

Chair, CDM Executive Board
UNFCCC

**Response to the request for review for the CDM project activity
"4MW AMDB Perting Mini Hydro Project"
(Ref. no.: 4015)**

2011-03-07

The DOE TÜV Rheinland Japan Ltd. was informed on 7th February 2011 that the CDM project "4MW AMDB Perting Mini Hydro Project" (Ref. no. 4015.), is under "Request for Review" because *three* requests for review have been received from members of the board.

All of these requests for review contain *the same three* issues. We would like to provide our response to the issue raised on the following pages.

In summary, we understand the issue raised in the "Request for Review" and regret if the previous Validation Report did not reflect and describe the validation results in sufficient detail. However, we hope that the input by the project participants and this explanation will find acceptance among the members of the Executive Board.

Yours sincerely

Dr. Manfred Brinkmann
CDM Program Manager
TÜV Rheinland Japan Ltd.

Chair, CDM Executive Board
UNFCCC

**Response to the request for review for the CDM project activity
"4MW AMDB Perting Mini Hydro Project"
(Ref. no.: 4015)**

2011-03-07

The DOE TÜV Rheinland Japan Ltd. was informed on 7th February 2011 that the CDM project "4MW AMDB Perting Mini Hydro Project" (Ref. no. 4015.), is under "Request for Review" because *three* requests for review have been received from members of the board.

All of these requests for review contain *the same three* issues. We would like to provide our response to the issue raised on the following pages.

In summary, we understand the issue raised in the "Request for Review" and regret if the previous Validation Report did not reflect and describe the validation results in sufficient detail. However, we hope that the input by the project participants and this explanation will find acceptance among the members of the Executive Board.

Yours sincerely



Dr. Manfred Brinkmann
CDM Program Manager
TÜV Rheinland Japan Ltd.

Issue 1 raised:

The DOE should further substantiate how the starting date of the project activity is in line with the CDM Glossary of Terms.

In doing so, the DOE is requested to explain why the first day concrete was poured at site (27/04/2007) is considered as starting date, given that:

(a) the O&M agreement was signed on 24/04/2007; and

(b) the site clearance for access road to power intake and power house started in December 2006.

TÜV Rheinland's response:

The validation team has updated the validation report Section 3.5.1 in order to revise the project starting date in line with the CDM Glossary of Terms, Version 05.

The texts from the report has been extracted & included below:

The starting date of the project activity is the date when the letter of awards had been issued for the following:

- a) Package A: Construction & Completion of Power Intake, Penstock, Powerhouse & Associated Civil & General Mechanical & Electrical Works, 21 December 2006 /P09/*
- b) Package B: Design, Supply, Installation & Commissioning of Power Generating Equipment & Associated Works, 21 December 2006 /P09/*
- c) Package C: Supply, Delivery, Laying, Jointing, Termination, Testing & Commissioning of 11 kV Transmission Line & Associated Works, 21 December 2006 /P09/.*

The validation team has cross checked the actual construction implementation progress as stated in the PDD Section B.5 versus the project milestone chart /P38/ & confirmed that the actual construction activity has started since early Feb 2007 i.e. started with site possession

Initially, the project participant had considered the first day concrete was poured at site, i.e. 27/04/2007 /P15/ as the project starting date. The validation team has reviewed the supporting document /P15/ which is a letter submitted by AMDB Perting Hydro Sdn. Bhd. to Tenaga Nasional Berhad. The official letter was submitted to Tenaga Nasional Berhad (the electricity buyer) with the purpose to inform the project commencement date (i.e. the 1st pouring of concrete at site). This letter was submitted as required in the power purchase agreement i.e. Renewable Energy Power Purchase Agreement (REPPA), dated 29 November 2006 /P08/, paragraph 11.1.

However, in line with the Glossary of CDM Terms, Version 05 /P47/, the validation team had determined the starting date of the project activity to be the date when the letter of awards have been issued, as listed above /P09/. CAR no. 5 has been raised to the project participant & this has closed out after the corrections have been positively verified by the validation team.

The validation team has *also* cross checked following evidences:

- a) Signed contract (Operation & Maintenance Agreement between AMDB Perting Hydro Sdn. Bhd. & AMDB Power Services Sdn. Bhd. dated 24 April 2007 /P10/.*
- b) Project Management Consultancy Agreement between AMDB Perting Hydro Sdn Bhd and AMDB Power Services, dated 2 Feb 2007 /P21/. The validation team has verified the agreement & confirmed the scope of the project management consultancy includes preliminary activities, construction stage & other services as outlined in the agreement.*

and confirmed that based on the dates of stipulated in these documents, the earliest possible date for project starting date will be still **21/12/2006**. There are no other major construction conducted prior to this date, as confirmed during on site interview with the project participants & *review of the project milestone chart /P38/.*

Hence according to the Glossary of CDM Terms, Version 05, /P47/ the start date shall be considered to be the date on which the project participant has committed to expenditures related to the implementation or related to the construction of the project activity /P09/. The date selected in this case has been confirmed to be appropriate

The validation team also would like to inform that the statement “***the site clearance for access road to power intake and power house started in December 2006***” which was indicated in the PDD Table B.7 has been revised in order to avoid misunderstanding. As explained above, based on the project milestone chart /P38/, it is confirmed that the actual construction activity has started since early Feb 2007 i.e. started with site possession

Issue 2 raised:

The DOE is requested to further substantiate how it has validated the prior consideration of the CDM for the project according to VVM version 1.2, paragraph 104 (b).

TÜV Rheinland's response:

The validation team has updated the validation report Section 3.5.1 in order to provide justifications for the validation of the prior consideration of the CDM according to VVM version 1.2, paragraph 104 (b)

The texts from the report has been extracted & included below:

Date of CDM consideration	<i>18/10/2006</i>
Justification of and evidences (references) on the CDM consideration date of project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project participants have considered CDM as part of the project development when the initial inquiry on CDM process was submitted to Malaysia Energy Centre (Pusat Tenaga Malaysia) by the PP /P16/ <i>on 13 May 2005</i>, as confirmed during on site interview. <i>The inquiry submitted includes the submission of project data sheet for feasibility study to be conducted by Malaysia Energy Centre /P16/. The validation team considers this as evidence of CDM awareness by the project participants prior to the project activity start date.</i> <i>However, in line with the requirements stipulated in the Guidelines On The Demonstration And Assessment Of Prior Consideration Of The CDM, EB 49, Version 03 /P46/ article 6(a), ".....Evidence to support this would include, inter alia, minutes and/or notes related to the consideration of the decision by the Board of Directors, or equivalent, of the project participant, to undertake the project as a CDM project activity", the validation team have considered the following as the real objective evidence for CDM consideration:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) Internal memorandum : Sg Perting Mini Hydro Project In Bentong, Pahang Under The Small Renewable Energy Power Program – Approval To Proceed With The Project Implementation, dated 18 October 2006 /P39/. This document showed the evidence of the application for approval from the AMDB Project Development Committee to proceed with CDM, including the consideration of CDM revenue to proceed with the project. The validation team considers this document to be valid & able to substantiate that the benefits from CDM (in this case, the CDM revenue) were the decisive factor in the decision to proceed with the project</i> Confirmed through the review of the following documents during on site visit to substantiate that the PPs have taken the real actions in order to continue the project activity as CDM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) CDM Agreement finalized & signed with CDM consultant, SV Carbon Sdn. Bhd., dated 3 March 2008 /P30/</i> <i>b) Email CDM application for validation quotation to DOE, dated 27 June 2008 /P44/</i>

	<p>c) <i>Signed quotation with DOE for CDM validation, dated 22 September 2008 /P45/</i></p> <p>d) <i>Quotation / bids received from 2 potential carbon credit buyer dated 19 November 2008 & 17 April 2009 /P48/</i></p> <p>e) <i>Signed ERPA, dated 23 November 2009 /P34/</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The validation team had also validated the following events which had caused the project delay, as stated in PDD Table B.7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Change of Management (Project was put on hold). This was re-confirmed by the validation team during on site interview & review of the evidences presented by the PP i.e. Announcement of AMDB Berhad become the subsidiary of AMCORP Group Berhad dated on 14th June, 2007 /P31/ b) Appointment of CEO on 30th July, 2007 /P32/ c) Stop Work order given to contractor to immediately stop all services in relation to the project /P29/ d) Start work order to civil contractor for the mini hydro project /P29/ <p><i>From the project history of CDM development above, including evidences presented, the validation team could confirmed that there is less than 2 years of a gap between the documented evidences submitted to the DOE. The validation team concluded that continuing & real actions were taken to secure CDM status for the project activity</i></p> <p>Hence, according to EB 49 Annex 22 Guidelines on the Demonstration and Assessment Of Prior Consideration of CDM Version 03, proposed project activities with a start date before 2 August 2008, for which the start date is prior to the date of publication of the PDD for global stakeholder consultation, are required to demonstrate that the CDM was seriously considered in the decision to implement the project activity. With the justification presented above, the validation team concluded that the project activity conforms to the stipulations defined in the EB 49 Annex 22, regarding the serious consideration of CDM activity</p>
--	---

Issue 3 raised:

The DOE is requested to further explain the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis, in particular,

(a) how the DOE confirmed that the input values from project financial model (PDD page 15) were available at the time of investment decision;

(b) how the DOE confirmed that the total investment is suitable according to the VVM version 01.2 paragraph 111 (b), by only comparing the project activity with one other project; and

(c) how the DOE has validated the 5% escalation of the O&M cost in line with the VVM version 01.2 paragraph 111.

TÜV Rheinland's response:

(a) how the DOE confirmed that the input values from project financial model (PDD page 15) were available at the time of investment decision;

The validation team has updated the validation report Section 3.5.4 in order to provide justifications for the availability of the input values from the financial model (PDD page 15) at the time of investment decision:

The texts from the report has been extracted & included below:

“The validation team had reviewed the following input values used in the financial calculation through review of sources presented in the PDD Section B.5 & financial calculation spreadsheet. The validation team has noted the earlier document reviewed to support objective evidence of CDM consideration requirement i.e. Internal memorandum : Sg Perting Mini Hydro Project In Bentong, Pahang Under The Small Renewable Energy Power Program – Approval To Proceed With The Project Implementation, dated 18 October 2006 /P39/. This document showed the evidence of the application for approval from the AMDB Project Development Committee to proceed with CDM, including the consideration of CDM revenue to proceed with the project.

The validation team considers this document to be also the objective evidence to indicate the investment decision timing. The internal memorandum showed that the projected investment cost of around RM 31 million & IRR of around 8.0% without CDM revenue.

For the purpose of validating the financial input parameters, the validation team has considered the investment decision date in order to validate the consistency, appropriateness of the input values with this timing & consistency of the listed input values application in the financial calculation spreadsheet

Parameter	Reference Documents / Evidences
Installed capacity (MW) = 4.2 Net export capacity (MW = 4.0)	<p><i>The validation team has confirmed this parameter to be correctly reflected in the PDD through review of Technical specification for turbines & generators – April 2006 /P07/ & this document is available at the time of investment decision</i></p> <p><i>The validation team also reviewed the Renewable Energy Power Purchase Agreement (REPPA), 29 November 2006 /P08/ Clause 5.1 related to Sales & Purchase of Electrical Energy. It states that the</i></p> <p><i>a) Quantity of the net electrical energy generated & delivered to the Tenaga Nasional Berhad in any one complete calendar year shall</i></p>

	<p><i>not exceed 28,032,000 kWh plus 20%, equivalent to 3.2 MW/hour</i></p> <p><i>b) Quantity of the net electrical energy generated & delivered to the Tenaga Nasional Berhad between 30.835,200 kWh (exclusive) & 33,638,400 kWh (inclusive) shall be deemed as Additional Energy. Any excess electrical energy exceeding Additional Energy shall be delivered to Tenaga Nasional Berhad (i.e. 3.52 MW/hour to 3.84 MW/hour) at no cost</i></p> <p><i>* Assuming the generating hours to be 8760 hours / year</i></p> <p><i>Due to the restriction imposed in the REPPA, the maximum net export capacity will be 4.0 MW & the validation team concluded the value applied is valid</i></p>
<p><i>Annual power supplied to grid (MWh) = 28,032</i></p>	<p><i>This was calculated based on the plant capacity, which is expected to operate at 80% utilization factor. This has been determined based on the flow duration curve of Sungai Perting /P11/ & the validation team has verified the calculation in the spreadsheet /P06a/ as correct. This reference document /P11/ is also available at the time of investment decision, verified by the validation team</i></p> <p><i>The plant load factor has been determined to be in compliance to the Guidelines For The Reporting And Validation Of Plant Load Factors, EB 48, Version 01, /P49/, article 3 (b). The validation team confirmed that the plant load factor has been determined by a third party engineering company i.e. an engineering consulting firm – Angkasa Consulting Services Sdn. Bhd. (http://www.acssb.com.my/acssb/hydro1.htm - website address showing the project reference)</i></p> <p><i>Cross-checked the company website address: http://www.acssb.com.my/acssb/history.htm & found that the company is an engineering consulting firm registered with Kementerian Kewangan Malaysia (Ministry of Finance Malaysia), Board of Engineers Malaysia and other Government Authorities in Malaysia.</i></p> <p><i>Besides, the validation team could also verify the requirements stated in the Renewable Energy Power Purchase Agreement (REPPA), 29 November 2006 /P08/ Clause 5.1 & confirmed that the quantity of the net electrical energy generated & delivered to the Tenaga Nasional Berhad in any one complete calendar year shall not exceed 28,032,000 kWh plus 20%, equivalent to 3.2 MW/hour</i></p> <p><i>The validation team concluded that the value applied is valid</i></p>
<p>Capital expenditure</p>	<p>The capital expenditure (value RM 31.5 million in total) consists of mainly:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Civil works 2. Turbine, Generator & accessories 3. Transmission line 4. Project management 5. Consultancy fees <p>The detailed cost breakdown including the applicable supporting evidences such as letter of awards, signed contracts & quotation /P09,</p>

	<p>P21/ for each category is listed clearly in the financial calculation spreadsheet, worksheet "Note 3". For each category, the cost breakdown indicated in the financial calculation spreadsheet has been cross checked versus the supporting evidences & PDD. It is also noted that the main equipments such as the turbines and piping makes up almost 70% of the total capital expenditure, as confirmed by the validation team (i.e. RM 22 million).</p> <p><i>The project participant has submitted the revised financial calculation spreadsheet /P06b/ whereby the additional work cost for transmission line has been removed as this was only available at later stage after the investment decision date in October 2006</i></p> <p><i>The validation team has cross checked each of the costs indicated in the financial calculation spreadsheet /P06b/, worksheet "Note 3" versus the corresponding supporting evidences & confirmed that each of the input values indicated are valid during the time of investment decision, in line with the Guidelines On The Assessment Of Investment Analysis Version 03.1 EB 51 /B08/, article 6.</i></p> <p>The validation team has also conducted a further comparison with the total capital invested for this project activity versus other comparable registered CDM project in the same country /P28/. The validation team has cross checked CDM Pipeline list in http://cd4cdm.org/ website & confirmed so far there are only 2 registered CDM project for hydropower project /P28/ i.e. ref. no 3719 & 1736</p> <p>It shows an approximate range of <i>USD 4,421,077</i> to USD 11,198,718 The total capital invested for this project activity lies well within this range [assuming exchange rate 1 USD = RM 3.76 (average in year 2005), therefore RM 31.5 million = USD 8,377,660]. <i>By comparing the cost per MW, it shows an approximate range of USD 2,210,538 to USD 2,488,604. For the project activity, it is below this range i.e. USD 1,994,680</i></p> <p><i>The validation team has researched for further information about the investment cost from other implemented mini-hydropower projects in Malaysia without CDM but however, this information are not publicly available. Hence, the validation team decided to refer to an article titled "Overview of mini and small hydropower in Southeast Asia" /P41/. In this article, it was mentioned that ".....The specific investment cost per kW of SHP project also varies greatly from country to country, ranging from US\$600/kW to US\$4,000 - 6,000/kW."</i></p> <p><i>Assuming at the time of investment decision (October 2006), the exchange rate of 1 USD = RM 3.67 /P42/, this will give rise to an estimated investment cost ranging from RM 2202/kW to RM 14,680/kW</i></p> <p><i>For the project activity, cost per kW = RM 31.5 million / 4 MW = RM 7,875/kW</i></p> <p><i>The cost per kW for the project activity also lies well within this published range</i></p> <p>The validation team concluded the values indicated in the spreadsheet are correct & appropriate</p>
Operation & Maintenance Cost	<p>The value (RM 753,000 / year) has been cross checked with the PDD & financial calculation spreadsheet versus the signed contract between AMDB Perting Hydro Sdn. Bhd. & AMDB Power Services Sdn. Bhd./P10/.</p>

	<p>The validation team has also conducted a further comparison with the operation & maintenance cost for this project activity versus other comparable registered CDM project in the same country /P28/. The validation team has cross checked CDM Pipeline list in http://cd4cdm.org/ website & confirmed so far there are only 2 registered CDM project for hydropower project /P28/</p> <p>It shows an approximate range of USD 164,838 to USD 210,121. The operation & maintenance cost for this project activity lies well within this range [assuming exchange rate 1 USD = RM 3.76 (average in year 2005), therefore RM 753,000 = USD 200,266]</p> <p>The value applied was found to be correct & appropriate</p> <p><i>As for the annual escalation cost at 5% for the operation & maintenance cost, the validation team has verified the signed contract between AMDB Perting Hydro Sdn. Bhd. & AMDB Power Services Sdn. Bhd./P10/, Schedule 3. The Schedule 3 clearly showed the calculated amount to be paid every year with annual escalation cost of 5%</i></p> <p><i>Hence the validation team concluded the escalation rate of 5% applied is valid</i></p>
Power tariff	<p>The value (RM 0.167 / kWh) has been cross checked with the PDD & financial calculation spreadsheet versus the <i>offer letter received from Tenaga Nasional Berhad to AMDB Perting Hydro dated 22nd April 2006, (Ref No: TNB(B)/HEKO/PSTK 9/1/33) /P40/</i> & signed Renewable Energy Power Purchase Agreement (REPPA), 29 November 2006 /P08/. The power tariff does not include tax & there is no tax applicable for sales of power. The validation team has re-confirmed his through review of the Renewable Energy Power Purchase Agreement (REPPA), 29 November 2006 /P08/ & the <i>offer letter received from Tenaga Nasional Berhad to AMDB Perting Hydro dated 22nd April 2006, (Ref No: TNB(B)/HEKO/PSTK 9/1/33) /P40/</i></p> <p>The validation team has also compared with another 2 similar registered CDM project /P28/ & confirmed that the registered project also signed power purchase agreement with fixed tariff for 21 years.</p> <p>The validation team has reviewed the websites</p> <p>a) Ministry of Energy, Green Technology & Water Malaysia /P36/ b) Suruhanjaya Tenaga (Energy Commission) Malaysia /P37/</p> <p>Both websites has shown that the “renewable energy electricity producer shall be given a licence for a period of 21 years, to be effective from the date of commissioning of the plant.” Hence this term stated in the REPPA is valid & applicable for all other REPPAs signed by other local small hydropower projects</p> <p>As for the power tariff price trend, the price comparison for other local small power plants cannot be carried out by the validation team. The published information in the website /P36, P37/ has indicated that “Project developers will have to negotiate the Renewable Electricity Purchase Agreement with the relevant Utility, including the selling price on a willing-seller, willing buyer basis, based on take and pay.”</p> <p>There is no publicly available information in Malaysia which can show what is the actual power tariff price signed by other local small hydropower projects since this information is deemed to be confidential.</p>

	<p>However, the validation team is able to find out further information about the price in the published report “Overview of Policy Instruments for the Promotion of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency in Malaysia”</p> <p>http://www.serd.ait.ac.th/cogen/62/reports/countries/malaysia.pdf /P35/</p> <p>In this report, page 22, Section 3.2 Policy Initiatives & programs, it was indicated that “Selling price is capped at a ceiling of RM 0.17 sen / kWh”</p> <p>The validation team thus could conclude that the power price tariff for this project i.e. RM 0.167 / kWh and also RM 0.165 – RM 0.17 kWh for the CDM registered project /P28/ is valid.</p>
Insurance cost	<p>The cost breakdown for the insurance cost amounting total of RM 82,056 has been provided to the validation team for review.</p> <p>The values reflected in the financial calculation spreadsheet has been cross checked versus the quotation slip given by AON Insurance Brokers (Malaysia) Sdn Bhd. /P22/. Although there were some inconsistencies of values found during the desk review, the project participant has provided written explanation & justification on the errors in the quotation calculation & that the values reflected in the financial calculation spreadsheet were the correct & accurate values.</p> <p>The validation team has confirmed the justification provided are real & accepted.</p>
Payment to State Government	<p>The value has been cross checked with the PDD & financial calculation spreadsheet versus the Approval letter (approving the mini hydropower development project for Sg Perting, by AMDB) received from Unit Perancang Ekonomi Negeri (State Economy Planning Unit), Pahang, dated 30 May 2005 /P23/. The letter has stated that AMDB shall pay 2.2% of Gross Revenue (Gross billing to TNB) annually. <i>The validation team concluded that the value applied is valid</i></p>
<i>Budgeted CER price (Euro/tCO₂e) throughout Kyoto commitment period (Until end 2012)</i>	<p><i>The validation team was able to verify the published article in website titled “Carbon 2006 Towards a truly global market, dated 28 February 2006” /P43/ page 25 & found that the budgeted CER price used in the financial calculation spreadsheet lies within the price category of 5 – 10 EUR / tCO₂e</i></p> <p><i>During the time when the investment decision was made, no ERPA was signed yet at that time & hence it was budgeted by the project participant</i></p> <p><i>The validation team concluded the value applied is appropriate</i></p>
<i>Budgeted CER price (Euro/tCO₂e) post Kyoto commitment period (2013 onwards)</i>	<p><i>The validation team considers the budgeted price for the CER post Kyoto commitment period as valid & conservative</i></p>
<i>Operation period (years)</i>	<p><i>The validation team has confirmed the operation period of the project activity to correspond with the expected lifetime of the project. This was determined based on the REPPA /P08/ signed between the National Utility company, TNB and AMDB Perting Hydro Sdn Bhd where TNB will only purchase the electricity for 21 years.</i></p>

(b) how the DOE confirmed that the total investment is suitable according to the VVM version 01.2 paragraph 111 (b), by only comparing the project activity with one other project; and

See table above – “Capital Expenditure”

(c) how the DOE has validated the 5% escalation of the O&M cost in line with the VVM version 01.2 paragraph 111.

See table above – “Operation & Maintenance Cost”

-- End --

Reference Documentation in Validation Report Section 2.1

/P06/	<p><i>a) Financial & Emission Reduction Calculations Excel Spreadsheets "Perting Hydro Cashflow 220110.xls"</i></p> <p><i>b) Financial & Emission Reduction Calculations Excel Spreadsheets "Attn 7-Perting Hydro Cashflow_time of investment decision"</i></p>
/P07/	<p>Site layout drawing – August 2005</p> <p>Technical drawing for penstock length – Jan 2007 (for construction)</p> <p>Technical specification for turbines & generators – <i>April 2006</i></p>
/P08/	Renewable Energy Power Purchase Agreement (REPPA), 29 November 2006
/P09/	<p>a) Letter of Award – Package A: Construction & Completion of Power Intake, Penstock, Powerhouse & Associated Civil & General Mechanical & Electrical Works, 21 December 2006</p> <p>b) Letter of Award – Package B: Design, Supply, Installation & Commissioning of Power Generating Equipment & Associated Works, 21 December 2006</p> <p>c) Letter of Award – Package C: Supply, Delivery, Laying, Jointing, Termination, Testing & Commissioning of 11 kV Transmission Line & Associated Works, 21 December 2006</p>
/P10/	Operation & Maintenance Agreement, 24 April 2007
/P11/	Flow duration curve of Sungai Perting
/P15/	Letter from AMDB Perting Hydro Sdn. Bhd. to Tenaga Nasional Berhad informing commencement of project dated 27 th April 2007, (Ref No. amdbpwr/ptghy/corresp_tnb270407)
/P16/	Letter of CDM inquiry from AMDB to Malaysian Energy Centre, dated 13 th May 2005.
/P21/	Project Management Consultancy Agreement between AMDB Perting Hydro Sdn Bhd and AMDB Power Services, dated 2 Feb 2007
/P22/	Insurance quotation slip quotation given by AON Insurance Brokers (Malaysia) Sdn Bhd.
/P23/	Approval letter (approving the mini hydropower development project for Sg Perting, by AMDB) received from Unit Perancang Ekonomi Negeri (State Economy Planning Unit), Pahang, dated 30 May 2005
/P28/	<p>Source: UNFCCC website</p> <p>Esajadi small hydropower project in Malaysia</p> <p>http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/JQA1205311728.41/view</p> <p>Project cost comparison spreadsheet</p>
/P29/	<p>Package A construction stop work order to civil contractor dated, 2 July 2007, (Ref No. PTGHY/002GN/010707(2))</p> <p>Package A construction start work order to civil contractor dated 15 Oct 2007, (Ref No. PTGHY/002GN/151007(3))</p>
/P30/	CDM Agreement finalized & signed with CDM consultant, SV Carbon Sdn. Bhd. dated 3 March 2008
/P31/	Announcement of AMDB Berhad become the subsidiary of AMCORP Group Berhad dated on 14th June, 2007

/P32/	Appointment of CEO on 30th July, 2007
/P34/	Signed ERPA, dated 23 November 2009
/P35/	Overview of Policy Instruments for the Promotion of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency in Malaysia http://www.serd.ait.ac.th/cogen/62/reports/countries/malaysia.pdf
/P36/	Ministry of Energy, Green Technology & Water Malaysia http://www.kettha.gov.my/en/content/small-renewable-energy-power-programme-srep
/P37/	Suruhanjaya Tenaga (Energy Commission) Malaysia http://www.st.gov.my/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=5245&Itemid=4228&lang=en
/P38/	<i>Milestone chart, Construction of Mini Hydro Power Plant at Sg Perting, Pahang, For AMDB Perting Hydro Sdn Bhd</i>
/P39/	<i>Internal memorandum : Sg Perting Mini Hydro Project In Bentong, Pahang Under The Small Renewable Energy Power Program – Approval To Proceed With The Project Implementation, dated 18 October 2006</i>
/P40/	<i>Offer letter received from Tenaga Nasional Berhad to AMDB Perting Hydro dated 22nd April 2006, (Ref No: TNB(B)/HEKO/PSTK 9/1/33)</i>
/P41/	<i>Overview of mini and small hydropower in Southeast Asia, Nathaniel C. Domingo, Fidelpio V. Ferraris, Prof. Rowaldo R. Del Mundo</i>
/P42/	<i>History currency exchange rate USD to MYR, year 2006</i>
/P43/	<i>Carbon 2006 Towards a truly global market, dated 28 February 2006</i>
P/44/	<i>Email CDM application for validation quotation, dated 27 June 2008</i>
/P45/	<i>Signed quotation with DOE for CDM validation, dated 22 September 2008</i>
/P46/	<i>Guidelines On The Demonstration And Assessment Of Prior Consideration Of The CDM, EB 49, Version 03</i>
/P47/	<i>Glossary of CDM Terms, Version 05</i>
/P48/	<i>Quotation /bids received from 2 potential carbon credit buyer dated 19 November 2008 & 17 April 2009</i>
/P49/	<i>Guidelines For The Reporting And Validation Of Plant Load Factors, EB 48, Version 01</i>