

---

# VALIDATION REPORT

---

**ILFS**

**The TIMARPUR-OKHLA Waste Management Company Pvt. Ltd's (TOWMCL) integrated waste to energy project at Delhi**

Date of issue:	Project No:
30-07-2007	CDMVal0468
Project title	Organisational unit:
The TIMARPUR-OKHLA Waste Management Pvt. Ltd's (TOWMCL) integrated waste to energy project at Delhi	SGS Climate Change Programme
Revision number	Client:
1	ILFS

#### Summary:

ILFS has commissioned SGS to perform the validation of the project: The TIMARPUR-OKHLA Waste Management Pvt. Ltd's (TOWMCL) integrated waste to energy project at Delhi. The scope of the validation is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project's baseline study and monitoring plan and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against Kyoto Protocol requirements, UNFCCC rules and associated interpretations. SGS has employed a risk-based approach in the validation, focusing on the identification of significant risks for project implementation and the generation of CERs.

The report is based on the findings of document reviews, the stakeholder consultation process and responses from the project participants to the findings raised in this report.

The report and the annexed validation describes a total of 18 findings which include:

- 8 Corrective Action Requests;
- 10 New Information Requests; and

All the findings are closed with proper documentation and checked by the Assessor.

Subject:		
CDM validation		<b>Indexing terms</b>
Work carried out by		
Sanjeev Kumar - Lead Assessor Pankaj Mohan - Assessor Dr. J M Nair - Expert		
Technical review (name and date)		
Dr. Jochen Gross - Technical Reviewer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organisational unit
Authorized signatory (name and date)		
Siddharth Yadav	<input type="checkbox"/>	Limited distribution
Date of final decision:	Number of pages:	
11/09/2007	34	<input type="checkbox"/> Unrestricted distribution

## Abbreviations

CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Proponent
TOWMCL	Timarpur Okhla Waste Management Company Limited
GHG	Green House Gas
CER	Certified Emission Reductions
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change
KP	Kyoto Protocol
DPR	Detailed Project Report
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
DoE	Designated Operational Entity
DNA	Designated National Authority
MoEF	Ministry of Environment and Forests
RDF	Re-Derived Fuel
MSW	Municipal Solid Waste
AM	Approved Methodology
CAR	Corrective Action Request
NIR	New Information Request
EB	Executive Board
ODA	Official Development Assistance
IRR	Internal Rate of Return
WACC	Weighted Average Cost of capital
RoE	Return on Equity
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

## Table of Content

Table of content.....	4
1. Introduction.....	5
1.1 Objective.....	5
1.2 Scope.....	5
1.3 GHG Project Description.....	5
1.4 The names and roles of the validation team members.....	5
2. Methodology.....	6
2.1 Review of CDM-PDD and additional documentation.....	6
2.2 Use of the validation protocol.....	6
2.3 Findings.....	7
2.4 Internal quality control.....	7
3. Validation Findings.....	8
3.1 Participation requirements.....	8
3.2 Project design.....	8
3.3 Baseline selection and additionality.....	9
3.4 Application of Baseline methodology and calculation of emission factors.....	10
3.5 Application of Monitoring methodology and Monitoring Plan.....	10
3.6 Choice of the crediting period.....	10
3.7 Environmental Impacts.....	10
3.8 Local stakeholder comments.....	11
4. Comments by Parties, Stakeholders and NGOs.....	12
4.1 Description of how and when the PDD was made publicly available.....	12
4.2 Compilation of all comments received.....	12
4.3 Explanation of how comments have been taken into account.....	12
5. Validation opinion.....	13
6. List of persons interviewed.....	14
7. Document references.....	14

## Annexes:

Annex 1: Additional Information to be Checked During Site Visit

Annex 2: Validation Protocol

Annex 3: Findings Overview

Annex 4: Statement of Competence

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Objective

ILFS has commissioned SGS to perform the validation of the project: “The TIMARPUR-OKHLA Waste Management Pvt. Ltd’s (TOWMCL) integrated waste to energy project at Delhi” with regard to the relevant requirements for CDM project activities. The purpose of a 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 relevant UNFCCC and host country criteria are validated in order to confirm that the project 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 of the quality of the project and its intended generation of Certified Emission Reduction (CER). UNFCCC criteria refer to the Kyoto Protocol criteria and the CDM rules and modalities and related decisions by the COP/MOP and the CDM Executive Board.

### 1.2 Scope

The scope of the validation is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project's baseline study and monitoring plan and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against Kyoto Protocol requirements, UNFCCC rules and associated interpretations. SGS has employed a risk-based approach in the validation, focusing on the identification of significant risks for project implementation and the generation of CERs.

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

### 1.3 GHG Project Description

The Project activity is preparation of RDF fluff by treating Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) and using that RDF fluff as fuel to generate 16MW of Power and export that power to northern regional grid which is primarily fossil fuel based. The project will avoid GHG emissions on two grounds i.e. methane emission avoidance and also avoid fossil fuel emissions which would have happened in generating that amount of power in northern regional grid.

#### Baseline Scenario:

The most plausible baseline scenario for the project is the continuation of the waste disposal at a landfill without capturing the landfill gas. The electricity will also be generated in the Northern regional grid by thermal power plants.

#### With Project Scenario:

The Project activity is preparation of RDF fluff by treating Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) and using that RDF fluff as fuel to generate 16MW of Power and export that power to northern regional grid which in turn reduces GHG emissions.

#### Leakage:

As per the methodology AM0025 version 6; applicable for the project activity, leakage is considered in the project activity.

#### Environmental & Social Impacts:

According to Assessor, there is no negative environmental and social impact expected due to the project activity.

**1.4 The Names and Roles of the Validation Team Members**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Affiliate</b>
Shivananda Shetty	Team Leader	SGS India
Sanjeev Kumar	Lead Assessor	SGS India
Pankaj Mohan	Assessor	SGS India
Dr. J M Nair	Expert	SGS India

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1 Review of CDM-PDD and Additional Documentation

The validation is performed primarily as a document review of the publicly available project documents. The assessment is performed by trained assessors using a validation protocol.

A site visit is usually required to verify assumptions in the baseline. The site visit was carried out by Mr. Pankaj Mohan and the separate checklist was made and attached as Annex 1. The person from Client side was also there and the documents were checked and some of the local stakeholders were also interviewed to know about their involvement in the project and also asked them how these people are getting benefit of this project.

### 2.2 Use of the Validation Protocol

The validation protocol used for the assessment is partly based on the templates of the IETA / World Bank Validation and Verification Manual and partly on the experience of SGS with the validation of CDM projects. It serves the following purposes:

- it organises, details and clarifies the requirements the project is expected to meet; and
- it documents both how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the validation.

The validation protocol consists of several tables. The different columns in these tables are described below.

<b>Checklist Question</b>	<b>Ref ID</b>	<b>Means of verification (MoV)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Draft and/or Final Conclusion</b>
<i>The various requirements are linked to checklist questions the project should meet.</i>	<i>Lists any references and sources used in the validation process. Full details are provided in the table at the bottom of the checklist.</i>	<i>Explains how conformance with the checklist question is investigated. Examples of means of verification are document review (DR) or interview (I). N/A means not applicable.</i>	<i>The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist question and/or the conformance to the question. It is further used to explain the conclusions reached.</i>	<i>This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (Y), or a <b>Corrective Action Request (CAR)</b> due to non-compliance with the checklist question (See below). <b>New Information Request (NIR)</b> is used when the validation team has identified a need for further clarification.</i>

The completed validation protocol for this project is attached as Annex 2 to this report

## 2.3 Findings

As an outcome of the validation process, the team can raise different types of findings

In general, where insufficient or inaccurate information is available and clarification or new information is required the Assessor shall raise a **New Information Request (NIR)** specifying what additional information is required.

Where a non-conformance arises the Assessor shall raise a **Corrective Action Request (CAR)**. A CAR

is issued, where:

- I. mistakes have been made with a direct influence on project results;
- II. validation protocol requirements have not been met; or
- III. there is a risk that the project would not be accepted as a CDM project or that emission reductions will not be verified.

The validation process may be halted until this information has been made available to the assessors' satisfaction. Failure to address a NIR may result in a CAR. Information or clarifications provided as a result of an NIR may also lead to a CAR.

**Observations** may be raised which are for the benefit of future projects and future verification or validation actors. These have no impact upon the completion of the validation or verification activity.

Corrective Action Requests and New Information Requests are raised in the draft validation protocol and detailed in a separate form (Annex 3). In this form, the Project Developer is given the opportunity to "close" outstanding CARs and respond to NIRs and Observations.

## 2.4 Internal Quality Control

Following the completion of the assessment process and a recommendation by the Assessment team, all documentation will be forwarded to a Technical Reviewer. The task of the Technical Reviewer is to check that all procedures have been followed and all conclusions are justified. The Technical Reviewer will either accept or reject the recommendation made by the assessment team.



### 3. Validation Findings

#### 3.1 Participation Requirements

The host Party for this project is India. India has ratified the Kyoto protocol. Initially project proponent did not submit Letter of Approval from Indian DNA; hence CAR (01) was raised. In response to CAR (01) project proponent replied by providing the letter of approval dated 15<sup>th</sup> May 2007 having reference number F.No. 4/3/2007 - CCC. The letter of approval was seen and the original was scanned and attached herewith. This was accepted hence CAR (01) was closed out.

The project is a unilateral project so there is no direct involvement of an annex1 party at this stage but will ultimately help in reduction of GHG emissions. No Annex I Party has been identified in the PDD and therefore no further Letter of Approval was available. It is observed that the CDM EB has agreed that the registration of a CDM project activity can take place without an Annex I Party being involved at the stage of registration although it should be noted that before CER can be transferred to an Annex I Party, a Letter of Approval will need to be submitted.

#### 3.2 Project Design

The PDD of the present project activity has been prepared in accordance with the guidelines for completing CDM-PDD and followed template for CDM-PDD version 03. Thus when PDD was cross checked against these guidelines and template; it was found that the format used for CDM- PDD was correct one and the template is still valid.

NIR (02) was raised to get the clarification for using older version of Approved Methodology AM0025. The project proponent replied by providing the revised PDD using latest version of Approved Methodology AM0025. This was accepted and hence NIR (02) was closed out.

NIR (03) was raised to get the clarification on ODA utilization by the project proponent. The project proponent replied by providing the letter from their side mentioning that there is no ODA utilization. This was accepted after reviewing the letter and as this is a future project so this can also be checked during verification as well. Hence NIR (03) was closed.

CAR (04) was raised to get the clarification on Project boundary. The project proponent replied by mentioning the project boundary clearly in the revised PDD. The PDD provided was reviewed and found to be in accordance with methodology. As this is a future project this can also be verified during verification as well. This was accepted and hence CAR (04) was closed.

NIR (16) was raised to get the clarification that the project technology will not be substituted with more efficient technology during the entire crediting period. The project proponent replied by providing the letter stating its commitment with the technology for the entire crediting period. This was taken as assurance as this is a future project so this can also be checked during verification. This was accepted and hence NIR (16) was closed.

The PDD was not mentioning the initial training requirements for operation and maintenance so NIR (17) was raised. The project proponent replied by providing the description of training requirement for operation & maintenance in revised PDD. The revised PDD was checked and found that it can be accepted as this is a future project so this can also be checked during verification. Hence NIR (17) was closed.

### 3.3 *Baseline Selection and Additionality*

The project activity basically employs a technology to generate RDF fluff and use that as a fuel to generate electricity to be exported to northern regional grid. The project activity will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing methane emissions and fossil fuel emissions to generate that amount of electricity in northern regional grid. The project has applied baseline methodology AM0025 version 6. The baseline for the project activity is the continuation of the waste disposal at a landfill without capturing landfill gas and generation of power in northern regional grid by utilizing fossil fuel.

The project has adopted the investment barrier followed by technological barrier for the project activity to justify the additionality of the project. In order to get all the related documents on the basis of which the project was shown additional, CAR (08) was raised.

The project proponent replied by providing the revised PDD along with the supporting documents of IRR calculation i.e. IRR Calculation sheet and sensitivity analysis sheet. The IRR calculation sheet provided was checked for the assumptions taken by the project proponent and also checked for the formulas used and if these are correct or not and the values obtained from the formulas are correct or not. These were also verified with the supporting documents i.e. DPR. These were found to be correct. In addition to that the sensitivity analysis sheet provided was also checked and it was also found to be correct. The IRR of the project without CDM is 9.6% and it is less than the WACC of 11.2% and also less than the benchmark of 14%. The IRR increases to 16.5% with CDM benefits and it is crossing the WACC of 11.2% and also crosses the benchmark to make the project activity financial viable. The calculation of WACC was also checked and found to be OK. The proof for benchmark taken as 14% was also checked and taken as proof from the client. This was the CERC document provided by client mentioning the benchmark as 14% (Page 18). The IRR calculation sheet can also be uploaded as proof of additionality. The relevant pages from DPR (6.21.1, 6.21.2, 12.4, 12.5, and 12.6) will be uploaded as proof of additionality. The CS certificate verifying the DPR values, IRR Calculations, and Sensitivity analysis will also be uploaded as proof of additionality. The IRR is also provided in revised PDD as per EB guidelines.

The project proponent also provided the copy of DPR to show that the integrated technology used in the project activity is superior to the standalone technology and the document provided to substantiate technological barrier was reviewed and found to be in order. This is the future project so the barrier mentioned due to lack of trained manpower & training related matters mentioned in PDD and DPR can also be checked during verification.

The project proponent also provided the copy of board resolution in which CDM was considered to go ahead with the project activity. This was reviewed and found that CDM consideration is mentioned in the resolution. This can be accepted. This can also be uploaded as proof for CDM consideration.

It can be concluded that the project activity without CDM funds is not a financially viable alternative and by putting the project with CDM funds the financial risk is mitigated thus it is an additional activity. CAR (08) was closed out.

Based on the findings above, it was concluded that the project activity was not a likely baseline scenario and hence additional to any that would occur in absence of project activity.

### 3.4 *Application of Baseline Methodology and Calculation of Emission Factors*

The present CDM project activity is using baseline methodology AM0025 version 6. The PDD is applying the baseline methodology correctly.

The project proponent has calculated the emission factors as per the methodology taking IPCC &

Methodology data. These are mentioned in PDD clearly. These are calculated Ex-ante and are fixed for entire crediting period. These are only used in Emission reduction calculation.

CAR (05) was raised to get the clarification on baseline emission estimation which is mentioned in the PDD as per older version. The project proponent replied by providing the required information in revised PDD and as per approved methodology AM0025. The project proponent also provided the CER calculation sheet. This was reviewed by the local assessor and found that the excel sheet is in order. This was accepted and hence CAR (05) was closed.

CAR (06) was raised to get the clarification on project emission estimation which is mentioned in the PDD as per older version. The project proponent replied by providing the required information in revised PDD and as per approved methodology AM0025. The project proponent also provided the CER calculation sheet. This was reviewed by the local assessor and found that the excel sheet is in order. This was accepted and hence CAR (06) was closed.

CAR (07) was raised to get the clarification on leakage estimation which is mentioned in the PDD as per older version. The project proponent replied by providing the required information in revised PDD and as per approved methodology AM0025. The project proponent also provided the CER calculation sheet. This was reviewed by the local assessor and found that the excel sheet is in order. This was accepted and hence CAR (07) was closed.

The emission reduction calculation excel sheet provided based on AM0025 version 6 is clear and emission reduction estimation has decreased from 266061 tCO<sub>2</sub>e per annum to 262791 tCO<sub>2</sub>e per annum. This is clearly mentioned in revised PDD as well.

### **3.5 Application of Monitoring Methodology and Monitoring Plan**

The monitoring plan given in the revised PDD is clear and as per approved methodology AM0025 version 6.

The monitoring plan of the PDD was not mentioning QA / QC procedures properly so NIR (09) was raised. The project proponent replied by revising the PDD and mentioning that the annex 4 is providing the monitoring plan in detail. The revised PDD received was desk reviewed and found to be OK. This is taken as assurance from PP and will be cross checked during Verification as this is a future project. This was accepted and hence NIR (09) was closed out.

CAR (10) was raised to get the clarification on Responsibility & authority for registration, monitoring, recording, data archiving, calibration etc. were not mentioned in the Annex 4 of PDD. The project proponent replied by providing the revised PDD mentioning the details in Annex 4. This was reviewed and found to be in order. Hence CAR (10) was closed.

### **3.6 Choice of the Crediting Period**

The crediting period selected by the project proponent is Fixed crediting period. The crediting period of 10 years is mentioned in the PDD.

CAR (18) was raised to get the proof of starting date of project activity. The project proponent replied by providing the proof for the starting date as date of incorporation of company. This is now changed to date of construction as 1-04-2008 as per RFQ document. This is a future activity hence this was accepted after reviewing the revised PDD and hence CAR (18) was closed out.

### **3.7 Environmental Impacts**

The project activity is the MSW treatment and converted into RDF fluff to utilize this as fuel to generate electricity. The project which will be located in two locations in Delhi. The technology that will be used in the project activity is the integrated technology. This project activity provides the impression that the environmental impacts will be negligible as the project is a future project and can also be checked

during verification as well.

NIR (11) & NIR (12) were raised to get the copy of EIA report along with the clarification on no adverse environmental effect. The project proponent replied by providing the EIA copy and mentioning that EIA tells about the no adverse environmental effect. This was checked by assessor and it was found to be in order and can also be verified during verification as well as this is a future project. Hence NIR (11) & NIR (12) were closed.

NIR (13) was raised to get the clarification on pollution board clearance for the project activity. The project proponent replied by providing the pollution control board certificates (Authorization under MSW Handling Rules). This was accepted as deemed clearance and will also be checked during verification as well. Hence NIR (13) was closed.

### **3.8 Local Stakeholder Comments**

Media used to invite local stake holder comments was not mentioned in the PDD so NIR (14) was raised. In response to NIR (14) project proponent provided the copies of invitation letter along with the copy of newspaper cutting. The documents provided were checked and found satisfactory. These were accepted by the Assessor. Hence NIR (14) was closed.

The Minutes of local stake holder consultation was not provided hence NIR (15) was raised. The project proponent replied by providing the minutes of meeting. This was verified by assessor by meeting some local stakeholders at site. This was accepted and hence NIR (15) was closed out.

#### 4. Comments by Parties, Stakeholders and NGOs

In accordance with sub-paragraphs 40 (b) and (c) of the CDM modalities and procedures, the project design document of a proposed CDM project activity shall be made publicly available and the DOE shall invite comments on the validation requirements from Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited non-governmental organizations and make them publicly available. This chapter describes this process for this project.

##### **4.1 Description of How and When the PDD was Made Publicly Available**

The Project Design Document for this project was made available on the SGS website <http://sgsqualitynetwork.com/tradeassurance/ccp/projects/project.php?id=206> and was open for comments from 08-02-2007 until 09-03-2007. Comments were invited through the UNFCCC CDM homepage

##### **4.2 Compilation of all Comments Received**

No Comment received

##### **4.3 Explanation of How Comments Have Been Taken into Account**

No Comment was received.

## 5. Validation Opinion

SGS has performed a validation of the project: “The TIMARPUR-OKHLA Waste Management Pvt. Ltd’s (TOWMCL) integrated waste to energy project at Delhi” The Validation was performed on the basis of the UNFCCC criteria and host country criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

Using a risk based approach, the review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided SGS with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of the stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM and all relevant host country criteria. The project will hence be recommended by SGS for registration with the UNFCCC.

SGS has received confirmation by the host Party that the project activity assists it in achieving sustainable development.

By installing the project activity, TOWMCL has reduces CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by avoiding methane emissions along with reduction of fossil fuel emissions which would have happened for generating electricity in northern regional grid and thus the project results in reductions of greenhouse gas emissions that are real, measurable and give long-term benefits to the mitigation of climate change. A review of the Investment barrier along with Technological barrier for the project activity; demonstrates that the proposed project activity was not a likely baseline scenario. Emission reductions attributable to the project are hence additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity. The project is a future project as mentioned in the PDD. The project will likely to achieve the estimated amount of emission reductions.

The validation is based on the information made available to SGS and the engagement conditions detailed in the report. The validation has been performed using a risk based approach as described above. The only purpose of this report is its use during the registration process as part of the CDM project cycle. Hence SGS can not be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the validation opinion, which will go beyond that purpose.

## 6. List of Persons Interviewed

<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Short description of subject discussed</b>
10-04-2007	Mr. Arijit Paul	Consultant	<i>Baseline, Monitoring Plan, &amp; Local Stake holder mentioned in PDD were discussed in detail</i>
10-04-2007	Mr. Deepak Gupta	ILFS – Project proponent	<i>Project activity &amp; Technology discussion, Additionality mentioned in PDD was discussed in detail</i>

## 7. Document References

Category 1 Documents (documents provided by the Client that relate directly to the GHG components of the project, (i.e. the CDM Project Design Document, confirmation by the host Party on contribution to sustainable development and written approval of voluntary participation from the designated national authority):

- /1/ PDD version 1 dated 7<sup>th</sup> February 2007 (Web hosted)
- /2/ PDD version 2 dated 26<sup>th</sup> March 2007
- /3/ PDD version 3 dated 29<sup>th</sup> July 2007
- /4/ PDD version 4 dated 6<sup>th</sup> September 2007 (Present)
- /5/ Host country Letter of Approval
- /6/ Modalities of Communication

Category 2 Documents (background documents used to check project assumptions and confirm the validity of information given in the Category 1 documents and in validation interviews):

- /7/ CER Calculation sheet
- /8/ No Technology change letter
- /9/ No ODA Letter
- /10/ TOWMCL incorporation date proof
- /11/ IRR Calculation sheet along with sensitivity analysis sheet as Investment barrier proof
- /12/ Newspaper Cutting for getting local stakeholder consultation comments
- /13/ Invitation letter for LSC
- /14/ LSC Minutes of meeting
- /15/ DPR as Technological barrier proof
- /16/ EIA copy
- /17/ Board Resolution
- /18/ RFQ as start date proof

## Annex 1

**TABLE 12 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO BE VERIFIED BY LOCAL ASSESSORS / SITE VISIT**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Monitoring Plan for Baseline emissions and project emissions to be checked during site visit.	PDD	SV / DR	Monitoring Plan is OK and in line with methodology as it is a future project so this will be checked during verification as well.	Y	Y
Project boundary to be checked.	PDD	SV / DR	The project is future project so will be verified during verification. The site were seen but the construction is yet to be started.	Y	Y
Local stake holder comments needs to be checked during site visit.	PDD	SV / DR	Local stake holder comments were verified during site visit and no negative comments reported or seen during the site visit.	Y	Y
It is required to be checked whether the project technology used is likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period.	PDD	SV / DR	Project proponent told that the project activity will not be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the crediting period.	Y	Y
Environmental impacts to be checked.	PDD	SV / DR	No negative environmental impacts either reported by the local stakeholders or seen during site visit.	Y	Y

## Annex 2



**TABLE 1 PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS FOR CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM (CDM) PROJECT ACTIVITIES (REF PDD, LETTERS OF APPROVAL AND UNFCCC WEBSITE)**

REQUIREMENT	MoV	Ref	Comment	Draft finding	Concl
1.1 The project shall assist Parties included in Annex I in achieving compliance with part of their emission reduction commitment under Art. 3 and be entered into voluntarily.	DR	PDD	The project is unilateral and no annex I participant has been identified. But the project will assist Parties included in Annex I in achieving compliance with part of their emission reduction.	OK	OK
1.2 The project shall assist non-Annex I Parties in achieving sustainable development and shall have obtained confirmation by the host country thereof, and be entered into voluntarily	DR	PDD	Letter of approval from Indian DNA needs to be provided.	CAR1	OK CAR1 closed
1.3 All Parties (listed in Section A3 of the PDD) have ratified the Kyoto protocol and are allowed to participate in CDM projects	DR	PDD	The Project is unilateral and host country India has ratified Kyoto on 26 <sup>th</sup> Aug 2002.	OK	OK
1.4 The project results in reductions of GHG emissions or increases in sequestration when compared to the baseline; and the project can be reasonably shown to be different from the baseline scenario	DR	PDD	The project used AM0025 approved methodology but with older version, and will reduce GHG emissions by generating the energy from waste and replace equivalent amount of electricity from grid.	NIR2	OK NIR2 closed
1.5 Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited NGOs shall have been invited to comment on the validation requirements for minimum 30 days (45 days for AR projects), and the project design document and comments have been made publicly available	DR	PDD	International Stakeholder comments were invited from 08-02-2007 TO 09-03-2007.  No comment was received.	OK	OK
1.6 The project has correctly completed a Project Design Document, using the current version and exactly following the guidance	DR	PDD	The project completed PDD using current version and following guidance.	OK	OK

REQUIREMENT	MoV	Ref	Comment	Draft finding	Concl
1.7 The project shall not make use of Official Development Assistance (ODA), nor result in the diversion of such ODA	DR	PDD	As per PDD no ODA is utilized. Proof for the same is required.	NIR3	OK NIR3 closed
1.8 For AR projects, the host country shall have issued a communication providing a single definition of minimum tree cover, minimum land area value and minimum tree height. Has such a letter been issued and are the definitions consistently applied throughout the PDD?	DR	PDD	It is not qualified as AR project.	OK	OK
1.9 Does the project meet the additional requirements detailed in: Table 9 for SSC projects Table 10 for AR projects Table 11 for AR SSC projects	DR	PDD	It is not qualified as SSC, AR, and AR SSC projects.	OK	OK
1.10 Is the current version of the PDD complete and does it clearly reflect all the information presented during the validation assessment.	DR	PDD	Pending CARs & NIRs	Pending	OK
1.11 Does the PDD use accurate and reliable information that can be verified in an objective manner?	DR	PDD	The PDD is using information that can be verified in an objective manner.	OK	OK

**TABLE 2 BASELINE METHODOLOGY(IES) (REF: PDD SECTION B AND E AND ANNEX 3 AND AM)**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
2.1 Does the project meet all the applicability criteria listed in the methodology	PDD	DR	The project meets all the applicability criteria listed in the methodology.	OK	OK
2.2 Is the project boundary consistent with the approved methodology	PDD	DR	The project boundary is not clear.	CAR4	OK CAR4 closed

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
2.3 Are the baseline emissions determined in accordance with the methodology described	PDD	DR	Baseline emissions mentioned in the PDD are in accordance with the methodology AM0025 version 5, But of older version. Excel sheet needs to be provided.	CAR5	OK CAR5 closed
2.4 Are the project emissions determined in accordance with the methodology described	PDD	DR	Project emissions mentioned in the PDD are in accordance with the methodology AM0025 version 5, But of older version. Excel sheet needs to be provided.	CAR6	OK car6 closed
2.5 Is the leakage op the project activity determined in accordance with the methodology described	PDD	DR	Leakage mentioned in the PDD are in accordance with the methodology AM0025 version 5, But of older version. Excel sheet needs to be provided.	CAR7	OK CAR7 closed
2.6 Are the emission reductions determined in accordance with the methodology described	PDD	DR	Pending CAR 5,6,7	Pendi ng	OK

**Table 3**Additionality (Ref: PDD Section B5 and AM)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
3.1 Does the PDD follow all the steps required in the methodology to determine the additionality	PDD	DR	PDD is following the steps required in the methodology to determine the additionality.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
3.2 Is the discussion on the additionality clear and have all assumptions been supported by transparent and documented evidence	PDD	DR	<p>The Discussion on additionality is not clear and supporting documents needs to be provided.</p> <p>Technology barrier is not clear.</p> <p>Investment Barrier mentioned is not clear. IRR calculation sheet along with Investment proof needs to be provided.</p> <p>Barrier due to prevailing practice is not clear.</p> <p>How CDM will mitigate the risk of the barriers mentioned in the PDD.</p>	CAR8	OK CAR8 closed
3.3 Does the selected baseline represent the most likely scenario among other possible and/or discussed scenarios?	PDD	DR	The selected baseline represents the most likely baseline scenario. The baseline scenario is the continuation of the waste disposal at a landfill without capturing the landfill gas. The electricity will also be generated in the Northern regional grid by thermal power plants	OK	OK
3.4 Is it demonstrated/justified that the project activity itself is not a likely baseline scenario	PDD	DR	The project activity is not a likely baseline scenario.	OK	OK

**Table 4 Monitoring methodology (PDD Section D and AM)**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
4.1 Does the project meet all the applicability criteria listed in the monitoring methodology	PDD	DR	The project meets the applicability criteria listed in the monitoring methodology.	OK	OK
4.2 Does the PDD provide for the monitoring of the baseline emissions as required in the monitoring methodology	PDD	DR	PDD provide the monitoring of the baseline emissions as required in the monitoring methodology.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
4.3 Does the PDD provide for the monitoring of the project emissions as required in the monitoring methodology	PDD	DR	PDD provide the monitoring of the Project emissions as required in the monitoring methodology.	OK	OK
4.4 Does the PDD provide for the monitoring of the leakage as required in the monitoring methodology	PDD	DR	PDD provide the monitoring of the Leakage as required in the monitoring methodology.	OK	OK
4.5 Does the PDD provide for Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) Procedures as required in the monitoring methodology	PDD	DR	QA / QC Procedures to be elaborated more in PDD.	NIR9	OK NIR9 closed

**Table 5 Monitoring plan (PDD Annex 4)**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
5.1 Monitoring of Sustainable Development Indicators/ Environmental Impacts					
5.1.1 Does the monitoring plan provide the collection and archiving of relevant data concerning environmental, social and economic impacts?			Not applicable	N/A	NA
5.1.2 Is the choice of indicators for sustainability development (social, environmental, economic) reasonable?			Not applicable	N/A	NA
5.1.3 Will it be possible to monitor the specified sustainable development indicators?			Not applicable	N/A	NA
5.1.4 Are the sustainable development indicators in line with stated national priorities in the Host Country?	PDD	DR	No monitoring of sustainable development indicators is not mandatory in the Host Country. Pending CAR1	Pending	OK
5.2 Project Management Planning				CAR10	OK CAR10 closed

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
5.2.1 Is the authority and responsibility of project management clearly described?	PDD	DR	The authority and responsibility of project management is mentioned missing in Annex 4	CAR1 0	OK CAR10 closed
5.2.2 Is the authority and responsibility for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting clearly described?	PDD	DR	The authority and responsibility for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting. is missing in Annex 4.	CAR1 0	OK CAR10 closed
5.2.3 Are procedures identified for training of monitoring personnel?	PDD	DR	No training procedure of monitoring personnel has been identified. Please provide the document for the same.	CAR1 0	OK CAR10 closed
5.2.4 Are procedures identified for emergency preparedness for cases where emergencies can cause unintended emissions?	PDD	DR	Emergency preparedness is not mentioned. ( Annex 4 is missing)	CAR1 0	OK CAR10 closed
5.2.5 Are procedures identified for calibration of monitoring equipment?	PDD	DR	No specific procedure is identified and missing in Annex 4	CAR1 0	OK CAR10 closed
5.2.6 Are procedures identified for maintenance of monitoring equipment and installations?	PDD	DR	No specific procedure is identified and missing in Annex 4	CAR1 0	OK CAR10 closed
5.2.7 Are procedures identified for monitoring, measurements and reporting?	PDD	DR	No, procedure is explained in Annex 4.	CAR1 0	OK CAR10 closed
5.2.8 Are procedures identified for day-to-day records handling (including what records to keep, storage area of records and how to process performance documentation)	PDD	DR	No process performance evaluation procedure is identified and missing in Annex 4	CAR1 0	OK CAR10 closed

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
5.2.9 Are procedures identified for dealing with possible monitoring data adjustments and uncertainties?	PDD	DR	No procedure for data adjustments & uncertainties is explained in Annex 4.	CAR1 0	OK CAR10 closed
5.2.10 Are procedures identified for review of reported results/data?	PDD	DR	No specific procedure to review of reported results/data is mentioned in Annex 4.	CAR1 0	OK CAR10 closed
5.2.11 Are procedures identified for internal audits of GHG project compliance with operational requirements where applicable?	PDD	DR	No specific procedure identified ( Annex 4 is missing)	CAR1 0	OK CAR10 closed
5.2.12 Are procedures identified for project performance reviews before data is submitted for verification, internally or externally?	PDD	DR	No specific procedure identified ( Annex 4 is missing)	CAR1 0	OK CAR10 closed
5.2.13 Are procedures identified for corrective actions in order to provide for more accurate future monitoring and reporting?	PDD	DR	No specific procedure identified and missing in Annex 4.	CAR1 0	OK CAR10 closed

**Table 6 Environmental Impacts (Ref PDD Section D and relevant local legislation)**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
6.1 Has an analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity been sufficiently described?	PDD	DR	Analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity has been sufficiently described. Copy of EIA is required to be submitted by the PP.	NIR11	OK NIR11 closed
6.2 Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and if yes, is an EIA approved?	PDD	DR	EIA is required by the host party and the EIA is approved.	OK	OK
6.3 Will the project create any adverse environmental effects?	PDD	DR	According to PDD there is no adverse environmental effects. Proof to be provided.	NIR12	OK NIR12 closed
6.4 Are transboundary environmental impacts considered in the analysis?	PDD	DR	Yes	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
6.5 Have identified environmental impacts been addressed in the project design?	PDD	DR	The identified environmental impacts been addressed in the PDD.	OK	OK
6.6 Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country?	PDD	DR	The project comply with the environmental legislation in the host country. Pollution control board certificates to be provided by the PP.	NIR 13	OK NIR13 closed

**Table 7 Comments by local stakeholders (Ref PDD Section E)**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
7.1 Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	PDD	DR	Relevant stakeholders have been consulted.	OK	OK
7.2 Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?	PDD	DR	Media used is not provided in the PDD.	NIR14	OK NIR14 closed
7.3 If a stakeholder consultation process is required by regulations/laws in the host country, has the stakeholder consultation process been carried out in accordance with such regulations/laws?	PDD	DR	Stakeholder consultation as per CDM was carried out by the project proponent.  MOM to be provided.	NIR15	OK NIR15 closed
7.4 Is a summary of the stakeholder comments received provided?	PDD	DR	Summary of stakeholder comments received is provided in PDD.	OK	OK
7.5 Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	PDD	DR	Due account of stakeholder comments received is provided in PDD.	OK	OK

## TABLE 8 OTHER REQUIREMENTS

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<b>8.1 Project Design Document</b>					



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
8.1.1 Editorial issues: does the project correctly apply the PDD template and has the document been completed without modifying/adding headings or logo, format or font.	PDD	DR	Yes, the template has been applied correctly.	OK	OK
8.1.2 Substantive issues: does the PDD address all the specific requirements under each header. If requirements are not applicable / not relevant, this must be stated and justified	PDD	DR	Pending CARs / NIRs	Pending	OK
<b>8.2 Technology to be employed</b>					
8.2.1 Does the project design engineering reflect current good practices?	PDD	DR	Yes, the projects reflects current good practice through generation of power from waste	OK	OK
8.2.2 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?	PDD	DR	Project will be using state of the art technology and proper measures at design stage will be considered for better performance.	OK	OK
8.2.3 Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period?	PDD	DR	Project technology is not likely to be changed during the crediting period. Proof to be provided by the Client.	NIR16	OK NIR16 closed
8.2.4 Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to work as presumed during the project period?	PDD	DR	Training requirement not mentioned in PDD.	NIR17	OK NIR17 closed
<b>8.3 Duration of the Project/ Crediting Period</b>					
8.3.1 Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?	PDD	DR	Project starting date is defined clearly. Proof to be submitted by the project proponent.	CAR18	OK CAR18 closed
8.3.2 Is the assumed crediting time clearly defined and reasonable (renewable crediting period of max. two x 7 years or fixed crediting period of max. 10 years)?	PDD	DR	The crediting period selected is fixed for 10 years and start date of crediting period is from 01-04-2009.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
8.3.3 Does the project's operational lifetime exceed the crediting period	PDD	DR	The projects operational life time is 25 years which is more than the crediting period 10 years.	OK	OK

### Annex 3 FINDINGS OVERVIEW

**Findings from validation of [The TIMARPUR- OKHLA Waste Management Company [TOWMCL] INTEGRATED WASTE TO ENERGY project at delhi cdmval0468]**

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
1	CAR	Letter of approval from Indian DNA needs to be provided.	1.2
Date: 25-05-2007 [ Copy of HCA has been provided to the validator]			
Date: 18-06-2007 [Pankaj Mohan] [Comment Local Assessor] Letter of Approval dated 15 <sup>th</sup> May 2007 having reference number F.No. 4/3/2007 – CCC was provided which was desk reviewed and found to be in order. This was accepted and hence CAR1 could be closed.			
Date: 18-06-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar] [Acceptance and close out] OK Closed			

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
2	NIR	The project used AM0025 approved methodology but with older version, and will reduce GHG emissions by generating the energy from waste and replace equivalent amount of electricity from grid.	1.4
Date: [PDD has been revised according to the latest version of AM0025.]			
Date: 20-04-2007 [Pankaj Mohan] [Comment Local Assessor] The revised PDD received and hence NIR2 could be closed out.			
Date: 21-04-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar] [Acceptance and close out] OK, NIR2 closed			

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
3	NIR	As per PDD no ODA is utilized. Proof for the same is required.	1.7
Date: [An undertaking from the authorised personnel of the company is provided to the validator as a proof of no ODA is being utilised in the project activity.]			
Date: 20-04-2007 [Pankaj Mohan] [Comment Local Assessor] Letter received and this is found to be OK, Hence NIR3 could be closed.			
Date: 21-04-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar] [Acceptance and close out] OK NIR3 closed			

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
4	CAR	The project boundary is not clear.	2.2
Date: [In the revised PDD in section B.3, the project boundary is now clearly defined. ]			
Date: 20-04-2007 [Pankaj Mohan] [Comment Local Assessor] The revised PDD received and Project boundary is clearly defined. This is a future project hence this will be checked during verification as well. Hence CAR4 could be closed.			
Date:21-04-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar] [Acceptance and close out] OK CAR4 closed			

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
5	CAR	Baseline emissions mentioned in the PDD are in accordance with the methodology AM0025 version 5, But of older version. Excel sheet needs to be provided.	2.3
Date: [In the revised PDD the version 06 of AM0025 has been adopted and all the necessary revision to baseline emission calculation has been done as per the latest version. Excel sheet containing emission reduction calculation has been provided to validator]			
Date: 20-04-2007 [Pankaj Mohan] [Comment Local Assessor] The excel sheet received was checked during the desk review and This was checked for the formula as well. This was found to be OK hence CAR05 could be closed out.			
Date: 21-04-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar] [Acceptance and close out] OK CAR5 closed.			

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
6	CAR	Project emissions mentioned in the PDD are in accordance with the methodology AM0025 version 5, But of older version. Excel sheet needs to be provided.	2.4
Date: [In the revised PDD project emission has been calculated as per the AM0025 version 06. Excel sheet containing the emission reduction calculation has been provided to the Validator]			
Date: 20-04-2007 [Pankaj Mohan] [Comment Local Assessor] The excel sheet is OK and CAR6 could be closed.			
Date:21-04-2007 [ Sanjeev Kumar] [Acceptance and close out] OK CAR6 closed			

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
7	CAR	Leakage mentioned in the PDD are in accordance with the methodology AM0025 version 5, But of older version. Excel sheet needs to be provided.	2.5
Date: [In the revised PDD leakage emission has been calculated as per the AM0025 version 06. Excel			

sheet containing the emission reduction calculation has been provided to the Validator]	
Date: 20-04-2007 [Pankaj Mohan] [Comment Local Assessor] Excel sheet received is checked and found to be OK. CAR7 could be closed.	
Date: 21-04-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar] [Acceptance and close out] OK CAR7 closed	

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
8	CAR	The Discussion on additionality is not clear and supporting documents needs to be provided.  Technology barrier is not clear.  Investment Barrier mentioned is not clear. IRR calculation sheet along with Investment proof needs to be provided.  Barrier due to prevailing practice is not clear.  How CDM will mitigate the risk of the barriers mentioned in the PDD.	3.2

Date: 25-05-2007

[In the revised PDD, additionality (section B.5) has been explained in detail, all the supporting of the investments has been provided separately to validator. In the financial barrier section a sensitivity analysis has been provided to give more clarity on investment barrier aspects of the project activity. The technology barrier section has been substantiated with the supporting from the relevant section of the DPR where it is explained in detail why the project activity which manages waste through a combination of multiple technologies is superior to any of the stand alone technology. The sensitivity analysis explains how CDM revenue is helping to improve the project Internal Rate of Return (IRR) and Debt Service Coverage Ratio (DSCR). Further the board of the project proponent has taken up the project by considering fund inflow from CDM. Without CDM revenue the project would not have come up. A copy of the board resolution where the project was discussed is also provided as a reference.]

Date: 01-06-2007 [Pankaj Mohan]

[Comment Local Assessor] The replies provided along with the documentary proofs were checked by the local assessor during the desk review and found to be OK. This can be accepted and hence CAR8 could be closed out.

Date: 04-06-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar]

[Acceptance and close out] OK CAR8 closed

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
9	NIR	QA / QC Procedures to be elaborated more in PDD.	4.5

Date:

[QA/QC procedure has been elaborated in the Annex 4 of the revised PDD]

Date: 20-04-2007 [Pankaj Mohan]

[Comment Local Assessor] The revised PDD explains the QA/QC procedures in annex4 of PDD. Hence NIR9 could be closed.

Date: 21-04-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar]

[Acceptance and close out] OK NIR9 closed.

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
10	CAR	The parameters on Authority and responsibility of project management,	5.2.1

		Registration, Monitoring, Measurement, Reporting, Training, Internal Audit, Emergency preparedness, Calibration, Maintenance, day to day record handling and corrective actions are missing in Annex 4 of PDD.	
Date: 25-05-2007 [The parameters on authority and responsibility of project management, registration, monitoring, measurement, reporting, training, internal audit, emergency preparedness, calibration, maintenance, day to day record handling and corrective actions are included on Annex 4 of the PDD. Where a hierarchical organisation set up is provided with specific roles and responsibility of all the above mentioned parameters.]			
Date: 01-06-2007 [Pankaj Mohan] [Comment Local Assessor] The revised PDD submitted by the project proponent was checked and found that Annex 4 is mentioning the parameters on authority and responsibility of project management, registration, monitoring, measurement, reporting, training, internal audit, emergency preparedness, calibration, maintenance, day to day record handling and corrective actions. This was accepted and hence CAR10 could be closed out.			
Date: 04-06-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar] [Acceptance and close out] OK CAR10 closed			

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
11	NIR	Analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity has been sufficiently described. Copy of EIA is required to be submitted by the PP.	6.1
Date: 25-05-2007 [The copy of the EIA has been provided to validator]			
Date: 01-06-2007 [Pankaj Mohan] [Comment Local Assessor] The copy of EIA submitted was checked and found that it is in order and hence NIR11 could be closed.			
Date: 04-06-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar] [Acceptance and close out] OK NIR11 closed			

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
12	NIR	According to PDD there is no adverse environmental effects . Proof to be provided by the client.	6.3
Date: 25-05-2007 [The copy of the EIA which is provided to the validator explains why the project does not have any adverse environmental impact]			
Date: 01-06-2007 [Pankaj Mohan] [Comment Local Assessor] The copy of EIA provided was reviewed and found to be OK. Hence NIR12 could be closed.			
Date: 04-06-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar] [Acceptance and close out] OK NIR12 closed.			

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
13	NIR	The project comply with the environmental legislation in the host country. Pollution control board certificates to be provided by the PP.	6.6
Date: 25-05-2007 [Copy of the pollution control board certificates (Authorization under MSW Handling Rules) are provided to the validator.]			
Date: 01-06-2007 [Pankaj Mohan]			

[Comment Local Assessor] The copy of the same was received and checked during the desk review and found to be OK. Hence NIR13 could be closed.

Date: 04-06-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar]

[Acceptance and close out] OK NIR13 closed.

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
14	NIR	Media used to invite comments from local stakeholders is not provided in the PDD.	7.2

Date: 25-05-2007

[Stakeholder consultation was carried out in an open and transparent manner at each of the project activity location. Invitation was sent to each of the identified stakeholder including representatives of the local community. Mailing lists, letters inviting stakeholder consultation. Copy of the public notice in the newspaper for both of this stakeholder consultation meeting along with the Minutes of the Meeting (MoM) are provided to the validator. ]

Date: 01-06-2007 [Pankaj Mohan]

[Comment Local Assessor] The documentary evidences received were desk reviewed and found to be OK. These were also verified by the local assessor by meeting some of the local stakeholders at site. This was accepted and hence NIR14 could be closed.

Date: 04-06-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar]

[Acceptance and close out] OK NIR14 closed

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
15	NIR	Stakeholder consultation as per CDM was carried out by the project proponent. MOM to be provided.	7.3

Date: 25-05-2007

[MoM for stakeholder consultation has been provided to the validator.]

Date: 01-06-2007 [Pankaj Mohan]

[Comment Local Assessor] The MOM received from project proponent was found to be OK after the local assessor met few local stakeholders during site visit. This was accepted and hence NIR15 could be closed.

Date: 04-06-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar]

[Acceptance and close out] OK NIR15 closed

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
16	NIR	Project technology is not likely to be changed during the crediting period. Proof to be provided by the Client.	8.2.3

Date:

[An undertaking from the authorised personnel of the PP has been provided to the validator to confirm that the technology is not likely to be changed during the crediting period.]

Date: 20-04-2007 [Pankaj Mohan]

[Comment Local Assessor] Letter received and it is a future project so this will be checked during verification as well. NIR16 could be closed out.

Date: 21-04-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar]

[Acceptance and close out] OK NIR16 closed.

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
-----	------	-------	-----

17	NIR	Training requirement not mentioned in PDD.	8.2.4
Date: [The project does not require an elaborate and extensive training requirement. That is why it was not explicitly mentioned in the PDD. However, necessary on the job training programme will be given to operating personnel by the competent authority. This is now mentioned in the Annex 4]			
Date: 20-04-2007 [Pankaj Mohan] [Comment Local Assessor] The revised PDD mentions this and as it is a future project so This will be verified during verification as well. NIR17 could be closed.			
Date: 21-04-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar] [Acceptance and close out ] OK NIR17 closed			

Date: 15-3-2007

Raised by: Pankaj Mohan

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
18	CAR	Project starting date is defined clearly. Proof to be submitted by the project proponent.	8.3.1
Date: [The project is a future project. The SPV TOWMCL has been incorporated solely for the purpose of developing the project activity. That is why start of the project activity has been mentioned as the date when the TOWMCL was incorporated. The same was provided to the validator. This is now changed to date of construction as 1-04-2008 as per RFQ provided to the validator.]			
Date: 20-04-2007 [Pankaj Mohan] [Comment Local Assessor] Previously start date of taken as date of incorporation of company which is now changed to the start date of construction as per RFQ provided i.e. 1-04-2008. This was accepted as this is a future project so this will be checked during verification as well. CAR18 could be closed.			
Date: 21-04-2007 [Sanjeev Kumar] [Acceptance and close out] OK CARR18 closed.			

## Annex 4



## Statement of Competence

Name: Sanjeev Kumar

SGS Affiliate: SGS India Pvt. Ltd.

### Status

- |                           |                                     |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| - Product Co-ordinator    | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| - Operations Co-ordinator | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| - Technical Reviewer      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| - Expert                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

### Validation

### Verification

- |                                      |                                     |                                     |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| - Local Assessor                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| - Lead Assessor                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| - Assessor<br>/Trainee Lead Assessor | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

### Scopes of Expertise

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Energy Distribution  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Energy Demand  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Manufacturing  | <input checked="" 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<br>Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 12. Solvent Use   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 13. Waste Handling and Disposal   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 14. Afforestation and Reforestation   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 15. Agriculture   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

Approved Member of Staff by Siddharth Yadav Date: 16<sup>th</sup> May 2007



## Statement of Competence

Name:Pankaj Mohan

SGS Affiliate:SGS India Pvt. Ltd.

### Status

- |                           |                                     |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| - Product Co-ordinator    | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| - Operations Co-ordinator | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| - Technical Reviewer      | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| - Expert                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

### Validation

### Verification

- |                                       |                                     |                                     |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| - Local Assessor                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| - Lead Assessor                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| - Assessor<br>/ Trainee Lead Assessor | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

### Scopes of Expertise

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Energy Distribution  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Energy Demand  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Manufacturing  | <input checked="" 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<br>Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 12. Solvent Use   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 13. Waste Handling and Disposal   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 14. Afforestation and Reforestation   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 15. Agriculture   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

Approved Member of Staff by Marco van der Linden

Date: 03-04-07

## Statement of Competence

Name: Dr. Jayachandran M Nair

SGS Affiliate: SGS India Pvt

### Status

- Product Co-ordinator ☐
- Operations Co-ordinator ☐
- Technical Reviewer ☐
- Expert ☒

### Validation

### Verification

- Local Assessor ☒
- Lead Assessor ☐
- Assessor ☐
- / Trainee Lead Assessor

### Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable) ☐
2. Energy Distribution ☐
3. Energy Demand ☐
4. Manufacturing ☐
5. Chemical Industry ☐
6. Construction ☐
7. Transport ☐
8. Mining/Mineral Production ☐
9. Metal Production ☐
10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas) ☐
11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride ☐
12. Solvent Use ☐
13. Waste Handling and Disposal ☒
14. Afforestation and Reforestation ☐
15. Agriculture ☒

Approved Member of Staff by Marco van der Linden

Date: 25/08/06

- o0o -