

Validation Protocol for 16MW Bagasse based cogeneration plant of GMR Industries Limited (GIDL) CDMVal0324

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	Conc l
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 a unilateral project. However it would assist Annex-1 Party/ies through the sale of CERs.	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	Copy of letter of approval from Indian DNA needs to be provided. Letter of approval provided dated 14 th June 2006 having F.No.4/12/2006-CCC	CAR1	OK CAR 1 close d out
1.3 All Parties (listed in Section A3 of the PDD) have ratified the Kyoto protocol and are allowed to participate in CDM projects		UNF CCC	India ratified the Kyoto Protocol on 26 th August 2002 and is allowed to participate. (http://unfccc.int/parties_and_observers/parties/items/2109.php)	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	Yes the project activity result in reduction of GHG emissions as it uses Bagasse and replaces fossil fuel (Coal) for the generation of electricity.	OK	OK
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		UNF CCC	The project is open for comments on the UNFCCC website from 13 th April 2006 to 12 th May 2006. http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Validation/view.html?ProjectId=F1LBKG6WJ	OK	OK

REQUIREMENT	MoV	Ref	Comment	Draft finding	Concl
			OVAD3V3Z6ENBJMJ8Z UXG9&OE=SGS-UKL		
1.6 The project has correctly completed a Project Design Document, using the current version and exactly following the guidance	DR	PDD	Pending CARs / NIRs	Pending	OK
1.7 The project shall not make use of Official Development Assistance (ODA), nor result in the diversion of such ODA	DR	PDD	No ODA is utilized	OK	OK
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?			Not Applicable	N/A	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			Not Applicable	N/A	OK
1.10 Is the current version of the PDD complete and does it clearly reflect all the information presented during the validation assessment.			Pending Closure of CARs / NIRs	Pending	OK
1.11 Does the PDD use accurate and reliable information that can be verified in an objective manner?			Yes, The PDD use accurate and reliable information that can be verified in 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	Yes, the project meet all the applicability criteria listed in the methodology	OK	OK
2.2 Is the project boundary consistent with the approved	PDD	DR	Yes, the project boundary is consistent with the	TBC	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
methodology			approved methodology. To be checked during site visit. It was checked physically by the local assessor and found to be in order as per PDD.		
2.3 Are the baseline emissions determined in accordance with the methodology described	PDD	DR	Yes, the baseline emissions are determined in accordance with the methodology. There are no baseline emissions due to biomass decay or burning of anthropogenic sources. To be checked during site visit. There was no biomass decay happening at the site as seen by the local assessor physically during site visit.	TBC	OK
2.4 Are the project emissions determined in accordance with the methodology described	PDD	DR	Yes, the project emissions are determined in accordance with the methodology. To be checked during site visit. It was checked through excel sheets and each figure was checked and found to be OK.	TBC	OK
2.5 Is the leakage op the project activity determined in accordance with the methodology described	PDD	DR	No leakage is considered as per the methodology.	OK	OK
2.6 Are the emission reductions determined in accordance with the methodology described	PDD	DR	Pending data to be checked during site visit. Checked during site visit by the local assessor. Emission reductions in revised PDD increased so raised in U K Findings.	Pending NIR12	OK NIR12 Closed out

Table 3 Additionality (Ref: PDD Section B3 and AM)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
--------------------	------	------	----------	----------------	----------------

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	Yes, the PDD follow all the steps required in the methodology to determine the additionality.	OK	OK
3.2 Is the discussion on the additionality clear and have all assumptions been supported by transparent and documented evidence	PDD	DR	Starting date of the project activity is not mentioned. Documented evidences are to be provided by the Client. Sub step 2c and 2d are not clear. Excel sheet needs to be provided. Common practice analysis is not transparent.	CAR2	OK CAR 2 Close d
3.3 Does the selected baseline represent the most likely scenario among other possible and/or discussed scenarios?	PDD	DR	Yes, the baseline represents the most likely baseline scenario among the possible scenarios.	OK	OK
3.4 Is it demonstrated/justified that the project activity itself is not a likely baseline scenario	PDD	DR	Yes the project activity itself is not a baseline scenario as there is no legislation or law which says that the sugar industry has to export power to grid.	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	Yes, the PDD meet all the applicability criteria	OK	OK
4.2 Does the PDD provide for the monitoring of the baseline emissions as required in the monitoring methodology	PDD	DR	There is no baseline emissions considered for the project activity due to biomass decay. The baseline emission for displacement of electricity is monitored as per monitoring methodology.	OK	OK
4.3 Does the PDD provide for the monitoring of the project emissions as required in the monitoring	PDD	DR	Yes, the PDD provides the monitoring of the project emissions as	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
methodology			required in the monitoring methodology.		
4.4 Does the PDD provide for the monitoring of the leakage as required in the monitoring methodology	PDD	DR	No leakage is considered.	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	Yes, as the company is a ISO9001 company so procedures are in place.	OK	OK

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	PDD	DR	The project proponent claims that the project leads to sustainable development and environmental impacts are minimal. No EIA is required. Pending CAR1. CAR1 closed	Pending	OK
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	OK
5.1.2 Is the choice of indicators for sustainability development (social, environmental, economic) reasonable?			Not Applicable	N/A	OK
5.1.3 Will it be possible to monitor the specified sustainable development indicators?			Not applicable	N/A	OK
5.1.4 Are the sustainable development indicators	PDD	DR	Pending closure of CAR 1 (Host country Approval)	Pending	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
in line with stated national priorities in the Host Country?					
5.2 Project Management Planning					
5.2.1 Is the authority and responsibility of project management clearly described?	PDD	DR	Yes, the authority and responsibility of project management clearly described.	OK	OK
5.2.2 Is the authority and responsibility for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting clearly described?	PDD	DR	No, data missing on authority and responsibility for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting	NIR3	OK NIR3 close d out
5.2.3 Are procedures identified for training of monitoring personnel?	PDD	DR	Yes, to be checked during site visit. Training schedule was provided to the local assessor.	TBC	OK
5.2.4 Are procedures identified for emergency preparedness for cases where emergencies can cause unintended emissions?	PDD	DR	No need for emergency preparedness in data monitoring is visualized by the project proponent. To be checked by local assessor. It was checked by local assessor that there is no scope for unintended emissions.	TBC	OK
5.2.5 Are procedures identified for calibration of monitoring equipment?	PDD	DR	GIDL is ISO-9001 company so procedure will be in place. To be checked during site visit. Calibration certificates provided to local assessor.	TBC	OK
5.2.6 Are procedures identified for maintenance of monitoring equipment and installations?	PDD	DR	Yes, to be checked during site visit. It was checked that the proper maintenance schedule was there for the monitoring equipments and installations.	TBC	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
5.2.7 Are procedures identified for monitoring, measurements and reporting?	PDD	DR	Yes, to be checked during site visit. It was checked by local assessor that the procedure for daily monitoring , measurement and reporting is in place.	TBC	OK
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	Yes, to be checked during site visit. It was checked by local assessor that the records will be kept for two years according to monitoring plan.	TBC	OK
5.2.9 Are procedures identified for dealing with possible monitoring data adjustments and uncertainties?	PDD	DR	No, data is missing for possible monitoring data adjustments and uncertainties.	NIR4	OK NIR4 Close d out
5.2.10 Are procedures identified for review of reported results/data?	PDD	DR	Yes, to be checked during site visit. During site visit it was also checked that the reported results will be reviewed by the project manager.	TBC	OK
5.2.11 Are procedures identified for internal audits of GHG project compliance with operational requirements where applicable?	PDD	DR	Yes, to be reviewed during site visit. It was checked that the internal audit team will be set up which will be doing the internal audit as per CDM requirement.	TBC	OK
5.2.12 Are procedures identified for project performance reviews before data is submitted for verification, internally or externally?	PDD	DR	Yes, procedure are in place for project performance review before data is submitted for verification internally , externally.	OK	OK
5.2.13 Are procedures identified for corrective actions in order to provide for more accurate future monitoring and reporting?	PDD	DR	No, procedures for corrective actions to provide more accurate future monitoring and reporting is not mentioned	NIR5	OK NIR5 Close d out

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			clearly in PDD		

Table 6 Environmental Impacts (Ref PDD Section F 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	No significant impacts expected.	OK	OK
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 not required as per the guidelines of APPCB.	OK	OK
6.3 Will the project create any adverse environmental effects?	PDD	DR	No, the project does not create any adverse environmental effects.	OK	OK
6.4 Are transboundary environmental impacts considered in the analysis?	PDD	DR	Yes, no adverse impacts	OK	OK
6.5 Have identified environmental impacts been addressed in the project design?	PDD	DR	Yes, No negative impacts seen or reported.	OK	OK
6.6 Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country?	PDD	DR	Yes, the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country.	OK	OK

Table 7 Comments by local stakeholders (Ref PDD Section G)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
7.1 Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	PDD	DR	List of stakeholders consulted to be provided. Rephrased in PDD.	NIR6	OK NIR6 close d out
7.2 Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?	PDD	DR	Yes, appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders.	OK	OK
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 process is not required as per law.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
7.4 Is a summary of the stakeholder comments received provided?	PDD	DR	Summary of stakeholder comments is not clearly mentioned in PDD	CAR7	OK CAR7 Close d out
7.5 Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	PDD	DR	Due account of stakeholder comments Not mentioned in PDD clearly.	CAR8	OK CAR8 Close d out

Table 8 Other requirements

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
8.1 Project Design Document					
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 project correctly applies the PDD template.	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
8.2 Technology to be employed					
8.2.1 Does the project design engineering reflect current good practices?	PDD	DR	Yes, the project design engineering reflects current good practices.	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	Yes, the project uses state of art technology.	OK	OK
8.3 Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period?	PDD	DR	Not likely to be changed during the crediting period.	OK	OK
8.2.4 Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to	PDD	DR	Training requirement not mentioned in the PDD	NIR9	OK NIR9

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
work as presumed during the project period?			clearly. Rephrased in PDD version 2.		Close d out
8.3 Duration of the Project/ Crediting Period					
8.3.1 Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?	PDD	DR	Project starting date is not mentioned. Operational lifetime is clearly mentioned. Rephrased in PDD version 2.	CAR10	OK CAR1 0 Close d out
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	Yes, crediting time is clearly defined 3X7 years.	OK	OK
8.3.3 Does the project's operational lifetime exceed the crediting period	PDD	DR	Yes, 25 years but contradicting with financial analysis of additionality in sub step 2c. Rephrased in PDD version 2.	CAR11	OK CAR1 1 Close d out

- oOo -