected.</div><div>2. Ok. Entire gCPA-DD has been checked and now all figures and boxes are now correctly located.</div><div>3. Not ok. In section A.1 the date of gCPA-DD version is removed by placeholders XX/XX/XXXX. Clarification requested.</div><div>4. Not ok. Section B.5.2 refers to Zizhong Duokang Swine Farm after equation two whereas this is gCPA-DD not rCPA-DD. Clarify.</div><div>5. Not ok. Under A.4.3.1 the gCPA-DD is missing statement w.r.t. that the starting date of a crediting period of the CPA shall be the date of its inclusion in the registered PoA or any date thereafter.</div><div>6. Not ok. Table in section B.5.3 is not as per template. Revision requested.</div></div>			
<b>Corrective Action #1</b>	<div><div>3. The date has been changed to 30/07/2012</div><div>4. The mistake has been corrected and the specific explanations</div></div>			

Related DDs	<input type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD	
Finding	gCPA-A3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
	<p>have been replaced with a place holder.</p> <p>5. A 4.3.1 has been changed to XX/XX/XXXX, or the date of inclusion into the registered PoA, whichever occurs later</p> <p>6. The table has been revised.</p>			
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b>	<p>3. Ok. Date of preparation of gCPA-DD has now been provided in A.1.</p> <p>4. Ok. gCPA-DD has been checked and found updated accordingly.</p> <p>5. Ok. Updated gCPA-DD has been checked and found that related text is deleted and replaced by placeholder.</p> <p>6. Ok. Updated gCPA-DD has been checked against unfccc template and found that table is now consistent.</p> <p>As all outstanding issues have been successfully solved this CAR is closed.</p>			
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements</p>			

Related DDs	<input type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD	
Finding	gCPA-B1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	The gCPA-DD does not make reference to the final emission reduction equation, equation 7 as per PoA-DD. Therefore clarification is requested.			
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	The reference has been included.			
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>OK. Updated gCPA-DD now provides emission reduction calculation including final emission reduction equation correctly and consistent as per PoA-DD.</p> <p>Therefore this CAR is closed.</p>			
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements</p>			

Related DDs	<input type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD	
Finding	gCPA-B2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Clarification is requested why parameter $UF_b$ (default value) is provided under section B.5.1.			
<b>Corrective Action #1</b>	All default values has been removed from the parameter list. It is now in			

Related DDs	<input type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	gCPA-B2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	line with the latest version of the PoA-DD.		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	Ok. Correctly and inline with EB41 Annex 22 and EB67 Annex 28 which states "Data that are calculated with equations provided in the selected methodology(ies) or default values specified in the methodology(ies) should not be included in the compilation", UF <sub>b</sub> has been excluded in B.5.1 of PoA-DD and subsequently from gCPA-DD and provided under Emission reduction section E.6.2 of PoA-DD or B.5.2 of gCPA-DD. Therefore this CAR is closed.		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	gCPA-B3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Clarify why further parameters like Genetic source, FFR are provided under section B.6.1 of gCPA-DD.		
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	The monitoring parameter list has been revised according to the latest version of the PoA-DD. It does contain the genetic source and the FFR as per the methodology.		
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	Not ok. As the determination of parameters Bo and VS has been revised the parameters genetic source and FFR are to be monitored to ensure that the genetic source is from Annex I party and farms uses formulated feed ratios and that the use of FFR can be validated. PoA-DD and gCPA-DD have been checked and found consistent on these parameters. However clarify why parameter TDL <sub>y</sub> is provided under section B.6.1 of gCPA-DD whereas this parameter is provided under section E.6.3 of PoA-DD data and parameters that are to be reported in CDM-SSC-CPA-DD form.		
<b>Corrective Action #2</b>	The parameter TDL <sub>y</sub> has been shifted to the correct section.		
<b>DOE Assessment #2</b>	Updated gCPA-DD has been checked and found that parameter TDL <sub>y</sub> has been moved to section B.5.1 which is correct as this is constant parameter for all CPAs under this PoA. Therefore this CAR is closed.		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Related DDs	<input type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
-------------	---------------------------------	--	--

Finding	gCPA-D1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Section D.1 states "Please tick if this information is provided at the PoA level. In this case sections D.2. to D.4. need not be completed in this form." However related ticked boxes are missing. Please clarify.			
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	The Tick Box has been included.			
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	Ok. Updated gCPA-DD has been checked and found that tick box as per template is now included. Therefore this CAR is closed.			
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements			

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD
Finding	gCPA-1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL <input type="checkbox"/> FAR

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD																																																							
Finding	gCPA-1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR																																																						
<b>Description of finding</b> <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Please update the generic CPA-DD according to the finalized PoA-DD, especially keep the information consistent between the following sections: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Generic CPA-DD</th> <th>Finalized PoA-DD</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>A.1.</td><td>A.1</td></tr> <tr><td>A.2.</td><td>A.2. and A.4.2.1.</td></tr> <tr><td>A.3.</td><td>A.3.</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.1.1.</td><td>A.4.1.1.</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.1.2.</td><td>A.4.1.2.</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.2.1.</td><td>*Not prior to GSP of PoA-DD</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.2.2.</td><td>-</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.3.1.</td><td>B.1.</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.3.2.</td><td>B.2.</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.4.</td><td>-</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.5.</td><td>A.4.5.</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.6.</td><td>A.4.4. and A.4.4.1.</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.7.</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>B.1.</td><td>A.1</td></tr> <tr><td>B.2.</td><td>A.4.2.2.</td></tr> <tr><td>B.3.</td><td>A.4.3. , E.5. , E.5.1. and E.5.2.</td></tr> <tr><td>B.4.</td><td>E.3.</td></tr> <tr><td>B.5.</td><td>E.6.</td></tr> <tr><td>B.5.1.</td><td>E.6.3.</td></tr> <tr><td>B.5.2.</td><td>E.6.1. and E.6.2.</td></tr> <tr><td>B.5.3.</td><td>-</td></tr> <tr><td>B.6.</td><td>E.1. and E.2.</td></tr> <tr><td>B.6.1.</td><td>E.7. , E.7.1., E.7.2. and A.4.4.2.</td></tr> <tr><td>C.1. to C.3</td><td>C.1. to C.3</td></tr> <tr><td>D.1. to D.4.</td><td>D.1 to D.4.</td></tr> <tr><td>Annex 1 to Annex 4</td><td>Annex 1 to Annex 4</td></tr> </tbody> </table>				Generic CPA-DD	Finalized PoA-DD	A.1.	A.1	A.2.	A.2. and A.4.2.1.	A.3.	A.3.	A.4.1.1.	A.4.1.1.	A.4.1.2.	A.4.1.2.	A.4.2.1.	*Not prior to GSP of PoA-DD	A.4.2.2.	-	A.4.3.1.	B.1.	A.4.3.2.	B.2.	A.4.4.	-	A.4.5.	A.4.5.	A.4.6.	A.4.4. and A.4.4.1.	A.4.7.		B.1.	A.1	B.2.	A.4.2.2.	B.3.	A.4.3. , E.5. , E.5.1. and E.5.2.	B.4.	E.3.	B.5.	E.6.	B.5.1.	E.6.3.	B.5.2.	E.6.1. and E.6.2.	B.5.3.	-	B.6.	E.1. and E.2.	B.6.1.	E.7. , E.7.1., E.7.2. and A.4.4.2.	C.1. to C.3	C.1. to C.3	D.1. to D.4.	D.1 to D.4.	Annex 1 to Annex 4	Annex 1 to Annex 4
Generic CPA-DD	Finalized PoA-DD																																																									
A.1.	A.1																																																									
A.2.	A.2. and A.4.2.1.																																																									
A.3.	A.3.																																																									
A.4.1.1.	A.4.1.1.																																																									
A.4.1.2.	A.4.1.2.																																																									
A.4.2.1.	*Not prior to GSP of PoA-DD																																																									
A.4.2.2.	-																																																									
A.4.3.1.	B.1.																																																									
A.4.3.2.	B.2.																																																									
A.4.4.	-																																																									
A.4.5.	A.4.5.																																																									
A.4.6.	A.4.4. and A.4.4.1.																																																									
A.4.7.																																																										
B.1.	A.1																																																									
B.2.	A.4.2.2.																																																									
B.3.	A.4.3. , E.5. , E.5.1. and E.5.2.																																																									
B.4.	E.3.																																																									
B.5.	E.6.																																																									
B.5.1.	E.6.3.																																																									
B.5.2.	E.6.1. and E.6.2.																																																									
B.5.3.	-																																																									
B.6.	E.1. and E.2.																																																									
B.6.1.	E.7. , E.7.1., E.7.2. and A.4.4.2.																																																									
C.1. to C.3	C.1. to C.3																																																									
D.1. to D.4.	D.1 to D.4.																																																									
Annex 1 to Annex 4	Annex 1 to Annex 4																																																									
<b>Corrective Action #1</b> <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	Updated to be consistent.																																																									

Related DDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> generic CPA-DD	<input type="checkbox"/> real case CPA-DD																																																																																	
Finding	gCPA-1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR																																																																																
<b>DOE Assessment #1</b> <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-1. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and DOE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	<p>The revised generic CPA-DD has been crosschecked with the finalized PoA-DD and the conclusion is described in the table below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Generic CPA-DD</th> <th>Finalized PoA-DD</th> <th>Consistent and Appropriate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>A.1.</td><td>A.1</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>A.2.</td><td>A.2. and A.4.2.1.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>A.3.</td><td>A.3.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.1.1.</td><td>A.4.1.1.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.1.2</td><td>A.4.1.2.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.2.1.</td><td>*Not prior to GSP of PoA-DD</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.2.2.</td><td>-</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.3.1.</td><td>B.1.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.3.2.</td><td>B.2.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.4.</td><td>-</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.5.</td><td>A.4.5.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.6.</td><td rowspan="2">A.4.4. and A.4.4.1.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>A.4.7.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>B.1.</td><td>A.1</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>B.2.</td><td>A.4.2.2.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>B.3.</td><td>A.4.3, E.5, E.5.1 and E.5.2.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>B.4.</td><td>E.3.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>B.5.</td><td>E.6.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>B.5.1.</td><td>E.6.3.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>B.5.2.</td><td>E.6.1. and E.6.2.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>B.5.3.</td><td>-</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate</td></tr> <tr><td>B.6.</td><td>E.1 and E.2.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>B.6.1.</td><td>E.7, E.7.1, E.7.2 and A.4.4.2.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>C.1. to C.3</td><td>C.1. to C.3</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>D.1. to D.4.</td><td>D.1 to D.4.</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent</td></tr> <tr><td>Annex 1 to Annex 4</td><td>Annex 1 to Annex 4</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent and Appropriate</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Thus finding gCPA-1 is successfully closed, all necessary information consistent between the finalized PoA-DD and the Generic CPA-DD (Generic CPA-DD Checklist 2).</p>				Generic CPA-DD	Finalized PoA-DD	Consistent and Appropriate	A.1.	A.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	A.2.	A.2. and A.4.2.1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	A.3.	A.3.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	A.4.1.1.	A.4.1.1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	A.4.1.2	A.4.1.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	A.4.2.1.	*Not prior to GSP of PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate	A.4.2.2.	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate	A.4.3.1.	B.1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	A.4.3.2.	B.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	A.4.4.	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate	A.4.5.	A.4.5.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	A.4.6.	A.4.4. and A.4.4.1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	A.4.7.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	B.1.	A.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	B.2.	A.4.2.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	B.3.	A.4.3, E.5, E.5.1 and E.5.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	B.4.	E.3.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	B.5.	E.6.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	B.5.1.	E.6.3.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	B.5.2.	E.6.1. and E.6.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	B.5.3.	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate	B.6.	E.1 and E.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	B.6.1.	E.7, E.7.1, E.7.2 and A.4.4.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	C.1. to C.3	C.1. to C.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	D.1. to D.4.	D.1 to D.4.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	Annex 1 to Annex 4	Annex 1 to Annex 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent and Appropriate
Generic CPA-DD	Finalized PoA-DD	Consistent and Appropriate																																																																																		
A.1.	A.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
A.2.	A.2. and A.4.2.1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
A.3.	A.3.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
A.4.1.1.	A.4.1.1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
A.4.1.2	A.4.1.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
A.4.2.1.	*Not prior to GSP of PoA-DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate																																																																																		
A.4.2.2.	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate																																																																																		
A.4.3.1.	B.1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
A.4.3.2.	B.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
A.4.4.	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate																																																																																		
A.4.5.	A.4.5.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
A.4.6.	A.4.4. and A.4.4.1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
A.4.7.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
B.1.	A.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
B.2.	A.4.2.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
B.3.	A.4.3, E.5, E.5.1 and E.5.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
B.4.	E.3.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
B.5.	E.6.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
B.5.1.	E.6.3.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
B.5.2.	E.6.1. and E.6.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
B.5.3.	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate																																																																																		
B.6.	E.1 and E.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
B.6.1.	E.7, E.7.1, E.7.2 and A.4.4.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
C.1. to C.3	C.1. to C.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
D.1. to D.4.	D.1 to D.4.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent																																																																																		
Annex 1 to Annex 4	Annex 1 to Annex 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent and Appropriate																																																																																		
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the first periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements																																																																																			

## 5 VALIDATION ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

### 5.1 General Description of the PoA

#### 5.1.1 Participation

##### LOA(s)

The precise title of this PoA is: Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation Programme.

Host country Approval for this PoA has been issued on 2012-03-16 vide official document 2012 No.3766 by National Development and Reform Commission, which is confirmed as P.R. of China's DNA. The PoA complies with the permission requirements and assists the host country in achieving sustainable development.

Annex-I country Approval for this PoA has been issued on 2012-04-19 vide official document EA/UPM/03/2012 by Environmental Agency, which is confirmed as United Kingdom's DNA.

#### Project Participants and CME

The PoA CME (Coordinating and Managing Entity) is Chengdu Oasis Science & Technology Co., Ltd., which is authorized as China's Project Participant. Another project participant is UPM Umwelt-Projekt-Management GmbH. Information regarding project participants is confirmed as consistent in the PoA-DD and LOAs.

However CAR PoA-A1, CAR PoA-A2, CAR PoA-A3, CAR PoA-A9, CL gCPA-A1 and CAR PoA-An1 have been raised and successfully closed.

#### 5.1.2 Contribution to Sustainable Development

The host country China DNA approves that the PoA complies with the permission requirements provided for in the measures for operation and management of CDM project and assists the host country in achieving sustainable development.

#### 5.1.3 PDDs editorial Aspects

The PoA-DD is using CDM-SSC-PoA-DD template version 01 and generic CPA-DD is using CDM-SSC-CPA template version 01. They are in compliance with the latest PoA-DD and CPA-DD templates and guidelines.

Nevertheless, CAR PoA-A8 and CAR gCPA-A3 have been raised and successfully closed.

#### 5.1.4 Technology to be employed

The description of the PoA is complete, accurate and in compliance with the PoA-DD

and CPA-DD templates and guidelines. The PoA will install biogas digesters, fed with the manure from animal e.g. pig at animal farms, which produces biogas mainly consisting of methane which is gainfully used for electricity and/or thermal energy generation e.g. via gas engine genset, gas boiler, cooking via cook stove or potentially transported to surrounding households for household utilization. A flare will be installed in case of exigencies. The approach adopted to achieve this is via

- a) **Financial support:** By offering additional considerable income generated by carbon credits, the PoA will enhance the financial attractiveness.

Prior to the installation of the biogas digesters the manure from livestock farms are stored in open lagoons deeper than 1 m with a retention time greater than one month. Therefore the manure was stored mainly under anaerobic conditions and generated GHG is emitted into the atmosphere. By the PoA the biogas (mainly consisting of CH<sub>4</sub>) is collected and destroyed. Under this PoA only avoided emissions from destruction of methane are claimed.

Besides, as the construction and installation of the technology employed has to follow national standards and regulations it is confirmed as environmentally safe and sound.

However CAR PoA-A2 has been raised and successfully closed.

### 5.1.5 Small Scale Projects

The value of annual emission reductions of every CPA proposed under this PoA is no more than 60 kt CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent annually for the type III component. The first proposed CPA is estimated to achieve 5,093 tCO<sub>2e</sub> emission reductions annually, which is further confirmed as less than 60 kt CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent annually; therefore, the proposed project is a small scale PoA. Besides the CPAs will be designed in a way that the number of project activities (farms within one CPA) which take part within a CPA are below a certain number to ensure that the threshold is met. Besides eligibility criterion 3.3 is established that only CPAs below this threshold are eligible and can be included under this PoA. By this it is ensured that the threshold limits will not be exceeded in any year of the crediting period. Further the DOE has recalculated the number of pigs necessary to reach the SSC threshold. According to this the number of market pigs produced per year would have to exceed 153,280 and the number of breeding pigs would have to exceed 17,350, 13.93 and 13.66 times higher than the number in first CPA.

The DOE has also checked and confirms that the CME has substantiated that the CPA is not a de-bundled component of large scale project through application of applicable EB 54, Annex 13 - "Guidelines on Assessment of Debundling for SSC Project Activities" (version 03).

However CAR PoA-A5 has been raised and successfully closed.

## 5.2 PoA Baseline, Additionality and Monitoring Plan

### 5.2.1 Application of the Methodology

By consultation of the UNFCCC website, it is confirmed that the Approved methodologies for small-scale CDM project:

AMS-III.D – *Methane recovery in animal manure management systems* (version 18). is applicable to the proposed PoA (AMS-III.D since EB35, October 2007).

The versions of the CDM Methodology approved by EB is valid during submission for registration.

The applied methodology AMS.III.D. refers to following tools and methodologies:

- *Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system (version 2.2.1).* Applicable – calculation of grid emission factor
- *Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption (version 01).* Applicable – monitoring procedures
- *Tool to calculate project or leakage CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fossil fuel combustion (version 02).* Applicable – monitoring procedures
- *Tool “Project emissions from flaring” (version 2.0.0).* Applicable – Project emissions from use of flare for exigencies.
- *Tool “Project and leakage emissions from road transportation of freight (version 1.0.0).* Applicable - Standard emission factors for light and heavy vehicles
- AMS.I.D. *Grid connected renewable electricity generation.* Applicable under this PoA w.r.t. project emissions from the use of electricity.
- AMS.III.AO *Avoidance of methane emissions through composting (version 1).* Applicable – calculation of project emissions from transport of manure

The methodology and tools are available at:

<http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/SSCmethodologies/approved>

Furthermore, all applicability conditions of the applied methodology have been met (please refer to Annex 6 assessments for related eligibility criteria 3.1, 3.1.1 – 3.1.5, 3.2, 3.2.1 – 3.2.3 and 3.3) and the PoA design is in line with all requirements and stipulations mentioned in all sections of the applied methodology. Besides, the PoA design is not expected to result in significant emissions, related both to project and leakage, other than those listed in the methodology.

However CAR PoA-E1 and PoA-E6 have been raised and successfully closed.

### 5.2.2 PoA Boundary and CPA Boundary

The boundaries (geographically and related to GHG sources/sinks) are correctly given in section A.4.1.2 and E.3 of the PoA-DD. The geographical boundary of this PoA is Sichuan Province and the physical boundary of a typical measure under this PoA is a farm husbandry including animal barns, manure storage, digester, biogas engine genset, biogas boiler, flare and household utilization of gas produced.

As per AMS.III.D (version 18) the boundary of the CPA of this PoA includes

- (a) The livestock;
- (b) Animal manure management systems (including centralised manure treatment plant where applicable);
- (c) Facilities which recover and flare/combust or use methane.

The information has been also correctly given in section A.4.1.2 and B.4 of the real case CPA-DD.

The physical delineation of the CPA under the PoA and the description of the emission sources and GHGs that are included in the CPA boundary are appropriate for the purpose of calculating project and baseline emissions for each CPA.

The methodology AMS.III.D indicates CH<sub>4</sub> are the GHG sources to be included in the boundary and CO<sub>2</sub> project emissions from electricity or fossil fuel consumption besides manure transportation; the DOE confirms that the justification by the PP is reasonable and evidenced. Besides, there are no other sources which are impacted by the project and not addressed by the applied methodology.

However CAR PoA-A4, CAR PoA-E2 and CL gCPA-A2 has been raised and successfully closed.

### 5.2.3 Baseline Identification

The procedure to identify the most plausible baseline scenario derived from the applied methodology has been applied correctly and is transparently and sufficiently documented in the PoA-DD.

The baseline is predefined in the corresponding methodology. The baseline scenario is therefore correctly defined as:

*As per AMS.III.D.*

9. The baseline scenario is the situation where, in the absence of the project activity, animal manure is left to decay anaerobically within the project boundary and methane is emitted to the atmosphere

DOE confirms that all plausible alternatives have been identified and the non-plausible alternatives have been properly justified and excluded. It has been assessed that the identified baseline scenario is plausible, conservative and reasonably represents what would occur in the absence of the proposed PoA, and

the approved methodology used is applicable to the identified baseline scenario. For a detail assessment of the baseline, please refer to Annex 1 and 2.

To ensure that the CPA complies with the baselines as described above eligibility criteria 3.1, 3.1.3., 3.1.4. and 3.1.5. are established.

However CAR PoA-E5 has been raised and successfully closed.

## 5.2.4 Calculation of GHG Emission Reductions

The PoA-DD applies steps and equations to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per the requirements of the applied methodology.

For the calculation of the GHG emission reductions the correct equations have been used reflecting the methodological choices.

Following equations are used for the calculation of the emission reductions:

The emission reduction is calculated as baseline emission deducted by project emission and leakage.

### Baseline Emissions:

$$BE_{III.D,y} = GWP_{CH_4} \cdot D_{CH_4} \cdot UF_b \cdot \sum_{j,LT} MCF_j \cdot B_{0,LT} \cdot N_{LT,y} \cdot VS_{LT,y} \cdot MS\%_{BL,j}$$

Where:

$BE_{III.D,y}$	Baseline methane emissions in year y (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
$GWP_{CH_4}$	Global Warming Potential for CH <sub>4</sub> (default value of 21 tCO <sub>2</sub> e/tCH <sub>4</sub> as per methodology)
$D_{CH_4}$	CH <sub>4</sub> density (default value of 0.00067 t/m <sup>3</sup> at room temperature (20 °C) and 1 atm pressure as per methodology)
$UF_b$	Model correction factor to account for model uncertainties (default value of 0.94 as per methodology)
$j$	Index for animal manure management system.
$LT$	Index for all types of livestock
$MCF_j$	Annual methane conversion factor (MCF) for the baseline animal manure management system “j”.
$B_{0,LT}$	Maximum methane producing capacity for the volatile solid generated for animal type LT (m <sup>3</sup> CH <sub>4</sub> (kgdm) <sup>-1</sup> )
$N_{LT,y}$	Annual average number of animals of type LT in year y (numbers).
$VS_{LT,y}$	Volatile solids for livestock LT entering the animal manure management system in year y (on a dry matter weight basis, kg dm/animal/year). Calculated via daily value VS <sub>LT,d</sub> x 365.
$MS\%_{BL,j}$	Fraction of manure handled in baseline animal manure management system “j”.

For the parameters B<sub>0,LT</sub> and VS<sub>LT,y</sub> section E.6.1 provides two choices. Developed country values can be applied in case the CPA to be included can justify that the following four conditions are satisfied:

- The genetic source of the livestock originates from an Annex I Party;
- The farm uses formulated feed rations (*FFR*) which are optimized for the various animal(s), stage of growth, category, weight gain/productivity and/or genetics;
- The use of *FFR* can be validated (through on-farm record keeping, feed supplier, etc.);
- The project specific animal weights are more similar to developed country IPCC default values.

In Case the above four conditions cannot be justified non-developed country values are applied. However as per conducted interview during onsite visit the government authorities especially from Agricultural Bureau<sup>/IM02/</sup> and PP<sup>/IM03/</sup> confirmed that generally all pigs in Sichuan originate from Annex I party The Netherlands. Further due to this parameter  $W_{site}$  is not monitored. This is substantiated as methodology AMS III.D §26 point 4 states under measurement method “when IPCC values of VS are adjusted for site specific animal weight as per para 10 (c) and equation 2 [...]” however the VS values are not adjusted under this PoA and §10 (c) of AMS III.D is not applied. Project specific animal weights are confirmed ex-ante to be more similar to developed country IPCC default values besides Genetic source and *FFR* are monitoring parameters therefore  $W_{site}$  is not used in any equation and therefore not monitoring is considered reasonable and plausible under this PoA.

### Project Emissions:

Based on AMS.III.D following project emissions have to be considered:

- a. Physical leakage of biogas in the manure management systems which includes production, collection and transport of biogas to the point of flaring/combustion or gainful use ( $PE_{PL,y}$ );
- b. Emissions from flaring or combustion of the gas stream ( $PE_{flare,y}$ );
- c. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from use of fossil fuels or electricity for the operation of all the installed facilities ( $PE_{power,y}$ );
- d. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from incremental transportation distances;
- e. Emissions from the storage of manure before being fed into the anaerobic digester ( $PE_{storage,y}$ ).

According to this the project emissions are calculated via following equation:

$$PE_{III.D,y} = PE_{power,y} + PE_{flare,y} + PE_{storage,y} + PE_{PL,y} + PE_{transp,y}$$

### CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from physical leakage ( $PE_{PL,y}$ ):

CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from physical leakage are calculated according to paragraph 13 option (b) of corresponding methodology. A default value of 0.05 m<sup>3</sup> biogas leakage per m<sup>3</sup> biogas produced is applied inline with methodology.

### CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from flaring or combustion of the gas stream ( $PE_{flare,y}$ ):

$PE_{flare,y}$  is set to zero. Flare is only for back-up/emergencies under this PoA. However if a flare is in operation PE from flaring will be calculated as following:

$$PE_{flare,y} = GWP_{CH_4} \cdot \sum_{m=1}^{525600} F_{CH_4, RG, m} \cdot (1 - \eta_{flare, m}) \cdot 10^{-3}$$

In case a CPA installs an open flare a flare efficiency of 50% is applied when flame is detected and 0% during all other times.

In case an enclosed flare is installed by a CPA the default values (Option A) as per related flaring tool are applied. This is 90% in case flame is detected in minute  $m$  and flame temperature and the flow rate of the residual gas is within manufacturer specifications. During other times the flare efficiency is 0%. Further for enclosed flares that are defined as low height flares, the flare efficiency in the minute  $m$  ( $\eta_{flare, m}$ ) are adjusted, as a conservative approach, by subtracting 0.1 from the efficiency as determined in Option A.

### CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from electricity use and fossil fuel for use the operation of installed facilities ( $PE_{power,y}$ ):

Related project emissions are calculated as following:

$$PE_{power,y} = PE_{el,y} + PE_{FC,j,y}$$

$PE_{el,y}$	Project emissions due to the use of electricity (tCO <sub>2</sub> e).
$PE_{FC,j,y}$	Project emissions due to the use of fossil fuel (tCO <sub>2</sub> e).

Project emissions from electricity use:

Generally the electricity demanded by the project should be generated by own equipment (gas engine genset) from own produced combustion of biogas. However in cases where electricity has to be taken from the grid the related project emissions are accounted as following inline with related tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption:

$$PE_{el,y} = EC_{PJ,y} \cdot EF_{CO_2} \cdot (1 + TDL_y)$$

Where:

$PE_{el,y}$	Emissions from the use of fossil fuel or electricity for the operation of the installed facilities in the year $y$ (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
$EC_{PJ,y}$	Net quantity of electricity consumed by the project in farm $p$ , year $y$ (MWh)
$EF_{CO_2}$	Emission factor of Central China Power Grid (tCO <sub>2</sub> /MWh)
$TDL_y$	Average technical transmission and distribution losses for providing year $y$ . In line with the tool the default value of 20% is applied.

### EF grid:

The grid emission factor was calculated as per the most recent data available at the time of PoA publication on the UNFCCC website for GSC, 2012-03-01. The data used in the EF calculation is in accordance with the data in the China Electric Power Yearbook from 2006 to 2010 (published annually) <sup>/CEPY/</sup> and the China Energy Statistical Yearbook from 2008 to 2010 (published annually) <sup>/CESY/</sup> as well as the data published by the NDRC on 2011-10-20 <sup>/GEF/</sup>.

The grid emission factor is determined *ex-ante* as a combined margin consisting of a combination of the operating margin (OM) and build margin (BM) according to the “*Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system*”, version 02.2.1”<sup>/TOOLG/</sup>. It has been calculated as 50:50 as the weights of the operating margin and the build margin respectively. Operating margin and build margin emission factor have been calculated as follows:

Operating margin emission factor: According to the data from the China Electric Power Yearbook (2006-2010)<sup>/CEPY/</sup>, low-cost/must run resources constituted only 38.18% in 2005, 35.26% in 2006, 35.47% in 2007, 39.27% in 2008 and 37.87% in 2009 among the total electric power generation of the CCPG. Therefore, the operating margin (OM) is calculated using the “simple OM” method which is justified because low cost and must run power plants constitute less than 50% of the total grid generation.

The aggregated generation and fuel consumption data are used due to the fact that more disaggregated data for power plants are not available in the CCPG. Country specific data for net calorific value of each type of fossil fuel obtained from the China Energy Statistical Yearbook from 2008 to 2010<sup>/CESY/</sup>, the emission factor of each type of fossil fuel taken from the IPCC 2006 default values<sup>/IPCC/</sup> and the total electricity delivered to the CCPG obtained from the China Electric Power Yearbook from 2006 to 2010<sup>/CEPY/</sup> are selected and are deemed reasonable.

Vintage data for the data years 2007, 2008 and 2009 from the China Energy Statistics Yearbooks 2008-2010<sup>/CESY/</sup> and the China Electric Power Yearbooks 2006-2010<sup>/CEPY/</sup> are used for the operating margin calculation, which are the most recent available data at the time of PDD publishing (2012-03-01).

The OM is calculated to be 1.0297 tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh as a generation-weighted average for the three years (2007-2009). The sources and calculation has been verified by TÜV NORD.

Build margin emission factor: Since plant specific fuel consumption and electricity generation data are not publicly available in China, the guidance requested by DNV from the CDM Executive Board for a deviation of the baseline methodology of AM0005 has been applied for calculating the build margin (BM) emission factor of this project<sup>/BMG/</sup>:

- Use of capacity additions from the years 2007 to 2009 is chosen and reaches 20.63% of the total installed capacity<sup>/CEPY/</sup>.
- Use of weights estimated using installed capacity in place of annual electricity generation. Thermal power plant accounts for 53.25% of the total installed capacity additions in this period<sup>/CEPY/</sup>. Since specific data for each technology is not available, the fraction of fuels (coal 97.66%; natural gas 2.21%; oil 0.13%) was estimated from the CO<sub>2</sub> intensity for the fuels used in the CCPG<sup>/CESY/</sup>.
- Use of the efficiency level of the best technology commercially available in the provincial/regional or national grid of China, as a conservative proxy, for each fuel type in estimating the fuel consumption. This is 39.45% for coal power plants and 51.77% for oil power plants and gas power plants respectively<sup>/GEF/</sup>.

The BM is calculated to be 0.4191 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/MWh. The resulting combined margin emission factor of 0.7244 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/MWh is fixed *ex-ante* for the first crediting period.

The DOE has checked the EF calculation as provided in Annex 3 of PoA-DD against the publicly available sources. Due to this and by recalculation DOE can confirm the correctness of the result of the applied grid emission factor.

Project emissions from fossil fuel will be calculated via:

$$PE_{FC,y} = \sum_i FC_{i,y} \cdot COEF_{i,y}$$

Where:

$PE_{FC,j,y}$	Project emissions due to the use of fossil fuel (tCO <sub>2</sub> e).
$FC_{i,j,y}$	Is the quantity of fuel type i combusted during the year y (mass or volume unit/yr);
$COEF_{i,y}$	Is the CO <sub>2</sub> emission coefficient of fuel type i in year y (tCO <sub>2</sub> /mass or volume unit)
i	Are the fuel types combusted during the year y

$COEF_{i,y}$  is calculated as per option B of tool to calculate project or leakage CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fossil fuel combustion:

$$COEF_{i,y} = NCV_{i,y} \cdot EF_{CO_2,i,y}$$

$NCV_{i,y}$	Weighted average net calorific value of fuel type i in year y (GJ/mass or volume unit)
$EF_{CO_2,i,y}$	Weighted average CO <sub>2</sub> emission coefficient of fuel type i in year y (tCO <sub>2</sub> /GJ)

### CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from incremental transportation distances ( $PE_{transp,y}$ ):

As per AMS.III.D project emissions due to transportation are calculated according to methodology AMS.III.AO.

$$PE_{transp,y} = \frac{Q_y}{CT_y} \cdot DAF_w \cdot EF_{CO_2,transport} + \frac{Q_{res-waste,y}}{CT_{res-waste,y}} \cdot DAF_{res-waste} \cdot EF_{CO_2,transport}$$

Where:

$PE_{transp,y}$	Emissions from incremental transportation in the year y (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
$Q_y$	Quantity of raw manure transported the year y (tonnes)
$CT_y$	Average truck capacity for transportation (tonnes/truck)
$DAF_w$	Average incremental distance for manure transportation (km/truck)
$EF_{CO_2,transport}$	CO <sub>2</sub> emission factor from fuel use due to transportation (kgCO <sub>2</sub> /km, default values 245 gCO <sub>2</sub> /km for light vehicles and 129 gCO <sub>2</sub> /km for heavy vehicles as per tool "Project and leakage emissions from road transportation of freight")
$Q_{res-waste,y}$	Quantity of residual waste transported the year y (tonnes)

$CT_{res-waste,y}$	Average truck capacity for residual waste transportation (tonnes/truck)
$DAF_{res-waste}$	Average incremental distance for manure transportation (km/truck)

As per onsite visit to the first CPA and based on the nature of the PoA in the majority of the project activities under this PoA  $PE_{transp,y}$  will be zero as the manure is transported via pipelines to the digester and the distance between the farm and the project plant is significantly short.

### Emissions from the storage of manure before being fed into the anaerobic digester ( $PE_{storage,y}$ )

As per methodology project emissions on account of storage of manure before being fed into the anaerobic digester shall be accounted for if both condition (a) and condition (b) below are satisfied:

- (a) The storage time of the manure after removal from the animal barns, including transportation, exceeds 24 hours before being fed into the anaerobic digester; and
- (b) The dry matter content of the manure when removed from the animal barns is less than 20%.

In case both condition (a) and (b) mentioned above are satisfied for a specific farm, the project emissions will be calculated by following equation. If not, the value of  $PE_{storage,y}$  is zero.

$$PE_{storage,y} = GWP_{CH_4} \cdot D_{CH_4} \sum_{LT,l} \left[ \frac{365}{AI_l} \sum_{d=1}^{AI_l} (N_{LT,y} \cdot VS_{LT,d} \cdot MS\%_l (1 - e^{-k(AI_l-d)}) \cdot MCF_l \cdot B_{0,LT}) \right]$$

Where:

$PE_{storage,y}$	Emissions from the storage of manure (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
$GWP_{CH_4}$	Global Warming Potential for CH <sub>4</sub> (21)
$D_{CH_4}$	CH <sub>4</sub> density (0.00067 t/m <sup>3</sup> at room temperature (20 °C) and 1 atm pressure)
$AI_l$	Annual average interval between manure collection and delivery for treatment at a given storage device l (days)
$N_{LT,y}$	Annual average number of animals of type “LT” in year “y” (numbers)
$VS_{LT,d}$	Amount of volatile solid production by type of animal LT in a day (kg VS/head/d)
$MS\%_l$	Fraction of volatile solids (%) handled by storage device l
$k$	Degradation rate constant (0.069)
$d$	Days for which cumulative methane emissions are calculated; d can vary from 1 to 45 and to be run from 1 up to $AI_l$
$MCF_l$	Annual methane conversion factor for the project manure storage device l from Table 10.17, Chapter 10, Volume 4 (%)
$B_{0,LT}$	Maximum methane producing capacity for the volatile solid generated for animal type LT (m <sup>3</sup> CH <sub>4</sub> (kgdm) <sup>-1</sup> )

### Leakage emissions:

As per §17 of AMS.III.D no leakage calculation is required.

Under PoA further leakage emission due to the use of replaced equipment in another activity is set to zero as baseline manure treatment system cannot be relocated. DOE can confirm this via onsite visit to first CPA. The baseline manure management system consists of concrete build pools/lagoons which cannot be relocated which destroying them. Besides eligibility criteria 5.4.1 and 5.4.2 have been established w.r.t. leakage. By this justification is given that the baseline equipment cannot be relocated or to ensure that in case of mobile equipment it is justified that the equipment is scrapped and scrapping is documented and scrapped equipment is stored until DOE verification. Therefore it is deemed reasonable and plausible to set leakage emissions to zero.

### Emission Reduction:

The emission reductions are then calculated by difference between baseline emissions and project emissions (leakage is set to zero):

$$ER_{III.D,y} = BE_{III.D,y} - PE_{III.D,y}$$

However as per methodology AMS.III.D the emission reductions achieved in any year are the lowest of the following:

The emission reductions achieved by a project activity under a CPA is determined ex-post through direct measurement of the amount of methane gainfully used and destroyed. Those emissions are calculated as following:

$$MD_y = BG_{Burnt,y} \cdot w_{CH_4} \cdot D_{CH_4} \cdot FE \cdot GWP_{CH_4} \quad (b)$$

Where:

$MD_y$	Methane captured and used gainfully by the project activity in year y (tCO <sub>2</sub> e).
$BG_{Burnt,y}$	Biogas flared or combusted in year y (m <sup>3</sup> )
$w_{CH_4}$	Methane content in biogas in the year y (volume fraction). A default value of 60% is applied as per the methodology.
$FE$	Flare efficiency in year y (fraction). 100% is applied for streams used for energy as these methane streams will be continuous monitored separately. This is inline with AMS.III.D §22. In case of installation of flare the efficiency of the flare will be determined as per related flaring tool <sup>TOOLF/</sup> .

Therefore the emission reductions are limited to the minimum of result

$$ER_{III.D,y,ex\ post} = \min[(BE_{III.D,y,ex\ post} - PE_{III.D,y,ex\ post}), (MD_y - PE_{power,y,ex\ post})]$$

Where:

$ER_{III.D,y,ex\ post}$	Emission reductions achieved by the project activity based on monitored values for year y (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
$BE_{III.D,y,ex\ post}$	Baseline emissions calculated (for projects using option in paragraph 9 (a)) <sup>1</sup> using ex post monitored values of $N_{LT,y}$ and if applicable $VS_{LT,y}$

<sup>1</sup> of methodology AMS III.D, version 18.

$PE_{III.D,y,ex\ post}$	Project emissions calculated using ex post monitored values of $N_{LT,y}$ , $MS\%_y$ , and if applicable $VS_{LT,y}$
$PE_{power,y,ex\ post}$	Emissions from the use of fossil fuel or electricity for the operation of the installed facilities based on monitored values in the year y (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)

The following parameters are ex-ante determined values:

- Operating Margin Emission Factor of Central China Power Grid ( $EF_{OM}$ ) 1.0297 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/MWh
- Build Margin Emission Factor of Central China Power Grid ( $EF_{BM}$ ) 0.4191 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/MWh
- Yearly volatile solid excreted per animal per year ( $VS_{LT,y}$ ) for  
Non-Developed Countries livestock: Breeding Swine: 109.5, Market Swine: 109.5, Dairy cow: 1,022, Other cow: 839.5, Broilers: 7.3; Layers: 7.3 and for  
Developed Countries livestock: Breeding Swine: 167.9, Market Swine: 109.5, Dairy cow: 1,861.5, Other cow: 949, Broilers: 131.4; Layers: 142.35. All values are kg dry matter animal<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup> as per 2006 IPCC
- Daily volatile solid excreted per animal per day ( $VS_{LT,d}$ ) for  
Non-Developed Countries livestock: Breeding Swine: 0.3, Market Swine: 0.3, Dairy cow: 2.8, Other cow: 2.3, Broilers: 0.02; Layers: 0.02 and for  
Developed Countries livestock: Breeding Swine: 0.46, Market Swine: 0.3, Dairy cow: 5.1, Other cow: 2.6, Broilers: 0.36; Layers: 0.39. All values are kg dry matter animal<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup> as per 2006 IPCC
- Maximum methane producing capacity for manure produced by livestock, of VS excreted ( $B_{0,LT}$ ) for  
Non-Developed Countries livestock: Breeding Swine: 0.29, Market Swine: 0.29, Dairy cow: 0.24, Other cow: 0.18, Broilers: 0.24; Layers: 0.24 and for  
Developed Countries livestock: Breeding Swine: 0.45, Market Swine: 0.45, Dairy cow: 0.13, Other cow: 0.1, Broilers: 0.36; Layers: 0.39 m<sup>3</sup> CH<sub>4</sub> kg<sup>-1</sup> as per 2006 IPCC
- Global Warming Potential for CH<sub>4</sub> (GWP) 21 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/tCH<sub>4</sub> as per 2006 IPCC
- Conversion factor of m<sup>3</sup>CH<sub>4</sub> to kilogram CH<sub>4</sub> ( $D_{CH_4}$ ) 0.67 as per 2006 IPCC
- Model correction factor to account for model uncertainties (0.94) ( $UF_b$ ) as per methodology AMS.III.D
- Fraction of manure handled in baseline animal manure management system ( $MS\%_{BL,j}$ ) 100% as per local situation ( to be confirmed by site visit, check of palnt layout and FSR)
- Methane content in biogas in the year y ( $w_{CH_4}$ ) of 60% as per methodology AMS.III.D

- Average technical transmission and distribution losses for providing electricity in year  $y$  ( $TDL_y$ ) of 20% as per Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption

For the data and parameters not to be monitored throughout the crediting period (i.e. they are determined only once and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), it is assessed that all data sources, assumptions and calculations are correct, applicable to the project and contribute to a conservative estimate of the emission reductions. For the data and parameters subject to monitoring, it is confirmed that the ex-ante estimated values for the monitoring parameters are plausible, and the emission reduction estimates provided in the PoA-DD are reasonable and conservative.

However findings CAR PoA-E7, CAR PoA-E9, CAR PoA-E11, CAR gCPA-B2 and gCPA-B3 w.r.t. the Emission Reduction calculation and parameters to be monitored by each CPA have been raised and successfully closed.

## **5.2.5 Additionality Determination**

### **Prior Consideration of CDM in decision making**

According to Glossary of terms EB 70 Annex 7 version 7 the starting date of a PoA is defined as the date on which the coordinating/managing entity officially notifies the secretariat and the DNA of their intention to seek the CDM status or the date of publication of the PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation. For this PoA this would be 2012-03-01. However due to problems at uploading via the UNFCCC interface providing an Error message that the date has to be 4 weeks in the future for SSC PoAs, PP has changed the starting date of the PoA to 2013-02-01. The starting date of the first CPA (2012-12-15) is a date after webhosting PoA-DD and therefore in the future and as per onsite visit no construction began, and as this is later than the commencement of validation of the PoA, i.e., the date on which the PoA-DD is first published for global stakeholder consultation (2012-03-01), thus as per paragraph 7(d) of PoA Procedures (version 04.1, EB55 Annex 38), EB66 Annex 3 §16 (d) and paragraph 2 of Guidelines on the Demonstration and Assessment of Prior Consideration of the CDM (EB62 Annex13) as well as VVS §194 (especially VVS version 2 §194) and §107, the DOE has determined that the CDM was seriously considered in the decision to implement the project activity.

### **Additionality justification as per methodology / methodological tools**

The additionality was justified in accordance with the requirements derived from applied methodology, PoA Procedures, and Guidelines on the demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities referred therein.

The additionality for any project activity within a CPA under this PoA will be demonstrated as following:

### **Demonstration of investment barrier using investment analysis**

Since the projects to be included in the PoA would be small scale projects, additionality of the projects would be demonstrated as per EB 70 Annex 5 §9 using the guidance given vide “Guidelines on the demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities” (Annex 27 EB 68) with “Non-binding best practice examples to demonstrate additionality for SSC project activities” (Annex 34, EB 35), “Guidelines on the Assessment of Investment Analysis” (Annex 5, EB 62) and “Guidelines for Objective Demonstration and Assessment of Barriers” (Annex 13, EB 50).

Appropriateness of Investment Analysis: The project activities getting registered under the PoA are the replacement of existing manure management system at livestock farms in Sichuan province. Since in these cases, the projects have an existing and operating treatment system which is inline with all host country requirements, none of the farms under any CPA has to invest into a new manure treatment system. Besides any project activity under this PoA will generate at least electrical and/or thermal energy which is an economic benefit to the livestock farm. Therefore simple cost analysis is not appropriate for demonstration of additionality of PoA project activities. Of the remaining two options, PoA envisages demonstration of investment barrier using benchmark analysis. Due to this and that the alternative would be to obtain electricity from the grid or to obtain thermal energy by e.g. combustion of fossil fuel the validation team is convinced that the use of benchmark analysis is appropriate and is in conformity with Guidance 19 of Annex 5, EB 62. Accordingly, the demonstration of additionality of projects under this PoA would involve proving that the project activity is a financially not attractive alternative by comparing pre-tax project IRR with the justified benchmark. This is in conformity with Paragraph 108 of VVM (Ver. 01.2).

In order to ensure objective assessment of the investment barrier with as little or no manual intervention or subjectivity playing any role, dedicated template has been developed. The financial calculation for first CPA acts as template and example for this PoA. The template has been divided into 5 worksheets as follows:

- a) Basic information
- b) Sensitivity Analysis
- c) Breakdown of O&M Cost
- d) Cash flow\_without CDM
- e) Cash flow\_with CDM

The first worksheet – Basic Information – provides all the input parameters required for assessing the investment barrier. It seeks all the conceivable information required to assess the investment barrier, be it technical, financial or regulatory. The template also clearly states what are input parameters (requiring manual entry) and what are calculations (which the system automatically does once the input parameters are entered). As per eligibility criterion 13 for all projects within one CPA and under this PoA a FSR has to be prepared which will be the only acceptable source for input parameters and leaves no scope for the projects to use alternative sources. The validation team will therefore cross check the information contained in the PDD vis-a-vis the FSR and based on its local and sectoral expertise, ensure the input

parameters are valid and applicable at the time of investment decision. Besides, while validating each project seeking registration under the PoA, the DOE will cross check the input parameters with available evidence, third-party or publicly available sources and with other parameters located in the same area and set up around the same time. The third worksheet – Breakdown of O&M Cost – provides a further detailed overview of the different O&M costs considered. This sheet does not contain any input parameter but consolidate information provided in Basic Information worksheet. The fourth worksheet – Cash flow\_without CDM – seeks to consolidate the information given in 'Basic Information' worksheet to form the basis for pre-tax project IRR calculations. All the cells are linked appropriately. The fifth worksheet – Cash flow\_with CDM – provides the pre-tax project IRR calculation identical to the calculation provided in the fourth worksheet but including revenues from CER sales. The validation report for each of the CPAs would ensure that the guidance given vide paragraph 88 and 113 c) of VVM (Ver.01.2) is adhered to.

#### Benchmark:

PP chose the investment analysis to substantiate additionality. As per step 2a in the Additionality Tool the PP decide to apply the benchmark approach. The benchmark approach is a suitable way of determining additionality. PP has well elaborated why this approach was chosen instead of Option I or II. Please refer to PoA-DD section E.5.1. In all project activities under this PoA and investment is required as well as the generated biogas can be used for thermal energy and/or electrical power generation. A potential source for an economic benefit.

The benchmark analysis will be conducted based on the pre tax project Internal Rate of Return (IRR). 7 % has been identified as a suitable value derived from the *Economical evaluation for construction project: Methods and parameters (3rd Edition)*. The approach has been assessed to be in line with the additionality tool. TÜV NORD could verify that the applied value is derived from the referenced industry guideline<sup>BEN/</sup>. This guideline is referencing recommended financial figures usually for state owned companies. The value provided for the animal husbandry sector is 7 % IRR pre-tax. Since the main purpose of this project is thermal and/or electricity generation, the benchmark is assessed to be appropriate.

Sensitivity analysis: PoA project activities would be tested for the robustness of the conclusion, viz., that the project activity is less economically or financially attractive than at least one other credible and realistic alternative by subjecting critical parameters to reasonable variations. Project activities which will be implemented under this PoA will use the generated biogas for electricity generation, thermal energy generation (steam, hot water), for cooking and household application e.g. via local gas network. Therefore a project activity could have different revenue streams by electricity sales or savings, savings in fossil fuel, revenue from sales of biogas for cooking and/or household application besides the sludge could be sold to farmers however e.g. as per 1<sup>st</sup> CPA is considered as given for free. Due to this and in accordance with §20 of Annex 5 EB 62 the following parameters are considered and deemed appropriate for sensitivity analysis:

- a) Total static investment

- b) Subsidy Received
- c) Electricity price
- d) Annual electricity generation
- e) Thermal energy generation
- f) Fossil fuel price
- g) Biogas price
- h) Annual biogas sold
- i) O&M costs
- j) Sludge price
- k) Biogas production

All the above parameters are subject to 10% variation to both positive and negative side in accordance with §21 of Annex 5 EB 62. The sensitivity analysis is conducted by varying one parameter at a time and keeping the other parameters fixed, the results are summed up in the 'Sensitivity Analysis' worksheet. The validation team is, therefore, convinced that the sensitivity analysis conforms to paragraph 111 of VVM (Ver 01.2) and Guidance 19, 20 and 21 of Annex 5, EB 62.

Conclusion: The performance of the template has been checked for the real case CPA submitted along with the PoA-DD. The financial spreadsheet calculation of the first real case CPA has also been presented which confirms that pre-tax project IRR is below the established benchmark. In the above background, Validation Team is convinced that the proposed method for evaluating the additionality of the PoA project activities is appropriate and valid.

The corresponding criterion as per PoA-DD section A.4.2.2 and E.5.2 related evidence examples are as following:

Nb.	Criterion	Description/rational	Evidence Example
4	The CPA shall fulfil the criteria of additionality demonstration defined in PoA-DD (section E.5.2)	To ensure the CPA is additional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IRR calculation sheet</li> <li>• ER calculation</li> </ul>

## Summary

As no CPA is allowed to have a start date prior to commencement of validation of the PoA and as it is confirmed via established eligibility criteria 7.2 that the start date of any CPA is not prior to the commencement of validation of the PoA (VVS §193) as well as the start date for this CPA is in the future and therefore after publishing DDs for global stakeholder consultation.

All the arguments and parameters in the PoA-DD are well evidenced. Related eligibility criteria are well established and ensure that in the absence of CDM none of the implemented CPA would occur.

However CAR PoA-A7, CAR PoA-B1, CAR PoA-E4 CAR PoA-E5 and CAR PoA-E6 were raised and successfully closed.

### 5.2.6 Eligibility criteria

Section A.4.2.2. of the PoA-DD provides corresponding eligibility criteria established for the inclusion of a CPA under this PoA.

The DOE confirms that the eligibility criteria have been well established and include criteria w.r.t. the applicability of the related methodologies AMS.III.D, criteria 3.1, 3.1.1 – 3.1.5, 3.2, 3.2.1 – 3.2.3 and 3.3. Further criterion 4 together with key criteria as per E.5.2 of PoA-DD for the demonstration of additionality as well as criteria to ensure that CME has control over all data and approves each CPA, criterion 1., that any CPA lies within the geographical boundary of the PoA, criterion 5.1., criteria to avoid double counting, criteria 2., 5.2, 10.1 and 10.2, further parameter w.r.t. the baseline, criteria 5.2, 5.3, 5.4.1 and 5.4.2, criteria w.r.t. de-bundling, criterion 2., that no ODA is involved, criterion 6., ensure consistent use of monitoring plan, criterion 9., as well as criteria to ensure that start date of any CPA is not prior to global stakeholder publication (2012-03-01) besides does not exceed the end date of the PoA and is evidenced by documentation, criteria 7.1, 7.2 and 8. Further in line with EB 55 Annex 38 §7 (f) and (g) as well as EB 70 Annex 5 §16 (g) eligibility criteria have been established w.r.t. national environmental regulation and local stakeholder consultation. An EIA has been conducted as per host country regulation, criterion 11 and that local stakeholders meeting is conducted, criterion 12. Finally an eligibility criterion has been established to ensure that all project activities under this PoA prepare a FSR, criterion 13.

For further assessment of all eligibility criteria see Annex 6. It can be therefore confirmed that established eligibility criteria cover at the requirement as per EB 55 Annex 38 §6 and §7 as well as EB 70 Annex 5 § 16 and §17.

However CAR PoA-A6 and CAR PoA-E5 have been raised and successfully closed.

### 5.2.7 Monitoring Methodology

The monitoring plan is in compliance with the applied monitoring methodology AMS.III.D (version 18).

However CAR PoA-E8 and CAR PoA-E9 as well as CAR PoA-E10 and CAR gCPA-B3 have been raised and successfully closed.

### 5.2.8 Monitoring Plan

According to the applied methodology, all monitoring parameters required by the applied methodology and related tools or other methodologies referred to within are contained in the monitoring plan. They are:

- The total amount of biogas supplied to the boiler, generator, flare and/or households ( $BG_{\text{burnt,y}}$ ). As flow meters measuring and providing normalized cubicmeters will be installed separate monitoring of biogas temperature (t) and pressure (p) is not required.

- Mass flow of methane in the residual gas on dry basis at reference conditions in the minute  $m$  ( $F_{CH_4, RG, y}$ )
- Flare efficiency in year  $y$  (fraction) ( $\eta_{flare, m}$ )
- Temperature in the exhaust gas of the flare ( $T_{EG, m}$ )
- Flame on or off ( $Flame_m$ )
- Net electricity consumed by the project in farm ( $EC_{P, j, y}$ )
- Quantity of fuel type  $i$  combusted in process  $j$  during the year  $y$  ( $FC_{i, j, y}$ )
- Weighted average net calorific value of fuel type  $i$  in year  $y$  ( $NCV_{i, y}$ )
- Weighted average  $CO_2$  emission factor of fuel type  $i$  in year  $y$  ( $EF_{CO_2, i, y}$ )
- Number of days animal is alive in the farm in the year  $y$  ( $N_{da, y}$ )
- Number of animals produced annually of type  $LT$  for the year  $y$  ( $N_{p, y}$ )
- Annual methane conversion factor (MCF) for the baseline animal manure management system  $j$  ( $MCF_j$ )
- Fraction of volatile solids (%) handled by storage device  $l$  ( $MS\%_l$ )
- Number of days that the animal manure management system was operational ( $nd_y$ )
- Annual average interval between manure collection and delivery for treatment at digester ( $AI_l$ )
- Quantity of raw manure transported the year  $y$  ( $Q_y$ )
- Average truck capacity for transportation ( $CT_y$ )
- Average incremental distance for manure transportation ( $DAF_w$ ,  $DAF_{res-waste}$ )
- Quantity of residual waste produced in year  $y$  ( $Q_{res-waste, y}$ )
- Average truck capacity for residual waste transportation ( $CT_{res-waste, y}$ )
- $CO_2$  emission factor from fuel use due to transportation ( $EF_{CO_2, transport}$ )
- The proper application of residual waste
- Genetic source of the production operations livestock
- The formulated feed rations (FFR)

It has been confirmed that for all monitoring parameters, conservative approaches have been ensured to derive values to emission reduction calculations during monitoring period.

The monitoring plan can be implemented and all the monitoring arrangements are feasible within the PoA design.

Nevertheless, CAR PoA-E8, CAR PoA-E9, CAR PoA-E10 and CAR gCoA-B3 were raised and successfully closed.

### 5.2.9 Project Management Planning

Management structure of the monitoring plan is defined in Section A.4.4 and E.7.2 and is assessed to be appropriate for the purpose of the projects monitoring. The overall responsibility for the monitoring will be held by the CME Chengdu Oasis Science & Technology Co., Ltd. Farms are responsible to install, operate, maintain and record data from related monitoring equipment. A PLC will be installed and where in exceptional cases where this is not possible data will be recorded manually and digitalized by C/ME. All data will be forwarded by farms to C/ME. All monitoring data will be kept at the CME or the database system managed by the CME. Emission reduction calculation will be based on data collected and installed in database system. The database system is confirmed as the data management system designed specifically for the PoA to ensure the data accuracy, to avoid double counting, to addressing uncertainty (QA/QC), and to manage 100% monitoring data storage for the monitoring of all CPAs.

The C/ME has established following operational and management arrangements:

- A record keeping system for each CPA under the PoA,
- A system/procedure to avoid double accounting e.g. to avoid the case of including a new CPA that has been already registered either as a CDM project activity or as a CPA of another PoA,
- The SSC-CPA included in the PoA is not a de-bundled component of another CDM programme activity (CPA) or CDM project activity.
- The provisions to ensure that those operating the CPA are aware of and have agreed that their activity is being subscribed to the PoA;

The farm owners will be responsible for the monitoring management of their project activity. The conduction of the monitoring and collection of the data will be forwarded to the C/ME. The C/ME will evaluate the data and compiles the monitoring reports for the single CPAs.

Emission reduction calculation will be based on data collected and installed in C/ME database.

CME has provided a management plan in line with EB 70 Annex 5 §19. The management plan was made available to the DOE, which can confirm that the CME has developed and implemented a management system that includes

- a) A clear definition of roles and responsibilities of personnel involved in the process of inclusion of CPAs, including a review of their competencies;
- b) Records of arrangements for training and capacity development for personnel;
- c) Procedures for technical review of inclusion of CPAs;
- d) A procedure to avoid double counting (e.g. to avoid the case of including a new CPA that has already been registered either as a CDM project activity or as a CPA of another PoA);
- e) Records and documentation control process for each CPA under the PoA;
- f) Measures for continuous improvements of the PoA management system;

g) Any other relevant elements.

Related sections in PoA-DD and CPA-DD substantiate the stated.

Nevertheless, CAR PoA-E10 has been raised and successfully closed.

### **5.2.10 Crediting Period and PoA Duration**

As per the PoA requesting registration uploading procedures, the start date of the PoA is defined as the starting date of the whole PoA crediting period. The start date of crediting period has been unambiguously stated in the PoA-DD section B.1, i.e. 2013-02-01 or on the date of registration, whichever is later. The PoA duration is stated in the PoA-DD section B.2 as 28 years, which is deemed appropriate.

Nevertheless, CAR PoA-B1 was raised and successfully closed.

### **5.2.11 Environmental Impacts**

Environmental Analysis is chosen to be done at SSC-CPA level.

For such project activities installed under the proposed programme, either an environmental impact assessment is required or for those project activities which do not utilize the produced biogas for electricity generation an environmental impact assessment result table. However both will be checked and approved by related government authorities. This has been verified via interview with representatives from provincial development and reform commission during onsite visit<sup>/IM02/</sup>.

Nevertheless, CAR PoA-C1 was raised and successfully closed.

### **5.2.12 Comments by Local Stakeholders**

Local stakeholder consultation is chosen to be done at SSC-CPA level.

Corresponding findings CAR gCPA-D1 has been raised and successfully closed.

### **5.2.13 CPA Eligibility Criteria**

A complete list of CPA Eligibility Criteria has been set up in section A.4.2.2 in conjunction with section E.5.2 "Key criteria and data for assessing additionality of SSC-CPA" of the PoA-DD and section B.2 of the generic CPA-DD, and is deemed appropriate and sufficient. For detailed assessment, please refer to Annex 6 of this validation report. DOE confirms that the established eligibility criteria cover the requirements as per EB 55 Annex 38 especially §6 (g) and 7 (a) to (h) as well as set out in EB 70 Annex 5 especially §15, 16 and 17.

## 6 VALIDATION OPINION

UPM Umwelt-Projekt-Management GmbH has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program (CP) to validate the programme of activities (PoA): “Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation Programme” with regard to the relevant requirements of the UNFCCC for CDM project activities, as well as criteria for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria include article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the modalities and procedures for CDM (Marrakech Accords) and the relevant decisions by COP/MOP and CDM Executive Board.

In the course of the validation 21 Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and 1 Clarification Requests (CLs) for PoA-DD and 6 CARs and 2 CLs for generic CPA-DD were raised and all have been successfully closed. No FAR has been raised and has no impact on issues related to registration.

The review of the PoA design documentations and additional documents related to baseline and monitoring methodology; the subsequent background investigation, follow-up interviews and review of comments by parties, stakeholders and NGOs have provided TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP with sufficient evidence to validate the fulfilment of the stated criteria.

In detail the conclusions can be summarised as follows:

- The PoA is in line with all relevant host country criteria (China) and all relevant UNFCCC requirements for CDM. Project activity approval have been obtained from DNA of China vide the Letter of Approval (HCA) dated 2012-03-16 and vide the Letter of approval from Annex I country UK (LOA) dated 2012-04-19.
- The baseline has been appropriately identified as per the applied methodology.
- The PoA additionality is sufficiently justified in the PoA-DD.
- The eligibility criteria established for CPA inclusion are deemed appropriate and sufficient.
- The monitoring plan is transparent and adequate.
- The calculation of the emission factors and the CPA emission reductions is carried out in a transparent and conservative manner.
- Information on the local stakeholders’ consultation by the project participants prior to submitting the PoA for validation is sufficiently provided in the PoA-DD.
- All information has been also consistently applied in the generic CPA-DD form.

The conclusions of this report show, that the PoA, as it was described in the project documentations, is in line with all criteria applicable for the validation.

Essen, 2012-12-11



Mr. Stefan Winter  
TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP  
Validation Team Leader

Essen, 2012-12-11



Mr. Jochen Schubert  
TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP  
Final Approval

## 7 REFERENCES

**Table 7-1:** Documents provided by the project participant

Reference	Document
/CPA-DD-G/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generic SSC-CPA-DD of “Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation Programme, CPA Nb. SCAFBG-XXXX-XX” version 1 dated 2012-02-28 (webhosted)</li> <li>Generic SSC-CPA-DD of “Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation Programme, CPA Nb. SCAFBG-XXXX-XX”(version 1.6, 2012-12-03) (final)</li> </ul>
/CPA-DD-R/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Real-case SSC-CPA-DD of “Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation Programme, CPA Nb. SCAFBG-2011-01 “, version 1 dated 2012-02-28 (webhosted)</li> <li>Real-case SSC-CPA-DD of “Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation Programme, CPA Nb. SCAFBG-2011-01” (version 1.8, 2012-12-03) (final)</li> </ul>
/BH/	Biogas Handbook, 2008, Published by University of Southern Denmark Esbjerg, Niels Bohrs Vej 9-10, DK-6700 Esbjerg, Denmark
/CF/	Chengdu Oasis Science & Technology Co., Ltd.: Confirmation that the proposed PoA is a voluntary action, dated 2012-02-15
/EF/	Oasis Science & Technology Development Beijing Co., Ltd.: The calculation spreadsheet for OM, BM and EF.
/HCA/	NDRC of China: Letter of approval for the proposed PoA and the first CPA, (No.3766), issued by NDRC in March 2012
/License/	Neijiang City Administration for Industry and Commerce: Business license of Zizhong Duokang Swine Farm Co., Ltd. (No.511025000025579 (1-1)), issued on 2009-05-07.
/LOA/	Letter of approvals from the Annex I Party UK (EA/UPM/03/2012) issued on 2012-04-19
/MAT/	2009 annual average temperature data for Sichuan Province from Sichuan Statistical Yearbook 2010
/MOC/	Modalities of Communication
/PoA-DD/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSC-PoA-DD of “Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation</li> </ul>

Reference	Document
	<p>Programme“, version 1 dated 2012-02-28 (webhosted)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSC-PoA-DD of “Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation Programme” (version 1.8, 2012-12-03) (final)</li> </ul>
/SSY/	Statistical Bureau of Sichuan and NBS Survey Office in Sichuan (NBS is National Bureau of Statistics): Sichuan Statistical Yearbook 2010,
/STAND/	<p>Related national or international standards or laws: :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NY/T-1220.1-2006: Technical Code for biogas engineering Part 1: Process design</li> <li>2. NY/T-1220.2-2006: Technical Code for biogas engineering Part 1: Design of biogas supply</li> <li>3. NY/T-1220.3-2006: Technical Code for biogas engineering Part 1: Construction and acceptance</li> <li>4. NY/T-1220.4-2006: Technical Code for biogas engineering Part 1: Operation and maintenance</li> <li>5. NY/T-1220.5-2006: Technical Code for biogas engineering Part 1: Evaluation of quality</li> <li>6. NY/T-1221-2006: Technical specification for operation maintenance and safety of biogas plant in scale animal and poultry farms</li> <li>7. NY/T-1222-2006: Criteria for designing of biogas plant in scale livestock and poultry farms</li> <li>8. GB-24500-2009: The minimum allowable values of energy efficiency and energy efficiency grades of industrial boilers</li> </ol>
/SHC/	<p>Evidences on stakeholder consultation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project introduction for questionnaires</li> <li>2. List of local stakeholders</li> <li>3. Questionnaires</li> </ol>

**Table 7-2:** Background investigation and assessment documents

Reference	Document
/AA/	CDM Executive Board: Attachment A to Appendix B of the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities, version 08. <a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Guidclarif/ssc/methSSC_guid05.pdf">http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Guidclarif/ssc/methSSC_guid05.pdf</a>
/AMS.I.D/	Applied methodology of Grid connected renewable electricity generation, (AMS-I.D. version 17)
/AMS.III.D/	Applied methodology of Methane recovery in animal manure management systems (AMS-III.D. version 18)
/AMS.III.F/	Applied methodology of <i>Avoidance of methane emissions through</i>

Reference	Document
	<i>composting</i> (AMS-III.F. version 10 and 11)
<b>/AMS.III.AO/</b>	<i>Avoidance of methane emissions through composting (version 1)</i>
<b>/BEN/</b>	Economic Evaluation for Construction Project: Method and Parameters (Version 3) (evidence for financial benchmark)
<b>/BMG/</b>	CDM Executive Board: <i>Guidance for request for deviation titled "Application of AM0005 and AMS-I.D in China"</i> , dated 1 December 2005 <a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/deviations/87512">http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/deviations/87512</a>
<b>/CEPY/</b>	Editorial Committee of China Electric Power Yearbooks: China Electric Power Yearbooks 2006 – 2010.
<b>/CESY/</b>	National Bureau of Statistics and NDRC: China Energy Statistical Yearbooks 2008, 2009 & 2010.
<b>/CPM/</b>	TÜV NORD JI / CDM CP Manual (incl. CP procedures and forms)
<b>/EIAL/</b>	Law of the People's Republic of China on Environmental Impact Assessment (President Decree No.77), issued by the president of P.R.China on 28 October 2002 and into force on 2003-09-01.. <a href="http://www.gov.cn/gongbao/content/2002/content_61822.htm">http://www.gov.cn/gongbao/content/2002/content_61822.htm</a>
<b>/GAIA/</b>	CDM Executive Board: Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis, version 05. <a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Guidclarif/reg/reg_guid03.pdf">http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Guidclarif/reg/reg_guid03.pdf</a>
<b>/GEF/</b>	NDRC: Chinese DNA's guidance for the determination of grid boundaries and emission factors, issued on 20 October 2011.
<b>/KP/</b>	Kyoto Protocol (1997)
<b>/MA/</b>	Decision 3/CMP. 1 (Marrakesh – Accords & Annex to decision (17/CP.7))
<b>/MOCP/</b>	Procedures for modalities of communication between project participants and the executive board (version 01, EB 45 Annex 59)
<b>/PoA-DDs-T/</b>	<b>CDM-SSC-PoA-DD</b> - Small-Scale CDM Programme of Activities Design Document form (version 01, EB 33 Annex 43) <b>CDM-SSC-CPA-DD</b> - Small-Scale CDM Programme Activity Design Document form (version 01, EB 33 Annex 44)
<b>/PoA-DDs-G/</b>	Guidelines for completing the SSC PoA DD, version 02.0, EB 67 Annex30. Guidelines for completing the SSC CPA DD, version 01.0, EB 66 Annex17.

Reference	Document
/PoAR/	<p>CDM Programme of Activities Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Manual (version 01.2; EB55 Annex 1, esp. para 165 – 168)</li> <li>2. “Procedures for registration of a programme of activities as a single CDM project activity and issuance of certified emission reductions for a programme of activities” (version 04.1, EB 55 Annex 38) (the “PoA Procedures”);</li> <li>3. “Clarifications regarding the procedures for registration of a programme of activities as a single CDM project activity and issuance of certified emission reductions for a programme of activities” (version 01, EB 60 Annex 26)</li> <li>4. “Procedures for review of erroneous inclusion of a CPA” (version 03, EB 61 Annex 22) (the “CPA Review Procedures”)</li> <li>5. Guidelines on assessment of de-bundling for SSC project activities (version 03, EB54 Annex 13)</li> <li>6. “Procedures for approval of the application of multiple methodologies to a programme of activities” (version 01; EB 47 Annex 31) (the “Multi-Meth Approval Procedures”);</li> <li>7. Guidelines for demonstrating additionality of microscale project activities (version 04, EB 68 Annex 26)</li> <li>8. Standard for demonstration of additionality of GHG emission reductions achieved by a programme of activities (version 01.0, EB 63 Annex 2)</li> <li>9. Standard for the development of eligibility criteria for the inclusion of a project activity as a CPA under the PoA (version 01.0, EB 63 Annex 3)</li> <li>10. Standard for application of multiple CDM methodologies for a programme of activities (version 01.0, EB 63 Annex 4)</li> <li>11. Implementation plan for standards for programme of activities (version 01.0, EB 64 Annex 2)</li> <li>12. Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities (version 03.0, EB 69 Annex 4)</li> <li>13. Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities (version 02.1, EB 70 Annex 5)</li> </ol>
/SHCL/	<p>State Environmental Protection Administration: <i>Interim Measures for stakeholder participation in EIA (Huan Fa [2006]No.28)</i>, issued on 2006-02-14 and into effect on 2006-03-18.</p>
/SSCG/	<p>General Guidelines to SSC CDM methodologies (version 19, EB 69 Annex 27)</p>
/Standr/	<p>Ministry of Agriculture of the People's Republic of China: Technical Codes for</p>

Reference	Document
	<p>Biogas Engineering (NY/T 1220.1-2006 to 1220.5-2006), issued on 2006-12-06 and into force on 2007-02-01</p> <p>Part 1: Process Design, NY/T 1220.1-2006</p> <p>Part 2: Design of Biogas Supply, NY/T 1220.2-2006</p> <p>Part 3: Construction and Acceptance, 1220.3-2006</p> <p>Part 4: Operation and Maintenance, 1220.4-2006</p> <p>Part 5: Evaluation of Quality, 1220.5-2006</p> <p>GB-24500-2009: The minimum allowable values of energy efficiency and energy efficiency grades of industrial boilers</p>
/Tier2/	Tier 2 approach to estimate CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from manure management, Chapter 10 “Emissions from Livestock and Manure Management”, under the volume 4 “Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use” of the “2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories”
/TOOLF/	Methodological tool “Project emissions from flaring”, version 2.0.0
/TOOLG/	Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, version 02.2.1
/TOOLL/	<p>Tool to calculate project or leakage CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fossil fuel combustion, version 02.</p> <p>Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from electricity consumption, version 01.</p>
/TOOLR/	Methodological tool “Project and leakage emissions from road transportation of freight”, version 1.0.0
/TOOLA/	Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality (version 6.0.0, EB65 Annex 21)
/VVM/	Validation and Verification Manual (Version 1.2; EB 55 Annex 1)
/VVS/	Validation and Verification Standard (Version 2.0 and 03.0; EB 65 Annex 4 and EB 70 Annex 3)

**Table 7-3: Websites used**

Reference	Link	Organisation
/baidu/	<p>1. <a href="http://baike.baidu.com/view/7627.htm">http://baike.baidu.com/view/7627.htm</a></p> <p>2. <a href="http://baike.baidu.com/view/43456.htm">http://baike.baidu.com/view/43456.htm</a></p>	<p>1. Baidu website: Introduction on Sichuan province</p> <p>2. Baidu website: Introduction on biogas utilization technology</p>
/dna/	1. <a href="http://cdm.ccchina.gov.cn/e">http://cdm.ccchina.gov.cn/e</a>	1. National Development and Reform

Reference	Link	Organisation
	nglish/index.asp 2.http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/default.aspx	Commission (DNA of P.R. China) 2. Environment Agency (DNA of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)
/gov/	<a href="http://english.gov.cn/">http://english.gov.cn/</a>	The Central People's Government of the P.R China
/cd4cdm/	<a href="http://www.cd4cdm.org">www.cd4cdm.org</a>	UNEP Riso Centre
/ipcc/	<a href="http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp">www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp</a>	IPCC publications
/unfccc/	<a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int">http://cdm.unfccc.int</a>	UNFCCC

**Table 7-4:** List of interviewed persons

Reference	Mol <sup>1</sup>	Date		Name	Organisation / Function
/IM01/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Wang Hai	Chengdu Oasis Science & Technology Co., Ltd. / General manager
/IM01/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ms	Fu Yinyin	Oasis Science & Technology Development Beijing Co., Ltd. / Project manager
/IM01/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Henning Huenteler	UPM Umwelt-Projekt-Management GmbH / Vice General manager
/IM02/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Wang Zhibing	Sichuan Province Development and Reform Commission / officer
/IM02/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Wei Qinglin	Sichuan Province Environmental Protection Bureau / officer
/IM02/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Deng Liping	Sichuan Province Agricultural Bureau / Officer
/IM02/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Qu Feng	Sichuan Province Rural Energy Department / Officer
/IM02/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Yin Xianzhi	Sichuan Province Rural Energy Department / Officer
/IM02/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Ding Rui	Sichuan Province Rural Energy Department / Officer
/IM02/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Song Yumin	Sichuan Province Rural Energy Department / Officer

Reference	Mol <sup>1</sup>	Date		Name	Organisation / Function
/IM02/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Cai Jian	Zizhong County Development and Reform Commission / officer
/IM02/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Chen Yong	Zizhong County Rural Energy Department / officer
/IM02/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ms	Liu Bing	Zizhong County Environmental Protection Bureau / officer
/IM02/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Zhu Kunlin	Shuikoumiao village, Shuanghe town, Zizhong County, Neijiang city, Sichuan province / resident
/IM02/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Jiang Yunqing	Shuikoumiao village, Shuanghe town, Zizhong County, Neijiang city, Sichuan province / resident
/IM03/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Liu Xuzhong	Zizhong Duokang Swine Farm Co., Ltd. / Vice general manager
/IM03/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Zhang Yiyong	Zizhong Duokang Swine Farm Co., Ltd. / Production manager
/IM03/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Luo Jianhua	Zizhong Duokang Swine Farm Co., Ltd. / Construction manager
/IM03/	V	2012-03-26 to 2012-03-31	<input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ms	Zhang Xiufen	Zizhong Duokang Swine Farm Co., Ltd. / Financial manager

<sup>1)</sup> Means of Interview: (Telephone, E-Mail, Visit)

# ANNEX

- A1:** Validation Protocol
- A2:** Assessment of Baseline Identification
- A3:** Assessment of Financial Parameters
- A4:** Assessment of Barrier analysis
- A5:** Outcome of the GSCP
- A6:** Eligibility Criteria Assessment
- A7:** Appointment certificates of the team members

## ANNEX 1: VALIDATION PROTOCOL

**Table A-1-1: CDM-POA-DD Requirements Checklist**

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<b>A. General Description of the Programme of Activities</b>				
<b>A.1. Title of the PoA</b>	<i>Document information shall be checked</i>			
A.1.1. Are title, current version number and the date of document completion given in section A.1 of the PoA-DD?	<p><i>Description:</i> The title of the PoA-DD, the version number and the date of completion are appropriately provided under section A.1 of PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> During the document review, the PoA-DD has been checked against PoA-DD template.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> No incompleteness has been identified, the requirement is fulfilled.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoA-DDs-T/	OK	OK
A.1.2. Has the latest version of the CDM-SSC-POA-DD form been applied? (EB 55 Annex 1, § 55) <i>The latest version is available at</i> <a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/PDDs_Forms/PoA/index.html">http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/PDDs_Forms/PoA/index.html</a>	<p><i>Description:</i> The latest version 01 of the CDM-SSC-PoA-DD form has been correctly applied.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> During the document review, the PoA-DD has been cross-checked against PoA-DD template version 01.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The latest version 01 of CDM-SSC-PoA-DD template was applied and the requirement is fulfilled.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoA-DDs-T/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>A.1.3. Has the POA-DD been duly filled w.r.t. all sections in accordance with the latest guidance(s) and procedures and all information are consistently described?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §§ 56, 57)</p> <p><i>As currently no guidelines for completing the PoA-DD are available the guidelines for completing the LSC/ SSC project shall be considered where deemed applicable.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> As per EB55 Annex 1 §§ 56, 57, the PDD should be completed in accordance with the applicable CDM requirements for completing PDDs. Thus, the requirements stipulated in CDM-SSC-PoA-DD form should be fulfilled. The PoA-DD has been duly filled in accordance with the requirements of CDM-SSC-PoA-DD form.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> During the document review, the PoA-DD has been cross-checked against the CDM-SSC-PoA-DD form version 01.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> No noncompliance has been identified and the requirement is fulfilled.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoA-DDs-T/	OK	OK
<b>A.2. Description of the PoA</b>	<i>Description regarding the general operating and implementing framework, the policy measure and the voluntary action shall be checked</i>			
<p>A.2.1. Has a sufficient description of general operating and implementing framework of the PoA been given?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 38, § 6)</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The general operating and implementing framework of the PoA has been set and almost sufficiently described in the PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA-DD has been checked against the paragraph 6 of Annex 38 EB 55.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The description of operating and implementing framework of the PoA is sufficient. But, some information is not clear and thus CAR PoA-A1 is raised.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	<del>CAR</del> <del>PoA-</del> A1	OK
<p>A.2.2. Is the PoA describing the policy/measure or stated goal that the PoA seeks to promote in a transparent and sufficient manner?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 38, §6 (c))</p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The stated goal of the PoA is described in the section A.2 of PoA-DD. But, it is not complete.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked against the paragraph 6(c) of Annex 38 EB 55. The representatives from</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>This encompasses incentive schemes and voluntary programmes, which leads to anthropogenic GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks.</i>	CME, consultancy, local government's officials and stakeholders were interviewed during onsite visit.  <i>Conclusion:</i> The description of the policy/measure is transparent and sufficient.			
A.2.3. Has a confirmation been given that the proposed PoA is a voluntary action by the coordinating/managing entity? (EB 55 Annex 38, §6(d))	<i>Description:</i> The section A.2 of PoA-DD states that the proposed PoA is implemented voluntarily by the C/ME. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The confirmation <sup>/CF/</sup> by C/ME is received and checked by the validation team. <i>Conclusion:</i> The confirmation <sup>/CF/</sup> by C/ME confirms that the proposed PoA is a voluntary action by C/ME.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /CF/	OK	OK
A.2.4. Will the PoA create other environmental or social benefits than GHG emission reductions? (EB 55 Annex 1, §§ 125 – 127) <i>Describe the other positive aspects not related to GHG emission reduction on the environment.</i>	<i>Description:</i> The PoA will create other environmental or social benefits than GHG emission reductions, including the following three aspects: 1) Improving the local environment and human health. 2) Diversifying energy supply. 3) Application of advanced technology. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The representatives from CME, consultancy, local government's officials and stakeholders were interviewed during onsite visit. The LoA from Chinese DNA confirms that the PoA shall assist China in achieving sustainable development <i>Conclusion:</i> The PoA will create other environmental or social benefits than GHG emission reductions.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /HCA/ /IM01/ /IM02/	OK	OK
A.2.5. Has information regarding the annual average emission reductions of the PoA or the	<i>Description:</i> This information regarding the annual average ERs (5,474 tCO <sub>2</sub> ) of the 1 <sup>st</sup> real case CPA has been indicated in PoA-	/PoA-DD/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
1 <sup>st</sup> CPA over the first crediting period been included in the description of the PoA? <i>PoA Requesting for Registration uploading step 4 requirement.</i>	DD. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA-DD has been checked against the DD of first specific CPA. <i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled	/CPA-DD-R/		
<b>A.3. CME and Participants of PoA</b>	<i>Description regarding the CME and the project participants shall be included</i>			
A.3.1. Does the section A.3 of the POA-DD include identification of the coordinating/managing entity (a private or public entity), Host Party(ies) and PoA participants? (EB 55 Annex 38, §4, 6 (a)) <i>Project participants may or may not be involved in one of the CPAs related to the PoA. The operators of individual CPAs are not required to be project participants. CDM programme participation is only recorded at the PoA level. (EB 55 Annex 38, §8)</i>	<i>Description:</i> The section A.3 of PoA-DD listed the following PPs from host Party and PP from Annex I Party. Chengdu Oasis Science & Technology Co., Ltd. from P.R. China China, which is also the CME. UPM Umwelt-Projekt-Management GmbH from United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section A.3 of PoA-DD has been checked against <i>EB 55 Annex 38, 6 (a) and the PoA-DD template.</i> <i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled. However CAR PoA-A9 has been raised due to inconsistency in name of CME.	/PoA-DD/ /PoA-DDs-T/	CAR PoA-A9	OK
A.3.2. Is there any Party directly involved as project participant, and if yes, is that Party's contact details included in annex 1 of the PoA-DD and is the information provided internally consistent with section A.3 of the PoA-DD? (EB 55 Annex 1, § 52)	<i>Description:</i> Any of host Party and Annex I Party does not wish to be considered as PP. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked and the representatives from CME, consultancy and local government's officials were interviewed during onsite visit. <i>Conclusion:</i> No Party was involved in the PoA as project participant.	/PoAR/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/	OK	OK
A.3.3. Has it been confirmed by the MOC that Coordinating/managing entity of the PoA	<i>Description:</i>	/PoAR/	CAR PoA-	OK

<b>Checklist Item</b> (incl. guidance for the validation team)	<b>Validation Team Comments</b> (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Draft Concl.</b>	<b>Final Concl.</b>
<p>communicates with the Board, and all Project participants information in the MoC is consistent with the PoA-DD? (EB 55 Annex 38, §11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Procedures for modalities of communication between project participants and the Executive Board shall apply, with the exception that the coordinating/managing entity shall be either sole or joint focal point for each area of communication. The limit of joint focal points for the programme shall be 5, or equal to the number of host Parties if greater than 5.</i></li> <li><i>Besides, as per the UNFCCC secretariat/CDM Team's request, following points shall also be checked by DOE before submitting request for registration:</i></li> <li><i>No modifications to the template/form (e.g., modifying or deleting sections of the form) should be made;</i></li> <li><i>Each document (MOC statement including the Annex 1) should be clearly dated;</i></li> <li><i>Title of the project and names of project participants and focal points should be fully consistent with those indicated in all other project documentation submitted at the request for registration stage (e.g., PDD, LOAs, etc.);</i></li> <li><i>Focal point scopes should be clearly and correctly indicated (e.g., one focal point entity cannot be designated with 'sole' authority while another focal point entity is designated with 'joint' authority for the same scope);</i></li> <li><i>Contact details and specimen signatures of focal point entities including those of project participants in Annex 1 should be correctly entered:</i></li> <li><i>only one telephone, fax, e-mail contact should be entered per authorized signatory. In cases where additional contact details are included, only the first indicated information will be taken into account and only the official business address of the proposed entity should be provided on the F-CDM-MOC form;</i></li> <li><i>the Statement of Agreement in Section 3 should be signed by</i></li> </ul>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All requirements below have been fulfilled by the submitted MoC at the time of requesting registration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) The MoC confirms that the CME of the PoA communicates with the CDM Executive Board;</li> <li>(2) The CME is either sole or joint focal point for each area of communication;</li> <li>(3) Number of joint focal points for the PoA is no more than 5, or equal to the number of host Parties if greater than 5.</li> <li>(4) No modifications to the template/form have been made;</li> <li>(5) Each document (MOC statement including the Annex 1) have been clearly dated;</li> <li>(6) Title of the project and names of CME and project participants and focal points have been fully consistent with those indicated in all other project documentation submitted at the request for registration stage (e.g., PDD, LOAs, etc.);</li> <li>(7) Focal point scopes have been clearly and correctly indicated;</li> <li>(8) Contact details and specimen signatures of focal point entities including those of project participants in Annex 1 have been correctly entered.</li> <li>(9) All inputs are typed in without hand-written.</li> </ol> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not all requirements above have been fulfilled by the submitted MoC at the time of requesting registration and following issues have been identified and corrections are needed:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At time of writing this draft validation report the MoC has not yet been submitted by the PP to the validation team, thus a finding is raised. After receiving the MoC, all requirements above will be checked by the validation team before closing this finding.</p>	/PoAR/ /MOCP/ /IM01/ /IM02/	A2	

<b>Checklist Item</b> (incl. guidance for the validation team)	<b>Validation Team Comments</b> (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Draft Concl.</b>	<b>Final Concl.</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>one authorized signatory for each project participant; signatures made available in Section 3 should correspond to those indicated in the related Annex 1 document;</li> <li>focal point entities who are not designated as project participants should not sign Section 3.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked and the representatives from CME and consultancy were interviewed during onsite visit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-A2 is raised.</p>			
<p>A.3.4. Have the coordinating/managing entity and all Project Participants listed in section A.3 of the POA-DD obtained letter of approvals on their participation in the PoA respectively?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 38, §9) (EB 55 Annex 1 §44, 51, 52)</p> <p><i>Indicate whether a letter of approval has been received, with a clear reference to the supporting documentation.</i></p> <p><i>Indicate whether this letter was provided to the validation team by the project participants or directly by the DNA.</i></p> <p><i>Letters of approval shall be issued in accordance with the guidance provided by the CDM Executive Board (EB16, Annex 6)</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The LoA from host Party (China) has been received from CME. But, the LoA from Annex I Party (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) have not been received.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The Chinese LoA has been checked by the validation team and the representatives from CME and consultancy were interviewed during onsite visit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-A3 is raised.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /HCA/ /IM01/ /IM02/	CAR PoA- A3	OK
<p>A.3.5. Does each of the written approvals confirm the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) that the corresponding party is a Party to the Kyoto Protocol;</li> <li>ii) that the participation is voluntary;</li> <li>iii) that the project contributes to the sustainable development in the country (only for host country approval(s));</li> </ul>	<p><i>Description:</i> The LoA from host Party (China) confirms the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) that China is a Party to the Kyoto Protocol;</li> <li>ii) that the participation is voluntary;</li> <li>iii) that the PoA contributes to the sustainable development in China;</li> <li>iv) that the project participant's information is exactly the same as in the PoA-DD;</li> </ul>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /HCA/ /IM01/ /IM02/	CAR PoA- A3	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>iv) that the project participant's information is exactly the same as in the PoA-DD;</p> <p>v) that the PoA title referred in the approvals is consistent with the one in the POA-DD submitted for registration, or is there an additional specification of the PoA, e.g. POA-DD version number;</p> <p>vi) that the CME is authorized for its coordination and implementation of the PoA from each Host Party (only for host country approval(s));</p> <p>vii) that the approvals are unconditional w.r.t. the above points?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1 §45 (a-d), 46, EB 55 Annex 38 §10)</p> <p><i>CME's coordination of the PoA can be authorized in the letters of approval from each Host Party or in a separate confirmation letter from each Host Party.</i></p>	<p>v) that the PoA title referred in the approval is consistent with the one in the POA-DD.</p> <p>vi) that the CME is authorized for its coordination and implementation of the PoA from China;</p> <p>vii) that the approval is unconditional w.r.t. the above points</p> <p>But, the LoA from Annex I Party (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) have not been received.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The Chinese LoA and PoA DD have been checked by the validation team and the representatives from CME and consultancy were interviewed during onsite visit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-A3 is raised.</p>			
<p>A.3.6. Are there any other project participants approved but not listed in the POA-DD? (EB 55 Annex 1, § 52)</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The LoA from host Party (China) has been received from CME. But, the LoA from Annex I Party (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) have not been received.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked by the validation team against Chinese LoA and the representatives from CME and consultancy were interviewed during onsite visit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> As Annex I LoA is pending CAR PoA-A3 has been raised.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /HCA/ /IM01/ /IM02/</p>	<p><del>CAR</del> <del>PoA-</del> A3</p>	<p>OK</p>

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>A.3.7. Are the approvals issued from organisations listed as DNAs on the UNFCCC CDM website?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1 §§ 44, 47, 48, 49 (b), 49 (c), 53)</p> <p><i>Indicate the means of validation employed to assess the authenticity, i.e. in case of doubt whether LoA has been verified with the DNA. Further describe which entity submitted the LoA for validation.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The LoA from host Party (China) is issued by Chinese DNA of National Development and Reform Commission. But, the LoA from Annex I Party (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) have not been received.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The Chinese NDRC has been checked by the validation team against the one listed in the UNFCCC webised.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> As Annex I LoA is pending CAR PoA-A3 has been raised.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /HCA/ /dna/ /unfccc/ /IM01/ /IM02/</p>	<p>CAR <del>PoA-</del> A3</p>	<p>OK</p>
<b>A.4. Technical description of the PoA</b>	<i>Location, boundaries, technical description, eligibility criterion, additionality, operational and management plan as well as monitoring plan shall be addressed.</i>			
<b>A.4.1. Location of the PoA</b>				
<b>A.4.1.1. Host parties</b>	<i>Location of the PoA shall be addressed and checked.</i>			
<p>A.4.1.1. Have all host countries been correctly listed in section A.4.1.1 of the PoA-DD?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, § 52)</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> There is only one host Party of China. The host Party (China) is listed in the section 4.1.1 of PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked during onsite visit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> No incompleteness has been identified and the requirement is fulfilled.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
<b>A.4.1.2. Physical / Geographical boundary</b>	<i>Assessment of physical / geographical boundaries of the PoA and application of national and sectoral policies / regulations within the defined boundary.</i>			
A.4.1.2.1. Does the POA-DD include a definition	<i>Description:</i> In the PoA-DD, the project boundary was defined as	/PoA-DD/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
of the boundary for the PoA in terms of a geographical area (e.g., municipality, region within a country, country or several countries) within which all CPAs included in the PoA will be implemented? (EB 55 Annex 38, §6(b))	Sichuan province. The same is verified by the validation team by checking the public information. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked against the public information about Sichuan province <sup>/baidu/</sup> . <i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled.	/PoAR/ /baidu/		
A.4.1.2.2. Has a clear map with English translations been provided, which unambiguously delineates the geographical boundary of the PoA?	<i>Description:</i> In the PoA-DD, a map with English translations has been provided, which can delineates the geographical boundary of the PoA. But, the map is not clear. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked against the public information about Sichuan province <sup>/baidu/</sup> . <i>Conclusion:</i> This requirement will be checked after CAR PoA-A4 is closed.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /baidu/	CAR <del>PoA-</del> A4	OK
A.4.1.2.3. Are all applicable national and/or sectoral policies and regulations within that chosen boundary reflected in the determination of the baseline? (EB 55 Annex 38, §6(b))	<i>Description:</i> It is not applicable because the baseline scenario is directly determined as per the small-scale methodologies of AMS-III.D. version 18. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked against the small-scale methodologies of AMS-III.D. version 18.. <i>Conclusion:</i> This requirement is not applicable for this PoA.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /AMS.III. D/	N/A	
<b>A.4.2. Description of a typical CPA</b>	<i>The description of the technology and the eligibility criteria shall be checked.</i>			
A.4.2. Has the POA-DD unambiguously defined a CDM programme activity (CPA) under the PoA? (EB 55 Annex 38, §6)	<i>Description:</i> The section A.4.2.1 of PoA DD has unambiguously defined a typical CPA under the PoA and the technology used by the CPA includes four stages: Stage 1 Biogas production in anaerobic digesters:	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
	<p>Stage 2: Biogas collection and purification:</p> <p>Stage 3: Biogas utilization/destruction</p> <p>Stage 4: Land application of sludge:</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked. The representatives from CME, consultancy, local government's officials and stakeholders were interviewed during onsite visit. The first real case CPA was investigated by the validation team during onsite visit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> A typical CPA under the PoA has unambiguously been defined in the PoA DD.</p>	/IM02/		
<b>A.4.2.1. Technology or measures to be employed by the CPA</b>	<i>The description of the technology / measures shall be checked.</i>			
<p>A.4.2.1.1. Does the PoA-DD contain a clear, accurate and complete description of the CPAs with regard to the technology / measures to be used?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §§ 58, 59; EB 55 Annex 38, §6(f))</p> <p><i>The PoA-DD shall contain a clear description of a typical CPA which provides the reader with a clear understanding of the precise nature of the project activity and the technology / measure to be used.</i></p> <p><i>Describe the process undertaken to validate the accuracy and completeness of the CPA description.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The section A.4.2.1 of PoA DD has an accurate and complete description of the technology/measures used by the CPA.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked. The representatives from CME, consultancy, local government's officials and stakeholders were interviewed during onsite visit. The technology used by the CPA was investigated by the validation team during onsite visit and cross-checked against with the biogas technology published in the well known website<sup>/baidu/</sup>.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The description of the technology/measures used by the CPA is accurate and complete.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/ /baidu/</p>	OK	OK
A.4.2.1.2. Is this description in accordance with	<p><i>Description:</i> The description of the technology/measures used by the CPA is in accordance with the real situation. The CPA is of</p>	/PoA-DD/	<del>OK</del>	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
the real situation or, in case of greenfield projects, is it most likely that the project will be implemented acc. to the project description? (EB 55 Annex 1, §§63, 64)	Greenfield and will be implemented as per this description.  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked. The representatives from CME, consultancy, local government's officials and stakeholders were interviewed during onsite visit. The technology used by the CPA was investigated by the validation team during onsite visit and cross-checked against with the biogas technology published in the well known website <sup>/baidu/</sup>  <i>Conclusion:</i> This requirement is/will be fulfilled by the implementers.  Nevertheless, some information is not clear and the CAR PoA-A5 is raised.	/PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/ /baidu/	<del>PoA-</del> A5	
A.4.2.1.3. In case the project involves alteration of the existing installation or process, is a clear description available regarding the differences between the project and the pre-project situation? (EB 55 Annex 1, §§63, 64) <i>Describe the steps taken to validate this issue.</i>	<i>Description:</i> It is not applicable because all the biogas digesters of the PoA are of Greenfield.  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked. The representatives from CME, consultancy, local government's officials and local stakeholders were interviewed during onsite visit. The biogas digesters used by the CPA was investigated by the validation team during onsite visit. .  <i>Conclusion:</i> This requirement is not applicable.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/	N/A	
A.4.2.1.4. Does the project use state of the art technology or would the technology result in a significantly better performance than any commonly used technologies in the host country?  <i>Describe the process undertaken to assess the state of the art technology.</i>	<i>Description:</i> The technologies used by the PoA are domestic technologies. During onsite visit, the CME confirms that the Technical Codes for Biogas Engineering (NY/T 1220.1-2006 to 1220.5-2006) will applied to the PoA.  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked. The representatives from CME, consultancy, local government's officials and local stakeholders were interviewed during onsite visit. The Chinese Codes for Biogas Engineering <sup>/Standr/</sup> were also checked.	/PoA-DD/ /IM01/ /IM02/ /Standr/	CAR <del>PoA-</del> A5	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
	<i>Conclusion:</i> The PoA uses the state of the art technology. Nevertheless, the CAR PoA-A5 is raised.			
<b>A.4.2.2. Eligibility criteria for inclusion of a CPA in the PoA</b>	<i>The eligibility criteria shall be checked for appropriateness and completeness</i>			
<p>A.4.2.2.1. Has the definition of eligibility criteria for inclusion of a CPA under the PoA included the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) appropriate criteria for demonstration of additionality of the CPA, and</li> <li>ii) all type and/or extent of information (e.g. criteria, indicators, variables, parameters or measurements) that shall be provided by each CPA in order to ensure its eligibility?</li> </ul> <p>(EB 55 Annex 38, §6(g))</p> <p><i>Assess the specified eligibility criteria in the POA-DD in order to determine whether or not these criteria are sufficient to ensure that all CPAs would comply with the CDM requirements applicable to the PoA, these</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> All eligibility criteria have been clearly described, esp. w.r.t. the following points, and detailed assessments are included in Annex 6 of this report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Methodology applicability requirement of the CPA</li> <li>(2) Other methodological / tool requirement of the CPA,</li> <li>(3) Technical requirement of the CPA, including procurement</li> <li>(4) Geographic requirement of the CPA boundary</li> <li>(5) De-bundling criterion for the CPA</li> <li>(6) Confirmation of no double-counting, e.g. to avoid the case of including a new CPA that has been already registered either as CDM project activity or as a CPA of another PoA, as well as internal double counting within all CPAs of this PoA</li> <li>(7) Contractual provisions to ensure that those operating the CPA are aware and have agreed that their activity is being subscribed to the PoA</li> <li>(8) Public funding requirement of the CPA</li> <li>(9) CPA start date not before PoA webhosting date</li> </ul>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/ /FSR/ /EIA/	CAR PoA- A6	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p><i>requirements shall include, inter alia,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>the means of demonstrating the additionality of the CPA and</i></li> <li><i>the applicability of the applied methodology.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The eligibility criteria represents an essential element of ensuring the smooth functioning of programmatic CDM, therefore the validation team may raise CARs which ensure the ease of application of the eligibility criteria. (EB 55 annex 1 para 167).</i></p> <p><i>Detailed assessment on the final criteria are included in the dedicated Annex A-6 of this report.</i></p>	<p>(10) CPA crediting period not exceed the PoA end date (11) Local stakeholder consultation prior to inclusion of the CPA (12) Environmental analysis requirement of the CPA (13) The additionality assessment criteria for each CPA (as per E.5 particularly in E.5.2 of the PoA-DD are met (14) Monitoring requirement of the CPA, including sampling and scrapping is applicable (15) The CPA shall be approved by the coordinating entity (16) Each eligibility criterion has specified at least one supporting document to be submitted at the stage of CPA inclusion.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not all eligibility criteria have been clearly described and following findings have been raised accordingly (after successful closure of all the findings, detailed assessments are to be included in Annex 6 of the final report):</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked. The representatives from CME, consultancy, local government's officials and local stakeholders were interviewed during onsite visit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-A6 is raised.</p>			
<b>A.4.3. Assessment and Demonstration of Additionality of the PoA as a whole</b>	<i>The assessment of additionality shall be validated with focus on whether the PoA itself is not a likely baseline scenario.</i>			
<p>A.4.3. Has it been demonstrated that in the absence of the CDM one of the following would have occurred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>the proposed voluntary coordinated action would not be implemented, or</i></li> <li><i>the mandatory policy/regulation would be</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Description:</i> The stated goal of the related CDM programme activity is defined in the PoA-DD and PoA-DD tries to demonstrate the following situation in the absence of the programme activity:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed voluntary measure would not be implemented. <input type="checkbox"/> The mandatory policy/regulation would be systematically not enforced and that non-compliance with those requirements is</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/</p>	<p>CAR PoA- A7</p>	<p>OK</p>

<b>Checklist Item</b> (incl. guidance for the validation team)	<b>Validation Team Comments</b> (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Draft Concl.</b>	<b>Final Concl.</b>
<p><i>systematically not enforced and that non-compliance with those requirements is widespread in the country/region, or</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>that the PoA will lead to a greater level of enforcement of the existing mandatory policy /regulation. (EB 55 Annex 38, §6(e))</i></li> </ul>	<p>widespread in the country/region.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The PoA will lead to a greater level of enforcement of the existing mandatory policy /regulation.</p> <p>The option 1 of “the proposed voluntary coordinated action would not be implemented in the absence of CDM” was selected to demonstrate the additionality of the PoA on the basis of the outcome of CPA level additionality demonstration.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The method that the demonstration of PoA additionality is based on the outcome of CPA level additionality demonstration is considered reasonable as per the para 7 of EB 70 annex 5 “Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities”. The para 7 of EB 70 annex 5 was checked by the validation team.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The demonstration of the PoA is deemed correct. But, the CAR PoA-A7 is raised regarding the minor issue.</p>			
<b>A.4.4. Operational, management and monitoring plan for the PoA</b>	<i>The operational and management arrangements shall be assessed</i>			
<b>A.4.4.1. Operational and management plan</b>	<i>The operational and management plan shall be assessed.</i>			
A.4.4.1.1. Has the coordinating/managing entity established the operational and management arrangements for the implementation of the PoA, which includes a record keeping system for each CPA under the PoA?	<p><i>Description:</i> The operational and management arrangements established by CME for the implementation of the PoA include four aspects.</p> <p>(i) A record keeping system for each CPA under the PoA;</p> <p>(ii) A system/procedure to avoid double accounting e.g. to avoid the</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>(EB 55 Annex 38, §6(i))</p> <p><i>The arrangements shall be suitable and sufficient to ensure that the CME:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>will have control of all records and information related to the implementation of individual CPAs and</i></li> <li><i>will be in a position to ensure each CPA is being operated in accordance with the specific requirements of the programme.</i></li> </ul> <p>(EB55 annex 1, para 166)</p>	<p>case of including a new CPA that has been already registered either as a CDM project activity or as a CPA of another PoA;</p> <p>(iii) The SSC-CPA included in the PoA is not a de-bundled component of another CDM programme activity (CPA) or CDM project activity.</p> <p>(iv) The provisions to ensure that those operating the CPA are aware of and have agreed that their activity is being subscribed to the PoA;</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked. The representatives from CME, consultancy, local government's officials and local stakeholders were interviewed during onsite visit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>			
<p>A.4.4.1.2. Are procedures identified for data management?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1 123 (b))</p> <p><i>Check whether appropriate provisions are considered for data management including responsibilities, what records to keep, storage area of records and how to process performance documentation.</i></p> <p><i>Check further the data archiving provisions for the project activity and ensure that provisions are made to archive data for the whole crediting period + 2 years.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The procedures for data management are identified in PoA DD, but are not complete.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked against the PoA standard.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-A8 is raised.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/</p>	<p>CAR PoA- A8</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>A.4.4.1.3. Has the arrangements included a system/ procedure to avoid double accounting, e.g., to avoid the case of including a new CPA that has been already</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The arrangements for the external double counting and internal double counting have been described in PoA DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked against the PoA standard.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
registered either as CDM project activity or as a CPA of another PoA? (EB 55 Annex 38, §6(i))	<i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled.	/IM02/		
A.4.4.1.4. Does a typical CPA qualify as a small scale CDM project activity as defined in decision 4 / CMP.1 annex II? (EB 55 Annex 1, § 136 (a) and EB 54 Annex 13 § 3) <i>Check if the proposed CPAs qualify within the threshold of one or more of the three possible types of small scale project activities.</i>	<i>Description:</i> This requirement is not applicable for the operation and management plan as per EB 55 Annex 38, §6(i). EB 55 Annex 1, § 136 (a) regarding the thresholds of SSC is not relevant for the operation and management plan. EB54 Annex13 § 3 regarding the debundling is not relevant for the operation and management plan. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> EB 55 Annex 1, § 136 (a) and EB54 Annex13 § 3 were checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is not applicable.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	N/A	
A.4.4.1.5. Has it been ensured that the small scale CPA is not a de-bundled component of another CPA or large scale CDM project activity? (EB 55 Annex 1, § 136 (c)) <i>Describe the steps taken to validate this issue. Pl. refer to the Compendium of guidance on debundling (EB 54, Annex 13).</i>	<i>Description:</i> The the arrangements for the debundling check has been descrbied in PoA DD. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked against the PoA standard.. <i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/	OK	OK
A.4.4.1.6. Has the CME made provisions to ensure that the CPA operators are aware of and have agreed that their activity is being subscribed to the PoA?	<i>Description:</i> This provision has been descrbied in PoA DD. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked against the PoA standard. <i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>Describe the steps undertaken by the CME. Check, if deemed necessary, appropriate provisions to meet training needs are in place.</i>		/IM02/		
<p>A.4.4.1.7. Does the management plan make provisions for meeting training and maintenance needs of the implementation of the PoA?</p> <p><i>Describe the process undertaken to assess the maintenance and training needs.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> No provision for meeting training and maintenance needs of the implementation of the PoA, has been found in the PoA DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked against the PoA standard.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-A7 is raised.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/</p>	CAR PoA- A7	OK
<b>A.4.4.2. Monitoring plan</b>	<i>The PoA general monitoring plan shall be assessed.</i>			
<p>A.4.4.2.1. If the CME does not wish to have all CPAs verified, has a description of the proposed statistically sound sampling method/procedure to be used by DOEs for verification of the CPA GHG emission reductions been provided?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 38, §6(k))</p> <p><i>Please refer to "Standard for Sampling and Surveys for CDM project Activities and programme of activities (Version 03)" (EB 69 Annex 4)</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The CME opts for a sampling approach to be used by the DOE for verification of some CPAs under the PoA. But, the description of the sampling method/procedure is not described.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked. The section V of Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities (version 03.0, EB 69 Annex 4), and the paragraph 18 of Validation and Verification Standard (Version 03.0; EB 70 Annex 3), have been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> As all CPAs under this PoA will be monitored and PoA states this, this criterion is fulfilled.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /VVS/ /IM01/ /IM02/</p>	Ok	OK
<p>A.4.4.2.2. In case the CME opts for a verification method that verifies each CPA, is there a transparent system defined and described in</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Not applicable as the CME opts for a sampling approach to be used by the DOE for verification of some CPAs under the PoA.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/</p>	N/A	

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>the PoA-DD that ensures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) no double accounting of ER occurs among all units within all CPAs, and</li> <li>ii) the verification status can be determined any time for each CPA?</li> </ul> <p><i>Please assess the provisions made by the CME.</i></p>	<p><i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.</p>			
<b>A.4.5. Public funding of the PoA</b>	<i>In case of public funding this should not lead to diversion of ODA to the PoA</i>			
<p>A.4.5.1. Is there a confirmation that official development assistance has not been diverted to the implementation of the PoA in case public funding is used?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 38, §6(n))</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The section A.4.5 states that there is no public funding from Annex-I parties for the programme of activities. Thus, the confirmation is not necessary.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked. The representatives from CME, consultancy, local government's officials and local stakeholders were interviewed during onsite visit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/</p>	OK	OK
<p>A.4.5.2. Has it been confirmed whether there are any bilateral or multilateral fund project participants involved in the PoA, and if yes, the following information shall be provided to the DOE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full official name of the entity fund;</li> <li>• Name of company managing the fund;</li> <li>• Party(ies) authorizing participation of the Fund;</li> <li>• DNA approval of voluntary participation in the PoA and confirmation that it has ratified the</li> </ul>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Not applicable as the section A.4.5 states that there is no public funding from Annex-I parties for the programme of activities. Thus, this means that no bilateral or multilateral fund is involved in the PoA.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked. The representatives from CME, consultancy, local government's officials and local stakeholders were interviewed during onsite visit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is not applicable.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/</p>	N/A	

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>Kyoto Protocol;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DNA authorization of the fund to the project participant (can be combined with the approval document) (EB 55 Annex 1, para 100 (b))</li> </ul> <p><i>Multilateral funds do not necessarily require written approval from each participant's DNA. However those not providing a written approval may be giving up some of their rights and privileges in terms of being a Party involved in the project. (Glossary of CDM terms (version 5))</i></p>				
<b>B. Duration of the PoA</b>				
<b>B.1. Starting Date of the PoA</b>	<i>The starting date shall be assessed</i>			
<p>B.1.1. What is the starting date of the PoA? Is it reasonable?</p> <p><i>The crediting period of the PoA should be renewed every seven years (every 20 years for A/R PoA) from the start date of the lifetime of the PoA. Life time of the PoA starts on the date specified in the PoA-DD section B.1 or on the date of registration, whichever is later. In case of small-scale PoA, the start date must be stated as at least 4 weeks after the estimated submission date; In case of large-scale PoA, the start date must be stated as at least 8 weeks after the estimated submission date.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The starting date of the PoA is defined as 2012-11-01, which is 4 weeks after the estimated submission date.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is fulfilled. However CAR PoA-B1 is raised.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	CAR PoA- B1	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>(PoA registration uploading requirements step 4)</i>				
<b>B.2. Length of the PoA</b>	<i>The length of the PoA shall be assessed</i>			
<p>B.2.1. What is the length/lifetime of the PoA? Is it reasonable?</p> <p><i>PoA duration should not exceeding 28 years (60 years for A/R) (EB 55 Annex 38, §6(h) and 7(d))</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The length of the PoA is 28 years which is consistent with EB 55 Annex 38, §6(h).</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked against EB 55 Annex 38, §6(h).</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/</p>	OK	OK
<b>C. Environmental Analysis</b>				
<b>C.1. Level of Environmental Analysis</b>	<i>The analysis shall be carried out either on PoA or CPA level</i>			
<p>C.1.1. Has it been clearly indicated on which level i.e. PoA level or CPA level, an environmental analysis has been carried out or will be carried out?</p> <p><i>(EB 55 Annex 38 § 6(l))</i> <i>Please check whether the indication is in line with the provided documentation.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> It is clearly indicated that the environmental analysis is done at CPA level.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked against EB 55 Annex 38 § 6(l).</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/</p>	OK	OK
<p>C.1.2. Has a justification sufficiently described in section C.1 of the PoA-DD on the choice of level at which the environmental analysis is undertaken?</p> <p><i>(EB 55 Annex 38 § 6(l))</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The justification is described in section C.1.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked. The officer from Sichuan Province Environmental Protection Bureau has been interviewed during onsite visit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/</p>	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<b>C.2. Documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts</b>	<i>The analysis shall be assessed</i>			
<p>C.2.1. Has an environmental analysis of the PoA as per requirements of the CDM modalities and procedures been undertaken and described in the POA-DD?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 38, §6(l))</p> <p><i>If this analysis is not undertaken for the PoA but is to be done at the CPA level this shall be described and reflected in the CDM-POA-DD and the CDM-CPA-DD</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The environmental analysis is undertaken at CPA level. The environmental analysis for each project farm included in CPA will be described and reflected in the specific CPA-DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/</p>	OK	OK
<p>C.2.2. Are transboundary environmental impacts considered in the analysis?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §§ 131 – 133)</p> <p><i>Check the documents and local official sources / expertise regarding transboundary environmental impacts.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Not applicable as EIA will be carried out at CPA level.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is not applicable.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/</p>	N/A	
<b>C.3. Environmental impact Analysis Requirements</b>	<i>It shall be assessed whether host Party laws / regulations require an EIA for a typical CPA</i>			
<p>C.3.1. Are there any Host Party laws/ regulations require for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for a typical CPA that will be included in the PoA?</p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The Law of the People's Republic of China on Environmental Impact Assessment was issued on 28 October 2002 and requires the EIA for construction project. But, the PoA DD states that an EIA is not required for biogas projects for thermal energy application,</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /EIAL/</p>	GL PoA- G1	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
(EB 55 Annex 1, § 136 (d)) <i>Check the relevant national environmental legislation.</i>	which is not consistent with Chinese law.  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked against Chinese law on EIA. The officer from Sichuan Province Environmental Protection Bureau has been interviewed during onsite visit.  <i>Conclusion:</i> This CL PoA-C1 is raised.	/IM01/ /IM02/		
C.3.2. In case an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is requested by the host party, has it been appropriately carried out and if applicable duly approved?  (EB 55 Annex 1, §§ 131 – 133) <i>Check the EIA and its approval, if applicable.</i>	<i>Description:</i> According to host country requirements an EIA or at least an EIA table has to be prepared and approved by local government.  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> By means of PoA-DD, interview with government authorities and CME besides CPA implementer besides host country legislation.  <i>Conclusion:</i> Related eligibility criterion is established as environmental assessment is done on CPA-level. However CL PoA-C1 is raised.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /EIAL/ /IM01/ /IM02/ /IM03/	CL PoA- C1	OK
<b>D. Stakeholders' comments</b>				
<b>D.1. Level of Local Stakeholder comments</b>	<i>The analysis shall be carried out either on PoA or CPA level</i>			
D.1.1. Has it been clearly indicated on which level i.e. PoA level or CPA level, local stakeholder comments have been or will be invited?  (EB 55 Annex 1, §§ 127– 129) <i>Please check whether the indication is in line with the provided documentation.</i>	<i>Description:</i> The local stakeholder comments have been invited at CPA level.  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked. The representatives from CME, consultancy, local government's officials and local stakeholders were interviewed during onsite visit.  <i>Conclusion:</i> The CPA level is selected for inviting the local stakeholder comments.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
D.1.2. Has a justification sufficiently described in section D.1 of the PoA-DD on the choice of level at which the local consultation is conducted? (EB 55 Annex 38 § 6(m))	<p><i>Description:</i> The justification is described in section D.1.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked. The representatives from CME, consultancy, local government's officials and local stakeholders were interviewed during onsite visit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/	OK	OK
D.1.3. Does the PoA-DD include provisions in case a stakeholder consultation process is required by regulations/laws in the host country, and if so, to ensure that the stakeholder consultation process is carried out in accordance with such regulations/ laws? (EB55 Annex38 § 6(m) &7(g) EB55 Annex1 § 128)	<p><i>Description:</i> As per Chinese regulation<sup>/SHCL/</sup>, the stakeholder consultation process is applicable for the projects having great impact on the environment. The CPAs under the PoA has a little impact on the environment and thus no stakeholder consultation process is required for the CPAs under the PoA. Nevertheless, the stakeholder consulting process for each farm included in CPA will be carried out.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD and Chinese regulation<sup>/SHCL/</sup> were checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is not applicable.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /SHCL/	N/A	
<b>D.2. Brief description how comments by local stakeholders have been invited and compiled.</b>	<i>The description shall be assessed.</i>			
D.2.1. With regard to the PoA, how have local stakeholders' comments been invited prior to the publication of the PDDs and compiled? (EB 55 Annex 38, §6(m); EB 55 Annex 1, §§128– 130) <i>If such comments are to be sought at the CPA level this shall be described and reflected in the POA-DD and the</i>	<p><i>Description:</i> The local stakeholder consultation is undertaken at CPA level. The stakeholder consulting process for each project farm included in CPA will be described and reflected in the specific CPA-DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p><i>CPA-DD.</i></p> <p><i>Check by means of document review and interviews with local stakeholders if and when a local stakeholder consultation process has been carried out, and whether comments by local stakeholders that can reasonably be considered relevant for the proposed CDM project activity, have been invited.</i></p>				
<b>D.3. Summary of the comments received</b>	<i>The description shall be assessed.</i>			
<p>D.3.1. With regard to the PoA, can the summary provided assessed as adequate and complete? (EB 55 Annex 1, §§ 128– 130)</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The local stakeholder consultation is undertaken at CPA level. The stakeholder comments received for each project farm included in CPA will be summarized and described in the specific CPA-DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	OK	OK
<b>D.4. Report on how due account was taken of comments received</b>	<i>The description shall be assessed.</i>			
<p>D.4.1. With regard to the PoA, has adequate due account been taken of comments received if any? (EB 55 Annex 1, §§ 128– 130)</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The local stakeholder consultation is undertaken at CPA level. The consideration for the comments received for each project farm included in CPA will be described and reflected in the specific CPA-DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	OK	OK
<b>E. Application of a Baseline and Monitoring</b>				

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<b>Methodology</b>				
<b>E.1. Title and reference of the applied methodology</b>				
<p>E.1.1. Does the PoA apply (an) approved, applicable and valid version of CDM methodology(ies) identical on the UNFCCC website?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §65, 71)</p> <p><i>The methodology should be approved by the EB for use in a PoA. Describe the steps to determine whether the methodology is correctly quoted and applied by comparing it with the actual text of the applicable version of the methodology available on the UNFCCC CDM website.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The AMS-III.D. version 18 was applied to the PoA and is the latest valid version. But, the tools and other methodologies to which the selected methodology refers are not indicated in the PoA DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The AMS-III.D. version 18 was cross-checked against the latest version in the UNFCCC website.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E1 is raised.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /AMS.III.D/ /unfccc/</p>	<p>CAR PoA- E1</p>	<p>OK</p>
<b>E.2. Justification of the methodology choice and its applicability to a CPA</b>	<i>The choice described shall be assessed</i>			
<p>E.2.1. Does a typical CPA apply a combination of approved methodologies? If so, has such combination been approved in accordance with “Procedures for approval of the application of multiple methodologies to a programme of activities”?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 38, §6(f) and EB 70 Annex 5, §28, 29)</p> <p><i>If a combination of approved methodologies is being applied this combination must be applied to all CPAs and must be applied in a consistent manner.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Not applicable as only AMS-III.D. version 18 was applied to the PoA and there is no combination of approved methodologies applied for the PoA.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked by the validation team.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is not applicable.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
E.2.2. Is the justification of the choice of the approved baseline and monitoring methodology(ies) for the typical CPA sufficient? (EB 55 Annex 38, §6(f))	<i>Description:</i> The justification of the choice of AMS-III.D. version 18 was carried out. The appropriateness of this justification is concluded in section E.2.3 below. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is fulfilled.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /AMS.III. D/	OK	OK
E.2.3. Can all applicability criteria in the methodology, the applied tools or any other methodology component referred to therein be sufficiently fulfilled by a typical CPA? (EB 55 Annex 1, §§66 (a), 66 (b), 68, 70, 75) <i>Describe for each applicability criterion listed in the selected approved methodology the steps taken to assess the information contained in the POA-DD.</i>	<i>Description:</i> The justifications are carried out for the applicability criteria of AMS-III.D. version 18. Each applicability criterion of AMS-III.D. version 18 was justified in PoA DD. But, some justifications are not sufficient. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The justifications in the PoA DD have been checked against each of the applicability criteria of AMS-III.D. version 18. <i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E2 is raised.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /AMS.III. D/	CAR <del>PoA-E1</del>	OK
E.2.4. Has a typical CPA been demonstrated as in accordance with all other PoA specific stipulations and requirement mentioned in the methodology and relevant tools/guidance, e.g., leakage? (EB 55 Annex 1, §70) <i>Describe the steps taken to check whether the proposed CPA meets all the other PoA specific stipulations and /or limitations mentioned in all sections of the approved methodology selected.</i>	<i>Description:</i> There is no other PoA specific stipulations and requirement mentioned in the methodology and relevant tools/guidance, which should be accounted for in the justification of the choice of the methodologies. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD, methodologies and POA-related regulations are checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is not applicable.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /AMS.III. D/	N/A	
<b>E.3. Description of the sources and gases included in the CPA boundary</b>	<i>Project Boundaries are the limits and borders defining the GHG emission reduction in project.</i>			

<b>Checklist Item</b> (incl. guidance for the validation team)	<b>Validation Team Comments</b> (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Draft Concl.</b>	<b>Final Concl.</b>
<p>E.3.1. Are the project's spatial boundaries (physical) of the CPAs to be included are clearly defined?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §§67 (a), 78 - 80)</p> <p><i>The PDD shall correctly describe the project boundary, including the physical delineation of the proposed CDM project activity included within the project boundary for the purpose of calculating project and baseline emissions for the proposed CDM project activity.</i></p> <p><i>Provide information on how the validation of the physical boundary has been performed either based on reviewed documented evidence or by describing what was observed/viewed during a site visit.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The boundary of a typical CPA is described in PoA DD. The geographic sites of all individual biogas systems included in the CPA define the CPA boundary. A biogas system consists of manure collection, generation, collection and destruction equipment. But, this defined boundary is not consistent with AMS-III. D version 18.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked, a CPA site has been visited and the CME and officials were interviewed during onsite visit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E3 is raised.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/	CAR PoA- E3	OK
<p>E.3.2. Are all sources and GHGs included in the project boundary as required in the applied methodology?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §§67 (a), 78 - 80)</p> <p><i>Provide information on how the validation of the GHGs and sources has been performed either based on reviewed documented evidence or by describing what was observed/viewed during a site visit.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The sources and GHGs in the boundary are described in the PoA DD, but do not comply with the requirements of AMS-III.D version 18.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked against AMS-III.D version 18. The CME has been interviewed during onsite visit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E3 is raised.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /AMS.III. D/ /IM01/ /IM02/	CAR PoA- E3	OK
<p>E.3.3. In case the methodology allows to choose whether a source and/or gas is to be included, is the choice sufficiently explained and justified?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §§67 (a), 78 - 80)</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Not applicable as there is not this kind of requirement in AMS-III.D version 18..</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The AMS-III.D version 18 was checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is not applicable.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /AMS.III. D/	N/A	

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>Confirm if the justification provided by the PPs is reasonable, based on assessment of supporting documented evidence provided by the PPs or by onsite observations.</i>				
E.3.4. Are provisions in place for the case that a CPA implementation might lead to GHG emissions within the project boundary which are expected to contribute more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emission reductions, which are not addressed by the methodology?  (EB 55 Annex 1, §77)	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Additional GHG emissions within the boundary, which are expected to contribute more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emission reductions and which are not addressed by the methodologies are not caused by the implementation of the PoA.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i></p> <p>The project activity is a state of the art technology. During onsite visit and CME interview, the potential such sources of GHG emissions were not observed</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>No additional GHG emissions which are not addressed by the methodology occur.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /IM01/ /IM02/	OK	OK
<b>E.4. Description of how the baseline scenario is identified and description of baseline scenario</b>	<i>The choice of the baseline scenario will be validated with focus on whether the baseline is a likely scenario, and whether the methodology to define the baseline scenario has been followed in a complete and transparent manner.</i>			
E.4.1. What possible baseline scenarios have been considered for all CPAs and are they complete according to the methodology? Does the list of alternatives contain the status-quo situation, the project not undertaken as a CDM project as well as all other viable means of supplying the	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>The baseline scenario of the PoA is defines as per AMS-III.D version 18 as follows:  <i>in the absence of the project activity, animal manure is left to decay anaerobically within the project boundary and methane is emitted to the atmosphere.</i>            As per paragraph 115 of VVS version 03.0, where the baseline</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /VVS/ /AMS.III. D/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>outputs or services that are to be supplied by the proposed CDM project activity?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §§ 67 (b), 82, §§ 104 – 106)</p> <p><i>Fill in all alternatives in table A-2.</i></p> <p><i>Describe how it was validated that all alternatives are plausible and no plausible alternative is excluded from the consideration.</i></p>	<p>scenario is prescribed in the approved methodology, no further analysis is required.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been against AMS-III.D version 18 and VVS.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All plausible alternative scenarios listed in the approved methodology have been considered, incl. the status-quo situation and the project not undertaken as a CDM project. In the course of document review and site visit, it has been validated that all other alternatives which supply comparable outputs and / or services have been taken into consideration. Thus no plausible scenario has been omitted.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following alternative scenarios/options have been omitted, Corresponding CAR/CL PoA-xx has been raised:</p>			
<p>E.4.2. Have the baseline alternatives sufficiently taken into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies, macro-economic trends and political aspirations?</p> <p>(EB55 Annex 1, §§ 85, 87(d); EB 55 Annex 38, § 6(b))</p> <p><i>Describe whether the PP has shown that all relevant policies and circumstances have been identified and correctly considered in the PDD in accordance with the guidance by the Board. Pl. consider the guidance EB 22 annex 3 (regarding E+ and E- policies).</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> As per paragraph 115 of VVS version 03.0, where the baseline scenario is prescribed in the approved methodology, no further analysis is required. Thus, this checkpoint is not applicable.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been against VVS.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /VVS/ /AMS.III. D/</p>	N/A	
<p>E.4.3. Are the provisions for the baseline scenario determination compatible with the available data and are all literature and sources clearly</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> As per paragraph 115 of VVS version 03.0, where the baseline scenario is prescribed in the approved methodology, no further analysis is required. Thus, this checkpoint is not applicable.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/</p>	N/A	

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
referenced? (EB 55 Annex 1, § 92(a)) <i>Describe whether the documents and sources referred to in the PDD are correctly quoted and clearly referenced.</i>	<i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been against VVS. <i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.	/VVS/ /AMS.III. D/		
E.4.4. What has been identified as the baseline scenario? Has the baseline scenario been determined using conservative assumptions where possible, including relevant references and sources (EB 55 Annex 1, §§80-91) <i>Describe the chosen BL scenario, taking into consideration the technology that would be employed and / or the activities that would take place in the absence of the proposed CDM project activity.</i> <i>Describe whether the choice of the identified baseline scenario is reasonable by validating the <u>key assumptions, calculations and rationales</u> used in the POA-DD. Describe whether these are listed, relevant and <u>conservatively interpreted</u> in the POA-DD.</i>	<i>Description:</i> The baseline scenario of the PoA is defines as per AMS-III.D version 18 as follows: <i>in the absence of the project activity, animal manure is left to decay anaerobically within the project boundary and methane is emitted to the atmosphere.</i> As per paragraph 115 of VVS version 03.0, where the baseline scenario is prescribed in the approved methodology, no further analysis is required. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The baseline has been checked against AMS-III.D version 18 and VVS. <i>Conclusion:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> The baseline scenario is reasonable and has been determined using conservative assumptions where possible. Please refer to comments in table A-2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following CARs / CLs have been issued because assumptions used in the baseline determination have been assessed to be not conservative  The baseline scenario is reasonable but some information is not clear. Thus, the CL PoA-E4 is raised.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /VVS/ /AMS.III. D/	CL PoA- E4	OK
<b>E.5. CPA additionality</b>	<i>The description shall be assessed</i>			
<b>E.5.1. Assessment and demonstration</b>	<i>The provisions for CPA addtionality assesement shall be checked</i>			

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<b>of CPA addtionality</b>				
<p>E.5.1.1. Does the POA-DD include provision that a typical CPA starting date will be defined in accordance with the CDM glossary of terms and substantiated with reliable evidences?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §101)</p> <p><i>Describe the evidence assessed regarding the prior consideration of the CDM (if necessary). Describe whether the evidence to support such consideration is adequately and transparently described in the POA-DD.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> There is no provision for the expected starting dates of all CPA in PoA-DD. Thus, whether all CPAs will be commenced after the PoA GSP date of 2012-03-01, can not be checked by the validation team.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E5 is raised.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	CAR PoA- E5	OK
<p>E.5.1.2. What is the starting date of the 1<sup>st</sup> CPA indicated in the real case CPA-DD section A.4.2.1? Is it after the commencement of validation of the PoA, i.e., the date on which the PDDs are first published for global stakeholder consultations?</p> <p>(EB55 Annex 38 §7(d))</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> During onsite visit in March 2012, there is no financial commitment for the first CPA. Thus, the start date of the first CPA is expected as 2012-05-01 in the real case CPA-DD section A.4.2.1, which is after the PoA GSP date of 2012-03-01.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section A.4.2.1 of the real-case CPA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> This checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /CPA-DD-R/	OK	OK
<p>E.5.1.3. Does the PoA-DD make provisions to describe the additionality justification, which follows the requirements of the applied methodology and/or other methodological tools?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §§67 (d), 94)</p> <p><i>Describe how it is validated that additionality justification is carried out in accordance with the applied methodology</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The additionality of a CPA has been demonstrated in the PoA DD based on Additionality Tool version 5.2. The justification almost follows the guidelines. But, there are some issues have been found.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked against Additionality Tool version 6 and Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis version 5.0.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E5 is raised.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /GAIA/	CAR PoA- E5	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>and/or applied methodological tools. Further focus your assessment on the reliability and credibility of data, rationales and assumptions, justifications and documentations provided by the PP.</i>				
<p>E.5.1.4. Is an appropriate analysis method chosen for the project (simple cost analysis, investment comparison analysis or benchmark analysis)?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §109)</p> <p><i>Describe why the selected analysis method is appropriate under consideration of potential revenues and costs, potential project alternatives and potential available benchmark values.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> No analysis method is chosen in the PoA DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked Additionality Tool version 6 .</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E5 is raised.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/</p>	<p><del>CAR</del> <del>PoA-</del> E5</p>	OK
<p>E.5.1.5. Is a clear, viewable and unprotected Excel spreadsheet template available for the investment calculation, if applicable?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §110)</p> <p><i>Describe the steps taken to validate this issue.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Not applicable as the Excel spreadsheet for financial analysis is not necessary for the PoA DD.t</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked against Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis version 5.0.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /GAIA/</p>	N/A	
<p>E.5.1.6. If applicable, were the input values used in the investment analysis valid and applicable at the time of the investment decision with sufficient evidences?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §111; EB 62 Annex 5)</p> <p><i>In case the basis for input values is a Feasibility Study Report (FSR) describe how it shall be ensured that the period in time</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The data sources are defined in PoA DD as FSR or contracts available prior to the project start date. But, it is stated that the more recent data source of the contracts has the precedence over the FSR.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked against Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis version 5.0.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E5 is raised.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /GAIA/</p>	<p><del>CAR</del> <del>PoA-</del> E5</p>	OK

<b>Checklist Item</b> (incl. guidance for the validation team)	<b>Validation Team Comments</b> (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Draft Concl.</b>	<b>Final Concl.</b>
<p><i>between the finalisation of the FSR and the investment decision is sufficiently short so that it is unlikely that input values would have materially changed.</i></p> <p><i>Please fill out Annex 3 of this report for detailed assessment.</i></p>				
<p><b>E.5.1.7.</b> If applicable, does the period chosen for the investment analysis, reflect the technical lifetime of the proposed CPA or in case a shorter period is chosen, is the fair value of the project activity's assets at the end of the investment analysis period (as a cash inflow) included?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §111; EB 62 Annex 5)</p> <p><i>Describe how the technical lifetime / period chosen for calculating financial parameter(s) is reviewed and which documents shall be utilised in the course of review. Describe furthermore the approach used to check the inclusion of a potential fair value.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Not applicable as the values for the project life time and residual value for CPAs are not available and thus can not be ex-ante fixed.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	N/A	
<p><b>E.5.1.8.</b> If applicable, has the fair value calculation included book value and expected potential profit or loss, and in accordance with local accounting regulations (where available) or international best practice?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §111; EB 62 Annex 5)</p> <p><i>State the accounting regulations applied for calculating the fair value and describe why these are applicable under the project specific circumstances. Describe potential mismatches between regulations and the approach applied</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Not applicable as the residual value for CPAs is not available and thus can not be ex-ante fixed.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	N/A	

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>for calculating the fair value.</i>				
E.5.1.9. If applicable, is the book value as well as the expectation of the potential profit or loss included in the fair value calculation? (EB 55 Annex 1, §111; EB 62 Annex 5)	<i>Description:</i> Not applicable as the residual value for CPAs is not available and thus can not be ex-ante fixed. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	N/A	
E.5.1.10. If applicable, are depreciation and other non-cash related items added back to net profits for the purpose to calculate the financial indicator? (EB 55 Annex 1, §111; EB 62 Annex 5)	<i>Description:</i> Not applicable as the information about depreciation and residual value for CPAs is not available and thus can not be ex-ante fixed. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	N/A	
E.5.1.11. If applicable, is taxation excluded in the investment analysis or is the benchmark intended for post tax comparisons? (EB 55 Annex 1, §111; EB 62 Annex 5)	<i>Description:</i> Not applicable as the information about taxation for CPAs is not available and thus can not be ex-ante fixed. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	N/A	
E.5.1.12. In case of project IRR: Are the costs of financing expenditures (loan repayments and interests) excluded from the calculation of project IRR? (EB 55 Annex 1, §111; EB 62 Annex 5)	<i>Description:</i> Not applicable as the information about loan repayments and interests for CPAs is not available and thus can not be ex-ante fixed. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	N/A	
E.5.1.13. In case of equity IRR: Is the part of the investment costs, which is financed by equity considered as net cash outflow and is the part	<i>Description:</i> Not applicable as the information about the calculated IRR for CPAs is not available and thus can not be ex-ante fixed. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	N/A	

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
financed by debt excluded in net cash outflow? (EB 55 Annex 1, §111; EB 62 Annex 5)	checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.			
E.5.1.14. If applicable, is the type of benchmark chosen appropriate for the type of IRR calculated (e.g. local commercial lending rates or weighted average costs of capital for project IRR; required/expected returns on equity for equity IRR)? (EB 55 Annex 1, §111; EB 62 Annex 5) <i>In case risk premiums are applied describe its suitability to reflect the risks associated with the project activity.</i>	<i>Description:</i> The types of the benchmark and the calculated IRR are not clear in the PoA DD. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E5 is raised.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	CAR PoA- E5	OK
E.5.1.15. If applicable, is the benchmark value suitable for the project activity, e.g., it has been consistently used in the past for similar projects with similar risks, and is it reasonable to assume that no investment would be made at a rate of a lower return than the benchmark? (EB 55 Annex 1, §111-112; EB 62 Annex 5) <i>Describe whether it is reasonable to assume that a lower rate of return would consequently result in the baseline scenario.</i>	<i>Description:</i> Not applicable as no internal company benchmark is used by CPAs under the PoA. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked.. <i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	N/A	
E.5.1.16. If applicable, is it ensured that the project cannot be developed by other developers than the PP? (EB 55 Annex 1, §111; EB 62 Annex 5)	<i>Description:</i> Not applicable as no internal company benchmark is used by CPAs under the PoA. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked.. <i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	N/A	

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>E.5.1.17. In case of financial additionality justification; has a sensitivity analysis been considered and does the same contain variation of parameters that constitute more than 20% of either total project costs or total project revenues and may vary throughout the project lifetime?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §§110, 111 (e); EB 62 Annex 5)</p> <p><i>Describe relevance of parameters used in the sensitivity analysis as well as their likeliness to vary during the project's lifetime. Parameters which are fixed on the basis of contracts, PPAs etc. may not be subject to variation and not adequate.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The sensitivity analysis has been specified in the PoA DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	OK	OK
<p>E.5.1.18. If applicable, have sensitivity analysis considered parameters constituting less than 20% of total project costs or revenues, which may have potential material impact on the financial parameter?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §110; EB 62 Annex 5)</p> <p><i>Describe whether those parameters are considered in the sensitivity analysis?</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> No parameter constituting less than 20% of total project costs or revenues has been considered in the PoA DD. But, the validation team deems that the annual electricity and thermal energy displaced should be considered in the sensitivity analysis.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E5 is raised.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	CAR PoA- E5	OK
<p>E.5.1.19. If applicable, is the range of variation reasonable in the specific context of the project activity, taking into consideration historic trends in the business sector?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §110; EB 62 Annex 5)</p> <p><i>Describe whether the range of variation is appropriate with focus</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> ±15% of variation change of main parameters has been considered in the PoA DD. But, the variation necessary to reach the benchmark has not been considered.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E5 is raised.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	CAR PoA- E5	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>on historic developments, e.g. price of oil / labour etc., energy potential in the region in question.</i>				
<p>E.5.1.20. If applicable, are there any barriers given which have a clear and direct impact on the financial returns of the project?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §§ 115, 137)</p> <p><i>In case of LSC projects those issues cannot be considered as barriers and shall be assessed in the investment analysis. In case of SSC projects the same fundamentals as for LSC projects shall apply, i.e. the assessment of the investment barrier according to EB 41, Annex 45.</i></p> <p><i>Please fill out Annex 4 of this report for detailed assessment.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The investment barrier (IRR without CERs lower than the benchmark) has been discussed in the PoA DD. With the CERs, the IRR will pass the benchmark, which means the barrier can be overcome.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/</p>	OK	OK
<p>E.5.1.21. If applicable, are the barriers described risk related (e.g technology failure, other performance related risks) or has the availability of sources of finance for the project been described and adequately substantiated?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §§ 115, 137)</p> <p><i>Identified barriers shall be in accordance with the Guidelines on the demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities (EB 68 Annex 27) and Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers (EB50 Annex 13)</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Not applicable as only IRR is used.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/</p>	N/A	
<p>E.5.1.22. If applicable, has it been justified that one or a set of real barriers prevent(s) the implementation of the project activity and do not prevent the implementation of at least one</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Not applicable as only IRR is used.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/</p>	N/A	

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
of the alternatives? (EB 55 Annex 1, § 117 (b))				
E.5.1.23. If applicable, have the established criteria justified and evidenced that the barriers given in the PoA-DD are real and appropriate? (EB 55 Annex 1, § 117 (a))	<i>Description:</i> Not applicable as only IRR is used. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	N/A	
E.5.1.24. Is the defined region for the common practice analysis appropriate for the technology/industry type? (EB 55 Annex 1, § 120) <i>Describe the why the project activity is not common practice in a transparent and unambiguous manner.</i>	<i>Description:</i> The Additionality Tool is selected, but the common practice is not carried out in the PoA DD. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.1 of PoA DD has been checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E4 and CAR PoA-E5 are raised.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	<del>CAR PoA-E4</del> <del>CAR PoA-E5</del>	OK
<b>E.5.2. Key criteria for assessment and demonstration of CPA additionality</b>	<i>The key criteria for CPA additionality assessment shall be checked</i>			
E.5.2.1. Does the PoA-DD provide unambiguous criteria to assess the decision taken to proceed with the CPA? <i>Describe the steps taken to validate the assessment of the decision making.</i>	<i>Description:</i> The PoA-DD provided the criteria but these criteria are not complete. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.2 of PoA DD has been checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E5 is raised.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /PoA-DDs-T/	<del>CAR PoA-E5</del>	OK
E.5.2.2. Does the PoA-DD provide unambiguous criteria to assess that the project would not be the most economically or financially attractive	<i>Description:</i> The criterion is that the IRR without CERs is lower than the benchmark. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.2 of PoA DD has been	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	OK	OK

<b>Checklist Item</b> (incl. guidance for the validation team)	<b>Validation Team Comments</b> (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Draft Concl.</b>	<b>Final Concl.</b>
<p>alternative without the revenues from the sale of CERs?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §108)</p> <p><i>Discuss the appropriateness of the criteria established. Pl. consider also the eligibility criteria as discussed above. Assess whether the PP has demonstrated how these criteria would be applied to assess the additionality of a typical CPA at the time of CPA inclusion.</i></p>	<p>checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>			
<p>E.5.2.3. Does the PoA-DD provide unambiguous criteria to assess the barriers identified in section E.5.1 of the PoA-DD which will prevent the CPAs occur without the CDM incentives?</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The criterion is that the IRR without CERs is lower than the benchmark.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.2 of PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	OK	OK
<p>E.5.2.4. In case similar projects will be identified, are there any unambiguous criteria to assess the key differences between the proposed project and existing or ongoing projects and what kind of difference has been observed?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, § 120)</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Not applicable as the common practice is not used.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.2 of PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	N/A	
<p>E.5.2.5. Are there any other key criteria and data for assessing additionality of a CPA which is necessary besides the ones mentioned above not included in the PoA-DD?</p> <p><i>Please fill out Annex 6 of this report for detailed assessment of all key criteria.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> There is no other key criteria/data that is not included in the additionality assessment of PoA DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E5.2 of PoA DD has been checked against “ Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis” (Ver. 5.0).</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<b>E.6. Estimation of Emission Reductions of a CPA</b>				
<b>E.6.1. Explanation of methodological choices for CPA Emission</b>	<i>In case the applied methodology provides choices the selection of options shall be assessed</i>			
<p>E.6.1.1. In case the methodology allows for different methodological choices, are the equations applied properly justified and have they been used reflecting the other methodological choices (i.e. baseline identification)? (EB 55 Annex 1 §§ 90, 91)</p> <p><i>Assess the correct selection and application of methodological choices. Describe whether proper justification has been provided (based on the choice of the baseline scenario, context of a typical CPA and other evidences provided) and whether the correct equations have been used reflecting the relevant methodological choices.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The AMS-III.D version 18 was selected by the PoA to calculate the ERs. The AMS-I.D version 17 and AMS-III.F version 01 which the AMS-III.D version 18 refers to, are also used by the PoA.</p> <p>The following tools are also used by the PoA:</p> <p>Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, version 02.</p> <p>Tool to calculate project or leakage CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fossil fuel combustion, version 02.</p> <p>The applied equations are consistent with the requirements of AMS-III.D version 18, AMS-I.D version 17, AMS-III.F version 10/11 and AMS-III.AO version 1 as well as related tools.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E.6.1 and E.6.2 of PoA DD has been checked against the applied methodologies and tools.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is almost fulfilled. But, not all methodologies used by the PoA are listed in the section E.6.1. Thus, the CAR PoA-E7 is raised.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /AMS.III.D/ /AMS.I.D/ /AMS.III.F/ /AMS.III.AO/ /TOOLG/ /TOOLL/ /TOOLF/ /TOOLR/</p>	CAR PoA- E7	OK
E.6.1.2. In case the implementation of the project activity lead to GHG emissions within the project boundary which are expected to	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The implementation of the project activity does not lead to GHG emissions within the project boundary that will contribute</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/</p>	N/A	

<b>Checklist Item</b> (incl. guidance for the validation team)	<b>Validation Team Comments</b> (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Draft Concl.</b>	<b>Final Concl.</b>
<p>contribute more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emission reductions, which are not addressed by the methodology, has this parameter been included in the calculation of the emission reductions?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §77)</p> <p><i>Please describe the extra parameters defined and calculated.</i></p>	<p>more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emission reductions that are not addressed by the applied methodology. Thus no extra parameter is necessary.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following GHG emissions caused by implementation of the project within the project boundary, have been identified as will contribute more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emission reductions, that are not addressed by the applied methodology:</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The PoA DD has been checked. The CME and the relevant stakeholders were interviewed.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.</p>	<p>/IM01/ /IM02/</p>		
<p><b>E.6.2. Equations, including fixed parametric values used for ER calculation</b></p>				
<p>E.6.2.1. Are the equations applied correctly according to the applied approved methodology?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1 §§67 (c), 89, 90, 91)</p> <p><i>Describe clearly the steps taken to assess whether the methodology has been applied correctly to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions. Further take into consideration that all estimates of the baseline emissions can be replicated using the data and parameter values provided in the PoA-DD.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The equations applied for calculation are correctly applied according to the approved methodology.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following mistakes have been identified in this context:</p> <p>The equations for <math>PE_{transp,y}</math> and <math>PE_{power,y}</math> are not correct as per AMS-III.F version 10.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E6.2 of PoA DD has been checked against AMS-III.D. version 18, AMS-I.D version 17, AMS-III.F version 10 and AMS.III.AO as well as the relevant tools..</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E7 is raised.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /AMS.III.D/ /AMS.I.D/ /AMS.III.AO/ /TOOLG/ /TOOLL/ /TOOLF/</p>	<p><del>CAR PoA-E7</del></p>	<p>OK</p>

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		/TOOLR/		
<p>E.6.2.2. Have parameters with fixed values for the whole PoA been listed in section E.6.2 of the PoA-DD?</p> <p><i>Only those parameters which can be determined at the stage of PoA validation and will be applied consistently for each CPA shall be included in section E.6.2 of the PoA-DD. Ex-ante estimation of monitoring parameters or parameters to be reported only at CPA inclusion stage shall not be included.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Please see the section E.6.3.1 below.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/</p>	<p>CAR PoA- E8</p>	OK
<p>E.6.2.3. Have conservative assumptions been used when calculating the baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage? (EB 55 Annex 1 §§ 90, 91)</p> <p><i>Describe clearly the steps taken to assess whether all the assumptions and data used by the PP are listed in the PDD including references and sources and are conservatively interpreted in the PoA-DD.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The assumption for the calculation of <math>PE_{power,y}</math> is not correct.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E6.2 of PoA DD has been checked. The CME and the relevant stakeholders were interviewed.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E7 is raised.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /AMS.III. D/ /AMS.I.D/ /AMS.III. AO/ /TOOLG/ /TOOLL/ /TOOLF/ /TOOLR/ /IM01/</p>	<p>CAR PoA- E7</p>	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		/IM02/		
<b>E.6.3. Data and parameters have to be reported in the CPA-DD form</b>				
<p>E.6.3.1. Have all data and parameters which remain fixed throughout the crediting period correct, applicable to the project and will lead to a conservative estimation of emission reductions?</p> <p><i>Describe clearly the steps taken to assess whether the values used for the fixed parameters are considered reasonable, correct and applicable in the context of the project activity.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> All "Values of data to be applied for the purpose of calculating expected emissions reductions" are considered to be reasonable, applicable and conservative.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following mistakes have been identified in this context:</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E6.3 of PoA DD has been checked against AMS-III.D. version 18, AMS-I.D version 17, AMS-III.AO version 1 and AMS-III.F version 10 and the relevant tools as well as the tier 2 approach.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E8 is raised.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /AMS.III. D/ /AMS.I.D/ /AMS.III. F/ /AMS.III. AO/ /TOOLG/ /TOOLL/ /TOOLF/ /TOOLR/ /Tier2/ /GEF/ /CEPY/ /CESY/</p>	CAR PoA- E8	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		/SSY/ /PoA- DDs-G/		
<b>E.7. Application of the monitoring methodology and description of the monitoring plan</b>				
<b>E.7.1. Data and parameters to be monitored by each CPA</b>				
<p>E.7.1.1. Are the means of monitoring of all parameters contained in the monitoring plan feasible and in accordance with the requirements of the applied methodology?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, § 123 (a), 123 (b), 124)</p> <p>Assess whether the provided information for all parameters w.r.t.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) label (name of the data / parameter)</li> <li>b) data unit</li> <li>c) description</li> <li>d) source of data</li> <li>e) value applied for ex-ante ER calculation</li> <li>f) measurement equipment / method / procedure</li> </ul>	<p><i>Description:</i> The means of monitoring of all parameters are contained in the monitoring plan, in term of the label, data unit, description, source of data, measurement equipment, monitoring frequency, QA/QC procedures. But, some information is not correct.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E7.1 of PoA DD has been checked against AMS-III.D. version 18, AMS-I.D version 17, AMS-III:AO version 1 and AMS-III.F version 10 and the relevant tools as well as the tier 2 approach.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E9 is raised.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /AMS.III. D/ /AMS.I.D/ /AMS.III. F/ /AMS.III. AO/ /TOOLG/ /TOOLL/ /TOOLF/	CAR PoA- E9	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
g) QA/QC procedures h) Any comment if necessary <i>are appropriately described and in compliance with the requirements of the methodology.</i>		/TOOLR/ /Tier2/ /PoA-DDs-G/		
E.7.1.2. Are all monitoring parameters as required by the applied methodology contained in the monitoring plan? (EB 51 Annex 1, §§ 67 (e), 122, 123 (a) , 124) <i>Assess whether all applicable parameters listed in the methodology are included in the monitoring plan.</i> <i>Pl. check further whether the selection of parameters not to be monitored is appropriate and in line with the applied methodology.</i> <i>In case of different approaches can be chosen acc. to the methodology assess whether the selection of parameters is justified and correct.</i>	<i>Description:</i> Not all monitoring parameters as required by the applied methodologies were listed in the monitoring plan. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E7.1 of PoA DD has been checked against AMS-III.D. version 18, AMS-I.D version 17, AMS.III:AO version 1 and AMS-III.F version 10 and the relevant tools as well as the tier 2 approach. <i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E9 is raised.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /AMS.III.D/ /AMS.I.D/ /AMS.III.F/ /AMS.III.AO/ /TOOLG/ /TOOLL/ /TOOLF/ /TOOLR/ /Tier2/ /PoA-DDs-G/	CAR PoA-E9	OK
E.7.1.3. Does the PoA-DD mention reasonable	<i>Description:</i> Not applicable as the ex-ante estimates of the ex-post	/PoA-DD/	OK	OK

<b>Checklist Item</b> (incl. guidance for the validation team)	<b>Validation Team Comments</b> (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Draft Concl.</b>	<b>Final Concl.</b>
<p>values for all ex-ante calculation / monitoring parameters?</p> <p><i>Describe clearly the steps taken to assess whether the values used for the monitoring parameters are considered reasonable, applicable and conservative in the context of the project activity</i></p>	<p>monitoring parameters can not be carried out at PoA level.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E7.1 of PoA DD has been checked against AMS-III.D. version 18, AMS-I.D version 17, AMS-III:AO version 1 and AMS-III.F version 10 and the relevant tools as well as the tier 2 approach.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> It is not applicable.</p>	/PoAR/ /AMS.III. D/ /AMS.I.D/ /AMS.III. F/ /AMS.III. AO/ /TOOLG/ /TOOLL/ /TOOLF/ /TOOLR/ /Tier2/ /PoA- DDs-G/		
<b>E.7.2. Description of the monitoring plan for a SSC-CPA</b>				
E.7.2.1. Has a monitoring plan for a CPA been developed in accordance with the approved monitoring methodology, and identified the monitoring provisions and data parameters a	<p><i>Description:</i> Some parts of the monitoring plan are not developed as the approved methodologies. The monitoring parameters listed in the section E.7.2 are not complete.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E7.2 of PoA DD has been checked against AMS-III.D. version 18, AMS-I.D version 17,</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /AMS.III. D/	<del>CAR</del> <del>PoA-</del> <del>E10</del>	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
CPA has to apply/monitor? (EB 55 Annex 38, §6(j))	AMS.III:AO version 1 and AMS-III.F version 10 and the relevant tools as well as the tier 2 approach. <i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E10 is raised.	/AMS.I.D/ /AMS.III. F/ /AMS.III. AO/ /TOOLG/ /TOOLL/ /TOOLF/ /TOOLR/ /Tier2/ /PoA- DDs-G/		
E.7.2.2. Are the QA/QC procedures appropriate sufficient to ensure the emission reductions achieved from the project activity can be reported ex-post and verified? (EB 55 Annex 1 124 (b)) <i>Please consider the description given in section B.7.2. Describe which QA/QC provisions are considered. Address Quality Management System provisions, calibration and maintenance of equipment. Address further any review procedures.</i>	<i>Description:</i> The QA/QC procedures are included in the section E.7.1 of the PoA DD, which complies with the Guidelines for completeing SSC PoA DD version 01.0. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E7.1 of PoA DD has been checked against the Guidelines for completeing SSC PoA DD version 01.0. Some issues are found. <i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E9 is raised.	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /PoA- DDs-G/	CAR PoA- E9	OK
E.7.2.3. Have all means of implementing the	<i>Description:</i> The means of implementing the monitoring plan are	/PoA-DD/	CAR	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>monitoring plan, e.g. procedures for data management, emergency preparedness, been described clearly and in line with the methodology?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1 123 (b), 124)</p> <p><i>Check whether all necessary equations have been provided in the PoA-DD. Pl. consider that ex-post and ex-ante calculations might be different.</i></p> <p><i>Please consider that additional equations might be necessary to calculate auxiliary parameters.</i></p> <p><i>Assess whether the described monitoring arrangements are sufficient and realistic to enable a thorough monitoring. Pl. consider also special monitoring conditions, e.g. downtimes of monitoring equipment etc</i></p>	<p>included in the section E.7.1 of the PoA DD, which complies with the Guidelines for completeing SSC PoA DD version 01.0.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E7.1 of PoA DD has been checked against the Guidelines for completeing SSC PoA DD version 01.0. Some issues are found.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The CAR PoA-E9 is raised.</p>	<p>/PoAR/  /PoA-DDs-G/</p>	<p><del>PoA-E9</del></p>	
<p><b>E.8. Date of completion of the application of the baseline study and monitoring methodology and the name of the responsible person(s)/ entity(ies)</b></p>				
<p>E.8.1. Have the dates of the completion of the application of the baseline study and monitoring methodology and the name of the responsible person(s)/ entity(ies) appropriately mentioned?</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Yes. The date of completion and the name of the responsible person are listed.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The section E.8 of PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	<p>/PoA-DD/  /PoAR/</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p><b>Annexes</b></p>				

<b>Checklist Item</b> (incl. guidance for the validation team)	<b>Validation Team Comments</b> (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Draft Concl.</b>	<b>Final Concl.</b>
<p>An.1. Has contact information on CME and Participants in the PoA been sufficiently and appropriately included in Annex 1 of the PoA-DD and consistent with section A.3?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, § 52)</p> <p><i>Each organisation listed in section A.3 shall include the following mandatory fields: Organization, Name of contact person, Street, City, Postfix/ZIP, Country, Telephone and Fax or e-mail.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The contact information in Annex 1 is correct and consistent with the section A.3 of PoA DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The Annex 1 and section A.3 of PoA DD have been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	OK	Ok
<p>An.2. Has any important Public Funding information been included in Annex 2 of the PoA-DD and consistent with section A.4.5?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 38, §6(n))</p> <p><i>Assess information from Parties included in Annex 1 on sources of public funding for the project activity which shall provide an affirmation that such funding does not result in a diversion of official development assistance and is separate from and is not counted towards the financial obligations of those Parties.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> There is no Public Funding for this PoA as indicated in Annex 2 of PoA DD, which is consistent with the section A.4.5 of PoA DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The Annex 2 and section A.4.5 of PoA DD have been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	OK	Ok
<p>An.3. Has any important Baseline information necessary to be included in Annex 3 of the PoA-DD and consistent with section E.4?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §§ 67 (b), 82, §§ 104 – 106)</p> <p><i>Assess any further background information used in the application of the baseline methodology. This may include</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The calculation for OM and BM, and the local temperature in Sichuan province are provided in Annex 3 which is consistent with the section E.4 of PoA DD</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The Annex 3 of PoA DD has been checked against NDRC's published OM and BM as well as Sichuan Statistical Yearbook 2010.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> However CAR PoA-E11 is raised.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/ /GEF/ /CEPY/ /CESY/	CAR PoA- E11	Ok

<b>Checklist Item</b> (incl. guidance for the validation team)	<b>Validation Team Comments</b> (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Draft Concl.</b>	<b>Final Concl.</b>
<i>tables with time series data, documentation of measurement results and data sources, etc.</i>		/SSY/		
<p>An.4. Has any important Monitoring information necessary to be included in Annex 4 of the PoA-DD and consistent with section A.4.4 and E.7?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 38, §6(j); EB 55 Annex 1 123 (b), 124)</p> <p><i>Assess any further background information used in the application of the monitoring methodology. This may include tables with time series data, additional documentation of measurement equipment, procedures, etc.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> There is no important monitoring information necessary to be included in Annex 4 of PoA DD, which is consistent with the section A.4.4 and E.7 of PoA DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The Annex 4 of PoA DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The checkpoint is fulfilled.</p>	/PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	OK	Ok

**Table A-1-2: Generic CPA-DD Requirements Checklist**

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<b>Consistency and specific CPA issues</b>	<i>This Checklist shall be filled by comparing the draft version of generic CPA-DD published for GSCP with the <u>finalized</u> PoA-DD, i.e., when all PoA related findings have been successfully closed.</i>			
<b>A. General Description of small scale CDM project activity (CPA)</b>				
<b>A.1. Title of the CPA</b>				
<b>A.1.1.</b> Are title, current version number and the date of document completion given in section A.1 of the generic CPA-DD?	<p><i>Description:</i> The date and the current version number are completed. The Title of the CPA is described in Section A.1 as 'Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation programme, CPA Nb.SCAFBG—'.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/	OK	OK
<b>A.1.2.</b> Has the exact name/title of the PoA been included in the header of the CPA-DD form?	<p><i>Description:</i> The exact name of 'Sichuan Animal Farms GHG Mitigation Programme' has been included in the header of the CPA-DD form, which is in accordance with the finalized PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked according to PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	OK	OK
<b>A.1.3.</b> Has the latest version of the CDM-SSC-CPA-DD form been applied? (EB 55 Annex 1 § 55)	<p><i>Description:</i> This project is under VVM track, therefore CDM-SSC-CPA-DD Form Version 01 need to be applied. The generic CPA-DD form has been checked according to the CDM-SSC-CPA-DD form. It is assessed that the correct version of form has been applied.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-	CAR gCPA- A3	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
	<p>However, editorial issues have been identified</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked according to CDM-SSC-CPA-DD form version 01.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-A3 has been raised and the consistency should be ensured.</p>	DDs-T/		
<b>A.2. Description of the CPA</b>				
<p><b>A.2.1.</b> Is the description of a CPA consistent between POA-DD (section A.2 and A.4.2.1) and the Generic CPA-DD (section A.2)? (EB 55 Annex 38, §15(d))</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> In Section A.2, the description of the small-scale CPA is provided. However, several differences have been identified, e.g. the biogas utilization, the land application, the technical standard, when compared the generic CPA-DD with PoA-DD. Therefore, revision is required.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked according to the PoA-DD</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1 has been raised and the consistency should be ensured.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	CAR gCPA- +	OK
<b>A.3. Entity/individual responsible for the CPA</b>				
<p><b>A.3.1.</b> Does the generic CPA-DD include information, e.g., name/contact details of the entity/individual responsible for the operation of the CPA, hence forth referred as CPA implementer(s)? (EB 55 Annex 38, §7 (a))</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The implementer needs to be revised according to the PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked according to the PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1, CL gCPA-A1 has been raised and the consistency should be ensured.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	CAR gCPA- + CL gCPA -A1	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>Please describe this entity/individual responsible for the CPAs and steps taken to verify the information.</i>				
<b>A.3.2.</b> In case the CPA implementers are also project participants of the PoA, are their names included in the PoA? (EB 55 Annex 38, §8)  <i>The operators of individual CPAs are not required to be project participants. CDM programme participation is only recorded at the PoA level.</i>	<i>Description:</i> The implementer need to be revised according to the PoA-DD.  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked according to the PoA-DD.  <i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1, CL gCPA-A1 have been raised and the consistency should be ensured.	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	CAR gCPA-1 + CAR gCPA-A1	OK
<b>A.4. Technical description of the CPA</b>				
<b>A.4.1. Identification of the CPA</b>				
<b>A.4.1.1. Host Party</b>				
<b>A.4.1.1.1.</b> Are all host parties included in the generic CPA-DD and consistent with section A.4.1.1 of the PoA-DD? (EB 55 Annex 38, §7 (b))	<i>Description:</i> The host party is 'People's Republic of China', which is included in generic CPA-DD and consistent with the Section A.4.1.1 of the PoA-DD.  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked according to PoA-DD.  <i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified.	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	OK	OK
<b>A.4.1.2. Geographic reference or other means of identification allowing the unique identification of the CPA</b>				

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>A.4.1.2.1. Does the generic CPA-DD include geographical reference or other means of unique identification of a CPA? (EB 55 Annex 38, §7(a))</p> <p><i>In case of stationary CPA, geographic reference should be used; in case of mobile CPAs, registration number, GPS devices, etc. should be used.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> In Section 4.1.2, the geographical reference has been provided including the address, latitude and longitude of the project. However, the map with the location of the CPA is missing, Please adjust according to the PoA-DD. Also, please clarify why gCPA-DD makes reference to project schedule under section A.4.1.2.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked according to the PoA-DD</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1, CL gCPA-A2 has been raised and the consistency should be ensured.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	<del>CAR</del> gCPA- + <del>CL</del> gCPA-A2	OK
<p>A.4.1.2.2. Has it been demonstrated that the CPA is within the geographical borders of the PoA? (EB 55 Annex 38, §7(a))</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> It hasn't been demonstrated that the CPA is within the geographical borders of the PoA, clarification is required as what has been indicated in the PoA-DD, Section 4.1.2.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked according to the PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1 has been raised and the consistency should be ensured.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	<del>CAR</del> gCPA- +	OK
<b>A.4.2. Duration of CPA</b>				
<b>A.4.2.1. Starting date of the CPA</b>				
<p>A.4.2.1.1. Does the generic CPA-DD include provisions that the start date can be clearly defined and evidenced? (EB 55 Annex 1, §99) <i>Apply the definition as per the "Glossary of CDM terms".</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The start date is defined as the date at which the implementation of biogas construction under the CPA will start or has started.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified..</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/ /PoAR/	OK	OK

<b>Checklist Item</b> (incl. guidance for the validation team)	<b>Validation Team Comments</b> (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Draft Concl.</b>	<b>Final Concl.</b>
<p>A.4.2.1.2. Does the generic CDM-CPA-DD include a confirmation that the start date of any CPA is not, or will not be, prior to the PoA validation commencement, i.e. the date on which the CDM-POA-DD is first published for global stakeholder consultation?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 38, §7(d))</p> <p><i>Please consider the following:</i>  <i>The CDM Executive Board decided to grant an exemption to PoAs that have commenced validation prior to 31 December 2009. Therefore such PoAs may include CPAs with a starting date between 22 June 2007 and the commencement of validation of the PoA, if a list of such specific CPAs is provided to validating DOE and UNFCCC secretariat prior to 31 January 2010. (EB47 Report Para72)</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> It is clearly defined that 'the start date is no earlier than the date of commencement of PoA validation'</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoAR/	OK	OK
<b>A.4.2.2. Expected operational lifetime of the CPA</b>				
<p>A.4.2.2.1. Does the the gCPA include provisions to ensure that the operational lifetime can be clearly defined and evidenced? (EB55 Annex 38 para7(d))</p> <p><i>Check whether the project lifetime can be clearly defined. Consider the guidance on the assessment of investment analysis (annex to the additionality tool).</i></p> <p><i>Check in case of phased implementation this has been reflected throughout the whole PDD incl. the financial</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The expected perational lifetime of the CPA is defined in Section A.4.2.2. as 20 years.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoAR/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>assessment, if applicable.</i>				
<b>A.4.3. Choice of the crediting period</b>				
<b>A.4.3.1. Starting date of the crediting period</b>				
<p>A.4.3.1.1. Does the generic CPA-DD address the appropriate starting date of the crediting period of the CPA? (EB 55 Annex 38, §7(c))</p> <p><i>The starting date of a crediting period of the CPA shall be the date of its inclusion in the registered PoA or any date thereafter.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The gCPA-DD refers to starting date as the date of the implementation of biogas construction under the CPA and the starting date is no earlier than the date of commencement of PoA validation. Further under A.4.3.1 of gCPA-DD it is stated that starting date of crediting period is the later of and the date of inclusion of the CPA to the PoA.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> As the gCPA-DD states that the starting date of crediting period is the later of and the date of inclusion of the CPA to the PoA this is ok. However CAR gCPA-1 and CAR gCPA-A3 were raised.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoAR/	CAR gCPA-1 + CAR gCPA-A3	OK
<b>A.4.3.2. Length of the crediting period</b>				
<p>A.4.3.2.1. Does the generic CPA-DD include the option to choose the type (fixed or renewable) and duration of the crediting period of the CPA?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 38, §7(c))</p> <p><i>Taking into account that the duration of the crediting period shall not exceed the end date of the PoA.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The crediting period is fixed. And the length of the period is indicated as ten years.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoAR/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<b>A.4.4. Estimated ER over the chosen crediting period</b>				
A.4.4.1. Does the generic CPA-DD include the estimated amount of emission reductions over the chosen crediting period of the CPA? (EB 55 Annex 38, §7)	<i>Description:</i> The gCPA-DD contains provisions to provide the estimated amount of emission reductions achieved during the chosen crediting period as per section A.2 and B.5.3. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked. <i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified.	/CPA-DD-G/	OK	OK
<b>A.4.5. Public Funding of the CPA</b>				
A.4.5.1. Does the generic CPA-DD include information and eligibility criteria regarding public funding of the CPA, and consistent with section A.4.5 of the PoA-DD? (EB 55 Annex 38, §6(n)) <i>In the generic CPA-DD, a table template without exact ER amount shall be included, nonetheless, fixed information throughout the entire PoA duration/.CPA crediting period can be also included.</i>	<i>Description:</i> There is no public funding from Annex-I. It is in accordance with the Section A.4.5. of the PoA-DD. Also an eligibility criterion is established w.r.t. ODA. <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD. <i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified.	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	OK	OK
<b>A.4.6. Information to confirm the CPA is not a de-bundled component</b>				
A.4.6.1. Does the generic CPA-DD include information to confirm that the proposed small-scale CPA is not a de-bundled component? <i>Refer to the guidance for determining the occurrence of de</i>	<i>Description:</i> The provisions of Section 4.6 is in accordance with the PoA-DD. Eligibility criteria is established to confirm that the SSC-CPA is not a de-bundled component of another CDM programme activity or CDM project activity.	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	Ok	OK

<b>Checklist Item</b> (incl. guidance for the validation team)	<b>Validation Team Comments</b> (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Draft Concl.</b>	<b>Final Concl.</b>
<i>bundling under a programme of activities (EB 54, Annex 13)</i>	<i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.  <i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified. Further confirmation will be provided for each CPA under this PoA via established eligibility criterion to justify that no CPA is a de-bundled component of another PoA or CDM project activity.			
<b>A.4.7. Confirmation that CPA is neither registered as an individual CDM or is part of another Registered PoA</b>				
<b>A.4.7.1.</b> Does the generic CPA-DD include provisions for a confirmation that the CPA is neither registered as a CDM project activity nor included in another registered PoA?  (EB 55 Annex 38, §7(h))  <i>Make sure that each single subsystem of the CPA, e.g., solar cooker, bio-digester, etc. is not registered as part of a CDM project or included in another registered PoA.</i>  <i>Make sure that no double counting of any emission reductions will occur.</i>	<i>Description:</i> The generic CPA-DD includes the provisions for the confirmation and it is in accordance with PoA-DD.  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.  <i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified.	/CPA-DD-G/  /PoA-DD/	OK	OK
<b>A.4.7.2.</b> Are there provisions to ensure that those operating the CPA are aware and have agreed that their activity is being subscribed to the PoA?	<i>Description:</i> The generic CPA-DD includes the provisions to ensure the awareness and it is in accordance with PoA-DD.  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.	/CPA-DD-G/  /PoA-DD/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
(EB 55 Annex 38, §6(i))	<i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified.			
<b>B. Eligibility of CPA and estimation of ERs</b>				
<b>B.1. Title and reference of the Registered PoA to which CPA is added</b>				
<b>B.1.1.</b> Has the exact name/title, version No. and date of the PoA-DD been consistently included in section B.1 of the generic CPA-DD form?  <i>Please ensure that the latest version number and date of the PoA-DD has been consistently included/updated in the generic CPA-DD.</i>	<i>Description:</i> The name/title, version NO.and the date of the PoA-DD is missing in Section B.1.  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.  <i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1 was raised and further correction is required.	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	CAR gCPA-1	OK
<b>B.2. Justification of why CPA is eligible to be included in the Registered PoA</b>				
<b>B.2.1.</b> Does the generic CPA-DD include information how each CPA will fulfill the eligibility criteria specified in the POA-DD?  (EB 55 Annex 38, §7(e))	<i>Description:</i> The eligibility criteria is required to be updated according the finalized PoA-DD  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.  <i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1 was raised and further correction is required.	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	CAR gCPA-1	OK
<b>B.3. Assessment and demonstration of additionality of the CPA, as per eligibility</b>				

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<b>criteria listed in the Registered PoA</b>				
<b>B.3.1.</b> Does the generic CPA-DD include information how each CPA will demonstrate additionality as specified in the POA-DD? (EB 55 Annex 38, §7(e)) <i>Including, as appropriate, the demonstration of the additionality of the CPA.</i>	<i>Description:</i> The additionality assessment is required to be updated according to the finalized PoA-DD <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD. <i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1 was raised and further correction is required.	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	CAR gCPA-1	OK
<b>B.4. Description of the sources and gases included in the project boundary and proof that the CPA is located within the geographical boundary of the PoA</b>				
<b>B.4.1.</b> Does the generic CPA-DD include information regarding sources and gases included in the CPA boundary and proof that the CPA will be located within the geographical boundary of the PoA? (EB 55 Annex 38, §7(a))	<i>Description:</i> The justification of sources is required to be updated according to the finalized PoA-DD <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD. <i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1 was raised and further correction is required.	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	CAR gCPA-1	OK
<b>B.5. Emission reductions</b>				
<b>B.5.1. Data and parameters that are available at validation</b>				

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
B.5.1.1. Are all data and parameters in section B.5.1 of the generic CPA-DD consistent with section E.6.3 of the POA-DD? (EB 55 Annex 38, §15(d))	<p><i>Description:</i> The data and parameter in Section B.1 are required to be updated according to the Section.6.3. of the finalized PoA-DD. And also, Clarification is requested why parameter <math>UF_b</math> (default value) is provided under section B.5.1.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1 and CAR gCPA-B2 was raised and further correction is required.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	<del>CAR gCPA-</del> + <del>CAR gCPA-B2</del>	OK
<b>B.5.2. Ex-ante calculation of emission reductions</b>				
B.5.2.1. Are CPA-specific conservative assumptions used and uncertainties addressed when calculating the baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage emissions? (EB55 Annex38 § 6(g) & 7(e(ii)))	<p><i>Description:</i> The assumption need to be updated according to the finalized PoA-DD</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1 was raised and further correction is required.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	<del>CAR gCPA-</del> +	OK
B.5.2.2. Are all information in section B.5.2 of the generic CPA-DD consistent with section E.6.2 of the POA-DD? (EB 55 Annex 38, §15(d))	<p><i>Description:</i> The data and parameter in Section B.5.2 are required to be updated according to the Section.6.2. of the finalized PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1, CAR gCPA-B1, CAR gCPA-B3 were raised and further correction is required.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	<del>CAR gCPA-</del> + <del>CAR gCPA-B1</del>	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<b>B.5.3. Summary of the ex-ante estimation of emission reductions</b>				
<p>B.5.3.1. Does the generic CPA-DD include a table of summary on the estimated amount of emission reductions over the chosen crediting period, incl. annual and total, of the CPA?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 38, §7)</p> <p><i>In the generic CPA-DD, a table template without exact ER amount shall be included, nonetheless, fixed information throughout the entire PoA duration/CPA crediting period can be also included.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The summary table is included in the generic CPA-DD. However, the rows are not correctly addressed. Please update the rows in the summary table.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked as well as UNFCCC template.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-A3 was raised and further correction is required.</p>	<p>/CPA-DD-G/ /unfccc/</p>	<p><del>CAR</del> gCPA-A3</p>	OK
<b>B.6. Application of the monitoring methodology and description of monitoring plan</b>				
<b>B.6.1. Description of monitoring plan</b>				
<p>B.6.1.1. Does the generic CPA-DD include provisions to demonstrate the application of the baseline and monitoring methodology as described in the most updated PoA-DD?</p> <p>(EB55 Annex 38 § 7(e))</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The generic CPA-DD includes the provisions to demonstrate the application of the baseline and monitoring methodology. However, they need to be updated according to the most updated PoA-DD</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1 was raised and further correction is required.</p>	<p>/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/</p>	<p><del>CAR</del> gCPA-1</p>	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
B.6.1.2. Are all monitoring parameters and relevant information in section B.6.1 of the generic CPA-DD consistent with section E.7.1 of the POA-DD? (EB 55 Annex 38, §15(d))	<p><i>Description:</i> The monitoring parameters and relevant information in Section B.6.1 need to be updated according to the Section E.7.1 of the PoA-DD. Please also clarify why further parameters like Genetic source, FFR are provided under section B.6.1 of gCPA-DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1, CAR gCPA-B4 was raised and further correction is required.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	CAR gCPA- + CAR gCPA- B3	OK
B.6.1.3. Is the monitoring plan described in the section B.6.1 of the generic CPA-DD in accordance to the approved methodology and section A.4.4.2 and E.7.2 of the PoA-DD? (EB 55 Annex 38 § 6(g) & 7(e(ii)))	<p><i>Description:</i> The monitoring plan is not inline with methodology and PoA-DD. Related findings are issued.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1 was raised and further correction is required to update gCPA-DD w.r.t. final PoA-DD. Please refer also to the related PoA findings raised are CAR PoA-E9 and CAR PoA-E10.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	CAR gCPA- +	OK
<b>C. Environmental Analysis</b>				
<b>C.1. Level of environmental analysis justification</b>				
<b>C.1.1.</b> Has the generic CDM-CPA-DD consistently justified the level of environmental analysis as per section C.1 of the PoA-DD?	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The environmental analysis has been undertaken for the whole PoA as reflected in the POA-DD.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The environmental analysis shall be undertaken for the CPA as</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/ /IM02/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
(EB 55 Annex 38, §7(f))	per requirements of the CDM modalities and procedures.  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD. Besides by interview with government officials.  <i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified.			
<b>C.2. Documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts, incl. transboundary impacts</b>				
<b>C.2.1.</b> Has the generic CDM-CPA-DD consistently provided information regarding environmental analysis as per section C.2 of the PoA-DD?  (EB 55 Annex 38, §7(f))	<i>Description:</i>  <input type="checkbox"/> The environmental analysis has been undertaken for the whole PoA as reflected in the POA-DD. Thus section C.2 of the CPA-DD needs not to be completed.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The environmental analysis shall be undertaken for the CPA as per requirements of the CDM modalities and procedures, and is consistently described as per section C.2 of the PoA-DD.  <input type="checkbox"/> The environmental analysis shall be undertaken for the CPA as per requirements of the CDM modalities and procedures, however, following finding(s) has/have been identified:  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD. Besides interview with government officials.  <i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified.	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/ /IM02/	OK	OK
<b>C.3. Environmental Impact Assessment requirement for a typical CPA</b>				

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<b>C.3.1.</b> Has the generic CPA-DD consistently provided information regarding EIA as per section C.3 of the PoA-DD? (EB 55 Annex 38, §7(f))	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The environmental analysis has been undertaken for the whole PoA as reflected in the POA-DD. Thus section C.3 of the CPA-DD needs not to be completed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The EIA shall be undertaken for the CPA as per requirements of the CDM modalities and procedures, and is consistently described as per section C.3 of the PoA-DD.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The EIA shall be undertaken for the CPA as per requirements of the CDM modalities and procedures, however, following finding(s) has/have been identified:</p> <p>Section C.3 of generic CPA-DD need to be revised according to Section C.3 of PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD. Besides interview with government officials.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1 was raised and further correction is required.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/ /IM02/	CAR gCPA-1 +	OK
<b>D. Stakeholders' comments</b>				
<b>D.1. Level of local stakeholder comments justification</b>				
<b>D.1.1.</b> Has the generic CPA-DD consistently justified the level on which comments by local stakeholders shall be invited as per section D.1 of the PoA-DD?	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The comments have been sought for the whole PoA as reflected in the POA-DD.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The comments shall be sought for each CPA.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	CAR gCPA-D1	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
(EB 55 Annex 38, §7(g))  <i>It is assessed whether stakeholders have been properly consulted in the development of the CPA. EB48 Annex 29 Para4(m)</i>	Section D.1 states “Please tick if this information is provided at the PoA level. In this case sections D.2. to D.4. need not be completed in this form.” However related ticked boxes are missing. Please clarify.  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.  <i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-D1 was raised and further correction is required.			
<b>D.2. Description how comments by local stakeholders have been invited and compiled</b>				
<b>D.2.1.</b> Has the generic CPA-DD consistently provided information regarding how comments by local stakeholders will be invited as per section D.2 of the PoA-DD?  (EB 55 Annex 38, §7(f))	<i>Description:</i>  <input type="checkbox"/> The local stakeholder consultations have been undertaken for the whole PoA as reflected in the POA-DD. Thus section D.2 of the CPA-DD needs not to be completed.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The local stakeholder consultations shall be undertaken for the CPA as per requirements of the CDM modalities and procedures, and is consistently described as per section D.2 of the PoA-DD.  <input type="checkbox"/> The local stakeholder consultations shall be undertaken for the CPA as per requirements of the CDM modalities and procedures, however, following finding(s) has/have been identified:  <i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.  <i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified.	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<b>D.3. Summary of the comments received</b>				
<b>D.3.1.</b> Has section D.3 of the generic CPA-DD sufficiently provided information regarding summary of comments received from local stakeholders? (EB 55 Annex 38, §7(f))	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The local stakeholder consultations have been undertaken for the whole PoA as reflected in the POA-DD. Thus section D.3 of the CPA-DD needs not to be completed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The local stakeholder consultations shall be undertaken for the CPA as per requirements of the CDM modalities and procedures, and the summary of comments received have been sufficiently described in section D.3 of the CPA-DD.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The local stakeholder consultations shall be undertaken for the CPA as per requirements of the CDM modalities and procedures, however, following finding(s) has/have been identified:</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	OK	OK
<b>D.4. Report on how due account was taken of any comments received.</b>				
<b>D.4.1.</b> Has section D.4 of the generic CPA-DD sufficiently provided information regarding how due account was taken of any comments received? (EB 55 Annex 38, §7(f))	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The local stakeholder consultations have been undertaken for the whole PoA as reflected in the POA-DD. Thus section D.4 of the CPA-DD needs not to be completed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The local stakeholder consultations shall be undertaken for the CPA as per requirements of the CDM modalities and procedures, and the report on how due account was taken of any comments</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the validation team)	Validation Team Comments (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	Ref.	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
	<p>received has been sufficiently described in section D.4 of the CPA-DD.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The local stakeholder consultations shall be undertaken for the CPA as per requirements of the CDM modalities and procedures, however, following finding(s) has/have been identified:</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> No deviation has been identified.</p>			
<b>Annexes</b>				
<p>An.1. Has contact information on entity/ individual responsible for the CPA been sufficiently and appropriately included in Annex 1 of the CPA-DD and consistent with section A.3 of the same?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, § 52)</p> <p><i>Each organisation listed in section A.3 shall include the following mandatory fields: Organization, Name of contact person, Street, City, Postfix/ZIP, Country, Telephone and Fax or e-mail.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> As Section A.3 need to be updated according to the latest PoA-DD, Annex 1 need to be updated accordingly.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1 was raised and further correction is required.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	CAR gCPA-1	OK
<p>An.2. Has any important Public Funding information been included in Annex 2 of the CPA-DD and consistent with section A.4.5 of the CPA-DD?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 38, §6(n))</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Public funding information is not addressed in Annex 2 and correction is required.</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1 was raised and further correction is required.</p>	/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/	CAR gCPA-1	OK

<b>Checklist Item</b> (incl. guidance for the validation team)	<b>Validation Team Comments</b> (justification and substantiation of information, data and evidences)	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Draft Concl.</b>	<b>Final Concl.</b>
<i>Assess information from Parties included in Annex I on sources of public funding for the project activity which shall provide an affirmation that such funding does not result in a diversion of official development assistance and is separate from and is not counted towards the financial obligations of those Parties.</i>				
<p>An.3. Has any important Baseline information necessary to be included in Annex 3 of the CPA-DD and consistent with section E.4 of the PoA-DD?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 1, §§ 67 (b), 82, §§ 104 – 106)</p> <p><i>Assess any further background information used in the application of the baseline methodology. This may include tables with time series data, documentation of measurement results and data sources, etc.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Annex 3 need to be revised according to the finalized PoA-DD</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1 was raised and further correction is required.</p>	<p>/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/</p>	<p><del>CAR</del> gCPA-1</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>An.4. Has any important Monitoring information necessary to be included in Annex 4 of the CPA-DD and consistent with section B.6 of the CPA-DD?</p> <p>(EB 55 Annex 38, §6(j); EB 55 Annex 1 123 (b), 124)</p> <p><i>Assess any further background information used in the application of the monitoring methodology. This may include tables with time series data, additional documentation of measurement equipment, procedures, etc.</i></p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Annex 4 has been left blank, please update according to the finalized PoA-DD</p> <p><i>Justification of evidences:</i> The generic CPA-DD has been checked and compared with PoA-DD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> CAR gCPA-1 was raised and further correction is required.</p>	<p>/CPA-DD-G/ /PoA-DD/</p>	<p><del>CAR</del> gCPA-1</p>	<p>OK</p>

## ANNEX 2: ASSESSMENT OF BASELINE IDENTIFICATION

**Table A-2:** Assessment of Baseline Identification

<input type="checkbox"/>	Baseline is not identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Assessment of baseline see below

PP Demonstration					DOE Assessment	
Baseline Alternatives identified	Inline with the Methodology	Eliminated	Reasons for elimination / non-elimination from list of alternatives	Evidence used	Evidence are appropriate	Assessment of validation team (results and means of assessment)
The baseline scenario is the situation where, in the absence of the project activity, animal manure is left to decay anaerobically within the project boundary and methane is emitted to the atmosphere. Baseline emissions (BE <sub>y</sub> ) are calculated by using one of the following two options: (a) Using the amount of the waste or raw material that would decay anaerobically in the absence of the project activity, with the most recent IPCC tier 2 approach (please refer to the chapter "Emissions from Livestock and Manure Management" under the volume "Agriculture, Forestry and other Land use" of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories). For this calculation,	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Baseline scenario is pre-defined in corresponding methodology AMS.III.D version 18 §9</i>	/rCPA-DD/ /FSR/ /EIA/	<input type="checkbox"/>	The baseline scenario is predefined in related methodology §9. Under this PoA the baseline emissions are calculated using the amount of the waste or raw material that would decay anaerobically in the absence of the project activity as per §9 (a) of AMS.III.D. Further related eligibility criteria are established to ensure that any CPA under this PoA corresponds to this baseline scenario. The EC established are 3.1, 3.1.1, 3.1.4 and 3.1.5. Please refer also to Annex 6 for assessment of related eligibility criteria. Based on the above DOE deems that it is ensured that the baseline scenario as per methodology can be sufficiently assessed during inclusion of a CPA. The installation of a lagoon is inline with related host country regulations. The baseline scenario will therefore be justified during CPA inclusion.

PP Demonstration					DOE Assessment	
Baseline Alternatives identified	Inline with the Methodology	Eliminated	Reasons for elimination / non-elimination from list of alternatives	Evidence used	Evidences are appropriate	Assessment of validation team (results and means of assessment)
information about the characteristics of the manure and of the management systems in the baseline is required. Manure characteristics include the amount of volatile solids (VS) produced by the livestock and the maximum amount of methane that can be potentially produced from that manure ( <i>Bo</i> ).						

### ANNEX 3: ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL PARAMETERS

**Table A-3:** Assessment of Financial parameters

<input type="checkbox"/>	No financial parameters are used for additionality justification
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As per additionality justification at CPA level
<input type="checkbox"/>	Assessment of all financial parameters see below

PP Demonstration					DOE Assessment		
Parameter	Value applied	Unit	Source of Information (please indicate document and page)	Reference	values applied are correct	Evidences used are appropriate	Comment
					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

## ANNEX 4: ASSESSMENT OF BARRIER ANALYSIS

**Table A-4:** Assessment of Barrier Analysis

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No barrier parameters are used for additionality justification
<input type="checkbox"/>	Assessment of barriers see below

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Kind of Barrier (invest, tech, other)	Description of Barrier	Evidence used	Appropriate	Explanation of final result
			<input type="checkbox"/>	

## ANNEX 5: OUTCOME OF THE GSCP

**Table A-5:** Outcome of the Global Stakeholder Consultation Process

(§§ 41, 42 VVM Version 1.2)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No comments were received during the global stakeholder consultation period
<input type="checkbox"/>	Comments were received during the global stakeholder consultation period. The comments (in unedited form) and the consideration/response of the validation team are presented below:

Comment No.:	Comment by:	Inserted on:	Subject	Comment <sup>*)</sup>	Action taken by the validation team to take due account on the comment <sup>*)</sup>	Conclusion (incl. CARs CLs or FARs)

<sup>\*)</sup> In case clarifications have been requested by the validation team corresponding rows shall be added

## ANNEX 6: ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA ASSESSMENT

**Table A-6:** Assessment on Eligibility Criteria for inclusion of CPAs under this PoA

A full list shall be included in section A.4.2.2 of the PoA-DD and B.2 of the generic CPA-DD. (EB 55 Annex 38 §12(b) and EB 70 Annex 5 §15)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligibility Criteria for inclusions of CPAs under this PoA have not been sufficiently described
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eligibility Criteria for inclusions of CPAs under this PoA have been sufficiently described as follows

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
1. The CPA has been approved by the C/ME.	The C/ME manages the CDM implementation of the proposed PoA. It shall therefore approve the CPA in a written statement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Written approval letter from the C/ME</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The criterion refers to EB55 Annex 38 §7 (h) and sufficiently addresses that the CPA is neither registered as a CDM project activity nor included in another registered PoA and therefore eligible under this PoA.
2. The SSC-CPA is not a de-bundled component of another CDM programme activity (CPA) or CDM project activity.	De-bundling check	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C/ME statement</li> <li>CPA database</li> <li>Checking with the official CDM websites</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This criterion 2 ensures that no double counting will occur. The validation team confirms this criterion together with criterion 10.1 and 10.2 give criteria that will prevent double counting of any small scale biogas digester within each CPA, among all CPAs in this PoA, between CPA in this PoA and another CDM project, or between CPA in this PoA and

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
				another CPA in another PoA. Thus this criterion is deemed appropriate and sufficient.
3. Applicability criteria of methodology AMS-III.D (Version 18)				
3.1. Project activities involve the replacement or modification of an anaerobic animal manure management systems in livestock farms to achieve methane recovery and destruction by flaring/combustion or gainful use of the recovered methane.	Applicability criterion 1 of methodology AMS-III.D (Version 18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FSR</li> <li>EIA</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This criterion 3.1 refers to applicability requirements of AMS.III.D version 18, paragraph 1, and is deemed appropriate.</p> <p>As per eligibility criteria 11 and 13 for each CPA a Feasibility Study Report and an EIA will be prepared. The FSR and EIA contain a description of the baseline scenario and the project scenario including the system to be installed how biogas generated and recovered is gainfully used. From this and from onsite visit DOE can clearly identify and assess whether this criterion is fulfilled.</p>
3.1.1. The livestock population in the farm is managed under confined conditions;	Applicability criterion 1 of methodology AMS-III.D (Version 18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Picture</li> <li>FSR</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This criterion 3.1.1 refers to applicability requirements of AMS.III.D version 18, paragraph 1 (a), and is deemed appropriate.</p> <p>As per eligibility criterion 13 for each CPA a Feasibility Study Report will be prepared. The FSR contains a description of the baseline scenario. Further picture(s) are provided for review. From this and from onsite visit DOE can clearly identify and assess whether this criterion is fulfilled.</p>
3.1.2. Manure or the streams obtained after treatment are not discharged	Applicability criterion 1 of methodology AMS-III.D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FSR</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This criterion 3.1.2 refers to applicability requirements of AMS.III.D version 18, paragraph 1 (b), and is deemed</p>

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
into natural water resources (e.g. river or estuaries)	(Version 18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EIA</li> </ul>		<p>appropriate.</p> <p>As per eligibility criteria 11 and 13 for each CPA a Feasibility Study Report and an EIA will be prepared. The FSR and EIA contain a description of the baseline scenario and the project scenario including the system to be installed how biogas generated and recovered is gainfully used. Especially the EIA contains a description on how the manure was treated prior to project implementation and the conclusion of the EIA shall be that the project does not have negative impact on environment. From this a from onsite visit DOE can clearly identify and assess whether this criterion is fulfilled. Further as FSR and EIA are to be approved by government DOE considers this criterion as reasonable and plausible.</p>
3.1.3. The annual average temperature of baseline site where anaerobic manure treatment facility is located is higher than 5°C;	Applicability criterion 1 of methodology AMS-III.D (Version 18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Official Publication (e.g. the Sichuan Statistical Yearbook)</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This criterion 3.1.3 refers to applicability requirements of AMS.III.D version 18, paragraph 1 (c), and is deemed appropriate.</p> <p>DOE has checked official available source, Sichuan Statistical Yearbook 2010, and checked versus PoA-DD Annex 3. By this DOE can confirm that information on average temperature as per Annex 3 of PoA-DD is consistent with related source. Further by this DOE can further confirm that the mean annual temperature for the 21 main cities in Sichuan Province in 2009 was at least 8.0 °C and therefore</p>

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
				above the required 5 °C. The latest available source will be checked during each CPA inclusion. Based on that DOE considers this criterion as sufficient and fulfilled.
3.1.4. In the baseline scenario the retention time of manure waste in the anaerobic treatment system is greater than one month, and in case of anaerobic lagoons in the baseline, their depths are at least 1 m;	Applicability criterion 1 of methodology AMS-III.D (Version 18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FSR</li> <li>Design of baseline manure management system</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This criterion 3.1.4 refers to applicability requirements of AMS.III.D version 18, paragraph 1 (d), and is deemed appropriate.</p> <p>As per eligibility criteria 11 and 13 for each CPA a Feasibility Study Report and an EIA will be prepared. The FSR and EIA contain a description of the baseline scenario and the project scenario including the system to be installed how biogas generated and recovered is gainfully used. Especially the EIA contains a description on how the manure was treated prior to project implementation and the conclusion of the EIA shall be that the project does not have negative impact on environment. Further the design information of the baseline management system provides technical specification where the retention time can be derived from. From this and by onsite visit DOE can clearly identify and assess whether this criterion is fulfilled. Further as FSR and EIA are to be approved by government DOE considers this criterion as reasonable and plausible.</p>
3.1.5. No methane recovery and	Applicability criterion 1 of methodology AMS-III.D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FSR</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This criterion 3.1.4 refers to applicability requirements of

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
destruction by flaring, combustion or gainful use takes place in the baseline scenario.	(Version 18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pictures</li> </ul>		AMS.III.D version 18, paragraph 1 (E), and is deemed appropriate. As per eligibility criteria 11 and 13 for each CPA a Feasibility Study Report and an EIA will be prepared. The FSR and EIA contain a description of the baseline scenario and the project scenario including the system to be installed how biogas generated and recovered is gainfully used. Especially the EIA contains a description on how the manure was treated prior to project implementation and the conclusion of the EIA shall be that the project does not have negative impact on environment. Besides pictures will be provided for substantiation. From this a from onsite visit DOE can clearly identify and assess whether this criterion is fulfilled. Further as FSR and EIA are to be approved by government DOE considers this criterion as reasonable and plausible.
3.2. The project activity satisfies the following conditions:				
3.2.1. The residual waste from the animal manure management system shall be handled aerobically.	<p>Applicability criterion 2 of methodology AMS-III.D (Version 18)</p> <p>The farms are advised on aerobic sludge handling according to a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statement on aerobic application by the Sichuan Biogas Society</li> <li>Instructions to farms</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This criterion 3.1.4 refers to applicability requirements of AMS.III.D version 18, paragraph 2 (a), and is deemed appropriate.</p> <p>A Statement on Aerobic Sludge Application by Rural Biogas Association<sup>/AER/</sup> has been provided to DOE. It is confirmed that the aerobic application is common practice in Sichuan.</p>

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
	guideline from the Sichuan Biogas Society. To confirm the compliance with this criterion, the claimed emission reductions are reduced by the share of farms that do not apply the correct procedures after the monitoring.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FSR</li> </ul>		As fertilizer is very useful for agriculture production, the farm and the local residents will use the residual waste as fertilizer. Besides this can be confirmed by interview with local farmers during onsite visit and by DOE observation during onsite visit. Further CME will instruct farmers on aerobic handling on final sludge. Therefore DOE considers this criterion as sufficiently applied.
3.2.2. Technical measures shall be used (including a flare for exigencies) to ensure that all biogas produced by the digester is used or flared.	Applicability criterion 2 of methodology AMS-III.D (Version 18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FSR</li> <li>Construction Contract</li> <li>Equipment purchase contract</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This criterion 3.1.4 refers to applicability requirements of AMS.III.D version 18, paragraph 2 (b), and is deemed appropriate. The DOE can verify the same by checking the FSR, the construction contract and equipment purchase agreements. Besides in some cases by onsite visit. Based on this DOE considers this criterion as sufficiently established.
3.2.3. The storage time of the manure after removal from the animal barns, including transportation, should not exceed 45 days before being fed into the anaerobic digester. If the project proponent can demonstrate that the dry matter content of the manure when removed from the animal barns	Applicability criterion 2 of methodology AMS-III.D (Version 18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FSR</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This criterion 3.1.4 refers to applicability requirements of AMS.III.D version 18, paragraph 2 (c), and is deemed appropriate. As the project scenario is described in the FSR and the FSR further provides a flow diagram of the different manure treatment steps from farm until biogas destruction including size of equipments used this could be reviewed via approved FSR. Further by onsite visit to the first real case CPA DOE

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
is larger than 20%, this time constraint will not apply.				could observe that the manure is directed from the barns via underground pipelines to the baseline manure treatment system. The distance between both is less than hundred meters. As the project will be located where the current treatment system is placed the transport time will be very short. Due to the above DOE considers that the compliance with this criterion could be sufficiently justified and assessed during inclusion.
3.3. Measures are limited to those that result in aggregate emission reductions of less than or equal to 60 kt CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent annually from all Type III components of the project activity.	Applicability criterion 7 of methodology AMS-III.D (Version 18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSC-CPA-DD</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This criterion 3.3 refers to applicability requirements of AMS.III.D version 18, paragraph 7, and is deemed appropriate. As next to SSC CPA-DD also ER calculation will be provided and under this PoA only Type III emission reductions will be claimed the fulfilment of this criterion can be easily verified. Therefore the DOE considers this criterion as sufficient.
4. The CPA shall fulfil the criteria of additionality demonstration defined in PoA-DD (section E.5.2).	To ensure the CPA is additional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IRR calculation sheet</li> <li>ER calculation</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As per section E.5.2 of PoA-DD the additionality of a CPA will be demonstrated as per Attachment A to Appendix B. For each project activity in each CPA an IRR calculation will be provided demonstrating that the IRR is below the established benchmark besides a sensitivity analysis is conducted along with corresponding justification. The benchmark applied will be based on 3 <sup>rd</sup> edition of Economic

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
				Evaluation for Construction Project: Methods and Parameters <sup>/BEN/</sup> . This document is published by government and widely used for investment decisions. According to this the benchmark for pre-tax IRR in animal husbandry is currently 7%. DOE has checked the source and found the value to be consistent and can confirm that the correct value has been chosen and applied. In case the underlying document, Economic Evaluation for Construction Project: Methods and Parameters, is revised or updated, the PoA documents will be also updated accordingly as stated in PoA-DD section E.5.1 states that “the benchmark might be updated along with the update of the related official guidance and documentation, which will be applied in financial analysis when conducting financial feasibility assessment for the project.” Hence DOE considers this criterion as appropriate and sufficiently established.
5. All farms meet the criteria below for farms to be included in a certain CPA.				
5.1. The farm is located within the geographic boundary of the CPA and within the geographic boundary of the PoA.	No farm should be located outside the defined CPA and PoA boundaries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPA farm database</li> <li>• SSC-CPA-DD</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The criterion refers to EB 55 Annex 38 §6 (b) and §7 (a) as well as EB 70 Annex 5 §16 (a) to ensure that each CPA under the PoA lies within the geographical boundaries of the PoA boundary. As per PoA-DD section A.4.1.2 the geographical boundary is defined as per as Sichuan

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
				Province. The CPA-DD under section A.4.1.2. will provide a map of geographical boundary of each CPA and will confirm the compliance to this criterion. Further the CPA-DD will provide the GPS coordinates of the corresponding city or county where the measures are installed. Therefore this criterion is deemed sufficiently established.
5.2. The farm will install a new anaerobic biogas digester to generate and recover biogas for utilization.	The digester in the project scenario will recover the biogas generated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FSR</li> <li>• Construction contract</li> <li>• Equipment Purchase Contract</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This eligibility criterion ensures that no second hand equipment is installed in any CPA. Further in conjunction with EC 3.1 it is ensure that recovered biogas is destroyed and gainfully used.</p> <p>The fulfilment can be assessed against check of FSR, construction contracts or equipment purchase agreements. Further by onsite visit and interviews conducted with PP or stakeholders.</p> <p>Due to this DOE considers this EC as sufficient.</p>
5.3. The farm will install equipment to utilize the biogas to generate electrical and/or thermal energy and/or to supply the gas to local households in the direct surrounding of the farm. No other forms of biogas utilization will be employed (e.g.	No alternative types of utilization as discussed in methodology AMS-III.H will be employed by the CPAs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FSR</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This criterion 5.4.1 refers to requirement of AMS.III.D version 18, paragraph 4, in case recovered biogas is used as indicated in AMS.III.H esp. §3</p> <p>(b) Thermal or mechanical, electrical energy generation after bottling of upgraded biogas, [...] or</p> <p>(c) Thermal or mechanical, electrical energy generation after upgrading and distribution [...]:</p> <p>(i) Upgrading and injection of biogas into a natural gas distribution grid with no significant transmission constraints;</p>

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
bottling).				<p>(ii) Upgrading and transportation of biogas via a dedicated piped network to a group of end users; or</p> <p>(iii) Upgrading and transportation of biogas (e.g. by trucks) to distribution points for end users.</p> <p>(d) Hydrogen production;</p> <p>(e) Use as fuel in transportation applications after upgrading.</p> <p>This PoA does not envisage using recovered biogas for hydrogen production, as fuel for transportation conduct any upgrading of the biogas for further utilization or e.g. bottling of upgraded biogas.</p> <p>As this criterion ensures that such project scenarios are excluded. As this could be assessed by FSR clearly DOE deemes this criterion as sufficiently established.</p>
5.4. One of the following two sub-criteria is fulfilled:				
5.4.1. The baseline animal waste management system cannot be physically transported to another site outside the project boundary.	Systems like concrete lagoons or dug holes cannot be transported physically. Therefore, leakage can be excluded.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Photos</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This criterion 5.4.1 refers to leakage requirements of AMS.III.D version 18, paragraph 27, and is deemed appropriate.</p> <p>The baseline scenario is the anaerobic treatment of manure in a lagoon and emission of methane into the atmosphere. As per onsite visit to the first CPA and by sectoral knowledge and experience by DOE in conjunction with host country competence lagoons in the host country are mainly build of concrete into the ground. A basin build of concrete is deemed</p>

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
				not mobile without its destruction. However to ensure this pictures will be provided. Besides that DOE can check this during onsite visit. Therefore this criterion is deemed reasonable and sufficient.
5.4.2. In case the baseline AWMS could be transported physically, it is scrapped, the scrapping has been documented and the scrapped equipment is stored until it was observed by the DOE.	By documenting and proving the scrapping of potentially mobile equipment, leakage can be excluded.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prove of scrapping, e.g. pictures</li> <li>• Scrapped equipment</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This criterion 5.4.2 refers to leakage requirements of AMS.III.D version 18, paragraph 27, and is deemed appropriate.</p> <p>This criterion is subsequently established to criterion 5.4.2 in case baseline equipment is not made of concrete and potentially mobile. By this criterion no such mobile equipment would be allowed to be removed from site until check by a DOE. This is inline with §27 of corresponding methodology which requires an independent check and documented as well as stored until it has been checked.</p> <p>Therefore the establishment of this criterion is deemed sufficient to demonstrate the same.</p>
6. The proposed project and the new CPA do not lead to a diversion of official development assistance (ODA).	Avoidance of CDM leading to a diversion of official development assistance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written letters to state that neither the CDM development process, nor the construction is funded by ODA.</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The criterion 6 sufficiently covers the public funding requirement from the UNFCCC and the proposed confirmation letter is deemed appropriate to demonstrate the compliance to the criterion.

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
7. The starting date of the CPA is determined and not prior to the Global Stakeholder Consultation of the PoA.				
7.1. The start date of the CPA lies either in the future, or can be determined with suitable evidence.	Requirement of EB 55, Annex 38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equipment purchase contract</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This criterion refers to EB55 Annex 38 §7 (e) and EB 70 Annex 5 §16 (d) to ensure that the start date of the CPA is supported by evidence. This can be sufficiently checked by the equipment purchase contract of main equipment e.g. digester, boiler, gas engine or EPC contract as well as construction contract or similar contract with major financial payment. Therefore this criterion is deemed sufficient.
7.2. The start date of the CPA is not before the date of public web hosting of the PoA documentation (01/03/2012).	Requirement of EB 55, Annex 38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equipment purchase contract</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This criterion refers to EB 55 Annex 38 §7 (c) and EB 70 Annex 5 §16 (d) to ensure that the start date of the CPA is not prior to the publication of the PoA for global stakeholder consultation. This can be sufficiently checked by the equipment purchase contract of main equipment e.g. digester, boiler, gas engine or EPC contract as well as construction contract or similar contract with major financial payment. Therefore this criterion is deemed sufficient.
8. The end date of the CPA does not exceed the PoA end date.	The CPAs will automatically be terminated when the PoA reached the end of its end date.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSC-CPA-DD</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This criterion 8 requires CPA crediting period not exceed the PoA end, which is in line with the UNFCCC requirement and is deemed sufficient. This criterion refers to EB 55 Annex 38 §7 (c) and EB 70 Annex 5 §16 (d) to ensure that the end

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
				date of the CPA is exceeding the end date of the PoA. The information will be included in the CPA-DD and checked against the registration date of the PoA plus 28 years.
9. The CPA implements a monitoring plan that is in line with the monitoring plan described in the PoA-DD (section E.7.2)	The monitoring plan of each CPA should be in line with the monitoring plan validated by the DOE and registered with the PoA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSC-PoA-DD</li> <li>SSC-CPA-DD</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This criterion ensures that the monitoring plan as per PoA-DD is consistently applied in each CPA.
10. Measures to avoid double counting are implemented.				
10.1. The CPA implementers confirm in written statements that:  a) All biogas systems to be newly installed under the CPA are not and will not be part of another CDM project or program activity and that no CERs will be claimed for the biogas system other than those to be claimed by the C/ME on behalf of the participating farms respectively; and  b) That they are aware and agree with the inclusion of the CPA to the proposed PoA.	The written statements of the CPA implementer compose the first layer of measures to avoid double counting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPA inclusion letter</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This criterion is to ensure the CPA exemption from debundling requirement EB 54 Annex 13 paragraph 10, and is deemed sufficient.

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
10.2. A check for double counting of single farms biogas plant to a negative result.	The check performed by the C/ME (procedures described in section A.4.4.1) composes the second layer of measures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPA farm databases of all previously included CPAs.</li> <li>CPA farm database of new CPA.</li> <li>Documents available on unfccc.int and farm databases in case of overlapping regions.</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This criterion 10.2 ensures that no double counting will occur. The validation team confirms this criterion together with criterion 10.1 and 2 that will prevent double counting of any biogas project within each CPA, among all CPAs in this PoA, between CPA in this PoA and another CDM project, or between CPA in this PoA and another CPA in another PoA. Thus this criterion is deemed appropriate and sufficient. Besides, the unique identification of each digester can be easily distinguished by the GPS location. The farm database will be crosschecked for each CPA accordingly.
11. An EIA has been conducted for each biogas plant that is part of the new CPA and comes to the conclusion that the project does not have significant negative impacts to the environment. Furthermore, the EIA (table or report) has been approved by the responsible authority.	An EIA needs to be conducted according to the national legislation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EIA table or report</li> <li>EIA approval</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This criterion refers to EB 55 Annex 38 §7 (f) and EB 70 Annex 5 §16 (g) to ensure that an environmental analysis is conducted as per host country requirements. For clear assessment of fulfilment of eligibility criteria (EC) especially EC 3.1, and 3.1.2, and as per requirement of local government C/ME has established this criterion. Furthermore the EIA has to be approved by corresponding authorities. Both, EIA and EIA approval, will be provided during inclusion of each CPA. As the PoA covers also projects and CPAs which could not use the recovered

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
				biogas for electricity generation as per interview with related government authorities those projects do not require an complete EIA report but only a simple EIA notification called EIA result table <sup>/IM02/</sup> . This EIA table will be forwarded to related authority and also approved by stamping. Therefore this criterion is deemed reasonable and plausible by DOE.
12. A local stakeholder meeting has been conducted for each biogas plant that is part of the new CPA and did not result in major negative objections against the project by the local stakeholders.	The local stakeholders need to be interviewed to provide sufficient opportunity to address any concerns or objections.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder meeting report</li> <li>Questionnaires</li> <li>Meeting records</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This criterion refers to EB 55 Annex 38 §7 (g) and EB 70 Annex 5 §16 (g) to ensure that information on how comments by local stakeholders have been invited, a summary of the comments is received and how due account is taken of any comment received.</p> <p>To comply with this requirement for each project activity under a CPA a stakeholder meeting has to be conducted, a meeting report has to be prepared and meeting records could be provided.</p> <p>Therefore DOE considers this criterion as deemed sufficiently established.</p>
13. A Feasibility Study has been carried out for each biogas plant and the results have been described in Feasibility Study Reports.	The project needs to be planned and approved by the local authorities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FSR</li> <li>FSR approval</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	For clear assessment of fulfilment of eligibility criteria (EC) especially EC 3.1, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3 and 5.3 and for clear assessment of document which is base for management decision C/ME established this

PP Demonstration			DOE Assessment	
Eligibility Criteria	Further Elaboration	Minimum Expected Evidence(s) to be provided during CPA inclusion	Appropriate and sufficient	Explanation of final result
Furthermore, the FSRs have been approved by the responsible authority.				<p>criterion.</p> <p>Furthermore a FSR is a requirement as per local government and has to be approved by corresponding authorities. Both, FSR and FSR approval, will be provided during inclusion of each CPA. DOE has reconfirmed this via interview with related government representatives during onsite visit<sup>/IM02/</sup>.</p> <p>Therefore this criterion is deemed reasonable and plausible by DOE.</p>

<sup>9)</sup> In case clarifications have been requested by the validation team corresponding rows shall be added

**ANNEX 7: APPOINTMENT CERTIFICATES OF TEAM MEMBERS****Statement of Competence**Appointment and authorization according to the procedures  
of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program**Mr. Ulrich Walter**

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Lead Assessor (Validation, Verification)	2014-12-08
	Technical Reviewer	
Ji	Lead Assessor Technical Reviewer	2014-12-08
VCS	Lead Assessor Technical Reviewer	2014-12-08

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA	TR SUBCATEGORIES
2.1	Electricity Distribution	
2.2	Heat Distribution	
3.1	Energy Demand	
5.1	Chemical Process Industries	
11.1	Chemical Process Industries	
12.1	Chemical Process Industries	
13.1	Waste Handling and Disposal	13.1.1 Waste Management 13.1.2 Waste Water Management
13.2	Animal Waste Management	
15.2	Animal Waste Management	

149 - Rev. 2, Date: 2011-12-07

149\_361-F003\_2011-12-07\_mw2.doc

361-F003 mw1 / 2011-08-02

**Statement of Competence**Appointment and authorization according to the procedures  
of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program**Mr. Stefan Winter**

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification)	2014-06-30
	Technical Reviewer	
VCS	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification)	2014-06-30

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA	TR SUBCATEGORIES
1.1	Thermal energy generation	1.2.1 Hydro 1.2.2 Wind 1.2.3 Geothermal 1.2.4 Solar 1.2.5 Tidal
1.2	Renewable Energy	
2.2	Heat distribution	
3.1	Energy demand	
13.1	Waste handling and disposal	13.1.1 Waste management 13.1.2 Waste water management
13.2	Animal waste management	
15.2	Animal waste management	

163 - Rev. 2, Date: 2011-08-10

163\_361-F003\_2011-08-10\_mw2

361-F003 mw1 / 2011-08-02

**Statement of Competence**Appointment and authorization according to the procedures  
of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program**Mr. Dr. Jochen Schubert**

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification)	2014-05-11
	Technical Reviewer	
VCS	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification)	2014-05-11

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA	TR INCLUDE SUB-AREAS
1.2	Renewable Energies	1.2.1 Hydro 1.2.2 Wind 1.2.3 Geothermal 1.2.4 Solar 1.2.5 Tidal
		13.1.1 Waste management 13.1.2 Waste water management
13.1	Waste handling and disposal	

056 - Rev. 2, Date: 2011-07-29

056\_361-F003\_2011-07-29\_mw2

361-F003 mw2 / 2010-04-19

**Statement of Competence**Appointment and authorization according to the procedures  
of the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program**Ms. Jing Yi Wang**

SCHEME	STATUS
CDM	Trainee
VCS / ISO 14064-2	Trainee

310 - Rev. 0, Date: 2012-05-15

310\_361-F003\_2012-05-15\_mw0.doc

361-F003 mw2 / 2012-04-05